Women's lives at the crossroads of social science and social policy, c.1870-1920: a collective biography

Janice Tripney

University College London

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

I, Janice Tripney, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

ABSTRACT

Women barely feature in histories of the social sciences in Britain, and their influence as producers of social knowledge on the origins of modern social policies is insufficiently appreciated. This thesis remedies this neglect by researching a variety of women and women's experiences of pursuing social science, mostly in England but with occasional examples from Scotland and Wales. Set against a backdrop of social change and legislative reforms from around 1870 to 1920, it examines the motives and influences that drew women to social science, how they negotiated access to and participation in intellectual activities, the facilitating role of overlapping organisations and social networks, and the outcomes of their actions. I approach the topic from a feminist perspective and address the lack of discussion of women's education and activities as emergent social scientists in the extant literature.

Central to the investigation was the selection of pragmatism as the research paradigm and the combined use of prosopography and collective biography to gather and analyse a dataset containing biographical information on 188 women, many previously forgotten. Data were drawn from a range of sources, including biographical dictionaries and autobiographical accounts. The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography was of special significance to the study. Generational differences were considered through use of Olive Banks' (1986) schema, namely two birth cohorts (1849-1871 and 1872-1891) which roughly correspond to the first and second generation of women's higher education.

The social sciences took shape in close interaction with the making of modern social policies. The argument that women were important agents in this process runs as an implicit thread throughout the thesis, contributing to knowledge on the relationship between research and policy. As the first study to attempt to identify all women in the formative years, the analysis reveals that women's early interaction with the social sciences was more widespread, and more diverse, than previously acknowledged. It contributes new dimensions to our understanding of the shifting identities and porous borders between academic and non-academic social science, and enables greater appreciation of women's influence in policy processes through

intellectual collaborations and contributions that often challenged and crossed disciplinary, institutional and role boundaries.

IMPACT STATEMENT

The findings of this study allow for a deeper understanding of the role of women as producers and mobilisers of social scientific knowledge, revealing their motives, contributions and achievements as a group and individually. To reach relevant beneficiaries and generate impact, research outputs will be published in scholarly journals to reach academics, and in other formats such as magazine articles so that the study results reach the broadest possible audiences. As well as targeted publications, two additional strategies that offer breadth and depth of influence in disseminating knowledge will be used to promote interaction with this research and help achieve wider benefits. First, new Wikipedia articles of women included in this study who do not already have one will be produced, drawing on the preliminary analyses advanced in my thesis. Outreach events (edit-a-thons) designed to bring together academics and non-academics to generate and improve Wikipedia content could be organised to facilitate this. Second, the creation of an interactive website underpinned by the prosopographical database that is the foundation of this thesis will ensure different stakeholders are better informed about early women in social science. Extensive search functionalities and graphical visualisations of relationships and networks will enable users to access and navigate through the collected data in an intuitive way. A website would make the research more visible to the academic community, benefiting future scholarship. An integrated blog with frequently updated content could be used to reach wider audiences. The resource could be developed over time as new biographical information becomes available and encourage user-generated content. A project advisory group would comprise experts from academia, professional and civil society organisations, and the public. Examples of similar collaborative initiatives include the *Visualising Historical Networks* project https://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~histecon/visualizing/graphing/economists.html; the *Orlando* project http://orlando.cambridge.org; and the *Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* project http://www.sixdegreesoffrancisbacon.com/.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT....1
IMPACT STATEMENT....2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....7
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS....8
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION....9
1.1 Overlooked lives: women in the early history of social science....9
1.2 Personal is political: influences in arriving at the thesis....17
1.2.1 Feminist scholarship: developing theoretical perspectives....17
1.2.2 Situating myself....20
1.3 Writing the lives of early women in social science....24
1.3.1 Using a contextual biographical approach....25
1.3.2 Fundamental concepts and definitions....30
1.4 Structure of the thesis....37
1.5 A note on women's names....39
1.6 A note on degree names and awards....40
CHAPTER 2. TRANSFORMATION IN BRITAIN, c.1870-1920....42
2.1 Government involvement in social and economic life in Britain....42
2.2 Wider transformations reshaping British society....45
2.2.1 Industrialisation and its social, economic, and cultural consequences....45
2.2.2 Politics and participation....51
2.2.3 Education reform and the changing role of the universities....53
2.2.4 Bureaucratic transformation....55
2.2.5 Transformation of intellectual life, in and beyond the universities....57
2.3 Explaining the advent of modern social policies – theoretical perspectives....61
2.3.1 Functionalism....61
2.3.2 Power resources....62
2.3.3 Historical institutionalism....63
2.3.4 Ideas and knowledge-bearing groups....64
2.3.5 Gender analysis and feminist research....66
2.4 Research aims, objectives and question....68
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY....70
3.1 Getting personal: knowledge production and reflexivity....71
3.2 Selecting biography....73
3.2.1 The turn towards biographical approaches in the social sciences....73
3.2.2 Researching groups of lives....75

3.3 Overview of the research strategy used in this study 82
3.4 Identifying the biographical subjects 83
3.4.1 Defining the research subjects: the formal selection criteria 83
3.4.2 Compiling the first round of names: sources 85
3.4.3 Compiling the first round of names: extracting names 89
3.4.4 Compiling the first round of names: verifying dates and removing duplicates 90
3.4.5 Applying the selection criteria to identify research subjects 91
3.5 Data collection 91
3.5.1 Methods for creating the biographical records 92
3.5.2 Data sources 94
3.5.3 Incomplete and imprecise data 95
3.6 From analysis to interpretation 98
3.7 Data management and storage 99
3.8 Ethical considerations 100
CHAPTER 4. THE FORMATIVE YEARS: CLASS, FAMILY AND SCHOOLING ... 103
4.1 Who were these women and where and when were they born? 104
4.2 Social origins 106
4.3 Childhood family background 116
4.4 Childhood education 125
4.5 Concluding remarks 134
CHAPTER 5. MAKING A WAY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: HIGHER LEARNING 135
5.1 The opening of higher education to women in Britain 135
5.2 General patterns of university entry 137
5.3 Studying for a first degree: places of study 141
5.4 Studying for a first degree: subjects studied 149
5.5 Studying for a first degree in the social sciences 155
5.6 Advanced studies in the social sciences 172
5.7 Concluding remarks 183
CHAPTER 6. MAKING A WAY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: PURSUING CAREERS ... 184
6.1 “If you compete with us, we shan’t marry you” 184
6.2 Career paths within and outside the academy: an overview 192
6.3 Professionalisation of social science: women in the academic world 194
6.3.1 Appointments, obstacles, and opportunities 195
6.3.2 Academic networks of support 199
6.4 Careers beyond the university 200
6.4.1 Independent 201

6.4.2 Social science and social reform 203
6.4.3 Expertise in and around government 207
6.6 Concluding remarks 209
CHAPTER SEVEN: PRODUCING AND MOBILISING KNOWLEDGE 211
7.1 Producing knowledge 211
7.2 Mobilising knowledge and connections 216
7.3 Concluding remarks 228
CHAPTER EIGHT: PROMOTING AND SUPPORTING POLICY CHANGE 229
8.1 Evaluating influence and contributions to policy development 229
8.2 Case study: Child poverty and its alleviation 231
8.3 Case study: Sweated industries and the minimum wage campaign 235
8.3 Case study. Mobilising social knowledge and connections for war work 241
8.4 Concluding remarks 247
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION 249
9.1 Women and early social science: an assessment 249
9.2 Gender and the politics of memorialisation 259
9.3 Reflections on my research journey 262
9.3.1 Methodological and practical issues that arose during the research 263
9.3.2 Negotiating the authorial self and self-reflexivity in my writing 269
9.4 Implications and recommendations for future research 270
9.5 A final comment about the future 274
APPENDIX A.1: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REFORMS 276
APPENDIX A.2: DATA SOURCES 279
APPENDIX A.3: SELECTION OF SUBJECTS 301
APPENDIX A.4: DATA COLLECTION TOOL 321
APPENDIX A.5: WOMEN ARRANGED BY DATE OF BIRTH 328
APPENDIX A.6: SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS BY STUDIED WOMEN 334
APPENDIX A.7: KEY BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON EACH INDIVIDUAL 374
APPENDIX A.8: MATERIAL MARKED FOR FOLLOW-ON RESEARCH 406
APPENDIX A.9: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN THE TEXT 408

Table of Figures

Table 4.1: Countries of birth (analysis by cohort and whole group) 105
Table 4.2: Social origins of sample (analysis by cohort and whole group)..... 107
Table 4.3: Political origins (analysis by cohort and whole group)..... 117
Table 4.4: Childhood education (analysis by cohort and whole group)..... 127
Table 5.1: Women's right to participate in higher education: legislative timeline ... 136
Table 5.2: Highest level of education (analysis by cohort and whole group) 137
Table 5.3: University/college attended (analysis by cohort and whole group)..... 143
Table 5.4: Undergraduate institutions[a]..... 147
Table 5.5: Undergraduate subject areas (analysis by cohort and whole group) 152
Table 5.6: Social science first degrees: decade started[a] 156
Table 5.7: Postgraduate subject areas (analysis by cohort and whole group)[a]..... 173
Table 5.8: Postgraduate institutions (all subjects)[a] 173
Table 5.9: Social science advanced degrees: decade started[a]..... 174
Table 6.1: Career paths (analysis by cohort and whole group)..... 193
Table A.3.1: Selection process detailing reason for exclusion 301
Table A.3.2: Sources used to identify research subjects 301
Table A.3.3: Initial list of names 302
Table A.7.1: Demographic information for 188 included women..... 374

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing this doctoral thesis has been one of the most challenging experiences in my professional life. I cannot thank my supervisor, Professor Miriam David, enough for her valuable direction, patience, and unwavering support. To her more than anyone my thanks are due.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

COS	Charity Organisation Society
CSU	Christian Social Union
FWF	Fabian Women's Group
ILP	Independent Labour Party
LSE	London School of Economics
NAPSS	National Association for the Promotion of Social Science
NBCA	National Birth Control Association
NBCC	National Birth Control Council
NCUMC	National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child
NFWW	National Federation of Working Women
NHS	National Health Society
NUSEC	National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship
NUWSS	National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies
NUWW	National Union of Women Workers
SAU	Shop Assistants' Union
SPEW	Society for Promoting the Employment of Women
TGWU	Transport and General Workers' Union
TUC	Trades Union Congress
UCL	University College London
ULPS	Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues
VWS	Victoria Women's Settlement
WCG	Women's Cooperative Guild
WEDL	Women's Employment Defence League
WIC	Women's Industrial Council
WLL	Women's Labour League
WNLA	Women's National Liberal Association
WPPL	Women's Protective and Provident League
WTUA	Women's Trades Union Association
WTUL	Women's Trades Union League
WUS	Women's University Settlement

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter sets out the background, context, and motivation for my work on women, social science, and social policy. I outline why I chose a period of half a century from roughly 1870 to 1920. My purpose in so doing is to get a broader understanding of how women struggled not only for the vote, or suffrage, but also for a wider social, political, and cultural place in public life. As a feminist social scientist, I want to not only celebrate extraordinary, trailblazing women but also to look back to find out more about so-called ordinary women who are under-recognised in existing histories but who deserve to be remembered for their work. This chapter introduces how I managed to find almost 200 such women and how I delve into their lives and begin to paint a picture of how women's lives were changing and what contribution such women made to these transformations.

This introduction includes five main elements. The first section will address the scope and rationale for the study and articulates what I hope to accomplish. Next, it will discuss influences in arriving at the thesis. Third, I explain the biographical approach used, with special attention given to defining important terms and concepts. The thesis structure is outlined in the fourth section. I finish with notes on how I approached women's names, and the naming of academic degrees and awards.

1.1 Overlooked lives: women in the early history of social science

Scholars disagree on when exactly the British welfare state was created (Powell, 2020), but many writers point to the importance of the years between 1870 and 1920 as a decisive period of administrative and legislative innovation, when the institutions and practices of a more interventionist form of government were established (Digby, 1989; Fraser, 2003; Pierson, 2006). This was also a time of great transformation and development within the social sciences. Fundamental shifts occurred in the rivalry between, on the one hand, predominantly deductive, philosophical understandings of social science and, on the other, empirical approaches that rejected metaphysics and insisted upon a more detached, scientific study of society (Bulmer, 1982). The creation of new knowledge about economic

and social life was further aided by the emergence of modern universities and professions (Fontaine and Backhouse, 2014).

Separately, these developments are well known to scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Two distinct fields of work have in recent years drawn out new insights by bringing these histories into conversation. Responding to the arguments put forward by Philip Abrams (1968) and Perry Anderson (1968), later commentators have challenged their observation that British social science was simply a tool for bureaucratic government that frustrated the later development of academic sociology in Britain. Lawrence Goldman offers a useful summary of their position, concluding that 'the failure to establish a clear-cut discipline called sociology at any time before the mid-twentieth century, if then, may not have been the product of intellectual weakness but of the successful penetration of what C. Wright Mills called "the sociological imagination" into many areas of British thought and public practice' (2007a, p.436). John Scott and Ray Bromley (2013, p.1) 'show the inadequacy' of Abrams and Anderson's claims through their study of a group of theorists led by Patrick Geddes, the noted sociologist and urban planner. More recently, Plamena Panayotova writes that Abrams' interpretation 'displays major weaknesses, not least a bias in favour of theoretical sociology together with a limited understanding of statistics' (2020, p.15). Others have challenged existing explanations about the development of modern social policy in the century before 1914. Peter Wagner et al. (1991) and more recently Kerstin Brückweh et al. (2012) are among several influential volumes to have responded to interpretations that focus almost exclusively on the impact of structural changes and class-based pressures and demands, with an argument about the relevance of social science knowledge to policymaking. This body of work has sought to stress, as Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol put it, the 'contribution of ideas, of knowledge-bearing groups, and of knowledge-generating institutions' (1996, p.30).

Both bodies of research invariably connect social knowledge in Victorian and Edwardian Britain with men. Among the most well-remembered figures are Henry Mayhew (journalist and social investigator of relevance to contemporary ethnography); Herbert Spencer (philosopher and sociologist who applied Darwinian evolution to social life); Charles Booth (shipowner, philanthropist and social

researcher who led a monumental investigation of working-class conditions in London and later influenced the government in the establishment of the old age pension); Seebohm Rowntree (industrialist and researcher known for his studies of poverty in York); Alfred Marshall (one of the most influential economists of his time); and Arthur Bowley (pioneer in developing sampling techniques) (Englander and O'Day, 1995). Much more neglected has been women's involvement in the production and mobilisation of new kinds of social knowledge in this period. The crux of my argument in this work is that women were active participants in this process. Thus, the task that I undertake is to disrupt the overlooked history of these pioneering women, setting them in a wider context that includes important advances in educational and career opportunities for women, the building of a professional and disciplinary base for the social sciences, and the early development of social policy in Britain.

Although some are less well-remembered than others, women belonging to the social science community in its formative years included, among many others, Minnie Haskins (sociologist and poet); Edith Hogg (political activist who investigated "fur pullers", a group of home workers who prepared rabbit skins); Barbara Drake (prominent trade unionist); Eglantyne Jebb (economist and social reformer who founded the Save the Children organisation); Ethel Bentham (pioneer of social medicine who co-investigated the daily lives of working-class families in Lambeth, published as a book *Round About a Pound a Week*, written by Maud Pember Reeves); Eleanor Marx (Karl Marx's daughter and a member of the Women's Industrial Council); Mabel Atkinson (economist who was active in the campaign for women's suffrage); and Florence Bell (anti-suffragist and author of *At the Works: A Study of a Manufacturing Town*). While by no means a formal grouping, examples such as these highlight what it meant to be a woman in social science in this period. They occupy different positions in time and space, embedded within a context of social structures and institutions that shaped the opportunities available to them. Some individuals had ties to formative academic disciplines. Social science was their primary professional pursuit, and they devoted themselves exclusively to teaching and research. For others, social science was one among many interests and did not dominate their professional lives. Such women often did not regard themselves as social scientists although engaged in much the same work as those

who did. Alternatively, social science was something that women engaged in for a short period of time before they married or took up career opportunities elsewhere.

Women as producers of social knowledge have been shown to be largely absent from mainstream histories of social science. As said of political geography in 2004, but with an argument that is applicable more widely in the social sciences: 'The marginalisation – and even exclusion – of gender and of feminist perspectives has yielded a field that is partial in the understandings and knowledges produced within it' (Staeheli et al., 2004, p.1). However, although women's contributions are rarely acknowledged, and none gets full coverage as a major founder, they have not been ignored entirely in traditional accounts of social science during its formative years. The achievements of the few eminent individuals do feature and are generally recognised and appreciated. Tim Delaney (2013), for example, has a chapter on contributions from women to classical social theory. John Scott (2007) includes four women (Jane Addams, Helen Bosanquet, Harriet Martineau; Beatrice Webb) in a book covering 50 key sociologists writing principally in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Feminist work on the history of women in social science has been articulated since the 1980s to provide an important corrective to male-centred accounts, overlapping with research on women's exclusion from the natural sciences (see, for example, Fara, 2018; Jones, 2017; Richmond, 2001; Rossiter, 1993; Watts, 2007). The first studies were often inspired by a desire to recover the names of lost women in social science and find female role models. Consequently, biographical/bio-bibliographical dictionaries were some of the earliest works produced, offering first step towards a coherent, comprehensive story. Specialising in the history of sociology in America, Mary Jo Deegan (1991) edited one of the first reference sources to document women's contributions to and influence on sociology, from the 1840s to 1990. Kristen Madden and colleagues (2004) did the same for economics, collating information on women who published on economic issues from 1770 through 1940. Another group of studies published in the 1990s and beyond offer broad historical surveys of the history of social science from a gender and class perspective, with limited attention to individual lives (Martin, 2008; Silverberg, 1998; Yeo, 1996).

Other scholars placed their analytical focus on selected groups of prominent women. Lynn McDonald (1993; 1994) re-examined the role that British, French, and American women played in founding the empirical social sciences from the sixteenth through the early twentieth centuries. Polkinghorn and Thomson (1998) present a collective biography of eight women economists from the eighteenth century to the present, including five British contributors (Jane Marcet, Harriet Martineau, Millicent Fawcett, Beatrice Webb, and Joan Robinson). Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998) include two of these women (Martineau and Webb) in making a case for the active and significant presence of sixteen women in the creation of sociology and social theory in the founding period, 1830-1930. A different approach is used by Grant et al. (2002). Their study examined articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology* between 1895 and 1940, comparing sociological writings by women and men to demonstrate how their writings and theories differ and were shaped by their gendered experiences.

Turning specifically to Britain and the years spanned by this project, one of the deepest areas of scholarship is on Beatrice Webb, for whom there is a lot of biographical material. Described on her death by John Maynard Keynes as ‘the greatest woman of the generation now passing’ (Letter to George Bernard Shaw, quoted in Skidelsky, 2000), she was both a prominent pioneer of social science in Britain and a leading social reformer. As the subject of over 30 biographies, Webb is characterised in several ways. While Beatrice Webb “the socialist” has dominated the literature, studies emphasising her contribution to sociology (Romano, 1998), ethnography (Ardis 1990), public administration (Eriguchi, 2009), and social policy (Harris, 1989) are part of a body of literature exploring the wider significance of her work and thought. She was not formally trained, having learned social science through the philosopher Herbert Spencer, a friend of her parents. Primarily because of him, she developed ‘a passion for ascertaining facts and discovering their relevance to theories of society and of human and animal behaviour’ (Cole, 1946, pp.13-14). While holding no formal academic position, she regularly lectured on a wide range of social science topics and made significant contributions to methodology, including writing the first research methods textbook in Britain, *Methods of Social Study* (1932). As a young woman she conducted her own independent empirical investigations and collaborated with Charles Booth on the

major study of her age, *Life and Labour of the People in London*.[1] In a research career that spanned 40 years, she researched and co-authored classic works in the tradition of empirical sociology, including a ground-breaking analysis of trade unionism, *Industrial Democracy* (1897). Along with her husband and others, she was central to the creation of several important institutions established in Britain in the late nineteenth century to support and develop the emerging social sciences, including the Fabian Society (1884) and the London School of Economics and Political Science, henceforth shortened to London School of Economics, or LSE (1895). In 1913, she also co-founded the New Statesman, an influential monthly periodical concerned with sociological issues.

Webb was well known within the network of scholars and activists associated with Hull House, a settlement house associated with the University of Chicago, co-founded in 1889 by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, following the example of Toynbee Hall in the East End of London. She visited Chicago and influenced the making of the *Hull-House Maps and Papers*, published in 1895. She came to know Edith Abbott, another prominent member of the Chicago circle, who arrived in England in 1906 to study at LSE and would later model her Methods of Social Investigation course at the University of Chicago after one taught by Webb (Costin, 2003; Deegan, 1988).

As a politically engaged social scientist working within the tradition of empirical social investigation, Webb had a formidable influence upon policy-making processes in Britain. During the 1890s, she served on the Royal Commission on Capital and Labour. In 1905, she was appointed to the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress, a body set up by Parliament to investigate how the system should be reformed and was largely responsible for drafting the Minority Report of that commission. Underlining the structural causes of poverty, her exhaustively researched report, for which Marion Phillips and Amy Harrison among others were researchers, was largely dismissed or ignored at the time (Offer, 2009). After her death, its recommendations were seen by many as having prepared the political and

[1] This is the title that the work is commonly known by, but it was earlier published under slightly different titles; for further details, see Bales (1999, pp.156-7).

intellectual foundations of the welfare state set up by post-war governments (Broschart, 1991; Knight, 2011; Ward, 2011).

An initial impression from reading the literature is that relatively little effort has been made to go beyond well-known personalities with large archive sources, such as Beatrice Webb, who tend to be examined in successive accounts, with analyses of less prominent women of this period generally given limited space. On closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that in recent years there has been an increasing interest in showing that women had a role in the development of the social sciences. Some time ago, researchers uncovered women's participation in the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (NAPSS), also known as the Social Science Association, an organisation at its height in the 1850s and 1860s (Martel, 1986; McCrone, 1982). Ground-breaking and original research by Maxine Berg (1989; 1992) pointed out the pioneering role of networks of women economic historians at LSE and in the early years of the Economic History Society. She followed up with a full-length biography of Eileen Power, one of the few women to make their careers as lecturer and then as professor at LSE (Berg, 1996). More recent biographies include Ann Oakley's (2011) study of the first woman to sit in the House of Lords, Barbara Wootton, who wrote on economics, politics, and the social sciences; and Grażyna Kubica's (2020) examination of the life and work of Maria Czaplicka, the first female lecturer in anthropology at Oxford University. Other women to frequent the pages of existing histories, some of whom have been subjects of full biographies, are Helen Bosanquet, (e.g., Lewis, 1991; McBriar, 1987); Violet Butler (e.g., Freeman, 2001; Smith et al., 2014); Margaret Harkness (e.g., Oakley, 2019); Shena Simon (e.g., Martin, 2003); Beatrice Edgell (e.g., Valentine, 2010); Clementina Black (e.g., Janssen, 2018; Oakley, 2019); and Hilda Ormsby (e.g., Maddrell, 2009).

Often grounded in a contextual biographical approach, these pioneering works have considerably enriched our understanding of women's place in, and contribution to, social science in Britain, the discriminatory practices at play, as well as ways in which social scientific knowledge has been shaped. Some have been significant in drawing attention to the close connection with social reform, as well as feminist perspectives and gender as an analytical concept. Nevertheless, existing studies

involving historians, sociologists, and others, tell only a partial, incomplete story. First, in advancing the question of women's early involvement in social science, much of the existing literature focuses on academic social science. This overlooks the fact that universities did not dominate intellectual life in the late Victorian period or the first half of the twentieth century. Consequently, it largely misses an opportunity to consider practitioners who worked outside or on the margins of academic life, and the different purposes knowledge was acquired for, particularly in relation to policymaking and practice. Second, there has been insufficient interest thus far in going beyond well-known personalities with large archive sources, such as Beatrice Webb, who tend to be examined in successive accounts. The influence of so-called minor figures in social science is still largely overlooked or at best underestimated, resulting in studies that are not representative of the breadth of social science work and practice. Research has tended to remember such women as Eleanor Rathbone, Eva Hubback, and Margaret MacDonald almost exclusively as social reformers, or trade unionists. Third, there has been no sustained work to join up existing studies into a coherent field. No single study exists which attempts to recover the entirety of women's early contributions to social science.

These drawbacks raise the question of whether there may be other women deserving of wider recognition, but who have yet to be recognised by scholars. Without deeper understanding of who these women were, we cannot say whether Beatrice Webb's background, motivation and experiences of social science are typical. Pat Thane makes a similar point in recent work: 'It is difficult to generalize from Beatrice Webb's experience to understand how women of her generation did and did not progress in the scientific system' (2020, p.149). Only when we have a more accurate sense of who was involved in social science might we be able to assess their contributions as they negotiated their complex positions both within and beyond the academy.

As such, there remains a need to substantiate women's early involvement in social science, by assessing their overall numbers, their social and intellectual backgrounds and connections, and their contributions. More work is also needed to understand why the work of women is absent from our understanding of the development and dissemination of social scientific knowledge. It is the intention of

this thesis to overcome some of the drawbacks just mentioned, extend earlier work, and fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge of women in social science during its formative years. The aim is to achieve as broad a picture of early women in social science as possible, to understand their motivation and assess their role, without sacrificing their individuality. To that end, I use a tried and tested method of feminist social scientists, which I shall outline, namely that of collective biography, combined with prosopography. I want to see the similarities and differences in women's experiences shaped by the historical context through which they have lived, and show how often, as so-called second-wave feminists have frequently argued, the "personal is political" (David, 2003).

1.2 Personal is political: influences in arriving at the thesis

The idea of a connection between the personal and the political is a significant legacy of the 1970s feminist movement. By calling attention to the interconnection between public and private spheres, it underscored the connections between the personal experiences of women and larger social and political structures. Topics such as housework, childcare and reproductive rights were raised as political issues that could be readdressed through political action. As noted at the time by Ann Oakley: 'whatever else feminist politics have done in the last decade, they have broadened the concept of the political'. 'Politics, in any and every sense', she continued, 'is about power, and it is as much about the power that men, wittingly or unwittingly, exercise over women as it is about the power that presidents and prime ministers wield over nations' (1981, p.310).

The claim that "the personal is political" has long been recognised as the definitive slogan of the 1970s. Although remaining one of the bedrocks of feminist theory and practice, it clearly means different things to different people. A brief account of how my understanding has informed the current investigation is outlined next, starting with the scholarship that has served as both foundation and inspiration for my work, then moving on to my own life and experiences.

1.2.1 Feminist scholarship: developing theoretical perspectives

A brief survey of feminist scholarship gives a sense of what feminist approaches offer this study. The 1970s saw a renewed focus on women in history, that might be thought a product of the feminist movement. Challenging historians and others to

shift the emphases of mainstream narratives to include women, it was suggested that writing women into history implied ‘not only a new history of women, but also a new history’ (Gordon et al., 1976, p.89). Women’s history, John Tosh observed in his classic guide to the subject, *The Pursuit of History*, has ‘done more than any other recent radical innovation to modify the shape of the discipline, enlarging its subject-matter and influencing its modes of explanation’ (2000, p.127).

First published in 1973, *Hidden from History: 300 Years of Women’s Oppression and the Fight Against It*, by British sociologist and historian Sheila Rowbotham, is often regarded as the catalyst for the “taking off” of women’s history in the UK. Offering a new account of women’s changing position in England from the sixteenth century to the 1930s, Rowbotham drew upon a diverse range of secondary sources ‘to bring to light those women who had remained “hidden from history”, yet who were of vital significance to both industrial and political protest and early feminism’ (Gleadle, 2001, p.1). Rowbotham was quickly followed by other investigations that redressed the balance of study, recovering the lives, experiences, and mentalities of women and their role as active participants in history. Pioneering work included a collection of essays edited by Martha Vicinus on women in Victorian society (1977); research on the women’s suffrage movement at grassroots level by Jill Liddington and Jill Norris (1978); and Joan Kelly’s seminal essay, *Did Women have a Renaissance?* Since then, many writers have made important contributions, prompting, as Sue Morgan puts it, ‘the widespread re-examination of fundamental historical presuppositions, not least through vastly democratising the vision of who and what should figure in historical discourse’ (2009, p.381).

The early work was not greeted with enthusiasm by all feminist scholars. Some expressed a concern that, without a theoretical basis, women’s history ran the risk of remaining marginalised within universities and other academic institutions (Kelly, 1984). Other arguments went further. Kathryn Gleadle, for example, noted critics’ insistence that ‘such a project … threatens to essentialise ‘woman’ and to elide and obscure the myriad of cultural, sexual, social and racial differences which … comprise the term’ (2001, p.3). Dissatisfied scholars also claimed that ‘stories designed to celebrate women’s agency began to seem predictable and repetitious

… information gathering to prove a point that has already been made' (Scott, 2004, p.22).

Academic feminists increasingly shifted their focus to the cultural category of gender. Writing in 1972 and 'balanced on the cusp of a new women's liberation movement', Ann Oakley's *Sex*, *Gender and Society* provided an early insight into the 'ways in which sex and gender are constructed, understood and represented' (1972, p.3). On the other side of the Atlantic, Natalie Zemon Davis, addressing the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians in 1974, argued against 'treating women in isolation from men', urging instead that 'we should now be interested in the history of both women and men … Our goal is to understand the significance of the sexes, of gender groups in the historical past' (Davis, 1976, p.90). By the mid-1980s, the concept of gender history had gained ground. An early example that exemplified the transformative potential of gender as an analytical tool was Leonora Davidoff and Catherine Hall's foundation text, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. 'The principal argument', the authors stated, 'rests on the assumption that gender and class always operate together, that consciousness of class always takes a gendered form' (Davidoff and Hall, 1987, p.13). As Hall later explained, their goal was 'not just to put the women back into a history from which they had been left out'; rather, it was to 'rewrite that history so that proper recognition would be given to the ways in which gender, as a key axis of power in society, provides a crucial understanding of how any society is structured and organized' (1992, p.12). Further methodological turns emerged in the late 1980s with the use of post-structural techniques to the practice of gender history. Work by Denise Riley (1988) and others argued for a discursive approach to historical study based on deconstructing the categories of "man" and "woman". Thus, the appropriate objects of study are epistemological categories: 'The story is no longer about the things that have happened to women and men and how they have reacted to them … it is about how the subjective and collective meanings of women and men as categories of identity have been constructed' (Scott, 1988, p.6).

Not everyone has approved of the conceptual shift to study of the historical construction of gender difference. Some have worried that the emphasis on "discourse" and "representation" has drawn attention away from the feminist

movement's primary goals of foregrounding women's lived experience and achievements and unmasking oppression. Others have objected to the obscure, overly theoretical jargon used by post-modernist and post-structuralist writers (Lauer and Anyidoho, 2012). The early work of Joan Scott (1986) was especially controversial. The American academic Joan Hoff, one of Scott's most forceful critics, explained the problem from the perspective of women's history and is worth quoting at length. In *Gender as a Postmodern Category of Paralys*is, Hoff critiqued the ways in which 'material experiences' had 'become abstract representations drawn almost exclusively from textual analysis' (1994, p.159). 'Flesh-and-blood women', she continued, had 'become social constructs, according to poststructuralists, with no "natural" or physiological context except as a set of symbolic meanings constructing sexual difference'.

I have been both informed and influenced by the body of feminist work produced over the past forty years of which the above strands form an important part. Like others, I take a broad and inclusive stance that recognises that the boundaries between different ways of "doing" history are often easily dissolved. New ideas emerging from the feminist epistemological challenges of the 1980s onwards have strengthened the field of women's history (Purvis, 2018), reflected in a new generation of compelling biographical studies of women that point to the centrality of gender. Greater opportunities for making historical narratives much richer and more nuanced exist, now that the benefits of looking at the past from the perspective of gender is successfully established. As has been argued recently of women's absence from the history of geography, 'there is a methodological need to focus on women as subjects … but a theoretical need to recognise their different experiences. Generalisations may be drawn from their individual experiences, but not universalisations' (Maddrell, 2009, p.4). These insights are applied in the chapters that follow.

1.2.2 Situating myself

Gender was present in this study from the outset since my own gendered experiences have already formed me as a scholar. On this issue, I have been greatly influenced by the argument made by feminist theorists and others that researchers have a responsibility to give the reader access to their worldview. To

put it another way, it is important to share the ideas, interests, beliefs, values, political preferences, and experiences that will shape both what is sought and found in the research process. By looking back at my own life and making visible my personal history and social location, I hope to facilitate a more informed, and critical reading of my research. Moreover, by questioning my own personal beliefs and values as a researcher, a further aim of the process of reflection is to help 'explain, justify and make sense of … [myself] in relation to others, and to the world at large' (Maclure, 1993, p.311). As Charles Wright Mills argues in the *Sociological Imagination*, 'the most admirable thinkers … do not split their work from their lives. They seem not to allow such dissociation, and they want to use each for the enrichment of the other' (1959, p.195). I struggle to say precisely how my own life history has shaped my academic endeavours but acknowledge that my interest in the study of women's lives stems in large part from the circumstances of my personal life, professional experiences, and political orientation. It is these formative influences that I explore in the remainder of this section.

Many people move through key stages of life - completing an education, beginning work, leaving home, marrying, and becoming a parent - in the same order as others in their society, but some do not follow the expected life course. An unmarried mother at eighteen, I am one of those people. Higher education was a path out of precarious employment and economic hardship, and I moved into academia in later life from a non-traditional route. Like many women, my career trajectory has been interrupted by family responsibilities, echoing literature on this topic (Edwards, 1993). I am only now pursuing a PhD after many years in a permanent academic post.

Generationally speaking, based on year of birth, I would be counted as "second wave" according to Miriam David's (2014) classification of feminism. In my experience, however, to be a young woman in the 1980s was to be caught between the waves of feminist history. As Rita Alfonso and Jo Trigilio described it, the feeling was that of 'standing on the beach with my surfboard, too late to catch the peak of the second wave and unwilling to conform to the rules of the pack riding the third' (1997, p.8). Having missed out on the feminist activism of the 1960s and 1970s, my connection to feminist politics came through wider social and political movements

that flourished in response to life under Margaret Thatcher. In 1986, I had moved to the East London Borough of Hackney, then one of the most deprived parts of the UK but also home to a radical culture made up of socialist, communist and anarchist activists. Being part of this community was significant on a personal level, not least because of shared childcare that came from living in communal, women-only housing, but was also inherently political, providing the 'physical and spatial infrastructure' for an activism that challenged the institutions that hold women back (Wall, 2017, p.93). Despite feminism not being an explicit part of my academic identity, I am fortunate to work in a specialist research centre where personal and institutional values come together in the pursuit of, to quote the feminist sociologist Ann Oakley, 'an emancipatory (social) science' that is first and foremost required to be practically relevant. The goal, she further explains, is 'to develop the most reliable and democratic ways of knowing … to ensure that those who intervene in other people's lives do so with the most benefit and the least harm' (2000, p.3).

A historian by background and training, my own affinities lie with a social science that has close ties with the natural sciences, though I do not reject other accounts of knowledge. With many of today's complex problems needing more than one kind of knowledge to solve them, I join others in perceiving close collaboration among experts across disciplinary boundaries as crucial (Bastow et al., 2014). The production of useful social knowledge, in my view, is not particularly well served by single-discipline silos. Rather, interdisciplinary collaboration between individual social science disciplines and between natural and social sciences is essential for solving the significant challenges facing humanity. I lean toward pragmatism as a research paradigm, am sympathetic to positivism and realism, and relatively unsympathetic towards the linguistic turn and associated strands of postmodern thought and theory. While elements of postmodernism, such as its relativistic reasoning, constructivist emphasis and narrative focus, can be appealing, I am with David Pilgrim when he argues that these strengths 'are simply a continuation of, or are shared by, prior traditions [it] challenges' (2000, p.9).

Other scholars point out that the inclusion of postmodern ideas into feminist theory runs the risk of damaging women's sex-based rights and, as Liz Stanley (1990) puts it, invisibilizing women as historical subjects. Consider for instance Judith Butler's

notion that “male” and “female” are simply linguistic constructions or Anne Fausto-Sterling’s claim that ‘sex is a vast, infinitely malleable continuum’ (1993, p.21). Arguments such as these claiming loss of the term “women” are problematic for contemporary social statisticians and others. A recent article by Alice Sullivan, Professor of Sociology at University College London (hereafter referred to under its present-day acronym, UCL), and Director of the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS 70), discusses the implications of conflating sex and gender identity in the 2021 UK census. As Sullivan says, information on gender identity is useful from the point of view of social statistics but cannot replace data on sex. Erasing the concept of sex in the census, and in surveys in general, she argues, has the potential to greatly skew the data, damaging our ‘ability to understand differences and to design evidence-based policies tackling problems facing girls and boys, women and men’ (Sullivan, 2020, p.522). No less significantly, any move to permanently replace sex with gender identity as a category of data collection and analysis risks the loss of a lot of information of potential interest to future scholars interested in understanding historical women. Without viable data on sex in university registers, population census, and archive collections it is unlikely I would have been able to conduct the study presented here.

I see myself not as a historian but as a social scientist who is interested in the methods and politics of women’s history, a field that necessarily depends on putting the study of women’s lived experience and agency front and centre. If we accept that the study of lives is rooted in autobiographical questions and preoccupations, then it follows that this study emerged directly from reflection on my own circumstances and to gain perspective on my own career. It is my attempt to understand the academic world of which I am part, my own motivation for taking this path, and the traces it has left upon me. I study women in part because I am a woman. My views reflect my own academic pathway and position as a white, female academic of working-class background situated in a UK university, working in an unapologetically applied field in the social sciences. This history is one of the reasons that I am interested in using biography to bring the lives of the women who feature in this study, most of them forgotten or neglected, to a more prominent place in research. I am drawn here to Liz Stanley’s arguments about authorial choice and the impossibility of separating biographers from the biographies that they write.

‘Treating the production of biography in an epistemologically and theoretically more critical fashion’, she writes, ‘requires recognising that the choice of subject is located within political processes in which some people’s lives, but not others’ are seen as interesting and/or important enough to be committed to biography’ (1995, p.9).

My main interest lies in putting women back into the historical record and view this as a profoundly political act. Those who taught at universities and university colleges will be represented, but so too will be the work of benefactors, civil servants, social reformers, independent scholars, and other non-academic authors. I chose to work on these women not purely because they were trailblazers in social science theory or method, although some were, but in relation to the relationship between research and policy. In 1902, Helen Bosanquet of the Charity Organisation Society made her position on the concept of useful knowledge clear: ‘Perhaps the greatest public obstacle to getting a sound public opinion on matters of social policy lies in the general ignoring of the fact that scientific principles are as much involved in them as chemistry or architecture, or any other of the arts of life’ (as cited in Jones, 1979, p.76). For Mary Walker, a Scottish social reformer who worked to improve conditions for women and children in industrialised Dundee, the practical application of knowledge was paramount: ‘strictly speaking’, she wrote in a paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Dundee Social Union, ‘study is only preparation for action, the idea is only of value in proportion as it sets the energies of our nature free to work … and [the] strongest claim is undoubtedly social work’ (Walker, 1899, p.3). Equally importantly, I was drawn to these women because they defied patriarchal cultural and social pressures of the time, challenging an underlying ideology that sought to limit their education and intellectual endeavours. Their careers did not always follow in a logical fashion, as unexpected opportunities and constraints either limited or enhanced the choices they subsequently made. Some of the same forces are equally applicable to my own story. To borrow Mary Bateson’s words, ‘we need to look at multiple lives to test and shape our own’ (1989, p.16).

1.3 Writing the lives of early women in social science

There are many varied ways to write about women’s past lives (Purvis, 2018). This thesis is based on biographical research. When I first started to think about this

extending my master's dissertation over a decade ago, I had serious misgivings about using biography, influenced in part by having taken undergraduate and master's degrees in traditional history departments that largely favoured a detached and objective approach to writing history. It is only through immersing myself in readings about feminist methodology and women's history that I have come to appreciate not only the validity of a biographical approach in historical enquiry but also biography as the most appropriate approach to my research. First, biography engages the insight offered by Charles Wright Mills (1959, p.3) that our social world is a product of individual action: 'Neither the life of an individual, nor the history of a society, can be understood without understanding both'. Jane Martin is right in observing that it is 'a method that offers a "prism" through which to view the complex layers of society, culture and politics, a way of moving from the general to the particular and back again, of estimating character, motive, behaviour, intention' (2002, p.101). Second, the tools of biographical research offer a useful means for exploring the themes raised by women's and gender history. As Susan Pedersen has convincingly argued, it provides opportunities 'to recover the lives, experiences, and mentalities of women from … condescension and obscurity … to re-examine and rewrite the historical narrative to reveal the construction and workings of gender' (2000, p.1). Third, biography offers a lens through which to explore women's capacity for agency and efforts to carve out a role for themselves, while also highlighting the complexities that framed their personal and professional lives. Finally, the use of an explicitly feminist approach allows the writer to address, as Barbara Merrill and Linden West put it, 'the inter-relationship between the constructions of one's own learning life history though autobiography and the construction of the life of another through biography' (2009, p.31).

1.3.1 Using a contextual biographical approach

There is no singular biographical approach to the study of historical women, but rather many varied ways of doing this form of research (Chamberlayne et al., 2000; Roberts, 2001; Miller, 2005). My work follows Liz Stanley (1987, p.21) in rejecting the 'conventional linear "jigsaw" model of biography', which seeks to identify 'each small detail of a person's life … to amass on paper the totality of these in a "complete view" of the biographical subject'. Rather, like previous feminist biographies stimulated by Stanley, I favour what she refers to as a '*kaleidoscope*'

approach (or metaphor) that recognises the possibility that ‘each time you look you see something different’ (Stanley, 1987, p.19, emphasis in original). Barbara Finkelstein makes a similar claim when she writes that biography ‘reveals the invisible, extracts detail from the myriad points of light, uncovers sources of illumination, and helps us disaggregate and reconstruct large heavenly pictures’ (1998, p.45). I am particularly drawn to Finkelstein’s insights on biography’s potential for revealing human agency. She lists three benefits of biographical enquiry that fit well with my work: (1) ‘a lens through which to explore the origin of new ideas’; (2) ‘a window on social possibility, revealing an array of social choices and alternative possibilities individuals and groups perceive and construct as they grow up, acquire identities, learn, labor, construct meaning, form communities and otherwise lead their lives’; and (3) ‘an aperture through which to view relationships and social change’ (1998, p.46). In my own study of women’s lives, I hope to bring in some of the insights of Finkelstein’s work.

When I first embarked on this project, I wanted to write about women and ideas. Specifically, I wanted to use biography to study the relationship between social knowledge and the development of social policies in Britain. To that end, I had imagined a series of in-depth policy case studies based around the lives and ideas of a few purposively selected women, something along the lines of *Women and Education, 1800-1980*, Jane Martin and Joyce Goodman’s collective biography of six British women educational activists (Martin and Goodman, 2003). As my research got underway, however, it soon became apparent that women’s early involvement in social science was far more widespread than had previously been acknowledged. Aware of my own unlikely passage to UCL and my sense of what it means to be a social scientist, it seemed important to avoid using a patriarchal conception of worth and to identify, name, and incorporate data in one work on as many of these women as possible.

With data on so many fascinating lives, I felt I had to find a way to illuminate as many individuals as possible while also providing depth of description. Prosopography has been chosen as a research tool because it allows me to accommodate reasonably large numbers of individuals and construct the story of early women in social science as a group (Verboven et al., 2007). It provides a

systematic way to discern broader trends and patterns of life experiences, career choices, and relations within the identified group that are not clearly visible when the focus is on extensive life histories of a few individuals. I can research and say something about a collective as well as its individual members. Collective biography, a feminist approach to research that prioritises individuals and their subjective experiences, provides a useful counterbalance to prosopographical analysis (Cowman, 2016). It was selected for its explicit interest in individuals and emphasis on, as Barbara Caine puts it, 'detailed case studies which use the situation, experiences and life-course of … a group of women to illuminate and to concretise the broader situation of women generally' (1994, p.252). A brief overview of how various techniques and methods associated with prosopography are used in conjunction with collective biography follows next, with full details provided in Chapter 3.

The search for names was achieved through a wide-ranging trawl of electronic and printed texts. I applied a set of five criteria to help me identify, and ultimately justify, who belongs to the social group and who does not. The scope was restricted to women born in the period 1849 to 1891 who engaged in social scientific inquiry (or otherwise supported the social sciences) in Britain. In establishing specific criteria for the determination of who may be labelled as such, a deliberate attempt was made to capture the complexity and diversity within social science in its formative years. The final criterion was that a minimum amount of information was required. Above all, to be able to locate the women in time and space, I needed their birth names and date of birth.

Most of the data I have gathered on the women is of a biographical nature. It is assembled mainly from entries in biographical dictionaries, as well as memoirs, college registers, obituaries and other documentary sources that offer valuable insights when researching women's lives. The electronic version of the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB) was an important source of information. Printed texts were generally available in UK libraries such as the British Library and the London School of Economics, accessed through personal visits. However, memoirs and autobiographies were occasionally difficult to locate, and I found these could be variable in quality, especially in relation to using the women's own words to

give them voice. Beatrice Webb's diaries, described by one biographer as an '"Other Self" … to whom she talked compulsively' (Seymour-Jones, 1992, p.xii), are voluminous and readily accessible from LSE Library's digital collections. At the other extreme, Olive Dunlop's (1907) out of print memoir relating to Girton College took months to locate and provides nothing of note. The same set of biographical data were, as far as possible, collected for every individual using a semi-structured coding scheme.[2] A biographical database has been compiled to store and manage the data.

Using biography grounded in a contextual history approach in conjunction with a feminist lens, this study places the women within the larger setting of the formative years of modern social policy and the social sciences. Most of this account concerns the end of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth, a period marked by wide-ranging economic, political and social changes. Although the title suggests coverage from c.1870 to 1920, this is only partly true. There is no neat and definitive beginning and end to the narrative, and I depart from these dates in discussing those women whose major life events are either side of this period. Some of the youngest subjects (those born after 1870) contributed to intellectual and public affairs until the very last years of their lives and were active agents in shaping the expanded welfare state of the 1940s-1960s. I make occasional references to these events.

Immersing myself in the lives of nearly 200 women, bearing in mind the sheer volume and complexity of their activities, had the potential to be overwhelming. I felt this particularly when it came to decide how to construct the analysis. One challenge was how to arrange the chapters to capture the influence of generation. My initial idea was for a consecutive approach based upon splitting the women along generational lines, with separate chapters according to year of birth. In the event, I decided against this and settled for one chapter on the early lives of the women (Chapter 4) followed by a second and third chapter on their later lives (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6), with a generational element contained within each chapter. This focus allows a broadly chronological narrative to flow in which the analysis weaves

[2] Semi-structured approaches: defined as those 'that have some explicit structure to them, in terms of theory or method, but are not completely structured' (Blandford, 2013, p.2).

together the women's personal and professional lives to highlight how one impacted the other, complicating our understanding of the 'complexities of individual lives situated in certain situations and at certain points' (Fitzgerald and Smyth, 2014, p.10).

To explore the wide variation and rich complexity of these women's experiences, the narrative combines a series of biographical excerpts (vignettes) of individual lives with descriptive statistics describing the backgrounds and career paths of the whole group in which I am interested. When identifying life stories for the vignettes presented in each chapter, I did not consciously target key figures or leaders but rather sought to illustrate my argument by selecting women based on the strength of their biographical connections. This would allow me to capture what Mahood (2009, p.8) refers to as the 'full complexity and mosaic patterning' of the subject's own story as well as the lives of her contemporaries.

Placed within the social sciences, this study of women and their agency is purposefully and unashamedly written from a women's history perspective. The (auto)biographical approach allows interrogation of often partial and fragmentary sources for clues 'as to the meanings for the subjects' sense of themselves' (Woollacott, 1998, p.333). Gender has been used as a category of analysis in a feminist reading of these women's biographies and careers. However, while the analysis has focused on women's experiences, a conscious decision was taken not to compare women with men. Focusing on how women's experiences are different to those of men has the disadvantage, as Morgan and Kunkel note, of assuming 'that the complexity of life in a particular social category … are somehow captured by not being a member of that reference group', undermining our ability to understand and illuminate women's situation (2006, p.17). 'The questions we ask', the authors continue, 'the concerns we attend to, and even the items we include on a survey will be more meaningful if we begin with a conviction that reality itself is different for groups in different social positions' (p.18). By avoiding a comparative approach (women/men), I can delve more deeply into the life stories of a historically specific group of women, to shed light on their varied subjectivities, as well as how social forces affected women's lives.

This study seeks to elevate women of the past, but it is not a straightforward celebration of women's achievements. Writing about women educators and networks, Fitzgerald and Smyth are correct in observing that the goal is 'to complicate these stories by revealing the tensions, inconsistencies, orthodoxies and contradictions in their lives' (2014, pp.10-11). As others have found, pioneering women can be unlikeable and there are certainly aspects of the women's lives discussed here that I would not celebrate. Some individuals supported views which, although common at the time, were unappealing to some of their contemporaries and are considered highly reactionary by many today. Take the example of Ethel Tweedie, an early ethnographer. She often wrote condescendingly of the working classes: 'One only has to deal with the lower orders to know why they are poor. They waste more good material than rich folk utilise, and then they grumble at poverty' (1918, p.41). Like Marie Stopes, founder of the first birth control clinic who tutored the nation on pleasure and the female body with *Married Love* (1918) and other writings, Tweedie was a supporter of eugenics-based theories and policies which sought to apply the concept of natural selection to prevent degeneration of Britain's population, through measures such as marriage restrictions for the "feeble-minded" (Jones, 1986). Certainly, the now discredited practice of eugenics has a complicated relationship with the social sciences (Renwick, 2011). Francis Galton, who coined the term itself in 1883, appealed for eugenics to be taken up by sociologists. Both the 1904 and 1905 volumes of the *Sociological Papers* (the *Transactions of the Sociological Society*) begin with a section on eugenics (Dahrendorf, 1995). Regarding the women in this study, I seek to neither defend nor attack their support of certain ideas but contend that this should not cancel out their wider achievements. It is not well-behaved women who make significant contributions to feminism, Helen Lewis (2020) reminds us, it is imperfect and multidimensional women.

1.3.2 Fundamental concepts and definitions

I now discuss at some length the working definitions of five central concepts needed for my inquiry: social science, feminism, group, network, and generation. As diverse meanings of these terms are possible, it is important to address early on any potential difficulties of terminology or focus and explain how I understand and intend to use these concepts in the context of this study.

Social science. I must be clear about who I claim to have been involved in social science, but this presents major difficulties since ‘at no time in its history has there ever been a consensus on the definition and purpose of social science in Britain’ (Goldman, 2005, p.111). Use of the term social science across Europe dates from the early nineteenth century when, as Senn notes, the ‘transformation of social inquiry from rational speculation to empirical research occurred, as part of the general conquest of philosophy by science’ (1958, p.568). Thinkers such as Auguste Comte and Jeremy Bentham had in mind a single science of society, one that would take its place in the hierarchy of the sciences, while others rejected the idea of a unified enterprise (Baker, 1964). Aided by the development of the universities and other institutions of higher education, distinct disciplines began to evolve, taking on intellectual characteristics that are still recognisable today.

Today, the terms social science and social scientist are typically reserved for university-based research and its producers. This narrow formulation has a distinct flaw when discussing the nineteenth and early-twentieth century conception of social science in Britain. Previous examinations of the history of social science have recognised that they function as aggregations of different groups of people with different agendas. Lucinda Platt points out that ‘there does not appear to have been a clear differentiation between what constituted research rather than journalism or polemic … Nor was there necessarily a greater credibility attributed to particular forms of knowledge’ (2005, p.17). Numerous studies have documented that social scientific thought and practice in this period was, as Goldman puts it, ‘inextricably linked to the practice of social reform’ and the formation of social policy (1987, p.171).

In the 1870s, at the beginning of our narrative, the professionalisation (namely academisation and disciplinary specialisation) of the modern social sciences was getting underway, but it was a slow and uneven process. First, there was not yet a profession of recognised social scientists. Many of those who produced and practiced social science did so from outside formal academic structures, with issues of professionalism versus amateurism of much less consequence to nineteenth-century intellectuals than they are today. Second, although several universities had established economics degree courses by the first decade of the century, the other

social sciences were a minor presence before the Second World War. Delimiting each discipline-in-the-making from its neighbours is easier said than done. Third, even as separate disciplines were forming, many writers continued to work outside disciplinary norms. As noted by Michael Billig, their work would cross 'without a second glance those barriers, which today seem insuperable, between science, social sciences and humanities' (2013, p.15). Finally, early studies often drew on a rough-and-ready empiricism that was largely divorced from social theorising until well into the twentieth century.

The boundaries of whom to consider part of the history of the social sciences is a political decision. These boundaries have been stretched by many scholars over the past three decades, who demonstrate how a historically accurate understanding of the concept that recognises this fluid environment is key to capturing women's early relationship to and involvement with social science. Thus, for the purposes of this study, I refer to similar attempts by others and define social sciences in its broadest sense.

Establishing whom to count required interrogation of ideas concerning identity and its construction. To put this another way, would Amy Harrison and Margaret Irwin, co-authors of *Women in the Printing Trade: A Sociological Study* (1904), have identified themselves as sociologists? Would their contemporaries have done so? These are difficult questions to answer when researching women in history. Autobiographies and census returns could potentially provide useful clues to women's self-identification, but I found both sources to be limited. To give just one example, Ada Heather-Bigg, an early student of political economy at UCL, was a prominent activist in organisations working for women's economic independence and published several articles on economic matters in the 1880s and 1890s, including one on women and the glove trade in *The Nineteenth Century* (1891). In the 1881 census entry for 14 Radnor Place, West London, her occupation is listed as "journalist". In 1911, by which time she is the head of the household, the entry records her occupation as "philanthropist and journalist". This reflects that many of these women did not derive their professional identify from social science and would not have thought of themselves as social scientists. Therefore, rather than relying solely on self-reports, I consider an approach that focuses on what people do, such

as serving on the council of the Royal Statistical Society (founded as the Statistical Society of London), publishing in the *Sociological Review*, or joining Charles Booth's project to map social conditions in London, instead of a disputable personal identity, to be the more appropriate way of identifying relevant individuals. Not only that, but we need to understand social science as much more than undertaking social research or producing publications, to include other contributions such as providing funding to support research activities**.** Here I have drawn inspiration from Kate Hill's important monograph on women, modernity and museums. By interpreting social science broadly to comprise a much wider range of activities, we are better able to recover 'both the agency of a wide range of women, and the strategies which were deployed to try to contain that agency' (Hill, 2016, p.6).

I spell out precisely how a broad definition of social science shaped the criteria that need to be fulfilled to be seen as part of the history of the social sciences in Chapter 3 and consider the implications of the approach taken in Chapter 9. A final point is that I use the terms social science, social research, and social investigation interchangeably throughout the text although I am aware this is not entirely unproblematic. The term scientific is used in its broader sense to refer to all scholarly forms of knowledge production, including those in the social sciences.

Feminism. Feminism is another important concept running through this study. Social scientists find it difficult to define the political activism of women. Over recent decades, terms such as "liberal", "equal rights", "individualist", "relational", "social" and "socialist" have been used to differentiate one group of feminists from another. Yet regardless of whether we are discussing "first-wave" feminists who struggled for change in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries or subsequent generations known as "second wave" and "third wave" feminists, not everyone uses these words to mean the same thing (Delmar, 1986; Phillips, 1993; Rendall, 1985). Moreover, the characterisation of feminist history as a series of three discrete "waves", famously utilised in analyses of feminism by Olive Banks in the mid-1980s, is itself heavily contested (David, 2014). As noted by American historian Karen Offen, feminism has been used as a blanket term for a whole range of political activities that women have engaged in, with both the word itself, and the concepts it conveys, inspiring controversy and debate 'infused with a political and emotional charge'

(1988, p.19). Different women define and relate to feminism differently, and feminists are at times in dispute even amongst themselves over the beliefs one must espouse to fall under the category of feminist.

Some scholars warn against using the term too broadly. In the 1980s, Nancy Cott voiced her concern that expanding the term feminism 'to cover every worthy or new endeavor women take up equates the term with "what women did" and renders it meaningless' (1987, p.9). For Lucy Delap, whether historical subjects were self-declared feminists or actively rejected the label should be an important signifier of whether we can encompass them within a feminist framework (2011, pp.320-2). Although I have appreciated their cautionary advice against using the term too broadly, my own experiences of embracing the principles of feminism without personally adopting the label as an identity marker have influenced how I interpret commitment to feminism. I broadly follow the criteria used by Olive Banks for her selection of subjects in *Becoming a Feminist* (1986). The 'main guiding principle', she argued, 'is the presence of a critique of the traditional subordination of women … and a claim for a new relationship between men and women which would give women greater control over their lives' (1986, p.2).

I had intended for feminist to be a criterion for inclusion but had to alter my original plans during the initial stages of research. Identifying whether an individual was involved with explicitly feminist organisations or events was relatively straightforward when suitable sources such as membership lists were readily available. By contrast, assessing someone's contributions to feminism through their research and writings rather than political activism was considerably more demanding. Detailed examination of published works was not only very time-consuming, but the results were often inconclusive. An additional challenge were women whose politics were inconsistent or changed over time. Take for example Beatrice Webb: she is typically portrayed as anti-feminist on the grounds of her opposition to women being given the vote. Less well known, and generally under-appreciated, is that despite publicly rejecting the feminist label, even after she had changed her mind on the issue of suffrage in 1906, she often gave women's issues top priority in welfare discussions (Nyland, 1995). Another woman from that generation, Louise Creighton, who before her marriage had been the first women to take the University of London's special

examination for women, and later lectured in economics at LSE (1906-07), changed her stance around the same time.

Identifying whether someone warrants the status of feminist would be a daunting task even in the case of well-documented individuals such as Webb; in many cases, through lack of sources and the reluctance of some women to adopt a feminist identity despite their agreement with feminist ideals, it is impossible. After further consideration, while taking Liz Stanley's (1995, p.11) cautionary advice against simplifying contradictory accounts of their subjects, 'instead of accepting that all these competing truths and selves may be true', I changed my position and decided against making "feminist" a criterion for inclusion in this study. This was a difficult decision to make and should not be taken as a reluctance to deal with the complexities of individuals and past eras. It remains consistent with an understanding of the broad nature of the first wave of the women's movement.

Group and Network. Prosopographical studies typically involve the delineation of a social group made of a set of individuals having certain characteristics in common. Keats-Rohan (2007, p.51) highlights that in 'most cases the target group is not a group in the sociological sense … The group is created and analysed by the researcher', as is the case here. I analyse the lives of a loose-knit group of women who engaged in various forms of social science in the years around 1900. When I use the term "group" it is in the sense of an aggregate of two or more people, without implying that these individuals considered themselves as a "unit" because of their shared interests.

We are now aware that individuals in groups are connected to each other by relationships across a range of interpersonal contexts and that these networks of ties matter. The anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain's classic study *Friends of Friends* defines the term network as 'the chains of persons with whom a given person is in actual contact, and their interconnection' (1974, p.24). Numerous studies have underscored the advantages that women in the nineteenth-century women's rights movement gained from female role models, friendships, and other networks of support (e.g., Abir-Am and Outram, 1987; Fitzgerald and Smyth, 2014; Levine, 1990; Vicinus, 1985). The suggestion that informal connections were used to circumvent restrictions on their participation in public activities is made by Rendall

(1987) among others. There is also a body of studies attesting to the key role of networks at the interface between social science and policymaking processes, in the shape of organisational linkages as well as interpersonal ties between individual social scientists (e.g., Nutley et al., 2007; Sharpe, 1975).

The life stories constructed in this study feature themes of personal agency and exploration. For my ideas about networks, I have borrowed from the feminist historian, Linda Eisenmann. Based on her work on higher education for women in America, Eisenmann suggests that networks offer 'a theoretical tool for examining individuals, their connections with peers and their agency as individuals and members of a particular social group', thereby permitting a more 'circular or web-like picture' (2001, p.468). To capture what is essentially a diffuse population with several dense networks, I have begun the process of reconstructing each woman's intellectual and significant interpersonal contacts. However, this would be a daunting task even in the case of well-documented individuals and the process remains ongoing. Participation in a network should not imply consensus among participants or that they all knew each other personally.

Generation and the life course. The construction of life narratives that show the importance of generational experiences to the women's achievements is a central theme, one which highlights the influence of historical context on an individual. Every generation – that is, people born and living at about the same time, regarded collectively – is assumed to move through the life-course differently to the one before. Widely applied in the 1950s by researchers who drew on the formative work of Karl Mannheim, the concept has recently re-emerged in feminist studies (Barclay et al., 2011).

As a way of speaking about generational differences, I followed the example set by Jane Martin (2003) and Miriam David (2014) and used the generational schema developed by Olive Banks (1986, pp.4-5), in which the main unit of analysis was defined as cohort based upon year of birth. Banks divided "first-wave" feminism into four cohorts: cohort I consisted of all those born before 1828; cohort II were born between 1828 and 1848; cohort III were born within the years 1849 and 1871; and cohort IV were born between 1872 and 1891. I clustered the women in my study along the lines of one of two possible demographic cohorts or generations, each of

approximately 20 years. The decision to use this schema was influenced by the chronology of the opening and gradual expansion of higher education to women.

Cohort 1 – born between 1849 and 1871 – the pioneers. Women in this demographic cohort represent the first generation to enter higher education in England, after women's colleges came to be established in London (from 1848), Cambridge (from 1869) and Oxford (from 1878). They were eligible to be of university age between c.1869 and 1891 and as the women who first attained university educations faced almost unbelievable hardship, prejudice, and dismissive attitudes.

Cohort 2 – born between 1872 and 1891 – the beneficiaries of expanded opportunities. This cohort of women came of university age between c.1892 and 1911, in the period of expansion and consolidation in women's education, when the movement made its most rapid advances. They had greater opportunities for accessing higher education than their predecessors and some seemed to distance themselves from the feminism of the pioneers and their achievements. 'The main battle was won, the rest seemed a matter of time, and we did not bother ourselves much about it', Barbara Hammond had recalled in 1928 (as cited in Weaver, 1997, p.41).

1.4 Structure of the thesis

This chapter has so far sketched out the background to the study and my overall approach and themes. It will close with a summary of the chapters that follow.

Chapter 2: Transformation in Britain – This chapter sets the scene for the evidence presented in subsequent chapters. It is divided into three main parts. A first section starts by outlining the principal social welfare reforms enacted during the period c.1870 to 1920, especially as they affected the lives of women. It then moves on provide a brief historical survey of several wider transformations shaping Britain: the impact of industrialisation; political democratisation; bureaucratisation; education reform; and the emergence of modern social science. Subsequent chapters will draw upon and extend this contextual information. The third section outlines various theoretical explanations about the origins and early development of modern social policies. My concern is not to present a comprehensive review of

welfare state theories advanced over the past 50 years, but rather to assess the contributions of the main theoretical perspectives to position my work.

Chapter 3: Methodology – This chapter describes and justifies the methodology. I begin by reflecting on my role as a woman researching other women, followed by a short review of current debates around biographical research. Next, I describe prosopography and collective biography, outlining their strengths and weaknesses, as well as their relevance to researching women's lives and their fitness for purpose for this thesis. The remainder of this chapter details how I approached biographical research based upon Banks' (1986) method of developing a cohort analysis. The last section considers ethical issues.

Chapter 4: The formative years: class, family, and schooling – This chapter establishes the identities of the women and creates a broad collective profile, in so far as the evidence allows. Who were these women, and where and when were they born? What were the distinguishing features of their upbringing and schooling? How did these factors impact upon choices made by these women in determining their future education and career? In looking at the importance of the women's formative years to their later life and work, particular attention is paid to social origins, family backgrounds and early education and whether these change as we move through cohorts.

Chapter 5: Making a way in social science: higher learning – Chapter 5 maps the women's participation in higher education, in the context of its opening up to women and the growing professionalisation of the social sciences. Why did most of the women discussed here decide to go to university? What sorts of courses did they do? Were their study choices determined by an ambition to establish a career in social science? Did they purposively select a university course that would help them in this regard, or did they drift into social science?

Chapter 6: Making a way in social science: pursuing careers – This chapter examines the various ways in which women marked their presence in social science in this period. It highlights the ambiguities of career experiences for women, including their complicated relationship with the academy and use of alternative venues. A new perspective helps us understand the relationship between academic

and non-academic social science as parallel and interconnected pursuits of social knowledge.

Chapter 7: Producing and mobilising knowledge – This chapter considers the scholarship activities and research conducted by these women, and the different communication channels used to spread and share this new knowledge with wider audiences.

Chapter 8: Promoting and supporting policy change – This chapter examines the nature of the relationship between research and policy using a series of case studies. The first focuses on a local initiative in Dundee to highlight the inadequacies of conditions in the city, especially for children. The second considers a study conducted in response to national policy debates at the time about "sweated" labour. The third covers the war years, when the British government actively sought contributions from women in social science.

Chapter 9: Conclusion – The final chapter brings together the findings from previous chapters and offers conclusions. I also review my research journey and the impact the study has had on me as a researcher. I set out the main issues that I encountered during the different stages and discuss how the study's limitations could have affected the findings. The final section concludes with thoughts on future directions for research in this area.

Appendices – Supplementary information has been included in the appendices to reinforce the main content and form a valuable starting point for future studies on this group of women. A list of all names meeting the selection criteria, arranged by date of birth, is provided (Appendix 5), as well as information on the sources used to identify the women (Appendix 2). Brief biographical profiles for all women have been specified (Appendix 7). There is also a working list of their publications (selected, if there are too many), providing an insight into the scale of women's published work in this period (Appendix 6).

1.5 A note on women's names

The full names of the women identified for the study are given in Appendix A.3. In the body text, I have tried to use the names by which the women were commonly

known. I aim to avoid the anachronistic practice, often seen in traditional biographies, of using only first names for women in juxtaposition with references to men with surnames and some title. To capture the reader's attention, a woman's name is written in bold font and followed by her life dates in parentheses the first time it is used (starting at Chapter 4). I do this because many of the women named are unlikely to be readily recognised. After the initial mention, a woman is generally referred to by last name only or she may be referred to by a pronoun. In a few instances, mainly to avoid monotony but also when writing about a woman's childhood or connections with family or close friends, I have departed from this practice and call her by her first name. In the case of unmarried and married names, I have tried to use whatever name is least confusing in the context and include alternative names in brackets where confusion might arise.

1.6 A note on degree names and awards

Differences in degree names between universities is a long-standing source of confusion. While the established terms Bachelor and Master were used widely in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there were no common standards for either degree. The pattern of women's admission to higher education also explains some of the discrepancies in the dates and wider information given in secondary sources. Some important points that are worthy of note are shared here:

- The ancient universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin granted the Master of Arts (MA) to Bachelor of Arts (BA) graduates a certain period after their first degree, without further academic work. Essentially, the MA was a formal recognition that the person was a BA.
- Some British institutions awarded postgraduate master's degrees that could only be obtained by further study. This included all master's degrees awarded by the University of London and the new universities created in the second half of the nineteenth century. These institutions did not follow the ancient universities' practice of conferring an MA upon a BA without further study.
- Scottish universities awarded the MA as a first degree, in place of the BA.
- Well into the twentieth century, women at the ancient universities were prevented from graduating with degrees that would entitle them to membership of the university. For example, women students at Cambridge initially sat 'special

examinations for women'. In 1881, they were admitted to the tripos examinations and sat the same exams as men.[3] Until 1948, however, they received only a certificate on completion of their course (what were known as "titular" degrees) and were not allowed to take part in graduation ceremonies.

- The universities of Dublin, Oxford and Cambridge admitted women to degrees for the first time in 1904, 1920 and 1948, respectively. Although women were not awarded degrees and did not have the status of 'graduate' until these dates, later historians often use this language and many of the women themselves refer to their 'graduation' and so on.
- Between 1904 and 1907, over 700 women who had passed examinations at the women's colleges of Oxford and Cambridge were conferred with Ad Eundem University of Dublin degrees at Trinity College Dublin. Women travelled to Dublin for the purpose of getting their work recognised and were awarded a BA, MA, or DLitt from that institution.[4]

[3] Tripos: any of the undergraduate examinations that qualify a student for a bachelor's degree at Cambridge University.
[4] As women with a BA of at least three years' standing were eligible for the University of Dublin's MA degree, the majority of the "steamboat ladies" were awarded both on the same day. Ten higher degrees (e.g., DSc and DLitt) were awarded in the period 1904-1907 (Parkes, 1996).

CHAPTER 2. TRANSFORMATION IN BRITAIN, c.1870-1920

This chapter establishes the background and context for the study by giving attention to the socio-historical context of the time and an important set of theoretical debates. There are three major components to this discussion, with women's lives and the effects of gender a consistent theme within each. The first section discusses a selection of key social and economic reforms enacted in Britain between roughly 1870 and 1920, a formative period marked by a significant shift in the acknowledged responsibilities of the British state to its citizens. The chapter then examines other transformations of long-term importance to emerge in Britain around the same time, including major advances in educational opportunities for women and girls and the emergence of modern social science in the context of the wider organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain. Building on this important discussion, the third section reviews the contributions of the main welfare theories advanced over the last 50 years: functionalism; power resources theory; historical institutionalism; ideational accounts and feminist analysis. In doing so, it identifies a need for an updated analytical perspective which considers the relationship between social science knowledge and policymaking by focusing on the critical role played by women. The chapter ends with details of the research aims and objectives.

2.1 Government involvement in social and economic life in Britain

As José Harris has observed, 'all political regimes have social policies of some kind, even if such policies consist simply in leaving the pursuit of welfare to the family or the local community or the corporation of the market' (1983, p.58). In the history of social policy in Britain, the decades around 1900 are significant for a series of political, economic and social changes which had a major impact on the scale and scope of public welfare provision. Successive British governments enacted a range of reforms (targeted mainly at the aged poor and certain groups of wageworkers) that afforded ever-greater protection against market failures and life hazards. Some measures contributed towards the emancipation of women and child welfare protection. A chronological outline of the major developments in British social policy in this period is provided in Appendix A.1.

Although under attack for much of the nineteenth century, the welfare structure implemented in England and Wales under the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, the so-called New Poor Law, provided a significant range of welfare functions throughout this period, administered locally by Boards of Guardians. Similar changes were made to the poor law for Scotland in 1845. With poverty generally understood as a sign of personal fault and moral inadequacy, it was a welfare system that prioritised institutionalised care and workhouse conditions were designed to deter any but the truly destitute from applying for relief (Fraser, 2003). At the same time, central government began to assume a degree of responsibility in certain areas, initially measures to control environmental risks to health and improve conditions for workers in factories. 'The trend', Holmes noted, 'was towards more rather than less central government intervening in economic and social matters' (1976, p.685).

The years between 1906 and 1911 are widely regarded as one of the most significant periods of change. There was, as Hay (1983, p.11) observed, 'a concentrated burst of activity by the Liberal government of these years' that seemed to challenge the dominant force in government and policymaking and took the state into areas that had hitherto been considered beyond its scope. Introduced under the guidance of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, the measures that laid the foundations of contemporary public services revolved around two main issues: the social welfare of the next generation and the organisation of the labour market. There was 'no underlying intention to establish the state as the permanent primary provider of welfare'; nonetheless, the reforms of 1906-1914 were 'a significant step forward, since they had either not been available before, or had been available only under very degrading conditions' (Thane, 1989, p.45).

The Great War extended the range of state responsibilities in social and economic matters and subsequent decades saw significant change as the state moved into new areas and provision became more comprehensive (Crowther, 1989; Garside, 2002; Malpas, 2005). As Pat Thane remarked, the various measures introduced by Conservative, Labour and Coalition governments which held office during the interwar era suggested 'a remarkable degree of consensus about the need for and efficacy of state intervention' (1989, p.16). Over time, the generosity and coverage

of state provision rose rapidly, in line with rising needs and aspirations. By the middle of the twentieth century, Britain along with most of the world's industrial-capitalist societies had become a self-proclaimed "welfare state".

Contemporaries and later scholars have drawn attention to the often-significant shortcomings of reforms implemented in this period. Many payments, they pointed out, were at subsistence level and placed responsibility on county councils, which meant success 'depended on local-authority initiative and the availability of financial resources' (Thane, 1989, p.18). Thus, while the Education (Provision of Meals) Act 1906, for example, allowed for expenditure to come out of the rates and provided a Treasury grant to fund 50 per cent of cost of school meals, it did not go as far as compelling local authorities to act. Furthermore, the idea of the deserving and undeserving poor that underpinned the 1834 legislation remained part of the framework of benefits and services, resulting in ongoing discrimination against many groups in society (Welshman, 2013). For instance, casual workers and those dismissed for misconduct were excluded from the 1911 national insurance scheme (Harris, 1972).

Some early accounts brought a feminist lens to the observation that many policies failed or unjustly treated women. The Unemployment Insurance Act 1920, for example, was shown to have introduced the practice of unequal contributions and benefits. From then on, scholars such as Joan Brown (1990) argued, women were accommodated in a scheme designed for men, both charged and paid less in line with women's lower paid status in the labour force. Other studies have concluded that the final policy outcomes did not reflect the reforming effort of campaigning women. Susan Pedersen, for instance, suggests that feminist proposals were sometimes 'not so much opposed as redefined and scaled down' (1989, p.104). While not disputing these arguments, it is important not to overlook that many of the early measures, despite their limitations, improved people's lives, especially in the poorest sectors of society. More importantly perhaps, nor should we undervalue the role played by women and the women's movement (broadly defined) in shifting the level of concern and attention paid to gender inequality; in other words, putting it high on the policy agenda as a subject fit for policy intervention.

2.2 Wider transformations reshaping British society

Several transformations of long-term importance emerged in Britain around the same time, forming the historical context against which the new welfare measures and the lives of the women discussed in this collection unfold.

2.2.1 Industrialisation and its social, economic, and cultural consequences

By the early nineteenth century, Britain had become the world's leading manufacturing, banking, and trading nation, with far-reaching consequences (Griffin, 2010). Hailed as the "workshop of the world", the significant increase in the scale of industrial employment was such that by mid-century over 40 per cent of the adult population worked in factories and workshops (Abramovitz and Eliasberg, 1957). Internal migration occurred on a grand scale as rural people moved to the capital and the northern industrial regions to seek work and a better life. London's population grew at a phenomenal rate: between 1800 and 1900 it increased from approximately 900,000 to 4.7 million and was over seven million by 1911 (Lockard, 2015). The shipbuilding yards, new docks, and large factories such as Lyle's sugar refinery on the banks of the river Thames all required large labour forces. Sweatshops, street markets and the rapidly expanding railways employed many of the working classes. The emerging lower middle-class was also of growing importance to the economy, as increasing numbers of men, and some women, moved into 'the new white-collar salaried occupations, most notably clerks, but also managers … teachers and certain shop assistants' (Crossick, 1977, p.12).

Across the country, rapid urban expansion and population growth resulted in growing socio-economic pressures, including a high demand for inner-city housing and widespread growth of urban slums notorious for overcrowding and squalid living conditions (Flanders, 2012; Wohl, 2009). Legal standards for minimum housing conditions were a new concept and often unenforceable. Along with other major cities, London was struggling to cope with the effects of industrialisation (Porter, 2000). Rents were exorbitant and overcrowding was rife, with reports of seven family members or more crammed in single-room accommodation, often in decaying buildings (Wise, 2009). The terrible conditions can be seen in detailed accounts by the journalist Henry Mayhew, work credited as being the earliest English ethnography (Thompson and Yeo, 1971). His article from *The Morning Chronicle*

newspaper shocked readers with vivid details of the appalling living conditions in a London slum: ‘The water of the huge ditch in front of the houses is covered with a scum … the air has literally the smell of a graveyard’ (Mayhew, 1852, pp.276-77). In Liverpool, large immigrant communities strained the city’s overcrowded housing stock (Lawton, 1955). Parkinson-Bailey (2000) describes the state of housing for the poor in the rapidly growing city of Manchester. Scotland faced similar challenges, with several cities suffering from severe social deprivation. Edwin Chadwick commented in 1842 that Glasgow’s unsanitary housing conditions were ‘the worse of any we had seen in any part of Great Britain’ (as cited in Crowther, 1990, p.265). According to Whatley (1992, p.298), Dundee was ‘the closest Scottish equivalent’ to Charles Dickens’ fictional industrial city of Coketown in the 1854 novel *Hard Times*.

By the last decades of the nineteenth century, poverty and wider deprivation had risen to endemic proportions and public concern about the many people suffering severe distress had become widespread. Before the 1880s, popular opinion was largely shaped by articles in *The Times* and other newspapers. People were also kept alert to the appalling living conditions in Britain through the works of writers such as Charles Dickens, Henry Mayhew and Arthur Morrison (Gillie, 2008). By the end of the century, more accurate statistical knowledge began to appear. Pioneering research by Charles Booth (1902) and Seebohm Rowntree (1901) estimated that, despite the overall growth in the British economy, some 30 per cent of the population lived on the edge of starvation. These studies made a significant contribution to the analysis of poverty, suggesting that major factors predisposing families to poverty were irregular employment, whether due to seasonality or ill-health, and the low pay of men and the still lower pay of women whilst they were in regular work.

In relation to public health, this period saw major changes in knowledge and practice of sanitation, hygiene, and infectious disease. At the same time, there were few effective drug remedies and overall morbidity and mortality remained high; industrial accidents and injuries were common (Bronstein, 2007). Concern for working-class health mounted during the Boer War of 1899-1902 when the poor medical condition of recruits was widely reported in the press. As many as nine out of ten volunteers were rejected because of physical inadequacy or ill-health (Thane, 1996). An inter-

departmental committee on physical deterioration, set up by the government in 1903, found that in some areas as many as one in four infants died in their first year and three per cent of children died between the ages of one and 10 (ICPD, 1904). Evidence from other sources suggested that a significant proportion of school children were permanently undernourished. In 1889, a London School Board put the figure at 12.8 per cent (Thane, 1989). Subsequent reports revealed significant regional and social class variations in fertility levels, infant mortality, ill-health, and overall life expectancy (Gazeley and Newell, 2015; Horrell and Oxley, 2012).

The transformation of Britain into an industrial nation had major consequences also for the ways in which appropriate male and female roles in society were perceived (Pateman, 1988). First published in 1865, the work titled *Sesame and Lilies*, by prominent social thinker and philanthropist John Ruskin, stands as a classic nineteenth-century statement on the different natures and duties of men and women. Other commentators sought to find biological grounding for the claim that women are intellectually inferior to men. In *Mental Differences between Men and Women*, the evolutionary biologist George Romanes, a close friend of Charles Darwin, used a Darwinian analysis to support an argument that women are incapable of pursuing anything but superficial study: ‘seeing as the average brain-weight of women is about five ounces less than that of men, on merely anatomical grounds we should be prepared to expect a marked inferiority of intellectual power in the former’ (1887, p.384). Such attacks on the legitimacy of women’s claim for intellectual, economic and political equality continued to be grounded in biology well into the twentieth century.

There is extensive research detailing the considerable restrictions placed on women’s public involvement throughout this period, not least the ancient universities’ fight to deny women entry (e.g., Blackburn, 2007; Honeyman, 2000). Nevertheless, although the concept of separate spheres remains influential as a way of interpreting the lives of Victorian and Edwardian women, it is important not to overplay the notion. It has been challenged in different ways by many scholars who argue that it presents, at best, a one-sided view of women’s experiences (Shoemaker, 1998). First, the ideal of private and public as separate spheres was often unobtainable for the poor. Second, research has emerged to show that a

significant minority of non-conforming women worked with, around and against gender stereotypes to challenge their exclusion from the public sphere.

An important strand of the cultural ideal that shaped many women's lives was the assumption of female economic dependency. However, this overlooked that many women had no choice but to work, either to make ends meet or if a husband became sick, injured or died. It is now generally agreed that a significant number of women in this period supported their families with wage-paying jobs (estimated at between 30 and 40 per cent of the workforce). Domestic service remained the largest category of female employment throughout much of this period. Census figures suggest that around a tenth of the female population was in service in 1851, with over 238,000 female domestic servants in London alone in 1891 (White, 2007). As the century progressed, however, employment patterns evolved in response to industrialisation (Valenze, 1995). Generally, male workers strove to secure employment that enabled wives to be full-time mothers, an aspiration in line with the notion of separate spheres. Circumstances meant this ideal was often impossible. There were changes in the way women worked, with a greater prevalence of gender-specific employment (Burnette, 2008). Perceived as a cheap and flexible labour force, women were prominent in industries that underwent considerable technological and organisational change, such as textiles, garment-making, and pottery. However, they were denied access to the best paid work in factories and to certain trades. Well-paid industries such as shipbuilding and construction employed almost exclusively male labour. By the end of the nineteenth century, men had also come to monopolise the high status and better paid white-collar and professional occupations.

Despite widespread working-class support for the concept of the family wage, a frequent complaint among women was unequal pay for the same work. For women working in the lowest-paid jobs, such as matchbox-making, and sorting rags, often 14 hours per day were needed to earn enough to survive (Perkin, 1993). Pat Thane (1996) notes that women were disadvantaged by conventionally lower pay (by half to two thirds) compared with men. In a society with limited social services, unequal pay was therefore particularly problematic for widows and other female-headed households with young children who had to support their families alone; unless they

had an additional source of income, many had a poor chance of supporting their families adequately (Horrell and Humphries, 1995).

The move to industrial employment increased the difficulty of combining work and childcare. Small children often meant working from home in poorly paid employment, especially laundering, needlework or other forms of piecework (Bean, 2015). Infant doping using opiates was reported to be a widespread practice, with overuse resulting in severe illness or death of the child (Berridge and Edwards, 1981). Parents who had no choice but work outside the home tended to rely on older siblings, relatives, neighbours, or often precarious dame schools. The quality of care was frequently poor and the costs substantial; according to Joyce Burnette (2008), mothers with several small children may have paid more than half of their earnings for a person to take care of them.

Poor conditions in factories and workshops put women's health and safety at risk. Pregnant working-class women often worked up until the day they gave birth and returned to work almost immediately (Perkin, 1993). Limited access to safe and effective contraception until well into the twentieth century meant women of child-bearing age might be almost continually pregnant (Pooley, 2013). There was little antenatal care and postnatal care was unregulated and of varying standards (Munro Kerr, 1954). Despite sporadic local attempts to license and educate practitioners, midwifery was essentially unregulated until national legislation was passed early in the twentieth century, starting with the 1902 Midwives Act. Consequently, between 1850 and 1930, the maternal mortality rate remained somewhere between four and five deaths per 1,000 total births in England and Wales (Chamberlain, 2006).

Middle-class women faced a gendered and limited labour market but growing numbers had begun to challenge their exclusion from full participation in the public sphere. Whilst paid employment for these women was regarded as unnatural, indeed unthinkable, some wanted to work (Holloway, 2005). There were also others who were forced to be self-supporting due to their family falling on hard times or because they had been disinherited for choosing to step beyond prescribed boundaries (Cowman, 2007). As Young notes, contemporary debates gradually 'shifted from … speculations about what could, or should, or would happen if middle-class women were to be admitted to the ranks of the educated, the trained,

and the gainfully employed to more practical considerations of the kinds of work in which women were actually engaging' (2019, pp.25-26).

However, throughout most of the period there were few culturally acceptable routes through to a successful career. Respectable employment remained largely restricted to occupations associated with supposed female skills or characteristics: governess, companion or, as the century progressed, schoolteacher and nurse, as well as lower middle-class occupations such as commercial clerks (Lawson and Silver, 1973). Embroidery, dressmaking, or millinery might be available for suitable trained women, and some women took advantage of increasing opportunities in publishing (Sutherland, 2015). Using census returns for 1851-1901, Gordon and Nair (2000) found growing numbers of women in Glasgow employed in new fields such as telephony or running small-scale businesses. Census data has also shown the high level of entrepreneurship among women (around 30 per cent of the total business population) in the second half of the nineteenth century (van Lieshout et al., 2019). However, whilst more opportunities for female employment were created, as structural societal changes occurred, change came slowly, and it is important not to overplay the opening of employment opportunities for middle-class women in this period (Smitley, 2009). As well as a shortage of suitable positions, virtually all were poorly paid. Contemporary reports drew attention to these problems, including analyses circulated in 1905 by the statistician Clara Collet, then working at the Board of Trade. The handful of senior posts made available, Gillian Sutherland reminds us, 'could hardly be said to represent a substantial and expanding set of opportunities for women graduates' (2015, p.44).

Industrial capitalism transformed the economy and dramatically changed the nature of work. Many writers have demonstrated how huge intellectual efforts were dedicated to legislative reforms to address the problems created by industrialisation. General acceptance of an active role for the state in social affairs cannot, however, be exclusively attributed to industrialisation. Other significant factors included the inclusion of new groups into political and public life, first men from the working classes, then women; the diversification of higher education in Britain, England especially; the evolution of a specialised state bureaucracy; and wider transformations in intellectual life.

2.2.2 Politics and participation

Economic and social change had a significant effect on the political life of the nation as groups and movements began to challenge the existing political system and demand greater equality. A series of parliamentary reforms transformed the political landscape by empowering formerly excluded groups and classes (Whitfield, 2001). British politics changed in other ways during this period. The 1867 extension of the franchise and associated reform of the representation system 'led to an increase in the level of electoral competition, a tightening of party discipline, and the introduction of a new style of politics' (Schweber, 1996, p.182). The 1880 general election involved the first national campaign with organised political parties and candidates (Pugh, 1982). As demands made upon politicians increased, and the role began to lose its attraction for young gentlemen, the social composition of elected members underwent a steady modification. By 1918, around 20 men from working-class backgrounds had entered the House of Commons, most elected as Liberal-Labour candidates or for the Labour Party (Guttsman, 1965).

The enlarged electorate following the 1867 and 1884 legislation brought within the political nation a significant proportion of the male working-class population, many of whom had first-hand experience of the social problems generated by modern industrial society. However, it was not until the end of the First World War, and the passing of the Representation of the People Act 1918 (Fourth Reform Act), that numbers of those entitled to vote substantially increased. This brought almost 14 million people into the electorate, extending the vote to practically all men and some women (Purvis and Holton, 2000). An estimated five million women aged between 21 and 30, plus two million women over 30, most of them working class, were still excluded from the franchise (Muggeridge, 2018). Full electoral equality for women was finally achieved with the Representation of the People (Equal Franchise) Act 1928.

Before and after the passing of the Representation of the People Act 1918, the struggle for equality dominated the lives of many women (Binard, 2014). Although the parliamentary franchise was repeatedly withheld from women over many years, women's participation in public life from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries was extensive and varied (Purvis, 1995). Scholars such as Birte

Siim (2000) have characterised active citizenship by women in the system of rights and responsibilities as the key to democratic inclusion. From the 1870s onwards, women could be found engaging in politics and the welfare sphere within their communities in greater numbers, through voluntary organisations and a variety of political organisations and elected bodies, as well as the numerous professions with direct experience in delivering social policy (Hollis, 1987). Women increasingly put themselves forward as local candidates, including positions on Poor Law Boards and School Boards (Cowman, 2014). By 1895, there were over 800 female Poor Law guardians in England, mostly in urban areas, and while 'the number of women elected never approached that of men, many of them have become symbolic for feminist historians' (King, 2004, p.29).

Civic activism involved women from all social classes. As John Garrard's work has shown, the 1894 decision to abolish the property qualification for candidates seeking election to public office was significant in extending opportunities to working-class women. In terms of claiming public space, 'working-class women were', he reflected, 'markedly more impoverished' compared to their middle-class sisters who had the time and financial resources (2002, pp.231-2). Nevertheless, small numbers of working-class women were increasingly able to enter the public realm and some exerted considerable influence.

In emphasising women's agency in this period, scholars rightly highlight the broad nature of women's interests and the desire for more than just legislative change. As Sandra Holton has outlined, many in the women's movement 'were also seeking an overall reform of the political and social systems of Britain' (1995, p.277). Whilst a substantial body of literature has sought to characterise women's reform efforts as being maternalistic (e.g., Koven and Michel, 1990), as Ruth Davidson has recently argued, 'it is questionable whether maternalism alone is sufficient to comprehend what was a complex mix of intentions and motivations' (2016, p.98). There has been a further tendency among some scholars to emphasise a feminist movement fractured by internal division after partial franchise victory in 1918, and in terminal decline thereafter (e.g., Kent, 1988). However, many scholars now question the preoccupation with categorising feminists into two camps and view distinctions between old (equality) and new (welfare) feminists as overstated. For DiCenzo and

Motuz, in one of the most direct and insightful critiques, ‘the tendency to characterise the differences between … feminists as a conflict between equality and difference has been reductive and misleading’ (2016, p.378).

2.2.3 Education reform and the changing role of the universities

Social change transformed the aspirations of the newly rich emerging from the middle class and brought increased pressure for social mobility (Gunn and Bell, 2003). One of the central ways to attain this aim was through the expansion of higher education, which saw unprecedented growth in the nineteenth century. In mid-century, there were but four universities in England in 1860, four in Scotland and three in Ireland, as well as a small degree awarding college in Wales. The ancient English universities were stagnant and impeded social mobility, both because they were expensive and because they imposed religious tests (Knights, 2010). As noted by Brown (2014, p.621), they were ‘assumed to be basically Christian institutions that transmitted a common culture to the country’s future leaders’ through a curriculum concentrated on divinity and the liberal arts. Within eighty years this situation had been completely transformed as assumptions about the purpose of universities were seriously questioned (Clark, 2006). Change owed much to the efforts of northern-based non-conformists from the industrial and professional middle classes. By 1900, higher education expansion and reform was widespread and universities across Britain had been ‘largely transformed into secular institutions … more dedicated to teaching the best students to the highest level their abilities would admit, and more committed to specialisation and to excellence in research’ (Brown, 2014, p.621).

Although student numbers rose markedly towards the end of the century, higher education was for the privileged few. Women and girls faced significant obstacles to learning, which in later life limited their access to the full range of occupational choices (Sutherland, 2015). However, the campaign to establish and improve female education was underway by 1850, undeterred by still fierce opposition from certain sections of society, the most intense condemnation from within the church (Burstyn, 1972; David, 1980) and medical profession (Rowold, 2010). Jane Robinson’s recently published book *Bluestockings* on the fight for female education in Britain quotes an article by the respected British psychiatrist Henry Maudsley in

the *Fortnightly Review* in 1874: ‘It is not that girls have not ambition, nor that they fail generally to run the intellectual race that is set before them’, he wrote, but ‘it would be an ill thing, if it should so happen, that we got the advantages of a quantity of female intellectual work at the price of a puny, enfeebled and sickly race’ (2010, p.71).

As the first all-women institution of higher learning in Britain, Bedford College, established in the Bloomsbury area of London in 1849, played a leading role in the advancement of female higher education. Reform gathered momentum in the 1850s and 1860s as increasing numbers of women began to attend university extension classes being offered around the country (Tuke, 1939). At the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the first residential university-level institutions of higher learning for women were founded from 1869 in the form of separate women’s colleges, although women’s access to full university degrees and membership at these institutions were still many decades away. Elsewhere in England, universities and colleges gradually became co-educational. The federal University of London, established in 1836 as a secular alternative to Oxford and Cambridge and initially serving University College, London (founded 1826) and King’s College, London (founded 1829), claims to have been the first higher education institution in England to accept women on equal terms with men, in 1878. Fifty years after it opened, UCL was the first to admit women to examinations and degrees, but they remained barred from some faculties – notably, engineering and medicine – for a further forty years (Stevenson, 1995). Women were not admitted on equal terms until after the First World War. Other opportunities for higher education for women in London included those offered by Westfield College (founded 1882), the ‘Ladies Department’ of King’s College (founded 1885), Royal Holloway (founded 1886) and the London School of Economics (founded 1895).

In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, the new civic colleges established around the country in major provincial cities, such as Liverpool and Bristol, admitted women to some, or all, of their classes before they received full university status (Alberti, 2005; Barnes, 1996; Walsh, 2009; Whyte, 2015). Like the constituent colleges of the University of London, these institutions all initially taught to the University of London syllabus and offered its degree (typically a BSc). Durham was

the last university in England to open to women, when admission to all courses and degrees (apart from divinity) was granted in 1895. The education system in Scotland was, in many ways, distinct from that of the rest of the country (Carter and Withrington, 1992). All four of the ancient Scottish universities started to admit female students on equal terms at the same time in 1892 after a long campaign by the Edinburgh Association for the University Education of Women (Hamilton, 1987), although 'each adopted somewhat different methods and advanced at differing rates' (Smith, 2014, p.14). From 1884, women were admitted to the three original constituent colleges (Aberystwyth, Cardiff and Bangor) of the University of Wales, a federal university modelled on the University of London, founded in 1893. The Royal University of Ireland, established in 1879 as an examining body and degree-awarding institution, included women from the start. Trinity College Dublin finally admitted women in 1904.

2.2.4 Bureaucratic transformation

Further transformation during this period came in the form of a relatively well-developed state bureaucracy that gradually evolved as the functional needs of the British state changed (Shefter, 1977). Important foundations were laid by the Trevelyan-Northcote investigations and subsequent report published in 1854. By attacking the existing patronage system as one of the main reasons for endemic inefficiency and public disrepute, the report's recommendations 'were radical and challenged the status quo' (Horton, 2006, p.34). While resistance from vested interests in Parliament and the administration was strong, over the next 70 years there followed a series of reforms that established a professional Civil Service in its modern institutional form (Cohen, 1941; Sutherland, 1972).

The introduction of merit-based recruitment gradually transformed the British Civil Service, opening it up to 'new blood and new ideas' (Horton, 2006, p.35). Key to this was educational reform. The Treasury initially linked the subjects to be examined for entry into the higher tier to the liberal curriculum taught at the elite universities, so senior administrative positions continued to be dominated by a male Oxbridge intellectual elite drawn from the same narrow social class as most members of Parliament. By the end of the century, however, the basis of high-level appointments had dramatically changed, and a merit-based Civil Service began to consolidate its

hold on upper-level administrative positions within government. Their role was enhanced greatly following the Liberal landslide election victory in 1906. As Abramovitz and Eliasberg's work has shown, ministers became more dependent on the advice of senior officials, who were increasingly seen as policy advisors as well as administrators; as such, they 'often had a critical part in the design and policy realisation of social reform measures' (1957, p.21).

Improvements in the structure and personnel of government led to the Civil Service gradually opening as a profession for women, although initially their exclusion from Oxbridge meant most did not enter through examination (the norm for men) but were nominated to their posts (Zimmeck, 2003). On the recommendation of three major government enquiries, central government departments with varying degrees of reluctance began to admit women, provided they could be accommodated separately: first the Board of Trade, then the Home Office and the Department of Education (Chapman, 2004).[5] Women were recruited as civil servants in higher positions, though appointments were initially restricted to areas 'where it was thought that the services of women could best promote the interests of the department' (Wheeldon, 2014, p.127). A common point of entry was Home Office appointed factory inspectors specialising in trades that employed women and children (Pellew, 1982). In 1914, there were an estimated 200 women inspectors (Royal Commission on the Civil Service, 1914, p.88).[6] Rose Squire was one of the first women to join, starting her appointment in 1896, shortly after completing a course of study leading to a Sanitary Inspector's Certificate. Her obituary in the *New York Times* notes that in 1921 she became the first woman to attain high rank, when other departments refused to employ women beyond the lowest grades.

Conscription during the First World War resulted in the vast expansion of government jobs for women. As demands for women in inspectorial roles increased, new departments such as the Ministry of Munitions were almost entirely staffed by women (Woollacott, 1994). Expectations of further development after the war were not realised, however. Priority was given to returning service men and recruits to the

[5] The Playfair Commission, (1874-1875), the Ridley Commission, (1888-1890) and the Royal Commission on Labour (1891-1892).
[6] The first female inspectors were called Sub-Inspector (Women) until 1904 when the title changed briefly to Junior Inspector before being renamed Women Inspectors. Factory inspectors were initially employed in a separate Women Inspectors' Branch of the Home Office Factory Department.

administrative class reverted to traditional Oxbridge entrants (Zimmeck, 1988). The Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act 1919, whilst enabling women to enter many professions for the first time, imposed considerable limitations upon women's employment in the British Civil Service. Not until 1925 would women graduates be allowed to enter open competition for the higher-ranking posts on equal terms with men (Evans, 1934).

2.2.5 Transformation of intellectual life, in and beyond the universities

The nineteenth century, as Martin Daunton observed, experienced 'a knowledge explosion … generated by an increase in the supply of information and its rapid diffusion through cheap printing, and by an increase in the demand for knowledge with an expansion in education and income' (2005, p.15). Organisations such as the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge (1826-1848) were founded with the object of encouraging universal literacy with the publication of inexpensive educational literature for those who were unable to obtain formal teaching and had a (particular) focus on scientific subjects (Cain, 1994). More broadly, new areas of knowledge were established, and a newly expanded intellectual elite emerged, formed of a very diverse group of intellectuals who increased attention to understanding the workings of industrial and economic processes (Collini, 1991). What many held in common was a belief in the notion that scientific solutions could be found to the harsh social and environmental costs of economic progress (Wagner, 2007). Ira Katznelson urges a more exact consideration of the problems addressed by the new producers of social knowledge. 'From the perspective of transactions between states and citizens', the main issue, he convincingly argues, was not capitalist industrialisation or the threat of social unrest; rather, it was 'how to shape the state's intervention to make markets function effectively and to make their distributional effects tolerable' (1996, p.23).

The British state was among the first to recognise the importance of collected statistics for identifying social problems and formulating policy (Innes, 2009). The first official census was in 1801. Later, new government departments were created and began to develop the capacity to collect and analyse official social statistics (Bulmer, 1982). The General Register Office, for example, was set up in 1837 to capture information on births, deaths and marriages in England and Wales (Higgs,

2004). These data were to be critical to understanding environmental disease and public health improvements. In time, official statistics would also become very important in ‘understanding the interaction between fertility, poverty and infant mortality, all crucial elements of the debates about the future of the nation in the 20th century’ (Platt, 2005, p.16).

Throughout most of the nineteenth century, a diverse set of intellectuals**,** analysts, and social commentators, including Harriet Martineau, John Stuart Mills, Thomas Malthus, Herbert Spencer, and Matthew Arnold, interpreted changes in modern society using the language of classical political economy entwined with moral philosophy (Whyte, 2005). Occupying a central role in elite social and political life, such figures, most of whom were men, tended to be generalist all-rounders rather than social scientists in its stricter modern sense, and wrote in newspapers, periodicals, and literary magazines such as the *Edinburgh Review* and *The New Age* (Collini, 2006). Many acted through the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (NAPSS) which, between its foundation in 1857 and its final conference in 1884, served as the pre-eminent forum for the discussion of social problems and as an unofficial adviser to governments (Goldman, 2007b). Its goals were, to quote its founder Lord Brougham, ‘to aid legislation, by preparing measures, by explaining them, by recommending them to the community, or, it may be, by stimulating the legislature to adopt them’ (Brougham, 1858, p.23). One of the first organisations to ‘welcome women to full membership … and to support their causes and rights’ (McCrone, 1982, p.44), NAPSS became a major public forum for the discussion of women’s issues. It would inspire the formation of women’s societies devoted to specific ends, such as the Ladies’ National Association for the Diffusion of Sanitary Knowledge. By late century, however, the emergence of a modern and more efficient civil service in the context of wider changes had limited the influence of NAPSS, and Britain saw a new intelligentsia steadily replace the all-rounders.

From the work of Katznelson (1996, p.29) and others we know that these new policy intellectuals were of two types: academic scholars in the social sciences ‘located mainly in burgeoning institutions of higher education, whose policy concerns and impact were indirect’, and non-academic practitioners, ‘whose emphasis was placed

far more directly on policy matters and public influence'. These groups were not mutually exclusive. Uniting them, as Lawrence Goldman observes, was a common goal to create a social science and to 'justify it as both a method of scholarly investigation and as a practical tool of social improvement' (1983, p.599).

Academic scholars in established institutions began to emerge in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. Until then, there was limited independent existence or organisation of the various disciplines offered by universities today. Britain experienced a period of intense professionalisation and crystallisation of specialist areas of research inquiry, as the intellectual break between science and philosophy caused the knowledge community to divide into separate areas for the study of economic, political, and social activities, each with distinctive intellectual tendencies (Goldman, 2005). At the same time as the attempt to create wholly separate professional disciplines, we see the emergence and substantial growth of the university system as we know it and its revival as the site of both the creation of new knowledge and its reproduction (Jarausch, 1983).

Over the same period, Britain experienced what Liesbeth Schweber refers to as 'the persistence and strengthening of a nonprofessionalized elite culture of social science' (1996, p.183). The main orientation of these reform-minded intellectuals was not to the emerging disciplines but focused rather more on policy matters. Towards this end, they were geared toward activism and advisory functions as well as research and 'often saw themselves as simultaneously advancing new findings about societal problems and logical recommendations for re-orientation of public policy' (Rueschemeyer and Skocpol, 1996, p.304). According to Katznelson, this group of 'labor experts, social workers, organizers of social surveys, public administration specialists, reformers concerned with social policy, and intellectuals within social movements and political parties' (1996, pp.33-4) used a variety of organisational fora to pursue their goals. In Britain, these included university settlements established across the country from the 1880s onwards; for instance, the East End of London hosted Oxford House in Bethnal Green (1884-) and Toynbee Hall (1884-) at Whitechapel (Scotland, 2007). Several major activist pressure groups also date from this period, notably the Fabian Society (1884-), Women's Industrial Council (1894-c.1917), and Eugenic Society (1907-). Often

reacting to the more traditional conception of charity, these organisations, and the individuals who worked for them, shared a faith in the application of scientific knowledge, and especially of social science, operating on the margins of academia as part of larger efforts to bring expertise to bear on the social problems of the period.

The growing bureaucratisation of the British state and general acceptance of its role in policy matters created opportunities for scientific experts working both inside and outside academia. Royal Commissions of Inquiry became an established part of government and represent one of the significant instruments of public policy (Rowe and McAllister, 2006). An early study by Clokie and Robinson reported that 'in the seventy years from 1830 to 1900 there were created some 388 Royal Commissions of Inquiry…an average over the whole period of a little more than five per annum' (1937, p.75). Many of these inquiries provided social researchers with opportunities for political influence (Bulmer, 1980). Over the same period, recognition of the need for government agencies and personnel to develop in-house statistical capacities also grew. By 1900, central government agencies, including the Labour Department at the Board of Trade, had begun to employ individuals, mostly men but some women, specifically for their statistical expertise (Wheeldon, 2014).

Some outside experts gained positions of influence within government without going through the Civil Service. This was the case for William Beveridge and Hubert Llewellyn Smith who were appointed to the Board of Trade in 1908 based on economic expertise acquired working on earlier inquiries led by Charles Booth and the Webbs (Schweber, 1996). Others were hired on an ad-hoc basis and their knowledge and analytical techniques pressed into public service. Blayney reports that Albert Kent, Professor of Physiology at University College, Bristol (now, the University of Bristol), was appointed by the Home Office in 1912 to conduct an 'investigation of industrial fatigue by physiological methods' (2019, p.317). As noted by Katznelson: 'Generalists continued to lead the civil service … but increasingly, the choices they had to make were defined for them by the specialist policy intellectuals' (2004, p.137).

2.3 Explaining the advent of modern social policies – theoretical perspectives

Many scholars have offered explanations for why successive British governments came to accept the value of new forms of social and labour protection. Interpretations differ as to who or what was pivotal in the process. In this section, I review a selection of the substantial theoretical literature that exists in this area (e.g., Cousins, 2005; Huber and Stephens, 2001; Leibfried and Mau, 2008). Explanations are grouped into five broad categories that incorporate multiple viewpoints. As it is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore the many important issues in great depth, attention is focused on the debates most relevant to this thesis.

2.3.1 Functionalism

The earliest theoretical explanations of modem social policies adopted a structural or functionalist understanding of their development. One variant emphasised the determining role of economic forces and their social and demographic consequences. Exemplified in early studies by Wilensky and Lebeaux (1958) and others, this literature assumes that: 'industrialization creates new demands for public spending as systems of social support based on kinship and the patrimonial traditions of agrarian societies are eroded' (Myles and Quadagno, 2002, p.36). During the 1970s, neo-Marxist accounts also used functionalist reasoning to explain the development of welfare states. According to Skocpol and Amenta, expansion was driven by the imperative imposed on the capitalist state 'to prepare appropriately motivated and skilled wage workers, and the need to allow employees and their families to consume adequate goods and services for daily and generational renewal' (1986, pp.134-5). Others assume the welfare state is a product of the democratisation of societies. Using the idea of social citizenship as a theoretical basis for understanding policy development, work by the British sociologist Thomas Marshall, first presented in 1949 in a lecture titled *Citizenship and Social Class*, made a major contribution. The social element, he argued, encompasses a broad range of rights, from 'the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in society' (1950, p.11).

Functionalist theories share the basic assumption that, as Carrier and Kendall put it, 'action is determined by external and constraining social and non-social forces, and … a proper understanding of the latter can provide a complete explanation of the former' (1973, p.211). Their main strength is the ability to explain the historic growth of social expenditure and the general trend for social policies in different advanced capitalist-industrial countries to converge. Where functionalist approaches are weaker is their capacity to explain enduring variation among welfare states. Mounting evidence disputing a clear (causal) link between level of industrialisation, modernity or capitalism and the relative earliness or lateness of welfare state development has resulted in widespread criticism (e.g., Myles, 1984; Stephens, 1979). Feminist scholars have been vocal in criticising its inability to explain why some of the first major welfare systems occurred prior to democratisation (Offen, 1994). Numerous feminist critiques of Marshall's model have emerged challenging both its mono-cultural character and focus on property and class at the expense of gender (e.g., Fraser and Gordon, 1992; Lister, 2003; Yuval-Davis, 1997). As Kabeer (2002, p.7) recounts 'the forces of socio-economic change [Marshall] describes are those of the industrial revolution in Britain, the exclusions he focuses on are those of property and class and his history of citizenship is that of a white, male working class'.

2.3.2 Power resources

By the late 1970s, alternative explanations from a non-Marxist tradition had emerged to challenge the functionalist idea that social programmes 'develop independently of party politics, the preferences of political leaders, or the balance of power among the political forces they represent' (Myles and Quadagno, 2002, p.37). In *The Democratic Class Struggle* (Korpi, 1983), the study that according to most sources firmly founded this approach, the main driving force is the level of working-class political mobilisation within a society, measured in terms of the share of the electorate supporting left-wing political parties or the proportion of employees in a trade union. Later studies within this tradition stress the power bargaining of other societal groups. Baldwin (1990) places significant emphasis on influential and powerful sections of the middle class, asking whether this group see it as in their interest to share risks with those less well off than themselves. As he puts it, the 'solidarity of one age has its roots in the selfishness of another' (1990, p.94).

Alternative versions point to the central role of business interests (Paster, 2013) and religious groups (Obinger, 2009). High voter turnout, an event that typically changes the class content of elections, has also found support in the literature (Iversen, 2001).

One of the strengths of research focused on the causal role of political conflict is that it rightly affirms the significance of human agency. Numerous studies based on quantitative, historical, and cross-national research have offered explanations for early welfare state consolidation and why specific policies can exhibit similar trends across countries with different political systems. Research in this tradition has, however, been widely criticised by feminist scholars, who highlight that it failed to notice that early social policies were not exclusively targeted at workers, most of whom were male, and ignored the role of women's agency (e.g., O'Connor et al., 1999; Skocpol, 1992; Wilson, 1977).

2.3.3 Historical institutionalism

This approach argues that the role of the state in explaining the origins of modern social policies is significant. It starts from the position that society-centred approaches, although able to highlight explanatory factors such as economic trends (functionalism) and social classes (power resources theory), do not provide a wholly adequate framework (Evans et al., 1995). Clearly formulated in Theda Skocpol's seminal work, *Protecting Mothers and Soldiers,* it is based on two core assumptions. The first understands 'political activities, whether carried by politicians or by social groups, as conditioned by institutional configurations of governments and political party systems' (1992, p.41). The second expects previously enacted policies to have a role in shaping policy outcomes. Both political institutions and policy legacies, it is argued, create constraints and opportunities for future reformers. Developed during the 1980s in efforts to explain why the United States took a different path to its European counterparts, an institutionalist perspective has served as an important tool for feminist political scientists (e.g., Skocpol, 1985; Skocpol and Orloff, 1986; Weir and Skocpol, 1985; Weir et al., 1988).

The influence of historical institutionalism has been considerable, partly because it is easily combined with other theoretical approaches. According to Béland and Hacker, 'even theorists who emphasise the primacy of social forces now generally

acknowledge and discuss the mediating role of political institutions' (2004, p.45). However, the approach is not without its problems, as noted by Lynch and Rhodes (2016). A common criticism is its inability to explain radical policy change. Some of its fiercest critics, such as Fiona Ross in her research on the British NHS, argue that this stems from its claims being generally 'too vaguely specified to be properly tested as theories' (cited in Hudson and Lowe 2009, p.187). Others emphasise a problematic evidence base (Drezner, 2010). From this perspective, the problem is that it is essentially an interpretative approach limited to generating compelling historical narratives (Peters et al., 2005). Critics also suggest that insufficient attention is given to policy actors, claiming their role is submerged within structural arguments that leave little room for human agency and an uncertain role for ideas, values and attitudes.

2.3.4 Ideas and knowledge-bearing groups

Recently, institutionalist scholarship has paid greater attention to ideational processes, emphasising the role of ideas, experts and expertise on the development of modern social policies (Béland, 2009). Many concur with political scientist Deborah Stone's view that 'the essence of policymaking in political communities [is] the struggle over ideas'; it is 'shared meanings', she adds, that 'motivate people to action and meld individual striving into collective action. Ideas are at the centre of all political conflict' (1997, p.11).

Studying the influence of ideas in policymaking is not new, however. The role of "great men" as the ultimate agencies of social change has been asserted in much of British history throughout the twentieth century. Goldthorpe (1964) recounted how the explanation of social change offered in 1905 by A.V. Dicey, the author of *Law and Public Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century*, centred on the dominant role played by thinkers such as Jeremy Bentham. Later critics lambasted the lack of theoretical focus in this type of work. Reviewing the existing literature in the late 1970s, Ian Gough boldly stated that he would only consider those 'explanations … which warrant the title "theories"' and did 'not intend to waste time on … descriptive accounts of social policy development' (1978, p.29). Carr (1964) and Stedman Jones (1972) made similar points.

Subsequent work attempted to address these concerns. Examples include Michael Freeden's (1978) examination of "New Liberalism" in the years between 1886 and 1914 which underscored the contribution of biological and evolutionary ideas to changing attitudes. José Harris (1992) considered the impact of Victorian cultural ideas and values about the working class on welfare state development. Feminist scholars have also made important contributions in this area, scrutinising the ideational processes behind the construction of social and economic problems. Jane Jenson's (1989) early work highlighted the way in which societal paradigms influenced pre-1914 labour protection legislation in France and the United States. There followed ground-breaking work by the British historian Jane Lewis on what she and others have termed the male breadwinner model ideal of the family and its implications for work, care, and policy development (1992; 2001).

The causal mechanisms by which ideas 'insinuate themselves into policymaking' are of increasing interest to scholars (Oliver and Pemberton, 2004, p.415). There can be few who would disagree with Sheri Berman's assertion that 'ideas do not have any impact by themselves … [but] influence politics only by acting through or on a particular political actor' (1998, p.22). In a similar vein, Heffernan (2002, p.749) argues that 'ideas explain the form of change that is enacted, but actors, institutions and environments provide the opportunity for change to be effected'. Where policy ideas come from is one of the most central questions in understanding their role in policy development. As political scientist John Kingdon noted, 'ideas can come from anywhere' (1984, p.71). Social movements, international organisations, transnational advocacy networks, consulting companies, business groups and political parties have all been revealed as sources of new ideas. Recognising that different types of ideas, including knowledge gained from research and analysis, may affect policymaking, scholars have identified academics and other intellectuals as another important set of actors in policy networks, one 'whose claim to knowledge and expertise enables their voice to be heard above others' (Campbell, 2002, p.29). While many studies have focused on how policy-relevant ideas are diffused (and through which actors and institutions), some have urged researchers to be more attentive to how and where ideas are produced. To that end, the concept of epistemic communities was developed by Peter Haas (1992) to represent groups of scientific experts with an authoritative claim to knowledge organised around a

special subject matter or issue, emphasising the heightened benefits of consensual knowledge for policymakers.

The decades around 1900 have also been the focus of projects that explore the relationship been social science and social policy, as part of a renewed interest in the structure and role of the state. Several volumes compare national experiences in the formative period, analysing developments over time (e.g., Furner and Supple, 1990; Wagner et al., 1991; Ziemann and Brückweh, 2012). Rueschemeyer and Skocpol's edited collection, *Social Knowledge, and the Origins of Modern Social Policies* (1996), brings together a set of papers that demonstrate the link between the emergence of the modern state and the growth of what they term "social knowledge" in several European and North American countries, as well as Japan. Chapters in this volume reveal the broad and often indirect ways in which knowledge, and knowledge-bearing individuals, groups and organisations, influenced policy development. 'Amidst the variation', the book editors conclude, 'there is one constant: intellectual expertise and authority invariably left their imprint on the formation of early modern social policies' (1996, pp.6-7).

Rueschemeyer and Skocpol make a strong case for studying the role of ideas in policy processes, asserting the 'need to understand more deeply both the ideas and the socio-institutional locations of the bearers of new knowledge about society who figured so importantly in the origins of early modern social policies' (1996, p.7). According to Béland and Mahon, ideas are not 'more important than actors and institutions'; the argument is that 'a focus on ideas provides a useful compliment to existing approaches' (2016, p.102). Put another way, the claim is not that the availability of social knowledge necessarily caused particular social policies in this period: it is that neither can be understood without accounting for the other. Whilst these perspectives appear to offer important insight into the research-policy relationship, their contribution to understanding women's role in these processes has been limited so far.

2.3.5 Gender analysis and feminist research

Feminist perspectives, as Vic George and Paul Wilding rightly point out, have 'enormously enriched the study of social policy and our understanding of those institutions which we call … "the welfare state"' (1994, pp.157-8). A substantial

literature examines women as clients of welfare states, calling attention to the way in which social policies had been shaped by normative assumptions about gender roles, especially ideas about the sexual division of labour and female dependency upon male earning power (e.g., Blackburn, 1995; Dale and Foster, 1986; McIntosh, 1981; Okin, 1979; Pascall, 1986; Wilson, 1977). Though this work has been hugely important for demonstrating ways in which the system has posed structural constraints on women, it attracted criticism for having made 'assumptions to the marginal role of women's agency in the construction of the welfare state' (Hobson, 1993, p.396).

In response, a rich body of theoretical and empirical literature on the varied roles played by women in shaping social policies has emerged. Elements of this work focus on the formative period from the late nineteenth century. As Misra and Akins note, 'Long before they received the right to vote, women … were engaged in political work, active in charitable foundations and working toward eliminating poverty even before the state began taking over welfare related duties' (1998, p.23). Two early edited collections stand out. Seth Koven and Sonya Michel's (1993) *Mothers of a New World* and Gisele Bock and Pat Thane's (1991) *Maternity and Gender Policies* bring together a series of influential studies from Britain and other Western industrialising countries at the turn of the nineteenth century. They share a similar argument centred on the observation that 'large-scale welfare programs and policies emerged at the same time as women's social action movements' in these countries (Koven and Michel, 1990, p.1076). Koven (1993) examined the British case, arguing that the largely female organisations who were responsible for funding and managing school health clinics, schools for invalid children and juvenile reformatories were important precursors to a more expansive welfare state. Over recent decades, a significant body of literature has emerged that has been central to this topic, including prior works that have emphasised the importance of women in the labour movement in pressing for maternal and child welfare benefits in the early twentieth century and the role of activists in the interwar era in agitating for equal pay (for example, see Hannam, 2010; Lewis, 1991; Smith, 1996; Thane, 1991).

Overall, the literature on the origins of modern social policies has tended to underplay the role of women as creators and users of social scientific knowledge.

The past decade has seen an increase in the number of studies exploring the historical connections between social science and reformism efforts, and the role of women in these processes. Chapter 1 highlighted work that goes some way to filling this importance gap in knowledge. However, much remains to be done in terms of recovering a wider and deeper sense of women's involvement in social science.

2.4 Research aims, objectives and over-arching question

The previous sections gave attention to the larger historical context and some of the main strands in thinking that have contributed to our understanding of the early development of modern social policies in Britain, with a special focus on the recent shift towards understanding the impact of knowledge and knowledge-bearing individuals and groups. The crux of my argument is that women were important agents in this process.

The aim of this thesis was to extend what is known about the appeal of social science for women between roughly 1870 and 1920; how they negotiated access to and participation in social science education and careers; and their contributions not just as scholars but also in distinct roles beyond the university. By portraying the significance of these women's lives, I want to show how often, as so-called second-wave feminists have frequently argued, the "personal is political" (David, 2003). The story of early women in social science, recovered and examined within this thesis using a combination of prosopography and collective biography, adds to our understanding of the overlapping histories of social science and social policy.

This aim was achieved through these objectives:

1. Undertake a survey to identify women who participated in social science, having first defined the group to be studied.
2. Collect biographical data for all individuals (on such properties as origins, personal relationships and careers), which are stored and organised in a relational prosopographical database built to facilitate analyses.
3. Investigate patterns and variations in social origins, family relationships, and early education, to reveal otherwise concealed influences on their motivations to pursue social science activities.

4. Investigate women's experiences in higher education as students of social science, mostly in Oxbridge and London but with occasional examples from other universities.
5. Examine the different roles and career paths through which women pursued social science.
6. Consider the work of early women in the social sciences and its influence in policy development.
7. Reflect on the historiographical silence about these early women in social science.

The overarching research question is: Why and how did women interact with the social sciences during the formative years, and what contribution did they make?

The argument unfolds in two parts. Chapters 4 to 7 explore the interconnected personal and professional experiences of this group (Part 1). Chapter 8 examines the nature of the relationship between research and policy in three exploratory case studies (Part 2).

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes and defends the methodology used in this study.[7] Overall, it argues that biography is a method by which we might understand early women in social science, if not the nature of the research-policy relationship in Britain itself. Although the focus is on historical subjects, the work falls within the scope of social science. Some readers may protest at an explicit and detailed discussion of methodological assumptions and choices, since these details are not routinely required of historians, and many works of history are written 'with barely a nod towards methodology' (Gunn and Faire, 2016, p.1). However, articulating what has been done to achieve a set of research results matters a great deal, regardless of field of study. Our understanding about any phenomenon is integrally bound up with how we have gone about studying it, and research results and conclusions need to be interpreted in this context. Lack of methodological transparency in research makes this harder for readers (Bryman, 2015).

As an academic with different research interests, I am not committed to a single lens through which I look at the world. To put it another way, there is no one epistemology or ontological belief with which I particularly identity. Instead, I alternate between different traditions depending on the area of research I am undertaking. In this study the intention is to explore and understand 'the world of human experience' (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.36), with no aspiration towards the generation of generalisable explanations. Placing the research problem as central, I have selected data collection and analysis methods that I consider the most likely to provide credible insights (Creswell, 2009). This way of thinking aligns with the pragmatic paradigm, with no philosophical loyalty to any alternative paradigm.[8]

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows. First, I consider my position as a feminist social scientist and discuss the reflexivity implied in the research process. Next, I present biography as an appropriate tool for the analysis of socio-

[7] Methodology: defined as both 'the collection of methods or rules by which a particular piece of research is undertaken' and 'the principles, theories and values that underpin a particular approach to research' (Somekh and Lewin 2005, p.346).
[8] Research paradigm: defined as a cluster of epistemological and philosophical beliefs; the [underlying] philosophical intent or motivation for undertaking a study (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.38).

historical phenomenon, and explore the possibilities offered by different biographical approaches used by sociologists, historians and others to study groups of lives. An overview and justification of my own approach is presented in the third section, where I also discuss and justify the specific techniques and methods used, considering both theoretical and practical issues. Fourth, I detail the procedures for defining and selecting the intellectual community that my research seeks to understand. In section five, I outline the variety of strategies used to assemble relevant biographical data. This is followed by an overview of how I approached the task of analysing and interpreting the dataset. The penultimate section covers technical and software-related issues. Finally, I conclude by discussing the ethical dimensions of the research.

3.1 Getting personal: knowledge production and reflexivity

I approached this study from a specifically feminist stance. It is important to recognise the many positions on the question of what makes research feminist; there are, as noted elsewhere, 'divisions *within* and *between* feminisms, as well as … divisions between feminist and non-feminist researchers' (Westmarland, 2001, p.1, emphasis in original). I follow Reinharz (1992), Weiner (1998) and others in the view that there is not one definitive feminist perspective or feminist methodology. 'What one means by feminist methodology', as noted by Caroline Ramazanoglu, 'depends in part on which authors one takes as examples' (1992, p.208). I adopt the widely used definition provided by Marjorie DeVault, who claims that its distinctiveness is in a shared commitment to certain goals: '1. Feminists seek a methodology that will do the work of "excavation", shifting the focus of standard research practice from men's concerns … to reveal the locations and perspectives of (all) women … 2. Feminists seek a science that minimizes harm and control in the research process … 3. Feminists seek a methodology that will support research of value to women, leading to social change or action beneficial to women' (1996, pp.32-34).

When it comes to method, many writers on the topic agree with Barbara Risman and colleagues that: 'no one method is a priori more feminist than another' (1993, p.608). I also support the stance taken by Liz Kelly and others that 'what makes feminist research feminist is less the method used, and more how it is used and

what it is used for' (Kelly et al., 1992, p.150). Feminist scholars may have different views on how to define feminist research, but there seems to be broad agreement that we can evaluate to what degree a research project is feminist by looking at the choices being made by the researcher.

Extensive self-reflexivity throughout the research process has become one of the significant contributions of feminist work, with scholars emphasising its importance some time before the concept was developed by Anthony Giddens in his structuration theory (1991). To quote Helen Roberts, there was a need for 'a reflexive sociology in which the sociologist takes her own experiences seriously and incorporates them into her work' (1981, p.16). Recent conversations about the use of biographical methods also emphasise the ways in which, as Linden West states, 'the personality, background, situation as well as the conceptual frame of the researcher … shape the way people tell their stories, and how these are interpreted' (as cited in Merrill and West 2009, p.101). Liz Stanley, a feminist sociologist who has been central to debates on feminist methods and methodology since the 1970s, has written extensively on the importance of reflexivity and personal knowledge in research inquiry. She uses the term auto/biography to capture the relationship between writing an account of one's own life through autobiography and the construction of others' lives through biography (Stanley, 1992). In using this term, her intention is to draw attention to how biographers choose subjects and topics that are almost always motivated by their own personal and/or professional lives and interests.

Such is the near universal approval on the virtue of reflexivity in theory and research practice, Maton (2003, p.54) observes that it has 'now become a sin to *not* be reflexive'. While there is little agreement within the social sciences as to what comprises reflexivity, most discussions of reflexivity share an interest in the question: How does the researcher prevent personal bias from influencing the study? Building upon the ideas of Liz Stanley and a strong body of feminist and methodological literature in this area, including Ackerly and True (2010), Hesse-Biber (2014) and Leavy and Harris (2019), two forms of reflexive research practice were incorporated into this thesis. Personal reflexivity involved being aware of how key facets of my social and cultural identity (such as age, social class, professional

background, and political stance) might have shaped my positioning within the research process. I am uninterested in a reflexivity that places myself at the core the research but have presented a short autobiographical narrative (sometimes called a positionality statement) in the introductory chapter. Epistemological reflexivity is concerned with the conditions of knowledge production. This meant I considered the assumptions and preconceived ideas that may have influenced the way that I defined the research problem or the research design, as well as the implications of any suppositions that I made for the research findings and my interpretations (Willig, 2008).

While conventional doctrine asserts that formal academic writing would be better written 'with no reference to the "I" author' (Lerner, 2001, p.16), there has been something of a paradigm shift in attitudes about the first person in recent decades (Davies, 2012). This is due in part to its alignment with the epistemologies of feminist research and the concept of positionality (Webb, 1992). In the 1990s, the feminist scholar Gesa Kirsch suggested that 'omitting the authorial I [was] a rhetorical strategy that can be (and has been) used to turn opinions into truth, to silence women … and to trivialize their concerns…. The uses of an authorial I (or lack thereof) have social, moral, and political consequences for which authors bear responsibility' (1994, p.382). Gayle Letherby offered a further explanation: 'writing in the first person helps to make clear the author's role in constructing rather than discovering the story/knowledge' (2003, p.141). I am encouraged by these arguments to use the first person in my thesis, although it is not sustained throughout the entire thesis. I return to the issue of reflexivity in research in the conclusion chapter.

3.2 Selecting biography

3.2.1 The turn towards biographical approaches in the social sciences

Biographical research, as a form of life writing, is a wide field of different approaches and research strategies. Though popular with the public, it has traditionally occupied a contested space on the margins of mainstream academic research. Historians who wrote biographies were often considered methodologically conservative, offering their readers 'an antiquated and unreflective approach to history' (Lässig, 2008, p.1). They have been criticised for being overly subjective and non-

generalisable. As late as 2000, David Ellis could argue that the genre of biography offered only 'lives without theory' (2000, p.1). Twenty years later, it would be difficult to make such a claim. Many works of biography now draw on a rigorous and explicit conceptual and methodological apparatus and such research is becoming more and more popular. Several recent works emphasise the importance of biography to the social sciences and detail the significant changes in the biographical genre that have taken place during recent decades as sub-fields within biography have grown (e.g., Chamberlayne et al., 2000; Holroyd, 2002; Lee, 2009; Renders and de Haan, 2013).

Recent changes in the way biographers research and represent the past has coincided with the more general shift within historiography, from a history that concentrates on structures and numbers, to one that is sensitive to the individual and the constructed nature of identity. Simone Lässig (2008) in her introduction to a recent volume on the biographical genre draws attention to the contribution of Pierre Bourdieu (1984; 1990) to understanding of the relation between agency and structure, and false assumption of an autonomous subject. To use Karl Marx's memorable dictum, formulated over a century and a half ago: 'Men [*sic*] make their own history, but they do not make it just as the please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past' (1869 [1852], p.389).

Over time, texts illustrating the life of an individual have given way to biographies seeking to explain how individual lives and broader social and cultural processes and patterns interconnect. 'Anyone who understands that the autonomy of the agentic subject is an illusion', Lässig notes, 'cannot help but relate the behavior and feelings of the individual to the fields in which the person was active, to the networks that he or she helped to construct, and to the social background conditions that influenced, shaped or even promoted individual decisions and actions' (2008, pp.10-11). The strength of biography is increasingly seen to rest, as Ian Kershaw argues, in using it as a lens 'through which wider problems of analysis can be viewed' (2008, p.35). This is exemplified by Carolyn Steedman's biography of the educationalist Margaret McMillan. Faced with the challenge that McMillan had left few private papers, Steedman developed an approach in which she used her subject's life as a

key rather than an end in itself: in this instance, as a window into British life, reflected in the overarching themes of childhood, culture and class (Steedman, 1990). Other exemplars of this approach include Barbara Laslett's (1991) biography of William Fielding Ogburn which is used to examine the historical process by which ideas about sociology developed in twentieth-century America.

Feminist, postmodern and postcolonial critiques of the genre have underpinned many of the recent innovations in practice that have seen, as Levke Harders (2014) highlights, a shifting of the biographical focus from texts that focus on the lives of well-known and influential figures to accounts of marginalised lives. While women's lives are of increasing biographical interest, the initial focus on recovering the achievements of neglected and forgotten women in history has progressively shifted toward analyses that can help trace the often-contradictory effects of gender and class on people's lives. The distinctive nature of feminist biography has been highlighted by Barbara Caine (2010) and others who emphasise its importance for showing women not only as victims but as activists and makers of history. Broader conceptualisation of the genre is reflected in new narrative forms (Nilsen 1996). Angelika Schaser's survey of recent biographical scholarship in Germany found most studies preferring 'at least partial abandonment of chronological structure in favour of thematic focus' (2008, p.74).

3.2.2 Researching groups of lives

The increased popularity of biography has given rise to a new growth of interest in studying groups of lives, producing a collective rather than individual biography. Two methods available to the researcher are prosopography and collective biography.[9] Both can be used in many fields and are rapidly growing areas of scholarship.

Contemporary interest in prosopography owes a great deal to Lawrence Stone, historian of early modern Britain noted for his work on marriage, families and the aristocracy, who advocated its use as a research technique throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Stone wrote an influential article in *Daedalus* defining prosopography as 'the investigation of the common background characteristics of a group of actors in history by means of a collective study of their lives'. He went on to explain that the

[9] The term 'method' is used loosely here, as prosopography and collective biography borrow methods from several disciplines.

‘method employed is to establish a universe to be studied, and then ask a set of uniform questions – about birth and death, marriage and family … and so on’ (1971, p.46). Two “schools” of prosopographical research are distinguished. While this methodological distinction has lost the validity it once had, it remains a useful starting point for the discussion here.

Studies based on relatively small, manageable groups of individuals, what Stone referred to as elite prosopography, are older and more traditional in origin. Popular amongst eighteenth-century encyclopaedists and historians in the late nineteenth century, this type worked best, Stone concluded, ‘when it is applied to easily defined and fairly small groups over a limited period of not much more than a hundred years, when the data are drawn from a very wide variety of sources which complement and enrich each other’ (1987, p.69). The first studies were concerned with (mostly political) elites, with the intention of gaining understanding of the role played by economic circumstances, kinship and other factors in how power was acquired and maintained. An early exemplar is Charles Beard’s (1913) explanation of the establishment of the American Federal Constitution through a close analysis of the class backgrounds, economic interests, and social outlooks of the United States founding fathers. More recent studies in this tradition have centred on the dynamics of other elite groups in society. A fine example is the work of Diane Jones on nineteenth-century non-conformist entrepreneurs. Using this approach, she constructed detailed case studies of nine prominent businessmen to re-examine Max Weber’s hypothesis regarding Protestant asceticism as the foundation of modern vocationalism, justifying her choice of methodology on the grounds of its ‘*overriding* concern with the “group” rather than the individual’ (Jones, 2001, p.333, emphasis in original).

Stone described the second type of prosopography as the mass study, a reference to the much larger number of individuals investigated using this approach. Researchers tend to be more concerned with subjects who are not members of a social elite, using aggregated data on individuals ‘to help explain ideological or cultural change … and analyse with precision the structure of society and the degree and the nature of the movements within it’ (Stone, 1971, p.47). This form of prosopography, which has traditionally been used in ancient and medieval history,

continues to play a very important part in the study of these communities, often in the form of major collaborative projects. One example is the *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* project, a continuation of work originally inspired by Arnold Jones in 1950 and sponsored since then by the British Academy (Martindale, 2001). Scholars in other fields of study have also taken an interest in this approach, especially in relation to nineteenth- and twentieth-century inhabitants. Over 150 years ago, Francis Galton (1865) used it as a starting point for work that attempted to statistically demonstrate the role of heredity in producing men of genius, partly brought on by reading *Origin of Species* (1859), the work of his cousin, Charles Darwin. Since the 1930s, researchers operating within the "mass school" have drawn more explicitly on sociological and psychological theory. For example, social anthropologists such as Elizabeth Bott (1957) have drawn on aspects of prosopography to study kinship patterns. A more recent example is Josie Abbott's (2009) study of women office secretarial workers around 1900, which pieces together a collective narrative about a largely uncelebrated group from partial and incomplete individual biographies.

An alternative variant of "mass" prosopography was developed by Pierre Bourdieu and his collaborators in the late 1970s. Several distinctive sociological concepts accompany this approach, among that the concept of field, which, 'as theorized by Bourdieu … designates a sub-space of the social space where a specific activity (such as art or science) is carried on' (as cited in Sapiro, 2002, p.388). In a typical Bourdieu-inspired prosopographical study, Donald Broady explains, the 'prime objective is to understand not the individuals or their interactions but the history and structure of the field itself – which in turn gives sociological meaning to the trajectories and destiny of the individuals' (2002, pp.381-2). Important contributions include Bourdieu (1984) and Sapiro (1999).

Where "elite" prosopography will typically involve a series of detailed case studies, researchers working within the "mass" school tend towards the use of quantitative analysis. There is an emphasis on obtaining representative samples and making causal inferences by 'testing the statistical correlations of many variables' (Stone, 1971, p.47). Advancements in computing and database construction have meant that researchers can now deal with vast amounts of data and carry out increasingly

sophisticated multivariate analyses. While the nature of historical sources means that it can be difficult to assemble samples that are amenable to quantitative analysis, some researchers are now using advanced statistical techniques, such as propensity-score methods, to address bias introduced by unrepresentative samples and missing data.

Feminists in different fields have utilised prosopography. The British sociologist Olive Banks pioneered its use as a sociological research method in work charting the history and development of British feminism. *Becoming a Feminist: The Social Origins of 'First Wave' Feminism*, which appeared in 1986, involved the collection and analysis of around 100 individual biographies, to demonstrate the variety and complexity of British feminism. Her approach was to examine different categories of formative experience, including class, religion, and relationship with parents, to discover which factors might predispose a woman to become a feminist. 'The main justification' for this study, she said, was 'its methodology, which by examining the lives of individual feminists makes possible the exploration of the way in which personal experiences interact with ideological perspective, and indeed with the level of commitment to feminism' (Banks, 1986, p.6).

Banks recognised the concept of generation as a likely factor shaping the women's experiences and divided her subjects into four "birth cohorts" to explore whether patterns of difference existed between the groups. Philippa Levine (1990) used a similar methodological approach for her study of English feminism in the period c.1850-c.1900. Ann Dingsdale's (1995) unpublished thesis on members of the Kensington Society is another early example. American feminist sociologist Angela Jones used the prosopographical method in a study of networks associated with the radical Niagara Movement, an influential civil rights group primarily led by W.E.B. DuBois. 'The lives of a group of individuals', she contends, 'can be pieced together to paint a more vivid portrait of the historical, social and political context under study' (2016, p.72).

Another increasingly popular means of studying groups of lives has been the collective biographical method. Krista Cowman provides guidance for those considering this type of approach for their research, many of whom, she notes, are 'rediscovering an interest in individuals and their subjective experiences' (2016,

p.85). By considering the members of the group as individuals and in relation to each other, collective biography is, she concludes, an ‘invaluable way of attempting to recover past experiences as well as of suggesting ways in which this was shaped by the broader structures in which it was situated’ (2016, p.99). This interpretation of collective biography is echoed by Barbara Caine who writes that it ‘has been particularly attractive to those concerned to link life stories with wider historical processes’, as well as those interested in the history of ideas and thinkers, who value its potential for ‘showing not only social and personal connections but also political developments which have directed the attention of people in particular ways, and how important personal interaction has been in the development of particular ideas’ (2010, p.61).

Researchers have approached collective biography in different ways and for different reasons. Cowman (2016, pp.91-4) is among those to point out the recent growth of interest among feminist scholars, sociologists, educationalists and historians, many of whom have drawn on the methodological and theoretical insights of Olive Banks. The techniques of collective biography are skilfully demonstrated in works focusing on sibling groups and on women’s friendships. Notable examples include Barbara Caine’s biography of Beatrice Webb’s sisters (1986) and Norma Clarke’s account of the interwoven lives, writing and relationships of four literary women (1990). The history of education has produced some significant collective biographies, including Jane Martin and Joyce Goodman’s *Women and Education 1800-1980*, a celebration of the lives and achievements of six little-recognised British educational activists within nineteenth- and twentieth-century history. The authors say they adopted collective biography for the potential it offers to ‘explore how these women resisted gender roles’ and were able to ‘construct their lives in whatever conditions they find themselves’ (2003, p.112). Although the book used a conventional style of dividing the text into a chapter on each subject, it nonetheless succeeded in treating the group of women “as a whole”. Elsewhere, Martin has lauded collective biography for its ability to offset the charge of atypicality levelled at studies focused on one individual. Writing about the social networks of women educational activists in London in the years around 1900, she argues: ‘As individuals, these women were very different personalities. As a group, they show how organized women in this period were active and influential far

beyond the suffrage movement' (2005, p.160). To take one other instance, Miriam David (2014) used the term to describe her work on second wave feminists in higher education.

Different understandings of collective biography include those associated with explicitly feminist work containing elements of both autobiography and biography. In the memory work developed by feminist sociologist Frigga Haug and her colleagues in Germany in the 1980s, researchers generate the data themselves in the form of systematically recalled memories (Haug, 1987). More recently, feminist education scholars Bronwyn Davies and Susanne Gannon have extended Haug's ideas to develop a form of collective biography that interrogates the researchers own lived experiences through the conceptual apparatus enabled by post-structural theory. With early roots in the philosophies of Michel Foucault and Judith Butler, this approach seeks 'to bring theory into collusion with everyday life' and has produced an extended body of research on gendered subjectivities and spaces (Davies and Gannon, 2006, p.4; Charteris et al., 2016; Gonick and Gannon, 2014). Another interpretation of collective biography that blurs the distinction between biography and autobiography emerges in the work of feminist epistemologist and sociologist Liz Stanley (1990; 1995; 2000; 2013; Stanley and Wise, 1990). Rooted in feminist ideas about place of reflexivity within sociological research processes, the influence of the biographer on the research may be discussed within the text or a radically subjective approach may be chosen in which the researcher engages with their own life story in the analyses. Using the term auto/biography to symbolise connections between autobiography and biography, this notion of collective biography, claims Stanley (1993, p.41), 'disrupts conventional taxonomies of life writing, disputing its divisions of self/other, public/private, and immediacy/memory'.

Prosopography and collective biography can be integrated within the same study to further explore and develop knowledge about groups of lives. Olive Banks' study on the origins of feminism can be interpreted as an attempt to marry the two approaches, although as previously noted this aspect of her work has not been sufficiently recognised and has only relatively recently been re-evaluated (Weiner, 2008). Also significant is research by Anna Hillyar and Jane McDermid on women in Russia during the formative years of the Communist Party. In the words of the

authors, the goal was to design a study ‘in which individuals and their experience of life and revolutionary work will not be obscured by the dry figures of statistical analysis or put into the shadows by a few from the ranks of their comrades-in-arms, especially the ranks of the party “officers”’ (2000, p.161).

As two forms of life writing, prosopography and collective biography have much in common and many scholars use the terms interchangeably, ‘as if these were one and the same thing’ (Cowman, 2016, pp.86-87). However, this fails to appreciate the clear distinction between the two, a point reiterated by Oldfield (2015) and others. For prosopography, which explores ‘biographical details about individuals in aggregate’, it is the group that is crucial (Smythe, 2000, p.85). Although there may be some discussion of individual data, analysing individual lives per se is not a major focus, and any evidence that is presented about an individual is included only ‘to uncover the collective and the normal’ (Keats-Rohan, 2007, p.141). By contrast, collective biography ‘self-consciously retains a focus on the individual even when it sits within work which aims to use individual lives to explore collective experiences, or within studies of communities’ (Cowman, 2016, p.87). It is not, as some suggest, a lesser form of prosopography, but a distinct approach to data collection and conceptualisation. As noted by Magdalino (2003, p.42), ‘the primary concern of one [is] the secondary concern of the other’. While it is important to distinguish between prosopography and collective biography, these approaches can be complementary and integrated within the same study to further explore and develop knowledge about groups of lives.

In rejecting traditional philosophical dualisms, I follow Bryman (1988) and others who argue that methods are not per se paradigmatically bound. Researchers should therefore avail themselves of whatever design is best suited for investigating their research questions to achieve the objectives set. Having a thorough understanding of available methods and techniques is key to ensuring that they are selected and handled appropriately. When studying groups of lives, an appreciation of the nuances that separate prosopography from collective biography is therefore paramount. It is important to recognise that each of these methods can be approached in a variety of different ways. As early as 1973, the classicist Thomas Carney argued against the idea that there was an ideal form of prosopography,

proposing instead that the ‘guidelines have to be adapted as the question and source materials under study indicate’ (1973, p.164). The authors of a major handbook reiterate that it remains ‘a plural rather than a singular beast’ (Keats-Rohan, 2007, p.20). Similarly, as Krista Cowman demonstrates in her recent review (2016), there is no ideal collective biographical approach to studying the past; rather, the way in which it is handled is a question that must be decided for each research project separately.

3.3 Overview of the research strategy used in this study

In an early account of the nineteenth-century movement for women’s education, Margaret Bryant emphasised the importance of going beyond the well-known personalities to include figures who generally neither sought nor expected recognition. She wrote that ‘what is needed is closer, more critical, and more balanced study of individuals and of the interplay between those able to take a leading part and those, sometimes equally active, taking a subordinate role’ (1979, p.30). Only by examining details about the lives and involvement of everyone who took part, she argued, can we really understand the campaign. In thinking about my own project, I sought to apply Bryant’s insights about the importance of including all women who engaged in the social scientific enterprise in the formative years. I have been guided also by the broader literature on feminist research and biography, taking note of issues that have been raised and using these insights to inform my approach. To that end, in ways reminiscent of Banks (1986) and Hillyar and McDermid (2000), this thesis benefits from a mixed method approach that is methodologically close to both prosopography and collective biography. Combining different methods in a single study, as Gorard argues, ‘can lead to less waste of potentially useful information’ (2004, p.7) and ensure the aims of the study are fulfilled.

To summarise, I have attempted to follow the principles outlined in work by Cowman (2016) and Verboven et al. (2007), for collective biography and prosopography respectively, while at the same time adapting them to the needs of this inquiry. The key methodological steps taken to implement my overall approach are presented next and the three sections that follow explain these in more detail.

Identification of research subjects (section 3.4). The research group were defined and identified using pre-specified criteria so that decisions about whom to count are less arbitrary.

Data collection (section 3.5). I compiled a prosopographical database of bibliographical information relating to every individual meeting the selection criteria. To build the biographical profiles, different types of data were collected using a structured questionnaire.

Data analysis and interpretation (section 3.6). Patterns and relations within and across the group of women were identified through the integration of different types of data at different stages of the inquiry. Accordingly, an integrative approach of embedding quantitative data in a qualitative study was used to provide both breadth and depth of description (Brannen, 2004; Creswell, 2009).

3.4 Identifying the biographical subjects

This section describes the process used to identify women to be included in the main analyses. First, I defined the target population and, based on this, established formal criteria to aid the selection process and provide a rationale for those who were selected. The second step was to systematically consult relevant sources for the purposes of generating an initial list of names (hereafter, the longlist). Finally, the selection criteria were applied to the longlist to identify women eligible for inclusion.

3.4.1 Defining the research subjects: the formal selection criteria

The group of women I am studying had counterparts in the network of female scholars and activists associated with the Hull House settlement in Chicago, the site of many urban research projects.[10] The object of my analysis cannot be defined so clearly and unambiguously, since the group of actors is not limited to a single intellectual or institutional setting. Besides, it is created by the researcher and includes, to quote Bulst and Genet, 'people whose lives were not coterminous or who never felt that they were members of a distinct body' (1986, p.6). To help avoid

[10] Accordingly, the efforts of these women have been variously described as the Hull-House school of sociology (Deegan, 1988) or the Chicago Women's School of Sociology (Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998).

arbitrary decisions, theoretically informed selection criteria were used as the basis for determining which women to include and which to omit. I present a summary of the criteria next, followed by a detailed explanation of each specification. All five criteria must be met for an individual to be included in the study.

- Woman.
- Social scientist.
- Born between 1849 and 1891.
- Active in Britain.
- Reasonably comprehensive biographical data.

Woman. As my research plan did not allow for "feminist" to be a criterion determining the selection of entries, the scope was limited to women.

Social scientist. The criteria for inclusion aimed to reflect the nature of social science in its formative years. Following the approach used by Deegan (1991) and Fleck (2011), to capture (mainly American) women's influence on sociology, and the history of sociology in the German-speaking world, respectively, I considered as social scientists those women who fulfilled at least one of the following six criteria.

- Occupied a chair and/or taught in the social sciences.
- Membership of a relevant learned or professional society (e.g., the Royal Statistical Society).
- Authorship of at least one social science article, review, report, book or pamphlet. This included published work in the new social scientific journals coming in existence (e.g., *Economic Journal*) and the fortnightly and quarterly non-specialist periodicals which continued to be the primary outlets open to many writers in this period (e.g., *Nineteenth Century*, *Westminster Review*, *Edinburgh Review*, and *Contemporary Review*).
- Conducted social research (e.g., research assistant on one of the large pioneering statistical projects of the age; civil servant conducting social inquiries within government; member of a select committee operating largely by an investigative process).
- Financed social science activities (e.g., providing grants and scholarships).
- Self-definition as a social scientist.

- Definition by others as a social scientist.

These criteria excluded women, such as Virginia Woolf (1882-1941), who used fiction to address social and economic issues.

Born between 1849 and 1891*.* The decision about which women to include considered the period in which they were active. Women's history and gender history, as noted by Shepard and Walker, have the potential 'both to complicate and, more fundamentally, to revise received narrative of change' (2009, p.1). In view of this, I adopted the schema proposed by Olive Banks and limited entries in the database to two generations of women: individuals born between 1849 and 1871 who came of university age between 1869 and 1891 and those born between 1872 and 1891 who benefitted from expanded educational opportunities.

Country of activism*.* Geographically, the focus is limited to Great Britain, used here to refer to England, Scotland, and Wales.[11] The primary consideration is whether a woman spent a significant period of her professional life in Britain over birthplace or nationality.

Enough biographical information*.* The final selection criterion was that there should be enough biographical data to enable unambiguous identification of the individual and establish eligibility for the study.

3.4.2 Compiling the first round of names: sources

Having established the group to be studied, I conducted a wide-ranging trawl of electronic and printed texts to generate a longlist of potential candidates for the study. The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB) provided a starting point for my research. This is an attractive source for researchers studying groups of lives but as noted by others it should not be used uncritically. To compensate for potential selection bias affecting the ODNB, a problem highlighted in previous studies, I widened the search and examined additional sources of information:

- ODNB (online edition).
- Specialist biographical dictionaries.

[11] From 1801 to 1922, England, Scotland, Wales, and the whole of Ireland were part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

- LSE Register, 1895-1932.
- Secondary literature.
- Snowballing.

Further information relating to each source type and the way they were searched is provided below.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (online edition). The ODNB is a major work of scholarship. First published in 2004 under the editorship of Henry Matthew and Brian Harrison, it has considerable potential as a gateway for researching individuals and their historical context (Thomas, 2005). Updated three times a year, the online version offers an efficient means of transmitting content and dramatically reduces the amount of physical travelling between institutions. As noted by Raven (2007), it can reach a much larger audience than could possibly be reached through printed volumes in reading rooms.

There are good reasons to assume that the new electronic version of the ODNB can be of use in this research project. First, one of the ODNB's original aims was to correct the omission of many women of significance. Entries for women have dramatically increased in recent years, such that the male to female ratio is now approximately 8:1 (nearer 5:1 for the twentieth century). Second, with its built-in search engine, the online version offers radically different research capabilities to the print edition. Sophisticated searches can be conducted across the entire range of material held in the database. Entries are indexed (or tagged) to allow structured searches in terms of set categories (keywords). Search fields include *Name*, *Fields of Interest*, *Sex*, *Life Dates*, *Religious Affiliation,* and *Places/Dates/Life Events*. For the latter, the user can search for a life event at a specific point in time, or in a specific place, or both. The *Fields of Interest* category has a dropdown option where the user can choose from 25 general areas, with the majority of these having additional sub-branches. Members of a discrete social group can be identified based on the person's name, keywords (index terms), or phrases entered by the user (free-text terms). Delimiters can be added from additional dropdown menus, and further refinements of results are possible using combinations of search terms. Third, it provides extensive opportunities for cross-referencing to additional primary and secondary sources of information. Each biographical entry contains electronic links

to relevant projects and databases: for instance, to corresponding entries in the Dictionary of National Biography (DNB) (1895-1900; 1912-1996), National Register of Archives, Bibliography of British and Irish History, and the Royal Historical Society's bibliography.

The search strategy used to identify the first round of female names from the ODNB combined a range of keywords ('index' and 'free-text' terms), limited by date. It was developed iteratively, using articles for women eligible for inclusion to identify additional search terms. The *Fields of Interest* category labelled "scholarship and research" had three relevant areas of interest: "social science"; "economics"; and "political science". "Social science" included two further sub-branches: "demographers"; and "sociologists and social theorists". The following search query was executed:

#1 Index search: *Sex* [women]
#2 Index search: *Date of Birth* [1849 – 1891]
#3 Index search: *Fields of Interest* ["scholarship and research: social science (demographers)" OR "scholarship and research: economics" OR "scholarship and research: political science"]
#4 Index search: *Fields of Interest* ["scholarship and research: social science (sociologists and social theorists)" OR "scholarship and research: economics" OR "scholarship and research: political science"]
#5 (#1 AND #2 AND #3)
#6 (#1 AND #2 AND #4)
#7 Free-text search: "social science" OR "social scientist" OR "moral science" OR sociology OR sociologist OR economics OR economist OR "economic history" OR "political economy" OR "political science" OR "political scientist" OR psychology OR psychologist OR anthropology OR anthropologist OR philosophy OR philosopher OR ethnology OR statistics OR statistician OR ethics
#8 (#1 AND #2 AND #7)
#9 (#5 OR #6 OR #8)

Specialist biographical dictionaries. Another source of items for the longlist was specialised biographical dictionaries that cover important names in a subject field. Nine such collections (eight printed and one online) were reviewed for female

names. The two-volume *Biographical Dictionary of British Feminists* was consulted (Banks, 1985; 1990). The earlier work contains data on the lives of around 100 women who were active in the women's movement between 1800 and 1930. The second volume extends the time span and adds women whose contribution to feminism began during the 1920s or in subsequent decades. Banks felt driven to produce this ground-breaking reference work for scholars interested in British feminism, arguing at the time that 'no other biographical dictionary provides this kind of emphasis, and existing dictionaries tend either to ignore feminists or, in some cases, seriously to misrepresent them' (1985, p.vii). It has many of the main names of the nineteenth-century women's movement, but also some limitations. Although Banks attempted to avoid arbitrary choice of subjects through use of explicit criteria, her own research interests still informed the selection. The use of a campaign-oriented definition of feminism led to a concentration on the major personalities and a few iconic representatives. Unknown women, such as those who ran local suffrage campaigns, are relatively absent.

I searched a more recent collection of first-wave British feminists by Cheryl Law (2000). This contains biographical sketches of over 200 significant female activists in Britain from 1914 through to 1968, including many individuals who are not included in either of Banks' volumes. In addition, a selection of reference works on social scientists were consulted. I searched the collections by Deegan (1991) and Dimand et al. (2000) which detail the lives of over 200 women who made significant contributions in sociology or economics, although discovered both to be heavily biased towards American social scientists. A collection compiled by Aldrich and Gordon (1989) on British educationalists was consulted but found to be mainly men. Finally, the digital collection of British and Irish economists compiled by the Royal Economic Society was searched.

LSE Register, 1895-1932. Published in 1934, the *LSE Register* provides information on all regular (Appendix F: Part I) and occasional (Appendix F: Part II) teaching staff that were employed over the period 1895-1932. Each entry details the subject taught and period of employment. The lists were manually examined for female names.

Secondary literature. Secondary literature on social investigation in the period c.1870 to 1920 was reviewed and potentially relevant female names extracted from each source. The following were of interest to the current inquiry.

- Women who undertook economic and social research as members of groups important to the early twentieth-century women's movement, notably the Fabian Women's Group (Alexander, 1988) and the Women's Industrial Council (Holloway, 1995).
- Women economic and social historians who were closely involved with the London School of Economics or the Economic History Society (Berg, 1992).
- Women civil servants appointed from the 1890s onwards who investigated the working conditions for women in industry (Wheeldon, 2014).
- So-called "lady explorers" who investigated London poverty from around 1870 to 1920 (Ross, 2007).
- Women involved as research staff and statistical assistants in the major empirical study of the period, Charles Booth's seventeen volume *Life and Labour of the People in London* (Bales, 1996).
- Female contributors to economics journals (Groenewegen and King, 1999).

Snowballing. First, publications produced by women identified as meeting the study inclusion criteria were checked for female co-authors and new names generated through this process were added to the longlist. Entries in the ODNB and other reference works rarely provide an extensive list of a person's published work, so a targeted search to identify evidence of women's writing in the social sciences was undertaken. I used the WorldCat library catalogue and search engine (http://www.worldcat.org/), entering women's names as search terms. I also examined a printed volume of references to women's economic writing pre-1940 compiled by Kirsten Madden and colleagues (2004). A second snowballing approach involved pursuing "leads" in sources consulted for women already included in the study (serendipitous discovery).

3.4.3 Compiling the first round of names: extracting names

The longlist of selected names was compiled in Excel. For most sources, the process involved extracting all names and adding them to the list. In cases where the source covered individuals of different nationalities, the names of non-British

women were not added; however, a record of their number in each source was stored separately. Sometimes names were discovered entirely by chance rather than intent (serendipitous discovery). These were added to the longlist as they became available.

Several sources listed some individuals by their title, initials, and surname (e.g., Miss B. Jones), initial and surname only (e.g., B. Jones), or surname appended with Miss or Mrs (e.g., Miss Jones). Additional searches were conducted to identify the persons concerned and when an individual could confidently be identified as female, and a given forename (or initial) was available, her details were added to the longlist. Although it was not always easy to determine identities from the available information, I continued throughout the study to try and identify exactly who these women were. For example, the name Mrs E.F. Hogg was initially entered on the Excel worksheet, before eventually being identified as Edith Frances (née Pittis) Hogg. Otherwise, incomplete names were omitted from the longlist.

3.4.4 Compiling the first round of names: verifying dates and removing duplicates

Life dates were recorded at the same time as the longlist was compiled for two reasons. First, date of birth was required for the selection process. Second, life dates helped distinguish between people with the same name (for example, Louisa Martindale (1839-1914) and her daughter (1872-1966). I attempted to establish or verify life dates for each woman on the longlist by consulting statutory (civil) registers of births, marriages and deaths and census returns. The genealogical databases held by the *Ancestry*, *GenesReunited*, *ScotlandsPeopl*e and *IrishGenealogy* gateways were used for this purpose. When a woman could not be located within national records, it was assumed that that she had been born in another country and attempts were made to confirm this by examining all available information. This included searching the records held by The National Archives to check if a person had obtained British citizenship through naturalisation.

There were temporary duplications in the longlist as some subjects initially appeared under more than one name. To aid removal of duplicates, it was necessary to identify and amalgamate cases in which different names referred to a single individual. A common source of duplication was individuals appearing in some

sources under their unmarried name, while elsewhere they were listed by their married name. In some cases, confusion arose due to errors in the original sources. For instance, Elizabeth Leigh Hutchins, one of the researchers for the feminist Fabian Women's Group, is referred to correctly in some documents as B.L. Hutchins (since she was generally known as Bessie, a derivative of Elizabeth) but appears incorrectly in other sources as Barbara Hutchins or Elizabeth Hutchinson. Women's use of pseudonyms or other alternative names also led to duplicates. Entries were combined as information became available to do so. For women with name changes or variations, the name by which they were best known to contemporaries was selected as the "entry name" for the database.

3.4.5 Applying the selection criteria to identify research subjects

The criteria for selection (section 3.4.1) were applied to the entries in the initial longlist. Women meeting the criteria for date of birth were considered at length to determine whether the remaining criteria were met. Insufficient biographical information on which to base a decision was an issue. Women for whom a reliable estimate of date of birth could not be determined by analysing all available information about their lives were excluded. Table A.3.3 (Appendix A.3) lists the names on the longlist; the sources used to identify each entry; and the outcome of the screening process, including reason for exclusion where relevant. A total of 188 women met the selection criteria and were included in the analysis.

3.5 Data collection

Having identified the women who would be the subjects of my research, the next stage was to gather data on their lives, careers, and networks, angled to their involvement in social science and social reform. A system was designed for the computerised management of information. The data were arranged in biographical records that relate to an identifiable person and each woman given a unique identifier. Section 3.7 provides further information on the relational database used to store and manipulate data. The remainder of this section provides details on methods for creating the biographical records; data sources; and incomplete and imprecise data.

3.5.1 Methods for creating the biographical records

I follow Harrie Jansen in using the concept of qualitative survey. 'A survey is a qualitative survey', she argues, 'if it does not count the frequencies of categories(/values) but searches for the empirical diversity in the properties of members, even if these properties are expressed in numbers' (2010, p.4).

Using a pre-structured qualitative survey. Biographical information thought to be useful to understanding each woman's life was collected according to a standardised set of questions addressed in relation to all members of the group. Drawing on insights by Jansen (2010) and others, the coding scheme (proforma document or questionnaire) used to assemble the data was designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative data. Decisions surrounding what questions to apply were led by the research aims and known limitations of the data sources (Verboven et al., 2007). The coding scheme was developed iteratively and piloted since its use imposed a regular structure on the data that influenced how the material could subsequently be analysed. A short version of the tool is detailed in Appendix A.4.

The coding scheme was designed as a set of multiple-choice questions relating to 26 variables (or fields). These are the parameters on which the later analyses are based. For instance, the "Marital Status" field had three possible response categories from which to select: married (at some point in life); never married; and not known. Each category allowed additional information to be entered as relevant, including whole or partial verbatim transcriptions. To help capture career mobility, for example, I added notes on the woman's age in different life phases (e.g., university study; academic appointment). The use of a category labelled "Other" allowed the collection of relevant information that did not strictly answer any of the set questions. The coding scheme was used as a heuristic tool and handled flexibly to allow the capture of data-rich biographies (Seidel and Kelle, 1995).

Each biographical record was constructed through the collection of attribute and relational data. Attribute data relates to the properties, qualities, or characteristics that belong to individuals as individuals, including demographic, experiential, and attitudinal variables. Relational data concerns the contacts, ties and connections that relate one individual to another, helping build understanding of social networks

and milieu. Much of the assembled data relates to ‘observable’ facts or acts (such as name of university attended and course taken); where possible, data on ‘unobservables’ (for example, a woman’s reasons for attending university) were also collected. The social origins of the women were measured by means of the father’s occupation, using the same four-fold contemporary classification as Olive Banks (1986).

The biographical entries within the database are divided into eleven sections.

- Basic biographical data (e.g., life dates, place of birth).
- Personal and family life (e.g., social origins, marriage and children, adult residence).
- Religious denomination and faith.
- Educational capital/experiences (e.g., schooling, reasons for attending higher education).
- Professional life (e.g., paid appointments, voluntary reform activities).
- Political beliefs and activities (e.g., involvement in parliamentary politics).
- Social science activities (e.g., editorial positions, lectures).
- Inter-personal relationships (e.g., academic colleagues).
- Social milieu and networks (e.g., organisational affiliations; membership in influential bodies).
- Recognition of distinction (e.g., honorary doctorates, official honours, awards and prizes).
- Publication record.

Data gathering was an iterative process whereby, as I progressed through the various stages, I returned to previous work that I had done and updated biographical records as new information became known. For instance, upon coding that a woman went to Girton College in a certain year, I first searched for other women who had attended during the same period then investigated the extent and nature of any personal connections between the women. I recorded national and international connections (such as academic collaboration across geographical spaces) where these could be established. Consideration was given to the different ways in which individuals could be related to an organisation (for example, member, secretary or observer).

I recorded details of the sources used to compile each person's biographical record in the database, as well as information on any conflicting data or potential biases (Keats-Rohan, 2007, p.58). I have denoted information as verified if the original primary source has been viewed, otherwise it is marked as unverified. Time limitations meant that it was not feasible to upload reproductions of all source materials and directly link each biographical 'fact' or 'event' to the document in which the original content is located, as recommended by Verboven, Carlier and Dumolyn (2007).

The database is also used to store bibliographic details for social science texts authored or co-authored by the women. Decisions as to whether to include a publication were usually based on the title alone, as it was not feasible within available resources to obtain the full reports for all the texts and verify their status. Where a woman's eligibility for this study was in question, it was sometimes necessary to establish with a greater degree of certainty that a publication warranted classification as social science. In such cases, the full report was sourced, and its contents examined.

3.5.2 Data sources

Consistent with Verboven et al.'s work on constructing a prosopographical database, I drew upon a wide range of publicly available sources to build up a picture of the women's lives since the use of 'a single source can lead to erroneous interpretations and one-sided views of the past' (2007, p.53). The sources consulted include those used to compile the initial longlist of names (section 3.4.1).

I deliberately selected a research design that prioritised various types of biographical sources. The ODNB and other biographical dictionaries and related works were a major source of data. These are considered a credible and reliable resource for research, provided 'the researcher remains conscious of the limitations' (Fokkens et al., 2017, p.199; Carter, 2013; Watts 2010a).[12] Statutory records were used to address gaps in the prosopographical database holding the data for this project, as well as to corroborate conflicting sources of information. After suggestions by Rodler et al. (2001) and Tight (2008), a small number of obituary

[12] Entries in the ODNB are written by specialist authors, largely based on primary sources, with authors relying as little as possible on secondary material, and peer reviewed.

notices published in newspapers and other periodicals were identified to fill gaps and help build up a picture of women's personal relationships and networks.

A summary of the source types consulted to assemble the biographical data follows, with full details provided in Appendix A.2.

- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.
- Specialist biographical dictionaries.
- Autobiographies, memoirs, and diaries.
- Independent works containing biographical information.
- Obituary notices printed in leading journals and periodicals.
- Birth, death, marriage and census records accessed via the following online gateways:
    - *Ancestry* https://www.ancestry.co.uk/
    - *GenesReunited* https://www.genesreunited.co.uk/
    - *ScotlandsPeople* https://www.scotlandspeople.gov.uk/
    - *IrishGenealogy* https://www.irishgenealogy.ie/en/.
- Naturalisation records via The National Archives:
    - https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/.

I searched online catalogues to identify relevant autobiographies, biographies and obituaries. The following resources were used for this purpose: WorldCat http://www.worldcat.org/; British Library http://explore.bl.uk; and Google Scholar https://scholar.google.co.uk/. The name of each woman in the database was entered as search terms.

I also consulted a wide range of general works on the period to contextualise the lives of the women. These sources were used when writing up. They are cited in the final bibliography (Appendix A.9).

3.5.3 Incomplete and imprecise data

As with any research undertaking, it was necessary to adopt a critical and reflective approach to the sources that were used, the task being to evaluate 'what is, and is not, to be counted as reliable evidence' (Oakley, 2010, p.434). Alistair Thomson reminds us that no source offers 'direct, unmediated and uncomplicated access to the past…. Every source is a constructed and selective representation of

experience, and part of the [researcher's] task is to consider the factors that shape the source and their relevance for our analysis' (2016, p.105). The data used for the current investigation were largely derived from biographical sources. While it was not feasible to cross-check, and attempt to corroborate, every single piece of information extracted from these sources (Goodwin, 2012), several strategies were used to reduce inconsistencies and minimise the risk of bias associated with a reliance on this type of data (Morse et al., 2002).

Life dates were a problem in my research, with some sources providing an approximate date of birth and/or death. I also encountered missing entries and dates recorded inaccurately or imprecisely (for example, "the early 1870s"). I mentioned earlier that I had consulted national records to verify important life dates. This undertaking resulted in firm birth and death dates for most of the women. A few dates are still approximate, such as was the case with the Jewish socialite and social reformer Adele Meyer (née Levis), for whom almost nothing is known about her early life except details obtained from official records. At the time of the 1871 Census (which records her age as eight years, and birthplace as France), the Levis family was based in Lancashire. A decade later, she is registered on the census return as a naturalised British subject living at a London address.[13] There are a few dates of death that I could not identify, most likely because the women died abroad or remarried. That these efforts were not fully successful serves as a useful reminder that, as Ann Oakley says, official records 'may seem incontrovertible', but they too 'contain holes, errors and inconsistencies' (2010, p.433).

Sources often reported contradictory information on university attendance dates, exam subjects and qualifications. In such cases, records of former students were searched to try to access the original data. Many colleges and universities have compiled, and even digitised, lists of students who registered or passed examinations in each academic year, though not all (UCL's institutional records, for example) are easily accessible or complete. Details of the volumes that were consulted are provided in Appendix A.2. When faced with other inconsistencies and

[13] Her given name was probably Adelaide. This spelling is used on her father's nationalisation certificate dated July 1871. Her age is given there as 9 years, confirming her date of birth as 1862. The name 'Adele Levis' is listed on Bedford College student registers for 1878 and 1879 but I am unable to identify corroborating evidence.

contradictions between sources, my general approach was to go with the most frequently cited information, while giving credence to the content in peer-reviewed academic sources over less authoritative sources.

I attempted to obtain information on 26 variables for the 188 women included in the study. For women who were major figures during their lifetime, I could generally rely on a substantial extant body of literature that documented their lives and works. For lesser-known figures, detailed accounts of their lives were scarce and sometimes no information was available beyond entries in the ODNB or related reference works. Some women did not feature in any of the biographical sources I consulted and appear to have left no memoirs or other personal papers. For these women, only a brief family history can be culled from public records. Overall, the information about a considerable number of women is fragmentary and it was often difficult to complete all fields of the database. Consequently, a large proportion of the biographical profiles are to some degree incomplete.

An incomplete dataset was an important consideration. I had two options. I could attempt to make statistical inferences by drawing on methods and techniques now being applied in several areas of social science to address partially missing data (Cohen, 2002; d'Agostino and Rubin, 2000). Gideon Cohen used propensity-score estimation to assess the International Lenin School's impact on the Communist Party of Great Britain. While I accept his argument that techniques such as these have 'potentially wide applicability' (2005, p.209) in work adopting a prosopographical methodology, insufficient resources prevented me from investigating how they might be used in this research. A second course of action was to limit my analysis to women with complete biographical details, excluding all those for whom the available evidence is sparse. The implications of this would have been to dramatically reduce the size of the sample, to around 30 individuals. Despite the recent "biographical turn" in the social sciences, biography continues to perpetuate, as Kristin Cowman puts it, 'an old-fashioned "great men" approach to history' (2016, p.85). Since one of the purposes of this work has been to address the absence of women's biography through the recovery of women who belonged to a social scientific community, many of them "neglected" or "forgotten", I also rejected this option. Instead, I have approached the methodological difficulties of

incomplete biographical profiles, as feminist researchers before me have done, as an opportunity. The issue of incomplete and imprecise data and its potential impact on the findings of the research is discussed further in Chapter 9.

3.6 From analysis to interpretation

> In terms of the dataset, the distinguishing feature of survey research is not the data collection nor the characteristics of the data per se but the form of analysis. (Jansen, 2010, p.1)

Through the lens of gender, generation and the life cycle, the narrative created brings together quantitative and qualitative data to demonstrate how, as Katie Barclay and colleagues put it, 'patterns evident in the past (and to an extent also imposed by the historian), such as life cycles, are shaped not only by factors such as period and class, but also by women's agency and negotiation of power' (2011, p.181). Two demographic cohorts provide an overall framework for teasing out the importance of generational experience to women's life stories, and for investigating the broad trends emerging from the compiled biographical data, permitting an exploration of the connections, commonalities and points of diversion within this distinct group of women.

To convey something of the wide variation and rich complexity of individual experience in these years, while keeping sight of the larger historical context, the narrative I have created arranges a series of biographical vignettes incorporating fragments of the women's stories, interspersed with depictions of historical events that influenced them and their ideas. I explore themes such as female space, networks, boundaries and social relationships. Central to the differing trajectories of women's lives is the question of subjectivity and enactment of agency, which no summary of statistics can adequately convey. Nevertheless, descriptive statistics are used to describe the women's social backgrounds, education, and other characteristics. I present the frequencies but do not analyse them, since the tables simplify complex processes, the evidence is patchy, and the number of subjects too small to draw statistically valid conclusions. These figures are included within the main body of text because they are integral to my research, providing valuable contextual information for the qualitative element of the study. The results presented in tables largely speak for themselves, but a few explanatory notes might be useful. "Not known" was used as a category where no details were available at all. Both the

numbers and the percentages within each cohort and for the whole group are provided. Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number, so may not add up to 100.

All women from my database are incorporated into the chapters, although many receive only cursory mentions. To provide greater visibility for the women and do justice to a greater number of them, I compiled Appendix A.5 naming all those who met the selection criteria. Key biographical information has been specified in Appendix A.7.

Finally, like all researchers, I had to be alert to the selective and interpretative roles that I might have adopted, and the potential for exaggeration and distortion. Frank (1997, p.87) wrote about an 'engaged biography' rooted in 'a personal and intense relationship between biographer and subject', the result of which might be a temptation to 'to import "colour" where none exists' (Danaher and Briod, 2005, p.229). Given various inconsistencies and gaps in the database, it was hugely important to heed warnings by Lawrence Stone (1971, p.58) and many others about claiming too much from the evidence. I discuss this issue further in the final chapter.

3.7 Data management and storage

Though this investigation did not involve use of a particularly large dataset and data processing could have been done manually, data management software was used for several reasons.[14] First, tools offered by the web-based application enabled quick and sensitive searches to be performed, aiding subsequent data analysis (Thomas et al., 2020). For the quantitative data, benefits included being able to generate different types of reports and results tables. Frequency reports were used to gain an overview of the answers given to specific questions, displaying all possible answers together with the number of records that were categorised with that answer. The crosstab function allowed cross-tabulation of the answers of one question against another to find the relationship between certain answers, such differences in higher education participation across the two cohort groups. For the qualitative data, the availability of a structured electronic dataset enabled efficient identification of relevant textual information. Second, the electronic format meant

[14] https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=1913

that the dataset could be managed, re-arranged, and manipulated more easily, saving a considerable amount of time (Keats-Rohan, 2002). Third, electronic storage helped maintain the integrity of the data and avoid the loss of potentially relevant material (Harvey and Press, 1996). Fourth, database construction leaves open the possibility of performing further, and potentially more advanced, analyses at a future date (for example, when statistically relevant quantities of biographical data have been collated and entered). Finally, there are immense opportunities for developing web-based resources to enhance the scope and potential of materials stored in prosopographical databases. The potential that digital technologies offer scholarship on women in the history of social science is discussed in Chapter 9.

3.8 Ethical considerations

Social scientists make an ethical commitment to maintain certain principles of conduct, such as taking a critical approach to sources, careful balancing of conflicting accounts, commitment not to falsify or distort evidence, and so on (Israel and Hay, 2006). Researchers used to be cautious about openly discussing the different sorts of ethical dilemmas they faced in their research and academic work, but that environment is changing and there have been significant improvements in the past two decades. Obligations have increased since the implementation of the EU General Data Protection Regulation in May 2018, along with the new UK Data Protection Act 2018, governing the holding or using of personal data.

Although there remain ‘relatively few discussions in the literature about the … ethical issues raised by “doing” biography’ (Oakley, 2010, p.425), those engaged in biographical research have begun to give thought to ethical implications of their decisions (Schmidt, 2014). Creating a biographical account when the subject is alive presents somewhat different ethical issues to research conducted on those who are deceased. For biographers concerned with the former, Molly Andrews emphasises the ‘need to tread cautiously with other people’s lives’ (2007, p.17). Accordingly, among the general ethical questions are those related to informed consent, anonymisation of data, and the reporting back of data to interviewees (Siouti, 2018). A specific ethical problem that may arise to challenge the resulting analysis stems from living subjects being in a position, by virtue of being alive, to influence the nature and content of the text. Tanya Fitzgerald and Jenny Collins raised this issue

in a recent collective biography of early women home scientists at the University of New Zealand, drawing on the example of Catherine Landreth who revised and edited the content of interviews conducted for an oral history to protect her professional legacy (2011, pp.80-82).

None of the women who feature in my study were still alive at the time of the research, so were unable to influence the nature and content of the text or be personally harmed by it. Some writers raise the question of whether biographers have a duty of care that goes beyond the deceased individual and considers the wellbeing of their descendants, former colleagues or friends. When reporting findings, researchers could be disclosing previously unknown personal information, and if it relates to a sensitive or controversial topic then there is the potential for the researcher to cause distress. Crossen-White (2015) reflected on this issue after using *The Times* digital archive to study drug-taking activity in the early twentieth century. The issue of anonymity had special relevance in this case because drug taking was a criminal offence, for at least part of the study period. An important consideration in the present study is the eugenics movement and its links to social science.

There are clear and growing indications that the rapid growth and enthusiasm from users of digital archives has ethical implications for researchers using biographical methods. Advances in technology mean that lives are increasingly on public display, challenging the very idea of a right to privacy. The case of Mario Gonzalez, who won his battle against Google when the Court of Justice of the European Union in Luxembourg backed his claim to have elements of his online past removed from easy reach of the public, has set a precedent for other living persons to exercise their “right to be forgotten” (Kassam, 2014). His action raises ethical questions about the right to privacy of individuals from the past, including the deceased. Some of my women made specific provision in their literary estate for the permanent collection of their papers or records. Beatrice Webb was clearly so confident of her place in history that parts of her multi-volume autobiography, based on extensive diaries she kept from 1873 until her death in 1943, were published during her lifetime. While other prominent figures, notably Mary Stocks and Eleanor Rathbone, are reported to have ordered all their personal papers to be destroyed on their death or deliberately

culled them to remove material that they preferred to be kept private, we simply do not know the wishes of most women from the past. Did they not think their lives or work important enough to save their papers, or did they simply want to remain anonymous and preserve their privacy even after death? The unprecedented ability of digital archives and other electronic resources to identify personal, and potentially sensitive, information suggests this is an issue that all biographers must grapple with in years to come.

The ethical question asked by Gesa Kirsch is, can ‘research represent the experiences of others without representing, misappropriating, or distorting their realities’? (1999, p.ix). Considering this, I endeavoured to remain true to the sources and my representation of the women’s stories, whilst not always agreeing with their intellectual or political positions. Liz Stanley calls this ‘the conundrum of how not to undercut, discredit or write-off women’s consciousnesses’, especially when these differ from our own (1984, p.201). In the end, it was Ann Oakley’s advice that I carried with me throughout the study: ‘The point of a biography is not to confirm the story someone tells … about their own life, but to provide a contextual interpretation of that story based on a rounded view of the evidence’ (2010, p.435).

CHAPTER 4. THE FORMATIVE YEARS: CLASS, FAMILY AND SCHOOLING

This chapter establishes the identities of early women drawn to social science and creates a broad collective profile, in so far as the evidence allows. While it is difficult to recover their exact numbers, from an initial list of over 800 women, I eventually determined that 188 women fit the description and were relevant to this study. The final list includes prominent women studied by prior scholars but many others who have so far been neglected in the secondary literature, whether histories of social science or about the early welfare state. While some women are well known, at least in certain circles, **Nettie Adler** (1868-1950) and **Eva Reckitt** (1890-1976) are among those who are virtually unheard of. Among those of her generation, **Beatrice Webb** (1858-1943) held a position at the centre of the social science establishment. As such, her life offered a model against which the lives of other members of the group could be examined.

This group of women matured in a period when young women of all social classes were attempting to seek greater autonomy and carve out a space for themselves in the public sphere. The first women were born in 1850, the year Maria Grey and her sister Emily Shirreff, pioneers in the cause of better education for women who would later appear on programmes of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, wrote of their regret that girls were raised ‘distrusting their own conclusions, and shrinking from responsibility, till they sink into mere puppets, useless to themselves and to others’ (Grey and Sherreff, 1850, p.30). The last women discussed here were born in 1891, just as the campaigns for women’s rights to education were escalating. Drawing attention to ‘the layers of formative experience’ (Hunt, 2013, p.493) that produced women interested in social science, this chapter examines their social origins, family backgrounds and childhood education, and whether these change across generations. It is argued that these factors informed the early choices made by the women in determining their future education and career.

4.1 Who were these women and where and when were they born?

Most of the 188 identified women were British subjects born in Britain or Ireland, as seen by their location of birth shown in Table 4.1. Several of the British-born women were the daughters of immigrant parents, including **Edith Eckhard** (1885-1952), tutor in LSE's social sciences department, who was born to German parents and grew up in Manchester's émigré community; the feminist and social researcher **Dorothea Zimmern** (1883-1982), and her cousin the educationalist **Alice Zimmern** (1855-1939), whose parents were naturalised British citizens born in Germany; and **Margrieta Van der Veen** (1871-1951), born in Lancashire not long after her parents had emigrated from Holland. Others were foreign-born but of British parentage. Nine women were born overseas in territories of the British Empire: Australia, India, New Zealand, and Canada. Angela Woollacott's study of Australian women drawn to London between 1870 and 1940 revealed that the 'opening of new careers for women in social work and state administration was a major impulse for their travel to England' (2001, p.57). That most were from the later birth cohort is unsurprising since these professions were unavailable until late in this period (Cree, 2019). **Marion Phillips** (1881-1932) was one of several women born in Australia. She left Melbourne in 1904 to take up a studentship at the London School of Economics. Adelaide-born **Dorothea Proud** (1885-1967) came to England in the follow decade aged 28 and investigated industrial conditions across Britain for six years, first as a sponsored doctoral student at LSE and then for the British government in the welfare department of the Ministry of Munitions during the First World War, before returning to Australia in 1919. A further nine women were born elsewhere in the world, including the educational and social philosopher **Margaret McMillan** (1860-1931). An early pioneer of the open-air nursery who promoted scientific intervention into child rearing, she was born in New York to Scottish parents who had migrated to the United States in 1840. The family returned to Inverness after the death of her father and younger sister in 1865 (Liebovich, 2019).

Four of the 188 women were foreign nationals at the time of birth and subsequently granted British citizenship through naturalisation, permitting the inspection of relevant files held in The National Archives. **Helene Reynard** (1875-1947), economist and college administrator, was born in Vienna, Austria. Her family had arrived in Britain from Germany in the 1880s, changing the family name from

Reinherz during the First World War (Pedersen, 2004). Under the 1870 Act, she was deemed to be naturalised when her father obtained British citizenship in October 1888. The nine-year-old **Adele Levis (later Meyer)** (1862-1930) had gained citizenship through the same route when her father became a British citizen in July 1871. Years later, she organised and funded a year's investigation into the unregulated tailoring and dressmaking trades, along with **Clementina Black** (1853-1922). Family genealogy sites indicate that **Varvara de Vesselitsky** (1872/3-1927), author of several studies including *Expenditure and Waste* (1917), a study of the economic effects of war on East End families published as part of the Ratan Tata Trust's support for research at LSE, was of Russian origin. Her entire family had also moved to London in the 1880s, but it was not until the 1920s, in the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution and Russian Civil War, that she and her brother Sergei de Vesselitsky, a keen mountaineer, were naturalised as British subjects, on 17 March 1923 and 8 October 1923, respectively (Home Office, 1923a; 1923b).

Table 4.1: Countries of birth (analysis by cohort and whole group)

Country of birth	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	Totals
England and Wales	68 (76%)	80 (82%)	148 (79%)
Scotland	7 (8%)	7 (7%)	14 (7%)
Ireland (including Northern Ireland)[a]	6 (7%)	-	6 (3%)
Australia	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	4 (2%)
India	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	4 (2%)
France	2 (2%)	-	2 (1%)
Germany	2 (2%)	-	2 (1%)
Other[b]	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	7 (4%)
Unknown[c]	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Totals	90	98	188

Notes:
a. Ireland was part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland from 1801 to 1922. For most of this period, the UK Parliament in London governed the island. Britain includes only England, Wales, and Scotland.
b. One each from USA, New Zealand, Canada, Switzerland, Poland, Austria, and Madagascar.
c. There was insufficient information on two women for a country of nationality of origin to be assigned.

By contrast, the anthropologist **Maria Czaplicka** (1884-1921) arrived in London in 1910 on a scholarship from the Mianowski Fund, the first Polish woman to receive

financial support for higher education abroad (Kubica, 2015). Czaplicka was born and raised in Warsaw, her family of impoverished Polish nobility, during a difficult time for academia in Russian-held Poland. Like many women, she had to go abroad to achieve her academic goals. Without financial resources or family support, she relied on grants and scholarships, including an award from the Mary Ewart Trust Fund based at Somerville College, Oxford. In 1921, Bristol University nominated Czaplicka for the prestigious Albert Khan Travelling Scholarship at the University of London for which British citizenship was required (Vider, 2017). Struggling with excessive work and financial difficulties, she committed suicide a few days after her naturalisation certificate was issued (Home Office, 1921).

4.2 Social origins

Britain was a highly unequal nation in the Victorian and Edwardian years: as Patricia Fara (2018, p.14) puts it, 'money, class and gender all mattered'. Analysis of the women's origins reveals the varied socio-economic background of the group. With small numbers, the usefulness of the figures in Table 4.2 is limited but it certainly the case that most women came from similar types of family representing a diverse cross-section of the middle class. Several women were from upper-class families connected to landed estates or the aristocracy who had often exerted political control over many generations. In the late nineteenth century, Deborah Gorham noted, 'gentility was not a clearly definable quality but revealed itself in nuances that clearly distinguished members of the established and dominant classes from those who still bore traces of their upwardly mobile progress' (2012, p.8). In Table 4.2, the term gentry has been used in the original sense to refer to the land-owning social class consisting of gentlemen who could live entirely from rent income, or at least owned land in the form of country estates. The sample contained many more genteel families of high social status and of wealth, but who did not hold land. Relevant details are noted for individuals in Appendix A.7. Eight women came from working-class homes and twelve remain unclassified due to limited surviving evidence about their early life. Therefore, in fitting somewhere between the peerage and the working class, the social origins of my women correspond with those of other groups within the nineteenth-century British women's movement identified and analysed by Olive Banks (1986) and Jane Martin (1999), among others.

Table 4.2: Social origins of sample (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All
Aristocracy and landed gentry[a]	3 (3%)	4 (4%)	7 (4%)
Professional[b]	54 (60%)	53 (54%)	107 (57%)
Business	26 (29%)	28 (29%)	54 (29%)
Working class[c]	3 (3%)	5 (5%)	8 (4%)
Unknown	4 (4%)	8 (8%)	12 (6%)
Totals	90	98	188

Notes:
a. Included in this total are landed families where fathers also engaged in a profession or commercial activities. Five cases: Eglantyne Jebb, Thereza Rucker, Charlotte Shaw, Dorothy Tennant, Helena Wright.
c. Includes employment in local government and Civil Service.
d. Manual or routine non-manual occupations.

Starting in the 1860s and continuing until the start of the First World War, Britain saw a huge increase in the number of people in Britain who counted as middle class. Towns, cities, and the economy expanded, and men became defined by their jobs rather than family background (Steinbach, 2016). The rise of the middle-classes in this period was in large part the expansion of the lower middle-class, since occupations such as shop and clerical work, both commercial and Civil Service, had grown much faster than other types of employment (Musgrove, 1959). Gillian Sutherland presents some summary statistics. 'In 1861', she indicates, 'they had represented less than 8% of the total working population; fifty years later, they represented around 14%' (2015, p.89). The number of people described as members of a profession also began to swell, as did the numbers of manufacturers, merchants and entrepreneurs that accumulated spectacular wealth in the nineteenth century (Nenadic, 1991).

Many of the early women in social science came from professional family backgrounds: academics, military officers and clergymen were prominent, as well as established professions such as law, medicine and teaching. It was rare to find family backgrounds connected to one of the newer service providers, but there are cases. The father of **Barbara Freire-Marreco** (1879-1967), for example, was an accountant, while **Winifred Cullis** (1875-1956) and **Olive Malvery** (1871-1914) were both daughters of civil engineers. Business families also have good

representation across both generations. This category groups together women from a wide range of social backgrounds. At one end, there are the daughters of financiers and industrialists with incomes of over £1,000 per year. Take, for instance, **Ethel De la Cour** (1869-1957), pioneer in the field of domestic science in Scotland, and first principal of the Edinburgh School of Cookery and Domestic Economy (later Queen Margaret University) after it was brought under the public control of the Scottish Education Department in 1909 (Begg, 2004). Born in Edinburgh, she was the daughter of Lauritz Ulrich De la Cour, a wealthy financier, shipbroker, coal merchant, and colliery owner of the Townhill Coal Company. At the other end of the spectrum there are women from significantly less affluent social backgrounds, the daughters of shopkeepers and other businessmen who managed on annual earnings of under £100. The figures suggest such women are disproportionately concentrated in the generation born after 1871.

Although common practice, coding of women's social origins based on father's occupation provides neither a robust nor an unproblematic measure.[15] It does, however, as noted by Gillian Sutherland in her study of early Cambridge students, 'have the merit of focusing attention on money'. 'To do new things', she continued, 'women … needed economic independence…Without economic resources you were dependent, on either family or husband, or both, and constrained by their expectations' (2015, pp.7-8). While women of all social classes in the final third of the nineteenth century still had only the most limited rights, autonomy and opportunities, new legislation had removed some important legal disabilities. For instance, the Married Women's Property Act, 1870 and 1882, following the first organised campaign for marriage reform sparked off by the noted feminist Barbara Bodichon, finally gave married women the same rights as unmarried women regarding finances and property (Griffin, 2003). Though these laws may not have changed societal beliefs of separate, gendered spheres, nor make women equal to men under civil law, they were a necessary step in the direction of women's equality. All the same, anxieties brought on by this legislation meant that change in other areas was slow. Important rights, such as to education and the vote, remained

[15] See Husbands (2015) for a discussion on this topic based on an analysis of sociology graduates in LSE and Bedford College for Women, 1907-1939.

constrained by laws and social norms that enforced women's social and economic dependence on men, especially women from the middle classes.

In the social context of the late nineteenth century, being independently wealthy often brought with it the freedom to avoid the only paths then open to most young middle-class women: getting married or training to become a teacher. Joan Perkins estimated that only 10 per cent of women had an independent income in this period (1989, pp.10-18). Several women discussed here were found to have had access to the necessary financial support to pursue an independent life, often having received a significant settlement on the death of their fathers. Many would be considered examples of the New Woman, that fictional icon of the fin-de-siècle examined by Richardson and Willis (2001).

Constance Naden (1858-1889), philosopher, poet and women's rights activist, was an independent scholar. A considerable inheritance from her grandparents' estate released her from the obligation to marry and, along with so many of her generation, she used much of it for the benefit of less-fortunate women. Her friend and early biographer, William Hughes, noted that, shortly before she died, she had committed to take 'responsibility of the Campden Houses [in London] … for the reception of ladies of limited means' (1890, p.50). Her financial independence and social status also allowed Naden to pursue educational opportunities unimpeded. Interested in languages, philosophy, and the sciences, she attended first the Birmingham and Midland Institute and then, from 1881 to 1887, Mason Science College, which became the University of Birmingham in 1900. It may have been here that she came under the influence of Herbert Spencer's philosophical ideas; she went on to deliver an address upon his Principles of Sociology to the sociological section at Mason Science College in 1889 (den Otter, 2004). Alongside publishing two volumes of poetry, Naden studied, wrote and lectured in both the natural and social sciences, regarding these roles, according to one biographer, 'as interlinked and reciprocal'; as such, she 'occupied a uniquely interdisciplinary position' (Stainthorp, 2017, p.1). Like many of her generation, she favoured philosophical endeavours over more policy-oriented scholarly work then at the forefront of the "condition of England" question. Still, she was actively involved in causes on behalf of women, including through the National Indian Association, until her early death in 1889 at the age of thirty-one.

Obituaries and wider sources reveal that Naden was among several women discussed here to be generous in their charitable support of social reform. Others made benefactions to the social sciences, acting as important patrons in several ways. This included leaving generous donations in their wills to establish some of the first scholarships open to women only. For instance, **Ada Heather-Bigg** (1855-1944) left funds designated for a prize still awarded for performance in final economics examinations at UCL. **Ellen McArthur** (1862-1927) bequeathed most of her estate to Cambridge University for a studentship and lecture series – which, as one biographer observes, 'has since been awarded to a large number of men and a very few women' (Erickson, 2006, p.1). **Bessie Hutchins** (1858-1935) made a gift of £2000 in 1926 to award a permanent research scholarship at the London School of Economics. The memorial scholarship endowed from the bequest of **Alice Ravenhill** (1859-1954) is still awarded at the University of British Columbia (de Zwart, 2016).

Women supported not only women's participation in the social sciences but the development of various disciplines, often through endowments made during their lifetime. In her retirement, the economist **Mary Marshall** (1850-1944) worked for over a decade as a volunteer librarian and provided funds towards maintaining the collection established in honour of her husband, Alfred Marshall. When she died, she left £10,000 to the university, 'for the development and increased usefulness of the Marshall Library' (Marshall, 1947, p.67). **Eleanor Rathbone** (1872-1946), a member of the noted Rathbone family of Liverpool, known principally for her successful advocacy of what become family allowances, helped establish the School of Social Science. She was the daughter of William Rathbone who provided financial backing for University College, Liverpool (University of Liverpool from 1903) as did a great number of important industrialists from the north. Eleanor's own connection with the university began around the same time when, in 1905, she raised a significant amount of private support to endow a new lectureship to be held jointly at the Victoria Settlement in the Everton area of the city and the University of Liverpool. Susan Pedersen (2004) records that **Elizabeth Macadam** (1871-1948), one of the earliest recipients of the Pfeiffer Scholarship, was appointed to this post in 1911. This scholarship had been established in 1894 at the bequest of Edward

Pfeiffer and his wife Emily Pfeiffer (feminist poet and promoter of women's education) to help students to study in this area of work (Dyhouse, 1995).

Another driving force behind many of the advancements in early social science was the Irish heir **Charlotte Shaw** (1857-1943). Described in 1896 by Beatrice Webb as a 'graceful woman' of 'irresponsible wealth' (1948, p.90), Shaw was the eldest of two daughters of a very wealthy Anglo-Irish Protestant landowner and investor. In her own words, she had 'a perfectly hellish childhood and youth' on account of a disapproving mother with conventional expectations centred on marriage (as cited in Dunbar, 1963, p.251). Like others of her generation and social class, it was a life lived predominantly at home, an environment that revolved almost entirely around social engagements and domestic management. Only as she reached her late thirties and gained financial independence on the death of her parents, first her father in 1885 followed by that of her mother in 1891, could she escape the limitations of middle-class Victorian womanhood and the ideals that she must live up to. She chose to do something about social inequalities, especially those affecting women. Through Sidney and Beatrice Webb, she joined the recently established Fabian Society, which led to an introduction to her future husband, the English playwright George Bernard Shaw, another of the Society's early members. College records indicate she was hugely influential during the early years of the LSE. She donated premises just off the strand in Adelphi Terrace in 1896, the year after it was established, and contributed substantial sums over the next 50 years to ensure its success (Dunbar, 1963).

Writing about women's agency in British museums between 1850 and 1914, Kate Hill argues that 'women tended to turn to the patronage of new institutions because they found that masculine institutions excluded or marginalised them' (2016, p.127). Ostensibly, this did not apply to LSE which had opened its doors to men and women equally from the start and awarded degrees without discriminating on sex. Even so, Shaw recognised that women still faced prejudice. As a committed feminist, she set about tackling one of the main obstacles to women doing social research at LSE, lack of funding (Dyhouse, 1995). In 1900, she established a trust to endow a series of research studentships, to the value of 100 guineas per year. One of the earliest recipients was Marion Phillips, later Chief Women's Officer of the Labour Party,

whose doctorate on the development of New South Wales was published in 1909 as *A Colonial Autocracy*. Her career advanced in 1906 when she began working as Beatrice Webb's research assistant, whom she first met through her doctoral supervisor Graham Wallas, a prominent member of the Fabian Society, investigating infant mortality for the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws (Goronwy-Roberts, 2000). Subsequently, after several years of the scholarship going to a man, Shaw stipulated that it should be limited exclusively to female students working on women's history and issues of gender, and that she herself would choose the research topics. The first recipient of the new women-only research studentship was **Eileen Power** (1889-1940) who received it in 1911-1912 and went on to become the second woman to be appointed to a Chair in Economic History at LSE. Whilst Charlotte Shaw's own contributions as a social researcher may have been rather limited, she was able to use her wealth and social and cultural capital 'both to open doors for women scholars and to influence the shape of the curriculum' (Pomata, 2004, p.45; Oakley, 2021).

In the professional and business categories there were also women from lower-middle class families, some with an income of less than £100 a year, well below the £400 per year thought necessary to sustain the public identity of a "gentleman" in this period (Musgrove, 1959). Several cases were identified, **Margaret Nevinson** (1858-1932) amongst them, of fathers who died when they were young. Like many other unmarried women in straightened circumstances, these individuals generally had few options other than a teaching career, which many took up until other opportunities came along. The political theorist **Teresa Billington-Greig** (1877-1964), who had to leave school at thirteen to work and ran away from home aged 17 with no qualifications, was supporting herself through teaching by the time she was 18. However, she had already decided to become a writer, recording in an unfinished autobiography: 'I did not regard teaching as a future life-work. It was not my goal, only a stepping stone on the way' (as cited in McPhee and Fitzgerald, 2001, p.70).

This was the path taken by **Anne Cummins** (1869-1936), one of the earliest medical social workers (or "Lady Almoner", the title by which social workers in hospital settings were officially known until 1964). After the death of her father, an

Anglican clergyman, she briefly worked as a governess and taught at what later became the Francis Holland School in London's Notting Hill before taking up the suggestion of Charles Loch, Secretary to the Council of the London Charity Organisation Society (COS) and friend of her late father, to do the training then being set up for COS volunteer workers (Baraclough, 2011). As one of the first to attend the London School of Sociology and Social Economics, which began teaching for the first time in 1902, Cummins would have combined theoretical study with practical experience in various societies and welfare agencies. Classes were organised under a joint committee consisting of representatives of the COS, the Women's University Settlement, and the National Union of Women Workers (NUWW), having developed from training initiated a decade earlier by Margaret Sewell (Warden of the Women's Settlement) and Octavia Hill (social reformer who laid the foundations of the modern profession of housing management) (Macadam, 1945).

Numbers attending the London School of Sociology were small, with 16 students registered in 1904-05 (Smith, 1952). Most left no trace in the historical record, possibly because they put their new skills into unpaid philanthropic activities. Relatively little had changed almost two decades later. The economist Barbara Wootton would remark of her students at Westfield College, London, in the early 1920s that 'few of them were training to become professional social workers: mostly they were young women of means and leisure who wished to engage in various charitable activities' (as cited in Sutherland, 2015, p.54). Despite her noted Scots family background, Cummins was left impoverished by her father's death and had to enter paid employment. Following her training, she took up an appointment at St Thomas' Hospital in London in 1905 where she was influential in establishing a comprehensive social work service, leading some sources to credit her with inventing the role of a modern social worker attached to a hospital (Burnham, 2016). Writing about the historical development of social work, John Pierson regards Cummins, who stayed connected with the settlement house movement and occasionally lectured at LSE, though wrote very little, as 'a good example of how hardline commitment to COS principles' (for instance, she opposed the introduction of subsidised meals for Lambeth mothers) 'could mix with forward-looking social work practice' (2011, p.32).

Although the economic circumstances of middle-class families in Britain at this time varied greatly, white-collar salaried professions offered families the possibility of upward mobility (Gunn, 2004). While both parents of the socialist **Grace Oakeshott** (1872-1929), author of several studies including an analysis of women in the cigar trade published in 1900 in the *Economic Journal*, came from working-class areas in the East End of London, she had 'the good fortune', her biographer Jocelyn Robson has noted, 'to be born into a family where personal aspirations were high' (2016, p.9). By the time of Oakeshott's birth, her father worked as a commercial clerk, positioning the Cash family firmly within the ranks of the lower-middle class. In the early 1880s, the family moved from Hackney in East London to the new development of Thornton Heath, near Croydon, then undergoing rapid transformation because of railway expansion. At the time, the area was becoming something of a home to free religious ideas, particularly those linked with socialism, including the New Fellowship and Fabians (Mackenzie and Mackenzie, 1977). Thoughts of political community may have prompted the family's move. However, formal education brought social status and, as Robson (2016, p.19) notes, 'probably uttermost in their minds was the need to find good secondary schools' for Grace and her siblings.

That the working-class group, at four per cent, should be the smallest category in this study is hardly surprising since these were women for whom the greatest obstacles to engaging in intellectual activities had to be overcome. Among this group were **Clara James** (1866-1954), a leading figure in the Women's Industrial Council, and **Dorothy Thurtle** (1890-1973), radical author of the Birkett Committee's Minority Report (1939) which advocated the legalisation of abortion, especially for poor women with large families (Farmer, 2008). As daughters of qualified tradesmen, both women were from better off sections of the working class; George Lansbury, Thurtle's father, would later move into politics and led the Labour Party from 1932 to 1935. Arguably, the best known from this group of eight women is the activist **Margaret Bondfield** (1873-1953), whose interests in women's economic and social problems would lead to her becoming Minister of Labour in Britain's second Labour government.

The formative influences on Bondfield were vast and varied. Born in the Somerset town of Chard, the tenth of eleven children, she recalled in her autobiography how her father, a self-taught radical Congregationalist, had ‘feared the workhouse’ when he was ‘paid off with a week’s wages’ (1948, p.13) from his job as foreman of a lace factory and unable to find regular work. After limited schooling at the local elementary school, she spent a year as a monitor (pupil teacher) ‘until another teacher could be found’; aged 14, she was apprenticed to a Brighton shop for five years, starting on £15 a year plus room and board (1948, pp.22-27). Shopwork, though still not entirely respectable, had opened a new field of employment for women (Cox and Hobley, 2014). Working extremely long hours, Bondfield was required to live in a dormitory above her employer’s shop. Spiritual and intellectual stimulus came from the “at homes” held every other Sunday for female shop assistants by Louisa Martindale, the widowed mother of one of the first women factory inspectors, **Hilda Martindale** (1875-1952). Moving to London in 1894, she began to move in socialist circles, became active in the newly formed National Union of Shop Assistants, and met many influential figures through her brother, including the trade unionist **Frances Hicks** (1861-c.1909). She joined the Ideal Club, a debating and recreational centre in London’s Tottenham Court Road, making political contact with Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Ramsey MacDonald and other leading figures, as she moved through such organisations as the Social Democratic Federation, Independent Labour Party, Fabian Society and the Women’s Industrial Council.

The Women’s Industrial Council had an explicit feminist aim directed towards improving the industrial environment, as explained in an article by one of its members published in the *Women’s Industrial News* surveying the first 20 years of the body’s existence (Papworth, 1914). It was co-founded in 1894 by Clementina Black, who later chaired its Social Investigations Committee which did much research in London and in other British cities exposing the conditions of women’s labour. At the request of Black, Bondfield joined with **Edith Hogg** (1856-1900), co-founder and Secretary of its Educational Committee, in completing a two-year survey of shop assistants’ working conditions. The 1898 report, republished the following year in the *Economic Journal*, detailed the long hours, poor conditions and pay, and other abuses faced by female shopworkers (Bondfield, 1899). Though the

enquiry cost Bondfield her job, the report's findings were used by Sir John Lubbock to secure a Select Committee in the Lords and eventually the passage of the Shop Hours Act 1904. Bondfield continued her many political activities over the next few years and undertook further studies. In 1910, she travelled to the United States and Mexico to research labour issues (Soldon, 1978). She carried out investigative work on married women's working conditions in the Yorkshire woollen industry with Clementina Black, contributing to Bessie Hutchins' chapter in *Married Women's Work,* a study of women's working conditions and home life carried out by the Women's Industrial Council (Hutchins, 1915). In 1923, she became MP for Northampton, after twice being unsuccessful. Like her parliamentary colleague, **Ellen Wilkinson** (1891-1947) who was elected in 1924 and served on the executive committee of the Labour Research Department, Bondfield brought research evidence into policymaking, to clarify problems and build support for policy change.

4.3 Childhood family background

In Victorian domestic ideology, as Linda Mahood noted in her biography of **Eglantyne Jebb** (1876-1928), 'under the influence of philosophers like Rousseau … the home was the primary agency of socialization for girls, functioning as a total institution where few other social groups could have much influence' (2009, p.37). There is relatively limited biographical material available on childhood family background for the individuals discussed here. However, some women reflect in their autobiographical writings on family connections and inherited beliefs, values and attitudes as playing a key part in influencing decisions as they travelled from girlhood to young womanhood. Several women's lives and later careers would appear to have greatly benefitted from relationships with parents and other members of extended families. In some cases, political and intellectual figures who visited the family home are significant. It was relatively common for households to engage in several areas of political and civic activity, among them support for reform of the electoral system, women's equality more broadly, and relief efforts on behalf of the poor.

Several women came from families with links to organised radical and freethought intellectual movements that had gained strength in the nineteenth century (Biagini, 2002). A prominent example of someone from the generation that inherited this

political legacy is **Clara Collet** (1860-1948). One of the earliest female UCL graduates and an important contributor in the opening volumes of Charles Booth's *inquiry into the Life and Labour of the People in London*, she had a long and distinguished career carried out from within government, notably at the Board of Trade, (and the Ministry of Labour, as it became known in 1917). Her father was close friends with the secularist George Holyoake, a leading figure in the cooperative movement, and a prominent champion of press freedom and editor of the *Free Press,* renamed the *Diplomatic Review* in 1866. Karl Marx, not long settled in London after being driven out of Paris following publication of the communist manifesto, was among its contributors. As a child, Collet was especially close to Marx' youngest and only British-born daughter, the slightly older **Eleanor Marx** (1855-1898), socialist campaigner and author of important theoretical work on the 'woman question' (Holmes, 2014). Several biographies reveal through Collet's diaries something about the intellectual environment at home and at the Marx house, from which both young women learnt about the socialist movement in Europe and beyond and might engage in political discussion (Miller, 2003). Collet's memory of the many radicals and refugees, Friedrich Engels among them, who would visit the Marx' house was of a 'room full of people all talking French at the top of their voices' (as cited in McDonald, 2004, p.20). Both Clara Collet and Eleanor Marx inherited their fathers' strong democratic impulses.

Table 4.3: Political origins (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All[a]
Radical politics[b]	12 (11%)	11 (9%)	23 (10%)
Mainstream politics[c]	8 (8%)	13 (11%)	21 (9%)
Humanitarian causes[d]	15 (14%)	20 (17%)	35 (16%)
Women's rights[e]	7 (7%)	13 (11%)	20 (9%)
Unknown	64 (60%)	61 (52%)	125 (56%)
Totals	106	118	224

Notes:
a. Total is more than 188 as multiple categories could be selected.
b. For example, Chartism, radical wing of Liberalism, Independent Labour Party, Christian Socialism.
c. For example, elected Member of Parliament, stood unsuccessfully for election, local politician.
d. Involvement in philanthropic activities, social work, community service.
e. Involvement in the struggles (sometimes as leaders) for property rights, women's suffrage, and educational and employment opportunities.

Another near contemporary who also inherited her father's political legacy was **Jane Unwin** (1851-1947), third daughter and fourth child of the Victorian reformer and Radical Liberal politician Richard Cobden, best remembered for his successful fight for repeal of the Corn Laws and his defence of free trade (Howe and Morgan, 2006). A prominent voice for extending the vote to women, Unwin had developed an early interest in the question of women's suffrage after attending a conference in London in her twenties, writing in her 1875 diary: 'No more aimless wanderings abroad for me, I shall enter into the Women's Suffrage Campaign and so have a real interest in life' (as cited in Howe, 2006). The feminist historian Sarah Richardson argues that the main collective achievement of Jane and her sisters was to carry on their father's work and ensure the family name survived. 'In doing so', she concluded, 'they proved themselves worthy successors to their father, guaranteeing that his contribution was not only sustained, but remodelled for a new age' (Richardson, 2006, p.246). While Unwin wrote relatively little during the years that she spent campaigning, she composed an introduction to *The Hungry Forties* (Unwin, 1904), part of the free trade case against Joseph Chamberlain's campaign in favour of tariff reform and imperial preference, which is described in her ODNB entry as 'an evocative and brilliantly successful tract' (Howe, 2006). Later, she donated her father's old home in Sussex to the London School of Economics, of which she had become a governor, serving alongside Charlotte Shaw and Beatrice Webb (Howe, 2006). Webb wrote of recurring problems in her diary on 2 May 1923: 'The poor lady … makes fretful complaints if a single bush is cut down or a stone shifted, whilst she vehemently resents the high spirits of the students … not to mention the opinions of some of the lecturers' (1923, p.426). LSE eventually renounced the house in exchange for a financial donation.

Distant relatives could also have a formative influence, and several of the women discussed here were related to figures who often stood at the forefront of reformist movements, including those outside the main cultural and intellectual center of London and Oxbridge**.** Take **Evelyn Fox** (1874-1955), mental health worker and occasional lecturer at LSE. A descendant of Charles James Fox, long-serving leader of the left-wing of the Whig party who, in 1797, inspired by the reforms then being undertaken by French republicans, called for a 'radical reform' of the British electoral system, she was born into a family steeped in radical and reforming

politics. **Alice Clark** (1874-1934), one of the pioneering women economic historians fostered by **Lillian Knowles** (1870-1926), the first female Professor of Economic History at LSE, spent her childhood in Somerset within a Quaker family that included many freethinking relatives in philanthropic and educational circles. Her grandfather was the radical liberal MP for Rochdale, John Bright, who sat in the House of Commons from 1843 to 1889, and who, in partnership with Richard Cobden, founded the Anti-Corn Law League, aimed at promoting free trade policies. Beatrice Webb's grandfather was the radical non-conformist Liberal Party MP for Wigan (1832-1839), Richard Potter, co-founder of the Little Circle, which was key in creating the 1832 Reform Act.

For several women, some of whom will be considered below, it is possible to link the drive to do something in the world to the childhood influence of families that were strong advocates for gender equality, especially around the issue of women's suffrage. Hilda Martindale paid tribute in her memoir, *From One Generation to Another* (1944), to her mother, Louisa Martindale, an active suffragist, and a member of the Women's Liberal Federation (WLF) and of the executive committee of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS). The women in **Mary Stocks**' (1891-1975) family were involved in the suffrage movement, and she had joined the NUWSS whilst still at school. Other women who had family members engaged in the women's movement include **Mabel Atkinson** (1876-1958), whose mother was a militant suffragette, and Alice Clark, who was related to several women who had taken a leading part in organised campaigning for women's rights in the 1860s in the Southwest of England. Many of the extended family of **Violet Butler** (1884-1982), one of several women active in Barnett House in its first decades, were politically active, and included leading figures in philanthropic and educational circles. Her aunt was the renowned social reformer Josephine Butler, best remembered for the campaign to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts which achieved its final success in 1886; her great-aunt was the widely admired early nineteenth-century author, Maria Edgeworth, whose philanthropy included actions during the Great Irish Famine of 1845-52 (Kelleher, 1997). **Margery Spring Rice** (1887-1970), social reformer involved with the issues of poverty and access to contraception who co-founded the North Kensington birth control clinic in 1924, was niece to two prominent feminists: the physician and suffragist Elizabeth Garrett

Anderson and Millicent Garrett Fawcett, co-founder of Newnham College and President of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) from 1907-1919. Significantly, Fawcett shared her husband's interests in economics and was well regarded for various early works on economics, including *Political Economy for Beginners* (1870), a brief but successful introductory text for schools that ran to ten editions, *Tales in Political Economy* (1875), and, with Henry Fawcett, *Essays and Lectures on Social and Political Subjects* (1872).

The influence of female relations who themselves had benefitted from higher education was potentially significant. Most of the cases identified, some of which are detailed in this chapter, are from the later generation (which is to be expected since higher education would have been largely closed to the mothers and aunts of those born before 1871). Dorothea Proud's parents were both fully converted to women's education; her mother had been a student at the University of Adelaide in the 1860s, two decades before women were admitted to degrees in Australia (McKinnon, 1986). **Amber Blanco White** (1887-1981) was the youngest daughter of **Maud Pember Reeves** (1865-1953), an early member of the Fabian Society executive committee and co-founder of the Fabian Women's Group. In 1889, as a young mother, Maud took the first part of a BA in New Zealand before abandoning her studies. Amber's father, William Pember Reeves, a New Zealand statesman who later became LSE's third Director, had given his daughter the choice: Cambridge or presentation at Court. She followed in her mother's footsteps, choosing to attend Cambridge. The father of Eglantyne Jebb was also opposed to women's right to education and careers. Fortunately, her aunt, the Newnham alumna and suffragist Louisa Jebb, stepped in. The Jebb Family Papers include a recollection by Eglantyne's sister Emily that they all regarded their aunt as 'the heroine of our childhood … the insurer of dreams, the instigator of ideas' (as cited in Mahood, 2009, p.48). With an influential family and social network, Jebb later worked alongside **Helena Swanwick** (1864-1939), **Mary Sheepshanks** (1872-1958), **Maude Royden** (1876-1956) and other prominent suffragists in the Fight the Famine Council and elsewhere.

The backgrounds of the eight working-class women who were drawn to social investigation reflect similar experiences of family radicalism, though typically of a

different kind. The families of Margaret Bondfield, Frances Hicks, and **Julia Varley** (1871-1952) were part of the generation of working-class radicals who were beginning, as Scriven (2012) and others have noted, to organise themselves and press for reform of the electoral system. Bondfield revealed in her autobiography (1948, pp.13-14) that her father had been active in the Anti-Corn Law League of the 1840s, and later secretary of the Chard Political Union, then a centre of radicalism in Somerset. Frances Hicks also lived through an impoverished childhood informed by strong non-conformist beliefs about equality. Born into a working-class London family with links to the Chartist movement, Hicks was exposed in childhood to radical political networks through her mother, Amie Hicks, an early member of the Social Democratic Federation, Britain's first left-wing political party, who had stood twice as their candidate for the London School Board in the 1880s. Hicks senior was also one of the founding members, with Clementina Black, of the Women's Trade Union Association, the immediate forerunner of the WIC, which had been created following the 1889 Dock Strike by women dissatisfied with the stance of the Women's Trade Union League (Hannam and Hunt, 2002).

Frances Hicks was one of a small band of dedicated working-class activists involved in the Council, working closely with middle-class members such as **Lucy Wyatt Papworth** (1874-1921). At its first meeting in 1894, it was Hicks who 'suggested that one of the aims of the new body should be to establish specialized committees to organize inquiries into various industrial issues' (Holloway, 2005, p.66). Clementina Black's resolution that a 'central council shall be established to organise special and systematic inquiry into the conditions of working women, to promote accurate information concerning those interests, and to promote such action as may seem conducive to their improvement' was seconded by **Margaret Irwin** (1858-1940) and passed by a large majority (cited in Mappen, 1985, p.61). Though Hicks published little, her enquiry into the work of dressmakers and tailoresses (1896) was included in a collection edited by the political writer and journalist, Frank Galton, secretary to the Webbs and later to the Fabian Society. The Council's social investigations were time-consuming and relied heavily on unpaid labour (Mappen, 1985). 'This probably explains', Gillian Holloway observed, why most of it was supplied by middle-class women, and 'the popularity of the Girls Club work amongst working-class members of the WIC' (2005, p.69), including Hicks and Clara James.

Some families were part of the British political elite and came from a very different social background to Bondfield, Varley and Hicks. **Edith Picton-Turbervill** (1872-1960), an early Labour Member of Parliament who later investigated the practice of mui tsai in Malaya and Hong Kong, grew up in a family with aristocratic connections. The economist **Lettice Fisher** (1875-1956) was born in Kensington, London, the eldest daughter of Sir Courtenay Ilbert, a distinguished British lawyer and colonial administrator who later served as the Clerk of the House of Commons from 1902-1921 and wrote several books on parliamentary and legislative history and procedure. Lettice was educated at Somerville College, Oxford. Later, she wrote on old age pensions and published articles on urban housing in the *Economic Journal* in 1899, 1902 and 1905. Several women had fathers or other close relatives who were at some point elected members of Parliament or had stood unsuccessfully as candidates. Of the families that had produced notable politicians, most were Liberal Party supporters at a time when widespread poverty and other social ills had begun to present a serious challenge to classical liberalism and the policy of laissez-faire capitalism associated with it. None was a leading exponent of the emerging strand of liberal thinking, what came to be known as “New Liberalism”, whose influence was discernible in the welfare legislation passed by the Liberal government of 1906-14.

In her autobiography, **Lily Montagu** (1873-1963) spoke of the lasting effects of being raised in an intellectual, Orthodox Jewish family (Montagu, 1943). Her father, the self-made millionaire and philanthropist Samuel Montagu, was head of one of the most distinguished, well-connected, and influential families in the Anglo-Jewish community (Campbell, 2018). As well as advancing Jewish institutions and charitable causes, he combined a notable career in business and government, sitting in the House of Commons from 1885 to 1900 as the Liberal MP for Whitechapel, a poor district of the East End of London (Lipman, 1990). Samuel Montagu was an important figure in his daughter’s life, but Lily would later reject many of her father’s religious beliefs and she would resist his advice that ‘a Jewish girl does not leave home unless there is something wrong with her’ (1943, p.16).

June Spence’s work suggests that Montagu looked to her father for ‘inspiration to act upon and change social and industrial conditions’ (2004, p.497), and followed

his lead as far as philanthropic activity went. Her objection to his support for the moralistic methods of the Charity Organisation Society, with its distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, are detailed in her biography of her father (Montagu, 1913). In another of her earliest writings, she found fault with her fellow philanthropists, commenting that they like to 'peep down the abyss in which the underfed, the ill-housed, and badly clothed work out their life's drama', and then forget 'the grim truth that if girls work for less than a living wage, in a vitiated atmosphere, they are not likely to become the strong, self controlled women whom we desire the clubs to train' (1904, pp.249-50).

Montagu's concern with the rights of workers, especially the rights of young female workers from London's Jewish community, shaped the direction of her social work. Her research explored the poor pay and industrial conditions endured by working-class girls across several genres. In her article, "The Girl in the Background" (Montagu, 1904), published in an edited collection by E.J. Urwick, vice-president of the Sociological Society and the first head of LSE's Department of Social Science and Administration, she wrote of the difficulties that oppressed working-class girls and the use of club work as a strategy to address these. It had been her close friend, **Margaret MacDonald** (1870-1911), who had helped Montagu 'to see the connection between so-called philanthropic and industrial work' (MacDonald, 1912, p.15), eventually leading her to club work, the forerunner of professional youth and community work, as well as involvement in organisations such as the NUWW and the WIC, where relationships developed with other early members, amongst them Beatrice Webb, Bessie Hutchins and Clementina Black. As the title of her 1941 book, *My Club and I*, suggests, there was no separation for Montagu between her personal values and her work on behalf of working girls. Having rejected many of her father's beliefs – on religion, female independence, and the role of philanthropy – she took her own path. Although she would eventually be disinherited, the influence of Samuel Montagu on his sixth child was considerable: according to one biographer, Lily's 'social concerns are in essence continuous with her fathers' (Dwor, 2018, p.348).

The absence of personal documents for many of the women means there are aspects of their early lives about which we can only speculate. This is the case for

the sociologist Varvara De Vesselitsky who first arrived at LSE as a student aged 39 in 1921. At the time of her death just a few years later, she worked as secretary to the Stepney Skilled Employment Association, Toynbee Hall (LSE, 1934). Though we know the route she took after university, what motivated her to first study and then practice social science remains largely hidden. Looking within genealogy resources, family obituary notices and a privately published recollection of her father's life and works by William Grey-Wilson (1918), colonial administrator and chairman of the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organisations, there is evidence that this was a family at the centre of European politics. Descended from an ancient Herzegovinian Serb family that had sought refuge in Russia in the eighteenth century, Varvara was the younger daughter of Gabriel de Vesselitsky, a diplomat with connections to the Russian Imperial Court, European political leaders and the British Foreign Office, and his American wife Julia (née Munroe). For reasons unknown, the family moved to London in the early 1880s, where her father, and later also her brother, worked as a writer and journalist, notably as the British correspondent of *Novoe Vremya*, one of Russia's most influential newspapers until the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917 (T.S.B., 1957). While details of Varvara's life are scant, and it is impossible to know how much influence family circumstances had on her decision to engage in social research, family connections give a sense of the environment in which she was raised, linking her to the political struggles of Russia at the turn of the century.

Family interests that went beyond philanthropy and welfare reform were an important factor for some. Eleanor Rathbone came from a wealthy family of Liverpool merchants and shipowners. With strong connections to the wider intellectual scene, the Rathbones 'looked upon business as a means to an end, not as an end in itself' (Marriner, 1956, p.105). Her father, William Rathbone, a liberal politician who served in the House of Commons for nearly 30 years, provided substantial financial resources for a variety of charitable causes, including nursing and workhouse reform (Hardy, 1981). Eleanor shared her father's interests in social reform from a young age. After university, she spent the years 1896 to 1902 collaborating with him on his public work. She might have become another philanthropist herself but for her father's involvement in social investigation. It was at his suggestion that she began researching the problem of causal labour at

Liverpool's docks, an inquiry that 'would make her name and serve as a basis for local reform efforts' (Pedersen, 2004, p.62). One of Rathbone's closest friends from Oxford was **Barbara Hammond** (1873-1961), daughter of the Reverend Edward Bradby. When she was 12, her father retired from his position as headmaster of Haileybury College to work at the new university settlement house of Toynbee Hall in London's East End, created as a centre for social reform and research. On leaving Lady Margaret Hall in 1895, Hammond became a volunteer for the Women's Industrial Council, her father's death two years earlier having brought her an independent income. Having started out as an economist, later she became widely known as an economic historian and published many well-received works with her husband.

4.4 Childhood education

Some of the most significant struggles of the mid-Victorian organised women's movement were to address women's frustration with the poor quality of education available to them (Dyhouse, 1995). For Frances Power Cobbe, social reformer and leading women's rights campaigner, female education in the 1850s was 'more shallow and senseless than can easily be believed' (1904, p.58). In the second half of the century, however, the expansion of secondary education for upper- and middle-class girls gathered momentum throughout Britain, eventually contributing to the extension of higher education for women.

Joyce Pedersen has shown how, in the latter half of the century, 'small, private ventures that offered a family-like environment for students started to give way to new, large-scale and more formally organised institutions' (1975, p.140). Two of the first institutions in Britain where girls could gain academic qualifications were Queen's College (1848), situated in Harley Street in London, and Cheltenham Ladies' College (1853), the model of the high-quality girls' boarding school after Dorothea Beale took over in 1858. In 1850, Frances Buss opened the North London Collegiate School in Camden Town, then a fashionable residential area situated between Hampstead and Bloomsbury, to meet the problem of the lack of education for middle-class girls in the capital. In 1871, she founded Camden School for Girls, an independent day school for less affluent families (Avery, 1991). Fortunate Scottish girls might receive an education at the Edinburgh Ladies' College ([1694]

1889) or St Leonards (1877), a residential girls' public school founded by the University of St Andrews (Moore, 2003). Change was slow but new schools emerged throughout the British Isles and many existing schools were reorganised. Ruth Watts has calculated that by the turn of the century 'there were over 160 grammar and high schools for girls' in the country (2007, p.121).

Increased provision for middle-class education during in the mid- to late-Victoria period is not in dispute, but it is important not to overstate the commitment to female education. Before 1870, it was still unusual for girls of all social classes to be formally educated. While working-class girls might be sent to dame schools, the attitudes of poorer parents were often shaped by social and occupational factors: many families needed the income from child labour (Stephen, 1998). Among the wealthier classes, girls tended still to be educated at home by means of governesses or private tutor, or they might be sent to live with an unmarried female relative, while boys and young men of comparable backgrounds increasingly progressed from private lessons to schools. The new girls' schools established from around 1850 had begun to meet the demand for female education among parents who could afford it, but their low numbers meant that they only served a privileged few: 'progress was slow, hesitant and politically fought' (Watts, 2007, p.122).

In addition to revealing that there were only thirteen girls' secondary schools in the whole of England, the report of the 1868 Taunton Commission into education, the first of several in this period, also raised serious concerns about deficiencies in standards, teaching provision, organisation and curriculum (Stephens, 1998). Changes in girls' education in the years immediately afterwards suggest some progress and reform, nevertheless schools with high academic expectations remained rare. The problem, many scholars have noted, was that schools continued to tailor education towards women's role as wives and mothers: to quote Gillian Sutherland, 'the domestic model took a long time to lose its resilience' (2015, p.19). Anything more intellectually challenging, where it existed, rarely went beyond the subjects required for a career in teaching. It would be well into the twentieth century before the opportunities for girls' secondary schooling in Britain equalled that of boys, including access to the kinds of courses that would have enabled women to go straight into the same university degrees as men (Dyhouse, 1977). Many girls

would have to wait until the Education Act of 1944 provided free secondary education for all pupils.

Turning to the women in this study, although many of the specific details on schooling, if they had any, are lacking, the surviving evidence indicates that most women received some formal education between the ages of five and 18 years. A breakdown by birth cohort and whole group is given in Table 4.4. However, it would be unwise to place too much emphasis on these figures since they say nothing about the status of the school or formal curriculum or teaching; any education received might be haphazard at best. **Margaret Harkness** (1854-1923), **Violet Markham** (1872-1959), and Beatrice Webb, to name only a few, reported only a year or so of somewhat erratic schooling in their later teens and sat no public examinations. 'The whole question', as Ruth Watts (2007, p.165) lays out in her collective biography of early female scientists covering the Middle Ages to the Second World War, 'is obviously deeper than that of mere access to schooling or not'.

Table 4.4: Childhood education (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All
Home-based education[a]	22 (24%)	8 (8%)	30 (16%)
Formal elementary education only	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (1%)
Formal secondary education[b]	46 (51%)	68 (69%)	114 (61%)
Unknown	21 (24%)	20 (21%)	41 (22%)
Total	90	98	188

Notes:
a. Includes self-education and private tutoring.
b. Includes private and family-run schools.
c. Includes unclear (two cases).

As was normal for most girls from late-Victorian upper- and middle-class homes, around one third of those discussed here were brought up by traditional parents, which meant they were educated privately, largely at home, by governesses, parents, or other relatives. This could mean many different things and there are examples from both birth cohorts who had very different experiences. One home-

schooled woman who did not achieve any formal qualifications but nonetheless was well educated was Clementina Black. Taught mainly by her mother, she was fluent in German, Italian, and French (Glage, 1981). In her unpublished memoirs, *The Mind of One Child*, she described learning to read at an early age 'as one of the most fortunate facts' of her life. Reading, she indicated, had given her 'a wide vocabulary, considerable acquaintance with English classics and the quite invaluable power of reading very rapidly' (as cited in Janssen, 2018, p.35). Importantly, it provided Black with the necessary skills to earn a livelihood through professional writing, which she combined with social research on behalf of the Women's Industrial Council and other political organisations. A generation later, the eugenic feminist **Sybil Neville-Rolfe** (1885-1955), who like **Marie Stopes** (1880-1958), and men such as Carlos Blacker, William Beveridge and Lancelot Hogben, was interested in the role of biology in solving social problems, was home-schooled by privately hired governesses. Proficient in foreign languages, she regretted her lack of higher learning throughout her life, writing in an autobiographical introduction to *Social Biology and Welfare* (1949): 'even two languages have been of the greatest assistance, but the absence of the mind training that a university education provides has been a very real hardship' (pp.13-14).

Home education was not always a bad experience for women and girls in this period, in learned and cultured households especially. Eglantyne Jebb and her sisters remained at home when their two brothers went away to the prestigious Marlborough College, where their uncle, James Gilmour, was a housemaster. For the Jebb girls, this meant music, drawing and foreign languages, through which they learned to be young ladies. Under the care of their father's radical sister, however, they were saved from a traditional genteel education and learnt science and natural history from home through practical activities such as cooking and collecting botanical specimens. In Quaker and Unitarian households, many of whom followed Joseph Priestley's views on science, gender and education, fortunate girls could learn much at home (Watts, 2010b). Constance Naden, the Oxford-educated anthropologist **Katherine Routledge** (1866-1935), and the social activist and writer **Isabella Ford** (1855-1924) are amongst those of this background who were given by the standard of the day what would have been considered an excellent education at home.

Social investigation in this period also attracted women whose background and early schooling differed markedly from that of Jebb and other middle-class home-schooled girls. Aside from the 41 women for whom no sufficiently informative details on schooling were located, records suggest that Margaret Bondfield, Dorothy Thurtle and Julia Varley left formal schooling with only an elementary education. The life of Varley, a hugely respected figure in the labour movement, illustrates some of the barriers that faced bright working-class girls. Like Bondfield and Thurtle, she came from a political family with a strong commitment to education, but financial circumstances prevented her continuing beyond elementary level. She began work at the age of ten in a Bradford mill, and after her mother died also had to care for her younger brothers and sisters (Thurlow, 2001). Despite, or perhaps because of, childhood experiences of poverty, women from humble backgrounds, especially those with limited formal education, tended to conduct social research that traded on their direct experience of working-class life. In 1904, after years in the labour movement championing women workers and seeking better pay and working conditions, Varley became a Bradford Poor Law Guardian. To get first-hand knowledge of the system of poor relief in England and Wales, she investigated the lives of destitute women known to go ‘on tramp’ in search of work or to beg by disguising herself and tramping from Leeds to Liverpool, publishing her work in a newspaper article in 1907 (Metcalf, 2015).

A common pattern among the middle and upper-class women discussed here, especially for the first cohort, was to be home educated until around the age of 14 and then receive a few years of formal education, often in small local schools. Writing in 1898, Alice Zimmern, author of several studies in education, including research on the US education system published as *Methods of Education in America* (1894), reported that over two thirds of girls in English secondary education received it in family boarding schools of the type described in L.T. Meads’ *A World of Girls* (Zimmern, 1898).

Take the example of Alice Ravenhill, educational pioneer, and promoter of the household science movement who in later life developed a keen interest in the arts and crafts of Canada’s indigenous peoples (de Zwart, 2016). A governess schooled her and her sister at home, while their brothers attended prestigious boarding

schools. Eventually, the girls were sent to a residential school in Richmond, prompted by their brother being sent home from Cheltenham College with scarlet fever. They attended another private school at St. John's Wood, London, which Ravenhill characterised in her autobiography, published in 1951 when she was ninety-two years old, as their 'second great adventure' (Ravenhill, 1951, p.35). Though it was a largely conventional education for girls whose main goal was marriage, Ravenhill expressed disappointment at having to leave formal education before she turned 17. Still, this did not stop her ambitions and she educated herself through readings of Spencer and Darwin, which 'not only furthered her general education but also laid the foundation for her future career' (Daniels and Bayliss, 1985, p.23). Such was the case with other women in the group. Boys in this period were often similarly educated, although there was still much argument about boys' education. While formal schooling before the age of 10 was becoming the norm for boys raised in the wealthiest families, this custom was far from universal before the twentieth century (Perkin, 1961). The philosopher and political activist Bertrand Russell (born 1872), grandson of Lady Henrietta Stanley, prominent campaigner for women's education and co-founder of Girton College, was educated almost wholly at home.

Some of the middle-class women's families prized education highly. As a result, their daughters received the best education then available in the country, whether for boys or girls, attending institutions that were committed to giving girls a comprehensive education in subjects like classics, mathematics, and science as preparation for taking the new public examinations (Nakagomi, 2016). **Adelaide Anderson** (1863-1936) was one of three women educated at Queen's College in London's Harley Street, attending around the same time as **Ethel Tweedie** (1862-1949) and **Margaret Llewelyn Davies** (1861-1944). **Charlotte Wilson** (1854-1944) attended Cheltenham Ladies' College in the years around 1870; Maude Royden was among those from the later generation to study there. Younger women in the first birth cohort and all of them in the second cohort could benefit from independent schools run by the Girls' Public Day School Company (GPDSC), later Trust, formed in 1872 to provide affordable day-school (non-boarding) education for girls. For instance, several women, including the political philosopher and peace campaigner Helena Swanwick, **Beatrice Edgell** (1871-1948), **Hermia Durham** (1873-1948),

and **Clara Rackham** (1875-1966) had attended Notting Hill High School in London, a girls' school esteemed for its teaching in the sciences (Sayers 1973). In 1875, the GPDSC opened its first school outside London, Norwich High School for Girls. **Dorothy Jewson** (1884-1964) was educated there before going on to Cheltenham Ladies' College. Hilda Martindale's family moved to Brighton so she and her sister could attend Brighton High School, founded in 1876. Further north, **Margaret McKillop** (1864-1929) was educated at Blackburne House Girls' School in Liverpool, the first academic girls' school in the country, established in the city's Georgian Quarter in 1844 (Tiffen, 1938).

Scotland had good girls' schools in all the major cities. Five of the women discussed here – **Ethel Collingwood** (1885-1973), **Agnes Crosthwaite** (1876-1965), **Dorothy George** (1878-1971), Barbara Hammond, and Clara Rackham – went to Scotland's first proprietary boarding school for girls. Modelled on Cheltenham Ladies' College and largely staffed by women associated with Girton College, St Leonards in St Andrews was established in 1877 as the St Andrews School for Girls Company (Grant et al., 1927). The city of Dundee was growing in prosperity from the textile industry and especially the manufacturing of jute, and with this came significant improvements to education that catered largely for the burgeoning middle class. **Mary Walker** (1863-1913), the daughter of a wealthy solicitor, first attended Tayside House, a private school for girls, before completing her schooling at the High School of Dundee, an independent day school with origins dated to 1239, where she received instruction in mathematics and elementary science. In the late 1870s, **Charlotte Ainslie** (1863-1960), the daughter of a pharmaceutical chemist, attended another prestigious Scottish secondary school, Merchant Company's endowed George Watson's Ladies' College, Edinburgh. She held various teaching posts (including lecturing in education and psychology at the Cambridge Training College for Women) before, in 1902, the school appointed her as its first woman head, a post she held until 1926. On the other side of the world, Dorothea Proud attended the first state-funded secondary school for girls in Australia, the Advanced School for Girls. Teachers there were amongst the earliest female graduates of the University of Adelaide (Mackinnon, 1986). Maud Pember Reeves was one of the first pupils at Christchurch Girls' High School, the second oldest girls' secondary school in New Zealand.

Several of the women sent to more academically oriented girls' secondary schools were connected in some way to noted campaigners for women's entry to higher education. Margaret Llewelyn Davies, who investigated the lives of working-class women, in association with the Women's Co-operative Guild, was educated at Queen's College in London's Harley Street, before entering Girton College, Cambridge in 1881. She was the youngest of seven children and only daughter of John Llewelyn Davies, Fellow of Trinity College Cambridge, an advocate of higher education of women. Her aunt, Emily Davies, was one of the most ardent campaigners for women's education and co-founded Girton College with Lady Henrietta Stanley and Barbara Bodichon. The parents of **Amy Bulley** (1852-1939), promoter of women's education and trade unionism, were friends with Anne Clough, the first principal of Newnham College, who had persuaded them to send their three daughters to Cambridge (Clough, 1897). The families of other women discussed here came from the same social and political circles as prominent educationalists. The statistician **Frances Wood** (1883-1919) and her nine siblings, Mary Creese writes, 'were brought up strictly, with no frivolities allowed and regular attendance at family prayers and chapel required' (2000, p.149). Their parents both valued female education and had the means to pay for it (albeit, several daughters were assisted with scholarships). All seven girls attended Notting Hill High School, not far from their home in Marylebone. According to Tim Cole (2018), their father Samuel, who in the 1871 Census is described as a lace manufacturer, had sought advice about his daughters' education from Lady Henrietta Stanley, founder member of the Girls' Public Day School Company which had started Notting Hill High School some years earlier. Frances and five of her sisters subsequently went on to university, 'for the time most likely a record achievement for a single family' (Creese, 2000, p.149).

That Samuel Chick and others like him agreed to their daughters going to these new and progressive institutions, reflected, in Cole's (2018, p.2) view, 'an openness to female emancipation that was unusual for the time', lending further support for the view that late-Victorian fatherhood encompassed greater diversity than hitherto acknowledged (Gordon and Nair, 2006). Support for formal secondary schooling was only one way in which parents encouraged their daughters in this period. It was relatively common for the middle-class women discussed here to be taught by their fathers as preparation for taking the new public examinations. The University of

Cambridge Local Examinations had opened to girls on the same basis as boys in 1868; the following year, the Higher Local Examinations became available, initially for women intending to become teachers (Raffaelli et al., 1995). A significant minority of fathers were clergymen. John Foley, who served as the vicar of Wadhurst in Sussex for over 40 years, taught his daughter, **Caroline Foley** (1857-1942), one of the first women to take up economics before she moved into Buddhist studies. It is notable as well that several fathers were university dons. This was the case for **Thereza Rucker** (1863-1941), one of the main forces behind the creation of the course in household science at King's College for Women, London, in 1908.

The founding student cohort at Newnham College consisted of five students who lived at a house at 74 Regent Street from 1871-72 with Anne Clough, and then for two years at Merton House, in the grounds of St. John's College. That Mary Marshall, the first female lecturer of economics at Cambridge and co-founder of economics at Bristol University with her husband, was among this first group of students, was in no small part the result of her father, the Reverend Thomas Paley, an evangelical clergyman of the Church of England and descendent of the eighteenth-century theologian and philosopher William Paley. We are fortunate to have access to her memoir, *What I Remember*, written in her later years and published three years after her death, but based on a diary she kept, which provides a rich first-hand account of her early life and of the schooling experience for young women. As she recalled, her father was unusual for the time in rejecting the gendered nature of the school curriculum, with its idea that girls should be restricted to such ladylike subjects as embroidery and music: 'We had a father who took part in work and play and who was interested in electricity and photography' (Marshall, 1947, p.7). 'For want of something to do', she wrote, she began studying with her father who taught her mathematics, divinity and science and encouraged her to enter for the Cambridge Higher Local Examination. She passed with distinction in the summer of 1871, which led to the offer of a scholarship to attend the University's Lectures for Women on condition she went to Cambridge to live with Anne Clough on Regent Street (1947, p.10).

4.5 Concluding remarks

Focusing on the private world of home and family, this chapter has highlighted the formative experiences that impacted upon early choices made by women drawn to social science. Like women in earlier accounts of women's activism in this period, the women discussed here were typical in that they shared many characteristics. They were predominantly from middle-class families that tended to be socially and politically active, with a strong sense of civic responsibility and an interest in their daughter's education. The evidence we have on some aspects of the women's backgrounds is often fragmentary, so we must be careful with the conclusions drawn from the results here. Still, the preceding discussion suggests that these factors had a direct bearing on the choices made by some women as they determined their future education and career. At the same time, the women's early life stories point emphatically to differences in personal circumstances and experiences. Women responded differently and took very different approaches to the start of their adult lives. For some women, family influence during childhood was responsible for their interest in social science; other women were set on this path during their university years; a final group started much later. The next chapter focuses on those women who took advantage of opportunities for higher education, many of whom were among the early applicants paying for courses in the emerging social sciences.

CHAPTER 5. MAKING A WAY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: HIGHER LEARNING

There were major improvements in the provision of higher education for women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, meaning that a key question must be what role these changes played in women's engagement in social science. Why did most of the women discussed here decide to go to university or college? What sorts of courses did they do? Were their study choices determined by an ambition to establish a career in social science? Did they purposively select a course that would help them in this regard, or did they somehow drift into social science?

To address such questions, this chapter focuses on the experiences of the part of this sample of women that went to university or college (146 individuals), with emphasis on educational developments in England. It maps out their participation in higher education, in response to opening of universities and related institutions to women and the emergence of different social sciences as subjects to study.

5.1 The opening of higher education to women in Britain

With the growing acceptance that women might be educated for a life beyond that of marriage and domesticity, the opening of secondary then higher education to women in Britain gathered steam during the middle and late-nineteenth century alongside the campaign to give women the vote. Detailing the opening of education to women is challenging, however. Although many of the new institutions were founded at the same time and expanded at roughly the same pace, as Carol Dyhouse has observed, 'neat chronological lists of dates of entry are not easy to draw up and can often be misleading. Women were frequently allowed access to classes before, or in some cases after, being allowed to sit degree examinations. There were sometimes special qualifications for women' (1995, p.12).

A timeline highlighting the opportunities opening to women at various British universities and university colleges is presented in Table 5.1. Chapter 2 provides additional contextual information.

Table 5.1: Women's right to participate in higher education: legislative timeline

Year	Cambridge	Oxford	London	Civic	UK, Other
1849			Bedford		
1869	Girton				
1871	Newnham				
1878		Lady Margaret	UCL		
1879		Somerville St. Anne's			
1880s		St. Hugh's	King's Westfield Holloway	Civic universities	University Colleges, Wales
1892					Scottish universities
1893		St Hilda's			
1894					University of Wales
1895			LSE		Durham
1904					Trinity College Dublin

'By the end of Victoria's reign', Martin Daunton observed, 'universities were moving to the centre of the organisation of knowledge' (2005, p.24). Yet only a small proportion of young people entered university in Britain each year during this period. Around the turn of the century, less than one in every 100 in each cohort made it, with women representing just 16 per cent of the student population (Anderson, 1992). As Carol Dyhouse has shown, this 'varied considerably between individual universities, within their faculties and through time' (1995, p.7). While it was extremely rare for women born before 1860 to enter higher education, the number of female students rose significantly during the period of expansion and consolidation, especially after 1890, in what Vera Brittain in her history of Oxford University calls the 'infiltration phase' (1960, pp.87-110). Even so, it must be remembered that we are talking about a few exceptional women. For instance, only around 30 per cent of UCL graduates were women in 1900 and a total of 46 students entered Girton in 1907 (Dyhouse 1995, p.17). Moreover, Oxford and Cambridge universities did not allow women to graduate until 1920 and 1948, respectively. While other institutions

across Britain awarded degrees to women much earlier, barriers to participation remained and women were treated, as Harte observes, as ‘second-class citizens in all manner of ways’ (1979, p.18).

5.2 General patterns of university entry

Biographical sources often report data on higher education and therefore in this area my information is relatively complete. Taking a broad view of what it means to be ‘at university’, from those who came to class once a week for a term to those who stayed for years, over two thirds of the women in this study benefited from some higher learning (Table 5.2). Some were persistent enough to obtain a doctorate.

Table 5.2: Highest level of education (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All
Unknown[a]	9 (10%)	1 (1%)	10 (5%)
Home-based education[b]	9 (10%)	2 (2%)	11 (6%)
Elementary	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (1%)
Secondary	10 (11%)	8 (8%)	18 (10%)
Undergraduate[c]	42 (47%)	51 (52%)	92 (49%)
Postgraduate	19 (21%)	34 (35%)	54 (29%)
Totals	90	98	188

Notes:
a. Includes unclear.
b. Includes home educated and privately educated.
b. Undergraduate refers to post-secondary education up to and including the level of a bachelor’s degree. Includes higher education and further education institutions (training colleges) delivering courses leading to professional certifications (e.g., teaching, sanitation and social work).

While most of the women discussed here appear to have worked towards degrees or other examinations set by the universities, some attended lectures without ever intending to complete a formal course of study leading to a qualification. For example, Thereza Rucker attended classes in English literature and German at Bedford College for Women, before taking a variety of correspondence courses from Edinburgh and Oxford Universities. Other women spent months or even years taking classes locally, then embarking on a full degree course elsewhere. **Ellen**

Leonards (1866-1953) attended several institutions before she started at Cambridge, where she obtained a first class in the History Tripos examination in 1888.

Women across the two generations entered higher education at different ages. It was far less common than it is today for women to gain university admission straight from school. For instance, the anthropologist **Winifred Blackman** (1872-1950) was over 40 when she registered in 1912 to study at Oxford's Pitt Rivers Museum. There could be many reasons for attending university later in life. Some women were burdened initially with domestic or caring responsibilities and obligations. The social theorist **Helen Bosanquet** (1860-1925), who like most girls of her generation and her class was educated at home by a governess, spent the early part of her adult life keeping house for relatives, and was 26 years old when she went to Newnham College, Cambridge. Margrieta Van der Veen helped care for a sick a brother before she attended university (Singer, 1955). Others entered higher education after several years in paid employment. This was the case for Dublin-born Sophie Bryant. Widowed before the age of 21, she became a teacher of mathematics in the expanding secondary school system, joining the North London Collegiate School in 1875 after an invitation by Frances Buss. Further encouraged by Buss, she had continued her studies and was one of the first female undergraduate students at UCL when the University of London opened its doors to women in 1878. It had been necessary though to embark on additional private study to address deficiencies in her early education; notably, she had never studied Latin, a subject then required for university admission. As a child, Bryant was mainly taught by her father, Fellow of Trinity College Dublin, and later Chair of Geometry at the University of London, with occasional governesses hired for French and German. In 1866, aged sixteen, she won a science scholarship for Bedford College, London (Rothman, 2003), and passed the Cambridge Local school-leaving examinations in 1867, the first year they were officially opened to girls.

Few of the women went straight into the same university courses as the young men of this period. Many were insufficiently prepared by the school system and had to continue self-education at home or in a public library until they were able to enter university. At least 30 women in my sample, including the **Janet Lane-Claypon**

(1877-1967), Dean of the Household and Social Science Department at King's College for Women between 1917 and 1923, had never been to a school at all. The first woman to be awarded a research scholarship from the British Medical Society, she went on to earn a DSc in physiology in 1905, and an MD degree in 1910 (Winkelstein, 2006). The question of entry requirements was one on which the first colleges for women strongly disagreed and consequently the same level of qualifications was not demanded everywhere. Polly Hill refers to the 'advance of the high school' (1995, pp.29-30), noting that two-fifths of Girton College students came through this route by 1890. However, formal secondary education for girls in many middle and upper-class families was not a consideration until at least the 1890s. Emily Davies, chief founder of Girton College, argued that women should learn the classics and mathematics to prepare for entrance exams the same way as men did. She wrote in a letter dated 9 January 1864: 'I'm afraid that if we begin with alterations in the scheme, we should be in a sea of difficulties…. My strongest objection is that the girls' certificates would not – in the present state of opinion – could not have the same value' (cited in McWilliams-Tullberg, 1975, p.33).

Davies insisted that students enrol with the intention of sitting the Tripos examination even though it had to be an unofficial one. Girton College in the early years therefore found itself at odds with other colleges that adopted a more pragmatic attitude, which was to admit women who were unqualified to do degree-level work and tailor provision to match their attainments and abilities. It is worth remembering that it was only in 1892 that Somerville College introduced a qualifying exam (Adams, 1996). The situation only started to change as girls' secondary schools were founded across the country in the final quarter of the nineteenth century.

There can be no doubt that attending university in the late nineteenth- and early-twentieth centuries was largely a middle-class phenomenon. Although historians disagree on the role of higher education in social mobility in this period, the university system, as noted by Kadish, 'was not then as socially elitist as is often assumed' (1989, p.124). Working-class students could occasionally find a route into higher education. My research supports existing assessments that women of all

social classes attended universities and university colleges across the country in this period.

The costs of attending university were high and significant numbers of women needed funds (Sheavyn, 1921). Writers such as Carol Dyhouse (2001) have produced important work on the history of student funding and the importance of women's eligibility for scholarships and bursaries. According to Margaret Tuke (1928), around half of female university entrants benefited from some form of financial assistance aside from family support. One important source of funding for women students in the decades around 1900 was the Gilchrist scholarship available through a Trust founded in 1865, which had begun to provide scholarship for women as soon as the women's colleges were established. Recipients included Eileen Power, for study at the École Nationale des Chartes in Paris in 1910; and **Helen Wodehouse** (1880-1964), who went up to Cambridge as a Clothworkers' Exhibitioner to study mathematics 1898-1901, then managed to stay on for a fourth year to read moral sciences as a Gilchrist Fellow. In 1893, Alice Zimmern was one of five women teachers to be awarded a Gilchrist travelling scholarship of £100 that year. Her study of the US education system resulted in her book *Methods of Education in America* (1894). It was not only less affluent women who needed to win a scholarship to fulfil their ambitions. For Helena Swanwick, it was only because her godmother financed her education that she was able to attend Girton College. Her father, Oswald Sickert, an influential figure in twentieth-century British art, had refused to pay her fees (Mitchell, 2018).

Financial insecurity might see women, regardless of background, combine study for a degree with employment, often in school teaching. Clara Collet and Teresa Billington-Greig both needed to earn a living and could not have gone to university without financial support. It is also the case of Margaret Nevinson, who taught classics at South Hampstead High School in London, part of the Girls' Public Day School Trust, while studying for the Lady Literate in Arts (LLA), which she took in 1882-3. The LLA was a type of external degree introduced by the University of St Andrews in 1876, before women were fully admitted as students, that they could complete through distance learning (Smith, 2014). Like other women, Nevinson had to piece together tuition from a variety of sources. She describes in her memoirs

how she ‘found time to attend a course of lectures on English Literature by Professor Morley at University College’ (Nevinson, 1926, p.65).

Carol Dyhouse (1995) and others have shown that choice of university in this period was strongly linked to class and social capital. Although autobiographies and memoirs written by the women discussed in this study sometimes provide insights about their struggles with male-dominated society and its restrictions on women, rarely are they rich enough to reconstruct motivational influences and comparatively few are by women outside the women’s colleges. However, there is some evidence in surviving sources that higher education was seen as a pathway towards their goals. Helena Swanwick wrote of her rebellion against society’s expectations and norms that ‘shut up the girls instead of the men’ and was determined to go to university despite her parents’ objections, ‘not at all relishing the idea of living as a dependent at home’ (1935, p.183). An autobiographical sketch written by **Edith Morley** (1875-1964) in the early 1940s, originally titled *Looking Before and After*, portrays something of the bleakness she felt as a young woman. ‘I hated my then mode of existence’, she wrote, ‘I found nothing to attract me to the only society open to me … I hadn’t enough to do, I hadn’t enough companionship, and I was full of unexpressed and unformulated longings for a life of usefulness’ (2016 [1944], p.52). Although Virginia Woolf was never a student there, Cambridge remained a lifelong source of resentment for the novelist and sharp critic of the university world, who once referred to it as ‘that detestable place’ (1912 letter to Lytton Strachey, as cited in Ryan and Bolaki, 2012, p.94). Some of the women discussed here may have put aside thoughts of the injustices that universities, especially the ancient centres of higher learning, committed against its female students. As shown below, many were students at Cambridge, Oxford or London. A few had attended the burgeoning new universities and university colleges elsewhere.

5.3 Studying for a first degree: places of study

A further differentiation among the women can be obtained by analysing the institutions at which they studied. Tables 5.3 and 5.4 show that the women were predominately students at the women’s colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, a pattern evident in both generations. Cambridge was twice as popular as Oxford. This was due in part to the student intake at Oxford colleges remaining small compared with

Cambridge in the early years. As noted by Claire Jones, by the time that 'Somerville and Lady Margaret Hall opened in Oxford in 1879 with nine and twelve students respectively … over 300 women had already passed through the two women's colleges at Cambridge', Girton and Newnham (2017, p.163). Whilst the women's colleges evidently played an important role in the higher education of the women in this study, it is noteworthy that around a third took classes at one of the constituent colleges of the University of London, or member institutions before they joined the federal university. A smaller number of women were identified as having studied at the new civic universities of England and Wales, in Scotland or abroad.

The ancient universities provided access to elites and elite networks and were widely regarded as the high point of intellectual life in Britain, a reputation which, as Rosemary Auchmuty has noted in her work on the first female law students at Cambridge, 'gave women's academic achievements there a particular symbolic as well as practical significance' (2008, p.65). In her memoirs, Edith Morley wrote of Cambridge and Oxford alone 'as affording "university" education – at any rate in the social sense of the term' (2016, p.43). Some women likely wanted to enjoy the privileges of their male peers and to demonstrate their abilities in a society that saw them as intellectually inferior. Jane Robinson in her research on the economist Lettice Fisher found that she wrote 'the most wonderful letters home describing a new heady experience of independence and intellectual freedom' (2015, p.38). Helena Swanwick recalled her first days at Girton College: 'To have a study of my own and to be told that, if I chose to put "Engaged" on my door, no one would so much as knock was … so great a privilege as to hinder me from sleep. I did not know till then how much I had suffered from the incessant interruptions of my home life' (1935, p.118).

June Purvis (1991) points out that there were also practical reasons why Oxford and Cambridge would attract women students. The women's colleges offered a system of highly personalised instruction that suited women disadvantaged by poor quality secondary education. Built some distance from the central colleges of the University, the women's colleges provided a residential collegiate experience that was well suited for women whose parents needed reassurance that their decision to invest in their daughters' education would not be at the cost of maintaining women's

socially prescribed roles. College authorities' sense of moral guardianship and protection meant they stood in *loco parentis* in relation to female students. Social lives were governed by strict rules; there were restrictions on visitors and requirements for chaperones when attending a lecture at which a man might be present until the end of the First World War.

For families based in Oxford there was another option, the Society of Oxford Home Students (later to become St Anne's College). This was the work of radical campaigners from the Association for Promoting the Higher Education of Women who felt that there should be a way for women to study at Oxford University while living at home or in lodgings and without having to be attached to any of the women's colleges, allowing students from a range of financial backgrounds to study at Oxford. Violet Butler, youngest child of the headmaster of Haileybury College and fellow of Oriel College, left home aged fourteen for three years' schooling at Wycombe Abbey before returning to Oxford to study at home, gaining a first-class honours degree in history from the Society of Oxford Home Students in 1905. Though the society had no centralised site (it owned no buildings until 1910), Butler had full access to lectures and tutorials, and could take advantage of the connections and networks offered by the university (Butler and Prichard, 1930).

Table 5.3: University/college attended (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All[a]
Oxford	5 (7%)	19 18%)	24 (14%)
Cambridge	18 (26%)	29 (28%)	47 (27%)
London	27 (39%)	37 (36%)	64 (37%)
Other, England and Wales	10 (14%)	7 (7%)	17 (10%)
Scotland	6 (9%)	3 (3%)	9 (5%)
Non-UK	3 (4%)	5 (5%)	8 (5%)
Unknown	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	4 (2%)
Totals	70	103	173

Notes:

a. Information in this table relates to 146 individuals with known details of having studied to undergraduate level. Several women attended more than one institution, sometimes at different universities.

London was the opposite of the small, self-contained world of Oxford and Cambridge. In the late nineteenth century, any woman who wished to study for a (non-medical) bachelor's degree in the capital would have had several colleges to choose from. The main options were Royal Holloway and Bedford College, two pioneering colleges for the education of women; UCL and Kings' College, both of which had been established for, and until well into the twentieth century were still dominated by, men; and, from 1895, the LSE, which was co-educational from the start. When the reforms initiated by the University of London Act 1898 came into force in 1900, these colleges became schools of the university.

While the University of London (or its predecessor institutions) did not have the high reputation of Oxbridge, and most students missed out on the residential collegiate experience, it had the advantage that women were not taught in separate classrooms to the male students and the chaperone system had begun to erode (Delamont, 1978). Many favoured the student culture over that of the ancient universities. Mary Stocks studied in London and graduated with a first-class BSc(Econ) in economic history. She later compared women's experience there with that at Oxford where she had moved in 1913: 'London, or rather the London School of Economics, and indeed London University, was an egalitarian world.… But Oxford was quite otherwise. Its women's colleges were there on sufferance … The centre of university social life was in the male college common rooms' (1970, pp.99-100).

The LSE and other constituent colleges of the University of London aimed to be inclusive, reflecting the aspiration of leading Fabian socialist Sidney Webb (1904) who had helped the university's reconstitution as a federal teaching institution**.** In the very early days, there was no entrance exam. Later, it increased access to the university system by offering different routes to an academic degree (Harte, 1986). First, the lack of residency requirements allowed students to attend while living at home. Second, it was possible to study for a London degree at other institutions across the country, including the predecessor institutions of universities such as Birmingham, Dundee, Leicester and Aberystwyth, and take its examinations as an external candidate without coming to London. Third, opportunities for part-time attendance meant students could combine paid work and study. Lastly, students

might choose to not attend any institution at all and take a London external degree by private study.

The different model of higher education offered by the University of London would have held appeal to women of the middle classes and those from high-aspiring working-class backgrounds. It was the case for the pioneer woman psychologist Beatrice Edgell, the first female psychology professor in Britain, an appointment that attracted considerable newspaper attention in 1927 (Valentine, 2006). A prolific writer over the course of a long career at Bedford College, her contributions to applied psychology included *Mental Life* (1926), a textbook specifically for the social studies students in the Social Science Department of Bedford College for Women. Her article "Government as Advertiser" published in the *Sociological Review* (1916) was a critical analysis, from the perspective of social psychology, of wartime propaganda posters, described, in her words, as 'a social experiment without a parallel in our history' (Edgell, 1916, p.48). Edgell was a woman with a long record of 'firsts' in her field. In 1901, she had become not only the first woman to gain a PhD from the University of Würzburg, one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in Germany, but also the first ever British woman to hold a doctorate in psychology.

Edgell's academic journey had started ten years earlier at University College Wales in Aberystwyth. Arriving in 1891, at an institution memorably described as 'the cradle of the cultural and natural revival of late-nineteenth century Wales' (Davies, 1993, p.439), she would have attended what is now known as the Old College in the town centre, and taken classes at much the same time as **Phoebe Sheavyn** (1865-1978), and **Amy Harrison** (1874-1970).[16] Edgell gained a London BSc degree in 1894 in mental and moral sciences, then spent nearly three years teaching schoolchildren in Blackburn and Sunderland, during which time she earned a teaching diploma. In 1897, she returned to Aberystwyth on a scholarship to specialise in philosophy, graduating with a first-class BA in the subject in 1898, followed by a MA degree in 1899. Elizabeth Valentine's (2006) biography of Edgell considers her achievements and struggles for academic success in the context of other early British women psychologists. As she notes, many of this group shared a

[16] Opened in October 1872 with 26 students, University College Wales became a founder member of the federal University of Wales in 1893/4 and changed its name to University College of Wales Aberystwyth.

background of strong familial support at a time when women were widely discouraged from entering the public sphere. Such parents often actively saw to it that their daughters benefitted from expanding educational opportunities. For Edgell and others in my sample, this involved financial assistance in the shape of various extension schemes and scholarships available in the late nineteenth century.

Scholars have suggested that, before the Second World War, the civic universities attracted women from a more diverse range of backgrounds than the residential colleges (Gilbert, 1988). Three women in this survey from working-class backgrounds attended civic universities as undergraduates, an unsurprising fact given the lower fees outside Oxbridge. Teresa Billington-Greig, political theorist who established the Glasgow branch of the Women's Social and Political Union in 1906, received her higher education through extension classes at Owens College, a precursor to the University of Manchester, studying in addition to her work as a teacher at a Roman Catholic school in the city. In 1909, Ellen Wilkinson, the daughter of a cotton operative who later became an insurance clerk, won a national scholarship to attend Manchester University, founded a few years earlier as the constituent colleges of the federal Victoria University (Owens College, Manchester; Yorkshire College, Leeds; and University College, Liverpool) separated. According to Carol Dyhouse, 'the question of women's eligibility for university scholarships and bursaries arose as soon as they enrolled as students' (1995, p.28). She also notes that scholarships in the new institutions were less likely to be reserved exclusively for men – which meant women stood a better chance of success, an important consideration for women further down the social scale who attended the civic universities for financial reasons.

We also must consider that some women would have favoured the new institutions over Oxbridge on the grounds they awarded actual degrees to women and the ancient universities did not. There is some evidence for this in the complaints made by distinguished academic women and others from the women's colleges who often made political statements by using the degree title anyway. For instance, **Annie Abram** (1869-1930) is described on the title page of her 1909 monograph, *The Effects Produced by Economic Changes upon Social Life in England in the Fifteenth Century*, as 'B.A. Cambridge Hist. Tripos'. She had taken the Tripos examinations at

Girton College in Cambridge under William Cunningham and Ellen McArthur but was denied a Cambridge degree, as the university did not then award degrees to women. She subsequently received a doctorate from the London School of Economics in 1909. Lillian Knowles also complained about being denied the qualification to which, had she been a man, her success in the Cambridge Tripos examinations would have entitled her. Despite having achieved a double first in History and Law, in 1893 and 1894 respectively, as she complained a few years later in her school newsletter, 'though the man gets the title [BA], the woman only gets the certificate' (as cited in Martin, 2014, p.745).

Table 5.4: Undergraduate institutions[a]

Girton College, University of Cambridge: Annie Abram, Adelaide Anderson, Amy Bulley, Minna Cowan, Agnes Crosthwaite, Margaret Llewellyn Davies, Olive Dunlop, Hermia Durham, Mary George, Mary Higgs, Dorothy Jewson, Theodora Keith, Lillian Knowles, Ellen Leonards, Ellen McArthur, Alice Murray, Beryl Power, Eileen Power, Helen Reynard, Margery Spring Rice, Caroline Skeel, Helena Swanwick, Helen Wodehouse, Alice Zimmern, Dorothea Zimmern.
Newnham College, University of Cambridge: Helen Bosanquet, Amy Bulley, Winifred Cullis, Myra Curtis, Edith Eckhard, Lynda Grier, Eva Hubback, Florence Keynes, Susan Lawrence, Mary Marshall, Grace Oakeshott, Clara Rackham, Margaret Read, Mary Sheepshanks, Shena Simon, Mary Smith, Ray Strachey, Martha Webb, Amber Blanco White, Charlotte Wilson, Mona Wilson.
Cambridge, Other/Unknown[b]: Victoria Bennett, Dorothy Jewson, Ella Pycroft.
Somerville College, University of Oxford: Winifred Blackman, Beatrice Blackwood, Stella Browne, Ethel Collingwood, Edith Deverell, Lettice Fisher, Evelyn Fox, Grace Hadow, Lettice Jowitt, Julia Mann, Margaret McKillop, Winifred Mercier, Edith Morley, Hilda Oakeley, Eleanor Rathbone, Katherine Routledge.
Lady Margaret Hall, University of Oxford: Janet Courtney, Barbara Freire-Marreco, Barbara Hammond, Eglantyne Jebb, Maude Royden.
St. Anne's, University of Oxford: Violet Butler.
Oxford, Other/Unknown: Sybella Gurney, Elizabeth Levett, Ray Strachey.
Bedford College, London: Charlotte Ainslie, Vera Anstey, Sophie Bryant, Lucy Fildes, Agnes Foxwell, Victoria Hazlitt, Alice Lee, Ellen Leonards, Hilda Martindale, Cécile Matheson, Clara Rackham, Margery Spring Rice, Thereza Rucker, Alice Zimmern.
University College, London: Elizabeth Abbott, Victoria Bennett, Sophie Bryant, Caroline Foley, Ada Heather-Bigg, Susan Lawrence, Edith Morley, Margaret Nevinson, Eva Reckitt, Marie Stopes, Frances Wood.
London School of Economics: Vera Anstey, Katherine Bathurst, Ellinor Black, Alice Bottomley, Mabel Buer, Mildred Bulkley, Violet Butler, Ethel Collingwood,

Agnes Crosthwaite, Maud Davies, Varvara De Vesselitsky, Minnie Haskins, Julia Mann, Hilda Ormsby, Mary Stocks, Dorothy Whitmore.

London, Other: Florence Barrett, Victoria Bennett, Ethel Bentham, Janet Campbell, Hazel Chodak-Gregory, Helen Colville, Louise Creighton, Rachel Crowdy, Anne Cummins, Dorothy Evans, Mary Sargant Florence, Sybella Gurney, Bessie Hutchins, Eglantyne Jebb, Janet Lane-Claypon, Martha Loane, Margaret MacDonald, Olive Malvery, Anna Martin, Hilda Martindale, Winifred Mercier, Nora Milnes, Alice Ravenhill, Constance Smith, Rose Squire, Lucy Streatfeild, Dorothy Tennant, Helena Wright.

University of Manchester: Teresa Billington-Greig, May Smith, Margrieta Van der Veen, Ellen Wilkinson.

University College, Bristol: Florence Barrett, Minnie Haskins, Ellen Leonards.

Other, England and Wales[d]: Victoria Bennett, Clara Collet, Beatrice Edgell, Dorothy Evans, Amy Harrison, Amelia Levetus, Constance Naden, Phoebe Sheavyn, Gertrude Tuckwell, Helen Wodehouse.

University of Edinburgh: Ellinor Black, Minna Cowan.

University of Glasgow: Mabel Atkinson, Minna Cowan.

University of St Andrews: Charlotte Ainslie, Ada Heather-Bigg, Margaret Irwin, Margaret Nevinson.

University College, Dundee: Mary Walker.

Other, Scotland: Margaret Irwin, Mary Paterson.

Non-UK[e]: Maria Czaplicka, Elizabeth Macadam, Hilda Ormsby, Dorothea Proud, Marion Phillips, Maud Pember Reeves, Evelyn Sharp, Ray Strachey.

Unknown. Florence Petty.

Notes:

a. Undergraduate refers to post-secondary education up to and including the level of a bachelor's degree. Courses leading to professional certifications (e.g., teaching, sanitation, and social work) are included in this definition. Individuals listed more than once if they attended multiple institutions. Includes predecessor institutions.

b. Cambridge Teacher Training College; Other/Unknown.

c. Kings' College; Royal Holloway College; University of London School of Medicine for Women; Stockwell Training College for Elementary Teachers; Maria Grey Training College; National Health Society; Slade School of Fine Art; Royal College of Music; London School of Sociology and Social Economics; Royal Free Hospital School of Medicine; Hyde Park New College; Guy's Hospital; Parker Institute; Chelsea Training College.

d. Liverpool Teacher Training College; Bishop Otter College, Chichester; Leicester College; Mason College, Birmingham; University of Birmingham; University College of Wales Aberystwyth; Dartford College of Physical Education; Canterbury (no further details); Cardiff (no further details).

e. Poland; Canada; Australia; New Zealand; France; USA.

When Trinity College Dublin offered *ad eundem* degrees to Oxford and Cambridge women during the period 1904-07, these women were amongst a group of over 700 women who took up the opportunity to make official their graduate status (Parkes, 1996). In 1905, Ellen McArthur, then a lecturer in history at Girton, received the first of ten higher academic degrees at Dublin awarded to women in this three-year period, based on published work. Lillian Knowles obtained one of the six DLitt

degrees awarded. Annie Abram travelled to Dublin to receive BA and MA degrees. Two alumni of Somerville College who made the journey were Edith Deverell, who at one time worked on Arthur Bowley's classic study, *Wages in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century* (1900), and Eleanor Rathbone, social reformer and first woman MP for the universities. **Shena Simon** (1883-1972), member of Newnham College and a leading activist and socialist who, with her husband, Ernest Simon, would become a formidable force in local and national politics, was also granted an *ad eundem* degree.

Some women doubtless travelled to Dublin as a matter of principle, and others to gain formal recognition of their academic studies to better compete against women who had graduated from degree-awarding universities like London. By the first decade of the twentieth century, formal academic qualifications were becoming increasingly necessary in public and professional life, which 'effectively excluded anyone without a highly specific form of education' (Daunton, 2005, p.1). Thereafter, women's appointment to the Civil Service by recommendation was gradually replaced with open recruitment by examination, the same way men gained their appointments.

In the context of increasing professionalisation, as others have pointed out, the liberal curriculum of Oxford or Cambridge had lost some of its dominance by 1900. Universities widened their curricula to include, among other things, the social sciences. Women had to choose where to complete their qualifications, which leaves one to ask whether institutions were selected because of the subjects being offered at the time.

5.4 Studying for a first degree: subjects studied

Students seeking a first degree in the decades either side of 1900 had limited options in Britain. Until the mid-nineteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge offered a narrow curriculum based on classics at Oxford and mathematics at Cambridge (Gibbins, 2005). At that time, the Cambridge Mathematics Tripos was the most prestigious degree in any British university and intended to provide the 'ideal foundation for a "liberal education" – a general training of the mind' for the 'future leaders of Britain and her Empire' (Warwick, 1994, p.57). It was not until university reform gathered speed that additional subjects began to appear on the curriculum

(Jarausch, 1983). Cambridge established new Tripos in the natural and moral sciences in 1848, reflecting a shift, as MacLeod and Moseley (2000) observe, 'from the traditional ideology of *universitas* and the conception of a liberal education … to an ideology of specialised knowledge' (as cited in Daunton, 2005, p.6, emphasis in original). In Oxford, there were separate courses in natural science in 1850, jurisprudence (law) and modern history in 1851, and theology in 1871. The same diversification of subject areas took place in other ancient universities across Britain (Rothblatt, 1983).

Some subjects were distinctive to certain universities. In contrast to Cambridge, which was 'closely associated with the advance of the sciences', Oxford 'maintained an ethos centred on the education of the country's elite in government and public affairs' well into the twentieth century (Forrester and Cameron, 2017, p.217). Meanwhile, students who chose the University of London or the provincial civic colleges in the second half of the nineteenth century had opportunities to study a much wider range of subjects (Vallance, 2016). From the start, these newer institutions emphasised vocational and professional training and arts subjects generally neglected at Oxford and Cambridge, and towards the end of the century played a vital role in helping to establish many of the new disciplines now recognised as the social sciences (Goldman, 2005). There was nothing inevitable, however, about the inclusion of the social sciences in the formal curricula of universities, nor where the disciplinary lines would be drawn. As Martin Daunton and others have noted, 'differences emerged between England and Scotland, London and the provinces, Oxbridge and the rest, as well as more generally between Britain and Continental Europe' (2005, p.12).

In principle, a range of academic subjects was open to women as they gained access to higher education; however, not all degrees were accessible to women in this period. First, the generally poor state of girls' secondary education limited women's options (Dyhouse, 1995). Second, the social sciences were relatively unspecialised until the early twentieth century. Economics was the first to emerge as a distinct field of study. UCL, a pioneer in teaching many topics at university level, and Cambridge University both established named professorial chairs in political economy, the forerunner of twentieth-century economics, as early as the 1820s.

However, for decades afterwards, courses were available only as subsidiary subjects (Maloney, 1993). It was the early 1900s before economics could be studied as a specialist degree in Britain (Kadish and Tribe, 1993) and the shift to formal academic status took longer still for the other social sciences (Morgan, 1993). Finally, studies have shown that perceptions about the gendered character of different areas of knowledge created barriers to women selecting certain academic subjects, especially economics. While this would diminish over time, gender stereotypes continued to shape the pattern of women's subject choices well into the twentieth century (Dyhouse, 1995).

It was rarely possible to determine the exact reasons for subject choices on the part of the women discussed here, or the extent to which they had specific vocational goals in mind when they made their selection. However, there is evidence the women studied a range of different subjects for their first degree, which did not necessarily include social science. A breakdown of the subjects studied is given in Table 5.5. Arts and humanities subjects attracted the most women and the sciences the fewest, a pattern that Claire Jones (2017) and others have shown was in line with the female student population during this period.[17]

Several of the women who had attended Oxford University studied Literae Humaniores (known as Greats), the traditional combination of classical languages, philosophy and ancient history regarded for a long while as the leading subjects to shape the morals and the minds of the country's future political leaders. Barbara Hammond arrived at Lady Margaret Hall on a scholarship. Her friends Eleanor Rathbone and **Hilda Oakeley** (1867-1950) read Greats at Somerville College. Idealism dominated philosophy in British universities at the time, which helped popularise the work of Kant and Hegel and inspired a generation of academic philosophers and social reformers (Tyler and Connelly, 2018). Oakeley received a first-class degree in 1898. Her autobiography records how she was taught by some of the leading figures in the movement, including Edward Caird and Bernard Bosanquet (1936, p.64). The three women were members of the Associated Prigs, a select debating group which met weekly in the 1890s for discussions on social

[17] Previous studies suggest women were more likely to select subjects in which were already educated or deemed particularly appropriate for a career in school teaching.

subjects and included Edith Deverell and Lucy Wyatt Papworth. Sarah Wiggins (2009) has persuasively demonstrated how this and other political and debating societies created by students within the women's colleges constructed a political education for the women, a space in which they learnt the art of political debate and female networking. Many of the women maintained subsequent contact with each other. Hammond, Rathbone, Deverell, and Papworth, for example, were all active members of the Women's Industrial Council.

Among those to study mathematics or the natural sciences was Margaret McKillop. Upon entering Somerville College in 1881, she became the first woman student admitted to the school of mathematics; she would later change her focus to chemistry and in 1885 was the earliest woman student at the university to obtain first-class honours in the school of natural science (Rayner-Canham and Rayner-Canham, 2008). Another young woman to excel academically in the natural sciences was Mary Walker, the eldest daughter of a prominent Dundee solicitor. Walker was among several women to make an important contribution to the development of social surveys in Britain. Other pioneering survey researchers include Eglantyne Jebb, **Mona Wilson** (1872-1954), **Florence Bell** (1851-1930), and **Cécile Matheson** (1874-1950). Matheson worked for a time at the Board of Trade, published widely on women's wages and employment, and was invited to give evidence to the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and the Departmental Committee on Old Age Pensions. Wilson co-authored a report for the Outer London Inquiry on the problems of unemployment and casual labour in West Ham (Howarth and Wilson, 1907). After university, Jebb became a research assistant to the social reformer **Florence Keynes** (1861-1958), wife of John Neville Keynes, who commissioned her to undertake the first comprehensive social survey of Cambridge (Mahood, 2009, p.117). Applying a central component of Rowntree's first survey of York carried out in 1899, Jebb concluded that in this city too there must have been 'a vast amount of what is sometimes called secondary poverty' (1906, p.32).

Table 5.5: Undergraduate subject areas (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All[d]
Arts and Humanities[a]	20 (30%)	32 (33%)	52 (32%)

Science[b]	13 (19%)	11 (11%)	24 (15%)
Social Science[c]	21 (31%)	30 (31%)	51 (31%)
Pedagogy/Teacher Training	2 (3%)	7 (7%)	9 (5%)
Other	1 (2%)	-	1 (-)
Unknown	10 (15%)	18 (18%)	28 (17%)
Totals	67	98	165

Notes:
a. For example, classics, literature, and history (except economic history).
b. For example, natural sciences, engineering, and medicine.
c. For example, moral sciences and economic history.
d. Information in this table relates to 146 individuals with known details of having studied to undergraduate level. Several women took more than one course of study, sometimes at different universities.

Mary Walker had embarked on a university education in 1883 as one of the first students at University College, Dundee (then a constituent college of the older institution of St Andrews). Given full access to the university, she sat in the same classes as men, a measure denied to women in all other Scottish universities at the time (Small, 2013). She received several awards and had two scientific papers published on avian anatomy (Walker, 1888; 1889). Around the same time, Walker's interests broadened to include social work. She left the university in 1889 without completing her BSc degree (which at this time all Dundee students gained from St Andrews University), shortly after joining the Dundee Social Union (DSU), a group formed the previous year by several of the university's professors, including the sociologist, biologist and town planner Patrick Geddes, to improve social conditions for the city's poor (Baillie, 2000). One of the first to take the social studies training programme introduced by Octavia Hill and Margaret Sewell in London in the early 1890s, Walker gained experience at settlement houses in Southwark and on Blackheath Hill, before returning to Scotland and eventually developing hew own training (Small, 2013). As part of a tight-knit community of men and women who were inspired by Geddes, she was to become 'the driving force and inspiration for the work of the DSU and for the development of social work in Dundee' (Burbridge, 2014, p.102).

Several women in the group studied medicine, often at the London School of Medicine for Women (now part of the UCL Medical School), founded in 1874 by Sophia Jex-Blake and others, and went on to practice as doctors. These included

Florence Barrett (1867-1945), **Victoria Bennett** (1864-1956), **Ethel Bentham** (1861-1931), **Janet Campbell** (1877-1954), **Hazel Chodak-Gregory** (1886-1952), and **Martha Webb** (1863-1951), to name a few.[18] While these women were first and foremost physicians, they were among the earliest in Britain to make the link between social science knowledge and medicine and public health. As such, their writing and research sought a broader understanding of the social world of patients, health, illness and healthcare. Winifred Cullis also falls into this category. The first woman to hold a professorial chair at a medical school (University of London, 1926-41), she taught at the LSE and published on industrial welfare and the application of science to healthy living (Bond and Cullis, 1935).

Helena Wright (1887-1982), an early advocate of family planning, is a further example of a medical doctor who probably would not have objected to the 'social scientist' description. Born in late-Victorian London, she was the elder daughter of Heinz (later Henry) Lowenfeld, a Polish-Jewish entrepreneur who had left Chrzanów on the Silesian border in the early 1880s. Her book, *Sex and Society: New Code for Social Behaviour* (1968), written in her eighties, was pioneering through its promotion of voluntary fertility and its effects in society. Earlier research published in the 1930s and 1940s tackled issues such as sex fulfilment in married women and contraception. Birth control, as contraception was known at the time, was then generally still a taboo subject despite some recognition by government, in the form the 1918 Maternity and Child Welfare Act, that the health of mothers, infants and young children was an essential part of public policy.

Wright was among the increasing number of women who looked to higher education as a route to a career and chose courses with the aim of using them professionally. As noted by Rosemary Auchmuty in her recent study on women's admission to the legal profession, 'once the idea that some middle-class women must work was accepted, why stop at teaching, and why restrict that work to those who *must*?' (2008, p.90, emphasis in original). Despite family obstacles, Wright likely had a career in mind when she selected her degree subject and enrolled in 1908 at the London School of Medicine for Women in Bloomsbury against her middle-class

[18] In 1896, the London School of Medicine for Women was renamed the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women. It merged with the University College Hospital's medical school in 1998 to form the UCL Medical School.

family's wishes (Hall, 2006). One of several British women doctors to initiate public debates on birth control and contraception, she too understood the relevance of social science to medicine, relying on statistical evidence to reinforce and expand the scientific dimension of her work advocating improvements and reform in women's healthcare (Rusterholz, 2020).

Around the same period, the institutionalisation of diverse social sciences, as part of the expansion and consolidation of higher education, had begun to usher in a new set of possibilities. Women were among the first to enrol on degrees principally dedicated to the social sciences, taking up opportunities for studying the emerging disciplines of economics, economic history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, social work and statistics.

5.5 Studying for a first degree in the social sciences

Women's options for studying the social sciences then being introduced as university subjects would have varied according to the year in which they entered higher education. The 51 individuals who studied social science to undergraduate level attended Cambridge (17 women), Oxford (6 women), UCL (4 women), LSE (13 women), Bedford (5 women) and/or other institutions (14 women). Whilst the numbers are small (Table 5.6), it must be remembered that student numbers for social science subjects in this period were small anyway. Several strands came together in the emergence of social science as an institutionalised activity in research and teaching. In the 1890s, there was concern that Britain's international standing was at risk because of inadequate teaching and learning. Professor Edward Gonner, in his 1894 address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, concluded that Britain 'had no regular system' compared to the United States and parts of mainland Europe, and backed the introduction of 'thorough and systematic study' of economics in British universities (1894, p.365). Among the social sciences, economic study was the first to attain the status of an accepted discipline in British academia. The institutionalisation of other subjects was considerably slower, with opportunities for degree-level studies limited to a few institutions until the 1950s. Not the least important factor in sustaining the early development of the new courses was the presence of women students who, as has

been noted elsewhere, formed a significant proportion of students taking examinations.

Table 5.6: Social science first degrees: decade started[a]

	Decade studies started					
	1870s	1880s	1890s	1900s	1910s	Total[d]
Moral Sciences Tripos – Cambridge	2	3	5	2	-	12
Economics Tripos – Cambridge	-	-	-	3	-	3
Historical Tripos – Cambridge[b]	-	-	1	1	-	2
Economic History, typically as part of BA – Oxford	-	2	2	2	-	6
BSc – UCL[c]	2	1	-	1	-	4
BSc(Econ), Special Subject Economics – LSE	-	-	-	5	1	6
Certificates/Diplomas – LSE	-	-	1	4	4	9
BSc/Certificates/Diplomas – Bedford College	-	-	2	2	1	5
Other, London	-	2	6	1	-	9
Other, England and Wales	1	-	-	2	-	3
Scotland	-	1	-	-	1	2
Totals	5	9	17	23	7	61

Notes:
a. Totals include those who started but did not necessarily complete an advanced degree. UCL and LSE degrees awarded by University of London. Totals do not include honorary degrees.
b. Included if student took separate paper in economic history.
c. For example, special subject, mental and moral sciences.
d. Information relates to a total of 51 individuals with known details of having studied social science to undergraduate level. Several women took more than one course of study, sometimes at different universities.

Cambridge. At the University of Cambridge, entry into the social sciences was initially through the Moral Sciences Tripos, a broad interdisciplinary area of study combining four subjects after its reorganisation in 1867: political economy, logic, moral and political philosophy, and mental philosophy (Gibbins, 2011). During the second half of the nineteenth century, Cambridge was 'the foremost centre in the world for the theoretical study of economics' (Coleman et al., 2006). Yet, over the years, students only ever modestly supported the moral sciences, and the course

remained unpopular even after it reformed in 1889. In 1870, for instance, only 15 men entered for examinations; in 1905, in both parts combined, there were only five male candidates and one woman (Brooke, 1993, p.437).

The first women taking this route might be taught and examined by sympathetic dons or professors who had a record of supporting women and were very critical of their exclusion from full rights at Cambridge University (Kadish, 1982). This included men such as Henry Sidgwick, one of the most influential ethical philosophers of the age and co-founder of Newnham College; the renowned logician and university administrator, John Neville Keynes; and his son, John Maynard Keynes, an ardent reformer when it came to university matters, including the treatment of women (Tribe, 2017).

Alternatively, they might be taught by Alfred Marshall, the dominant figure in British economics from about 1890 until his death in 1924. Two of the first students to arrive at Merton Hall (later Newnham College) took moral sciences: Mary Paley, who would later become the wife of Alfred Marshall, and Amy Bulley. Both sat the Tripos examinations as unofficial candidates in 1874. Mary recalls in her memoir that it was Marshall, then a lecturer in political economy at St. John's College, who encouraged her to read for the subject. She explained that it was the 'only one in which Economics found a place, and as it required neither Mathematics nor Classics it seemed suited for girls who had done little of either' (Marshall, 1947, p.14). This was likely the case for home-educated Helen Bosanquet, who specialised in political economy. Perhaps best known as a leader of the most influential late nineteenth-century charitable institution, the Charity Organisation Society, as well as for her role in developing social work as an academic subject and professional field, she was one of two women to gain first-class honours in the Moral Sciences Tripos in 1889 (Harris, 2004).

The Moral Sciences Tripos continued to attract women, notably those in the later cohort (those born after 1871), into the twentieth century, during what was an important period of curriculum reform in Cambridge economics. **Mary Smith** (1886-1974), pioneer in experimental psychology, had entered Newnham in 1905. She gained a First in 1909, taking psychology in Part II of the Tripos. Amber Blanco White arrived at Cambridge around the same time. In 1907, she is said to have

delivered ‘a brilliant paper’ on ‘propositions’ at the Cambridge University Moral Sciences Club, a philosophy weekly discussion group founded in 1878 by a group of male students at St John’s and Trinity (Pitt, 1982, p.118). Described in the diary of John Neville Keynes, one of her tutors in logic and economics, as a ‘clear and vigorous thinker [who] can express herself with admirable force and directness’, she gained a first in both parts of the Tripos in 1908 (as cited in Alexander, 2004, p.1). The daughter of prominent members of the Fabian Society, she herself was a leading member of a younger generation of Fabians (and co-founder of the Cambridge Fabian Society). Beatrice Webb, who received practically no formal education, had commended Amber’s academic record at Cambridge in a letter to her sister Mary Playne, dated September 1908, describing her as ‘an extraordinarily vital little person – but egotistical and vain and a dreadful little pagan’ (as cited in Mackenzie, 2008, p.316).

The last woman in this collection to follow the Moral Sciences Tripos route was Margery Spring Rice, who had to implore her parents to try for a place at Cambridge, eventually studying at Girton College from 1907-1910. Reflecting on the achievements of her pioneering grandmother, Lucy Pollard’s recent biography considers why she may have opted to read for such a degree, referring to a letter from Margery to her mother dated February 1909 ‘in which she says that she loves Moral Sciences because it is about how people feel and think’. ‘Perhaps she was also influenced’, the author further suggests, by Constance Jones, a distinguished philosopher and educator who had studied for the Moral Sciences Tripos under Henry Sidgwick in the 1870s, and Girton’s new Mistress, from 1903 until her retirement in 1916 (2020, p.27).

For Mary Sheepshanks, the opportunity to stay at Cambridge for an additional year after taking her final examinations for the Medieval and Modern Languages Tripos was important. During her first few years at Cambridge, she had met the philosopher and logician Bertrand Russell, whose progressive views about social and political change had influenced her. Later in life she would write in an unpublished autobiography of her regret at entering Newnham in 1892 to study languages: ‘Fortunately I was able to stay up for a fourth year, and I enjoyed a course in Moral Science, Psychology and History of Philosophy and Economics.

How I wished I had entered for that course or for History from the beginning!' (as cited in Oldfield, 1984, p.36). On leaving Cambridge, she became a social worker beginning with the Women's University Settlement near Blackfriars Bridge, Southwark, causing her father, an Anglican vicar (later bishop), with whom she had a difficult relationship, to all but disinherit her. On this episode, her biographer concludes that 'the pity was that although her father was the most significant member of the family for Mary, Mary did not matter very much to him' (Oldfield, 1984, p.120).

A historical approach was normal in the social sciences at the end of the nineteenth century. For a time, students at Cambridge could also enter economics through the History Tripos. William Cunningham, whose *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* appeared in 1882 following a career started in the university extension programme, and Frederick Maitland, pioneering legal historian, both shaped the study of history at Cambridge. This included the development of economic history which became a separate paper for the Tripos in 1885 (Kadish and Tribe, 1993). Students and scholars at the women's colleges were encouraged to take up the subject by Cunningham who, as chair of the Council of Girton College, helped establish a fund for women in need of financial aid (Berg, 1992). Ellen McArthur received surprisingly little attention until Amy Erickson's (2018) recent biography reclaimed her alongside the pivotal figures of Eileen Power and Lilian Knowles that feature prominently in Berg's research. One of the earliest women students in economic history at Cambridge, ranked joint fourth among all History Tripos candidates in 1885, McArthur became Girton's first history tutor and collaborated with Cunningham for many years. She taught a generation of women scholars (Erickson, 2018), many of whom specialised in economic history and had a powerful influence on the academic profession, including Annie Abram, Lilian Knowles, **Caroline Skeel** (1872-1951) and **Olive Dunlop** (1883-1970). It is credible that she also taught the Derbyshire-born **Theodora Keith** (1882-1930), another History Tripos student at Cambridge, who researched and wrote about the economic history of Scotland. In 1911, Keith was awarded a Pfeiffer Scholarship for graduate studies at Girton College, the year after the publication of her manuscript *Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707* (1910), the first volume of a series edited by Lilian Knowles. She later worked at the British Museum and London

School of Economics before moving to Scotland where, in 1919, she was appointed by Glasgow University as its first woman lecturer, in the Department of Political Economy.

As noted by one of the UK's leading historians of economics, it was only toward the end of the century that the university teaching of economics as a subject distinct from the terrain of traditional political economy began to develop at Cambridge (Tribe, 2005). The way was opened by Alfred Marshall who returned to Cambridge in 1884 to replace Henry Fawcett as Professor of Political Economy and immediately set about turning economics into 'an autonomous discipline that placed pioneering analytical techniques at the service of human improvement' (Soffer, 1978, p.70). He achieved this, Reba Soffer writes, 'by developing flexible tools of economic analysis that served the rational and moral progress of human nature in society, and by setting the professional standards of social responsibility that would later characterise the economics of Arthur Pigou, John Maynard Keynes and Joan Robinson' (1978, p.104). Although in later life Marshall lost interest in policy matters, in her judgement, this 'does not vitiate the genuinely liberal impulse that made him the remarkable founder of an economics with social welfare and self-respect as its ends' (1978, p.108). Noting in the mid-1880s how potential students were put off by 'the metaphysical studies that lie at the threshold of [the Moral Sciences] Tripos' (Marshall, 1885), he first directed his efforts at increasing the prominence of economics in the syllabus of that Tripos and the History Tripos. Later, he pushed Cambridge to establish a new Economics Tripos in 1903, the first specialist three-year course in economics anywhere in the world (Cook, 2009).

The production of a specialist course of study, Marshall believed, would cater for the serious students who were growing in numbers at Cambridge. He did not include women in his vision for advanced study in economics, having shifted his position on the question of women students (McWilliams-Tullberg, 1990). Initially, the new degree attracted only a small number of students but from the outset women displayed an interest. Keith Tribe has shown not only that Newnham College 'had a disproportionate number of students taking the Economics Tripos over three years', but that 'these women students did rather well' (2000, p.241). Shena Simon was in the first cohort of students. Educated at home, she passed the higher local

education examination and read economics at Newnham College from 1904 to 1907, narrowly missing a first-class degree. Being strongly influenced by Beatrice Webb, her postgraduate studies took her to the London School of Economics. A year later, **Eva Hubback** (1886-1949) gained a first class in Part II of the Economics Tripos, along with **Lynda Grier** (1880-1967). That both these women should have achieved higher honours than any man that year reading economics was, in Marshall's view, a 'very unfortunate business', recalled the economic historian and advocate of women's rights, Charles Fay (as cited in Groenewegen, 1995, p.258).

Oxford. At Oxford University, the social sciences were slow to develop, especially as single subject degrees, in comparison to the situation at Cambridge. Anthropology was initially only a minor element within the natural sciences established after about 1870 (Gosden, Larson and Petch, 2007, p.21). Although there was a nascent anthropology at Oxford from 1883, centred on the Pitt Rivers Museum and the work of Henry Balfour, John Linton Myres, Robert Marett and Arthur Thompson, an undergraduate degree with anthropology as a major component did not appear until 1970 (Rivière, 2007). A single honours degree in economics has never been offered at Oxford. Until the foundation of the philosophy, politics and economics (PPE) degree in 1920, which Keith Tribe (2017, p.918) says 'bore a close resemblance' to the Moral Sciences Tripos in Cambridge, economics was primarily taught as part of the modern history degree, after Thomas Green, Arnold Toynbee and others helped establish the field of economic history.

Elizabeth Levett (1881-1932) and **Julia Mann** (1891-1985) studied modern history at Lady Margaret Hall; Eglantyne Jebb was one term ahead of Maude Royden. Some were officially studying "Greats" (Literae Humaniores) but took up economic studies, often with Leonard Hobhouse, while still at Oxford. Though he officially taught philosophy during this period, Hobhouse became involved in economics through the work of Canon Barnett's East End settlement at Toynbee Hall. Later, he became a leading figure in sociology and, as one of the first two appointees to Chairs in Sociology at LSE, helped establish the subject in Britain (Scott, 2016). **Sybella Gurney** (1870-1926) was the first female student of Hobhouse in 1894. Another woman to study under him was Barbara Hammond. 'When I think of the names suggested … to me, amongst whom I was to select a Greats tutor … it fills

me with awe', she recalled many years later (as cited in Weaver, 1997, p.41). By all accounts a brilliant student, Hammond got a double first in Classical Moderations and Greats, the first woman at Oxford to achieve it. On leaving university, both women worked outside academia. Hammond would continue in economics. Gurney would follow Hobhouse into sociology, where she 'made important and largely unrecognized contributions to British community design theory and practice … as part of an idealistic circle of thinkers which included Patrick Geddes' (Wilson, 2018, p.320).

Oxford also offered university education in social work at Barnett House, what is now the Department of Social Policy and Intervention. Established in 1914, 'physically close to the heart of the university but not formally part of it for another 30 years', Barnett House 'set out not just to study contemporary social issues but to promote reform … through social policy and practice' (Smith et al., 2014, p.1). The women included in this study who played a key role in the development of the social training courses that would be taught to future generations of students at Barnett House are discussed in the next chapter.

The London Colleges. At University College, one innovation made by John Cairnes, Professor of Political Economy, was to allow women into his class in 1871: 'the first coeducational class in a British university' (Maloney, 1993, p.29). Within a few years, women began to study political economy at degree level under the professorship of William Stanley Jevons, a major figure in the fields of political economy and social reform. Jevons was inspired by the Belgian mathematician Adolphe Quetele and had a major influence on the development of empirical methods and the use of statistics in the social sciences (Groenewegen, 1991). At the time, political economy was not regarded as an important subject and attracted few students (Thomas, 2005), but a significant minority were women. One of the first female students was Ada Heather-Bigg, daughter of a noted pioneer in the development of orthopaedic appliances. She had started attending lectures in political economy in 1875, immediately before the appointment of Jevons, and between desegregation of classes and opening of degrees at UCL to women in 1878. In 1880, she completed the LLA diploma offered by the University of St Andrews. The student record of another of the college's earliest female

undergraduates, Sophie Bryant, indicates that she completed her BSc degree in 1881 with first-class honours in mental and moral science, and second-class honours in mathematics. The previous year, the University of London had made history when it became the first institution to award degrees to women when four students passed their BA degree examination (Harte, 1986).

According to Maloney (1993, p.32), the founding of the LSE appears to have 'had no obvious immediate impact either on teaching or on student numbers at University College'. Over time, however, LSE would become the main centre for the study of economics at London University. From its foundation in 1895, LSE had placed the social sciences at the forefront of its curriculum. Beatrice Webb recorded this in her diary for 21 September 1894, noted how 'Sidney has been planning to persuade the other trustees to devote the greater part of the money to encouraging research and economic study'. 'Last evening', she continued, 'we sat by the fire and jotted down a whole list of subjects which want elucidation—issues of fact which need clearing up' (cited in MacKenzie and Mackenzie, 1983, pp.56-7). Not only was LSE resolutely committed to the idea that universities had a vital role to play in solving the problems of modern industry and society, but from the outset it was clear from early interviews with William Hewins, LSE's first Director, and others that it 'intended to abandon the traditional Oxford and Cambridge approach to higher education' (Kadish, 1993, p.237).

According to Dahrendorf, the social sciences were 'not exactly invented at LSE', but it 'brought them together like no other university in Europe' (1995, p.viii). LSE initially offered courses thought useful as preparation for the public examinations held by the Civil Service and London Chamber of Commerce. Among the subjects listed in the first prospectus are statistics, commercial and industrial law, taxation, and finance (LSE, 1895). Over time, the curriculum expanded as LSE 'aligned itself more with model of the École Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris', where the social sciences already occupied an influential position (Bannerman, 2021, p.36). **Katherine Bathurst** (1862-1933) was one of the earliest students, attending classes from 1895 to 1897. Like many other LSE students in the early years, she took up an appointment in the Civil Service, becoming the third female school sub-inspector recruited by the Board of Education (Gordon, 1988). In 1904, she was one

of five women inspectors commissioned to conduct an enquiry into the problem of under-age children attending elementary schools. Edith Deverell, who had been appointed as a junior inspector in 1901, was also employed on the enquiry, but had resigned on her marriage to a fellow inspector, Francis Marvin, before the work was completed (Gordon, 1978). In step with modern ideas about children and childhood that had emerged in the late nineteenth century (Henrick, 1997), Bathurst's investigations led to appeals for national nurseries for very young children, which she set out in an article published in the *Nineteenth Century* (Bathurst, 1905). Her criticism of the Inspectorate's position in the report of the official investigation (Board of Education, 1905) led to a request for her resignations.

In 1900, LSE joined the federal University of London, and became a School of the university's newly created Faculty of Economics and Political Science (Dahrendorf, 1995). This development allowed it to start awarding a University of London BSc(Econ.) degree from 1904, although economics was initially only a subsidiary subject in the undergraduate programme, and it was some years before a separate economic degree was established (Maloney, 1993). Maxine Berg's investigation into women's academic networks in the early twentieth century revealed that women constituted a high proportion of students during the early years of LSE. For the period 1902 to 1932, she calculated that, 'of the 2500 in the Register who had qualified for degrees or diplomas, nearly half were women' (1989, p.9). Only a small number of these women are in my sample, either because they were born after 1891 or they left no trace of having continued in the social sciences. Published in 1934, the *LSE Register*, which lists all LSE graduates from 1895 to 1932, provides career histories for those who, during the early years, responded to a request for personal information. Two early students who do feature were **Mildred Bulkley** (1880-1958) and **Vera Anstey** (1889-1976). Both graduated with first class honours, in 1905 and 1913 respectively, specialising in economic history. Anstey had arrived at LSE in 1909, having won the University of London Gerstenberg Scholarship in Economics and Political Science, awarded annually on the results of the Scholarship Examination (Husbands, 2019).

Compared with economics, the shift to formal academic status for other major social sciences at the University of London and its constituent colleges was much slower

(Husbands, 2019). In 1900, sociology was not yet a serious discipline, although courses had periodically been taught before LSE added sociology as a new subject to the curriculum of the BSc (Econ) degree in the 1904-05 academic year (Renwick, 2012). LSE also modified the syllabus of the BA degree examination, adding sociology to the list of optional subjects. However, as Husbands (2014) has highlighted, the first undergraduate programme labelled sociology at LSE did not appear until 1920. Entries in the Register 1895-1932 indicate that between 1906-7 and 1914-15, there were 15 successful candidates in the BSc(Econ), Special Subject Sociology, degree, including eight women. None of the eight names appear in my sample, but one from a later sociology cohort does. Scottish-born **Ellinor Black** (1891-1956) graduated with a first-class BA(Hons) Sociology degree in 1922, after taking a Social Sciences Certificate from University of Edinburgh in 1916. Unmarried, she appears to have spent her entire career working in academia. She taught briefly at LSE in the Department of Social Science and Administration until 1924, then later joined the University of Liverpool as Lecturer in Social Science. In 1949, she left to direct the new School of Social studies at the University of Sheffield, an institution which, it is claimed, she 'modelled … on LSE's' (Husbands, 2019, p.238).

Berg (1992) noted that while most of the early LSE women held two-year certificates, the men tended to graduate with three or more years of study. The social worker and occasional lecturer **Dorothy Whitmore** (1881-1955?) for whom the only known biographical details are for her schooling and university courtesy of the LSE register of teaching staff, and Varvara De Vesselitsky studied for the Social Sciences Certificate and graduated after two years of study in 1913. Dorothea Proud gained this qualification in 1914, Julia Mann in 1915 and **Minnie Haskins** (1875-1957) in 1919. Haskins came to LSE at the age of 43; after gaining the Certificate with distinction, she took the Diploma in Sociology the following year. Agnes Crosthwaite arrived at LSE after studying at Girton College, Cambridge, and read for the Social Science Certificate (1917), Diploma in Sociology (1918) and Mental Health Certificate (1931). These women were some of the first graduates from LSE's Department of Social Science and Administration. Established in 1912, and supported by money from the Ratan Tata Foundation, the department was a product 'of the intellectual and political climate sparked by the Poor Law minority

report' (Dahrendorf, 1995, p.197). As such, its aims were to develop empirical research in the tradition of Booth and Rowntree and to develop and professionalise training for welfare workers (Bulmer, 1982). Haskins worked as a tutor in the Department from 1919 to 1939, initially alongside Crosthwaite who was there from 1918 to 1921 until she took up at appointment teaching economics and psychology at King's College, then from 1924 at University College Hospital. **Hilda Ormsby** (1877-1973) was one of the few students of geography in the early period. Another was **Alice Bottomley** (1884-1961). Starting with a one-year geography certificate in 1909, Ormsby graduated BSc(Econ) in 1919 and DSc(Econ) in 1931. The following year she succeeded Sir Halford Mackinder as LSE Reader in Geography and was one of the founding members of the Institute of British Geographers in 1933 (Pelizza, 2013).

Four decades earlier, training institutes and various examining bodies within the areas of health provision and sanitary reform emerged in the years immediately following the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act. Research by Jennifer Haynes (2006) on early women public health officers has shown that many of these institutes, which developed separately but simultaneously with the universities, were in or near London. Although formal qualifications did not become compulsory for those entering the sanitary and factory inspectorate until the twentieth century, women inspectors gained some of the first professional qualifications in public health and sanitary science in the 1890s. Memoirs written by women who followed this career path often reveal they had clear vocational aspirations on beginning study. **Rose Squire** (1861-1938), who began training at the beginning of 1893, and **Lucy Streatfeild** (1865-1950), from an upper-class military family, both gained diplomas through the National Health Society following examinations in subjects such as elementary anatomy, physiology, hygiene and sanitation (Haynes, 2006, Livesey, 2004). Formed in the early 1870s through the efforts of a group of philanthropic women and others, the work of the Society was later summarised by Ernest Hart, medical journalist and then chair of its council. By the 1890s, it was located near Oxford Street in central London, and local authorities all over the country recognised its qualifications (Hart, 1893).

Bedford College for Women began to offer courses in public health and hygiene in the 1890s (Brown, 2011). Hilda Martindale was one of several graduates who went on to have pioneering professional careers, often as part of the factory inspectorate. She first attended Royal Holloway College for two years and then studied at the Royal Sanitary Institute, passing the necessary examinations to become an associate. In 1897, she went to Bedford College, studying industrial hygiene and public heath under Thomas Legge, the first Medical Inspector of Factories and an authority on industrial disease (Martindale, 1938). She achieved the Hygiene Certificate (Martindale, 1944). In 1921, she become Deputy Chief Inspector of Factories and Director of Women's Establishments of H.M. Treasury. The economist Vera Anstey completed the Diploma in Public Health at Bedford College before studying for the BSc(Econ), specialist subject economic history, at LSE with the initial intention of becoming a factory inspector. She later became a member of the faculty and a noted authority on the economy of India.

Social science courses were eventually offered at various constituent colleges of the federal University of London as part of the London BSc (Hons) degree examinations (Porter and Ross, 2003). According to Rocquin, the teaching of sociology and other subjects at Bedford College was 'surprisingly developed', partly due to its links with LSE (2017, p.12). In 1918, a two-year, full-time course offering a Certificate in Social Studies was founded at Bedford College to replace the course on scientific instruction in hygiene taken by Hilda Martindale and others. Popular with women because social work offered good employment prospects, 'the number of graduates rose from 18 in 1920 to 30 in 1936' (2017, p.68). From 1925, Bedford followed the LSE in offering the BA (Hons) in sociology (as part of an inter-collegiate scheme with King's College), adopting an understanding of sociology that, according to Husbands (2014, p.180), was 'largely in the social administration tradition of Loch and Urwick rather than the ethical tradition of Hobhouse or the anthropological one of Westermarck'.

University instruction in domestic science and home economics, subjects then thought to be especially relevant to women, received a boost in 1908 when a three-year 'household and social science' course, offered initially as a College Certificate, was inaugurated at the Women's Department of King's College, London. Two years

later, the department was incorporated in the University of London with a distinct, independent existence as King's College for Women (Blakestad, 1994). Although controversial among educationalists, a group of women were convinced of the need for a more scientific and economically based study of the household with its associated concerns of nutrition and hygiene. Proponents of this view included Mabel Atkinson and several members of the Women's Industrial Council as well as growing numbers of teachers.

The problems of industrialisation dominated the early nineteenth-century statistical movement in Britain, as such pioneers as William Farr, Edwin Chadwick and Florence Nightingale set about establishing a firm foundation for modern statistics through their social and administrative work on sanitation and public health (Cullen, 1975). It was not until the closing decades, however, that statistics was redefined from a mathematical standpoint. Karl Pearson, prominent proponent of eugenics and UCL's Goldsmid Chair of Applied Mathematics from 1884, played a major role in establishing the mathematical and conceptual basis of the new academic discipline, one that 'arose principally out of biological rather than social or economic investigations' (Porter, 2003, p.242). In 1911, the Drapers' Company Biometric and Galton Eugenics laboratories, both then under Pearson's direction, merged to form a Department of Applied Statistics at UCL (now the Department of Statistical Sciences), the first university statistics department in the world (MacKenzie, 1981). Finally, from 1917, it was possible to take an undergraduate degree course in statistics, when Pearson set up the first such course in Britain (Magnello, 2009). Women are known to have attended lectures on statistics at UCL before it became a degree subject. While there is no evidence that any of the women in my sample took the undergraduate course, Frances Wood and **Alice Lee** (1858-1939) are among those to have used the new statistical methods developed by Pearson and others.

Other Colleges and Universities. Other institutions across the country, including the predecessor institutions of universities such as Birmingham and Aberystwyth where students took University of London examinations as external candidates, began expanding into different areas of social science around the turn of the century. In the early decades, the major emphasis was still on establishing separate university departments, chairs and permanent lectureships, rather than single-

subject degrees, but opportunities were growing (Baker, 2012). Women were amongst those who took up the new subjects, notably economics, philosophy, psychology and social work.

Universities in Manchester and Birmingham enrolled their first economic students around 1903, growing out of earlier provision (Tribe, 1993). Years before, **Amelia Levetus** (1853-1938) had taken courses on economics at Mason College (later the University of Birmingham) in the 1870s, possibly as part of a short-lived moral sciences course. Eventually settling in Vienna, and at the invitation of the Austrian economist Eugen Schwiedland, in 1897 she became the first woman to lecture at the University of Vienna and began publishing in economics shortly before her interest turned to the history of art (Large, 2003). That same year, the *Economic Journal* published her enquiry on behalf of the Social Branch of the Vienna Ethical Society into the conditions of working women in Vienna (Levetus, 1897). Margrieta Van der Veen studied philosophy at Manchester (then Victoria) University under Professor Samuel Alexander, a hugely influential philosopher in his day, graduating BA in 1895 and MA in 1901. Training in economics and political science came later, and the 1911 and 1921 censuses give her occupation as investigator at the Board of Trade. Another female student of that generation in Manchester was **May Smith** (1879-1968). She attended on an education scholarship and was awarded a BA degree and an external diploma in education from the University of London in 1903. In a short autobiography, published in *Occupational Psychology*, she gave an impression of her university life including the way in which choice of subject reflected her then status as a trainee teacher. ‘I should have liked to have taken an honours degree in philosophy’, she wrote, ‘but as I had to teach, and philosophy then had no market value, I took an ordinary degree which would give me three subjects I might eventually be able to teach, and for my own interest the greatest possible amount of philosophy’ (Smith, 1949, p.75). Though she had not planned to become an industrial psychologist, a field to which she later made a major contribution, it was Manchester that roused an interest in psychology. ‘We were lucky’, she recorded, ‘in that Professor S. Alexander taught philosophy which included some psychology’.

In the meantime, social work training was increasingly being offered at universities across Britain. Recent work by Viviene Cree (2019) and others has shown how, in the first decade of the century, university training for social work began to gain a foothold, building on its earlier roots in the COS and other bodies offering short courses to welfare workers. The University of Birmingham began with a series of evening classes in the Faculty of Arts in 1905-06. By 1908, this initiative had developed into a pioneering one-year social studies course involving a partnership between the university and social welfare organisations in the city, including the Birmingham settlement established at Aston in 1899 (Holmwood and Scott, 2014). Liverpool's School of Training for Social Work, which started teaching in 1905, supplemented the theoretical elements of courses by working in partnership with the Victoria Settlement for Women. Renamed the School of Social Science and Training for Social Work in 1907, it was incorporated into the university in 1917 as the School of Social Science, initially offering one-year diplomas and certificates (Starkey, 2006).

Comparing it to the LSE, Husbands notes that, "from the beginning", Liverpool's approach was "more pragmatic, more interventionist, more overtly meliorist, and more concerned with social issues as conventionally understood" (2019, p.363). By 1918, fuelled by the First World War's need for training in this area, seven universities across Britain had full-time courses of at least a year, either run by the university or closely connected with it. That year, these universities came together at the LSE with three other institutions to form the Joint University Council for Social Studies (Cree (2019). Elizabeth Macadam, an important voice in early-twentieth century social work circles, was among those present (Chapman, 2007). One of only a few university-based lecturers in the subject, Macadam had trained in social work two decades earlier at the Women's University Settlement in Southwark. None of the women in my sample appears to have taken the new degree courses in social work at Birmingham, Liverpool or elsewhere in the early decades of the century.

The introduction of social science degrees in Scotland, as distinct and recognised branches of knowledge, was slow compared to Oxbridge and London. Late nineteenth-century social scientists, Holmwood and Scott observe, did not try to 'make sense of their discipline' by looking north of the border (2014, p.15). There

are cases of women taking up opportunities to pursue short courses in the social sciences after graduation to improve their career prospects. For example, the Scottish labour activist Margaret Irwin gained the LLA diploma from St Andrews in 1880 after studying French, German, and English. In 1888, she sought out social scientific knowledge by attending classes in political economy at Glasgow's Queen Margaret College, the only women's college of higher education in Scotland. It is reasonable to conclude that she took these courses in preparation for her work in the trade union movement. In 1891, Irwin became the full-time Scottish organiser of the Women's Protective and Provident League, an organisation that promoted trade union for women workers, established by Emma Paterson in 1874. One of her main interests was the conditions for women who worked in laundries or at home and she conducted several enquiries on this issue for the Scottish Council for Women's Trades (SCWT), originally formed in 1894 as the Glasgow Council for Women's Trades (GCWT), including an article titled "The Problem of Homework", published in the *Westminster Review* in 1897. Like the Women's Industrial Council and the Manchester Women's Trade Union Council, the SCWT/GCWT committed much of their time to investigating and gathering evidence of industrial abuses to help develop arguments for legislation (Lewenhak, 1977).

The Glasgow University Women's Settlement, later established as a School of Social Study and Training, began social work training in 1902. It also offered short courses on social and economic history, remaining largely a teaching unit until it merged with the University in the 1940s. Edinburgh University established a similar initiative, in 1918. The Edinburgh School of Social Study and Training initially offered three courses: social ethics, social economics, and personal and public hygiene. None of my women were among the first wave of students but London-born **Nora Milnes** (1882-1972), who as an external student obtained a BSc in 1911 from the University of London before teaching at LSE, was appointed as its first Director. She later recounted the significant influence of several men, including idealist moral philosopher James Seth, Professor at the University, in setting up the school (Milnes, 1955). An obituary published in the *University of Edinburgh Journal* after her death captures the key role she has played: 'It is all too easy to underestimate the enormous determination required on the part of a woman to establish a department in its early years' (Anon, 1972, p.75). Officially taken over by

the University in 1928, the school became the Department of Social Study and Training. Teaching at both Glasgow and Edinburgh, Rocquin (2017) has noted, initially emphasised professional practice and it was some time before a strong orientation in social research methods began to be established.

5.6 Advanced studies in the social sciences

As Queen Victoria's reign came to an end, universities in Britain remained 'somewhat marginal in their engagement in research' (Daunton, 2005, p.24), postgraduate study was highly unusual, and the number of postgraduate students overshadowed by those in other countries. Master's level and research-based degrees to follow on from a bachelor's degree had only started to appear in the late nineteenth century (Simpson, 2009). In 1885, a change in the University of London regulations transformed its DSc (first introduced in 1860), from an advanced study course assessed by examination to one resembling a modern research degree (Harte, 1986). Durham University first offered a DSc in 1882 (Barnes, 2013). The University of Cambridge established its ScD (Doctor of Science) in the same year and in 1900 the University of Oxford establishing its Doctor of Letters (DLitt) for graduates who had produced a significant body of scientific work (Brock and Curthoys, 2000). The PhD degree, the most common type of doctorate today, did not appear in Britain until the end of the First World War.

To pursue a postgraduate degree, especially a doctorate, was extremely difficult as systemic barriers existed at many levels. Scholars point to several obstacles in women's path, including the difficulty they faced in securing grants for research. In the case of the women's colleges, Fernanda Perrone notes that the debate over research scholarships was 'complicated … by financial constraints' which saw undergraduate education prioritised (1993, p.354). Some postgraduate scholarships were available for women from the 1890s and a few more were founded in the 1900s, including Girton (1892), Newnham (1893), Bedford (1897) and Somerville (1903), as part of a wider movement in Britain to recognise postgraduate study. A concern to widen research opportunities for women, Dyhouse (1995) argues, was one of the factors that brought about the foundation of the British Federation of University Women in 1907.

Table 5.7: Postgraduate subject areas (analysis by cohort and whole group)[a]

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All[e]
Arts and Humanities[b]	3 (14%)	-	3 (5%)
Science[c]	3 (14%)	5 (14%)	8 (14%)
Social Science[d]	13 (62%)	29 (83%)	42 (75%)
Pedagogy	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)
Unknown	1 (5%)	1 (3%)	2 (4%)
Totals	21	35	56

Notes:
a. Totals include those who started but did not necessarily complete an advanced degree. UCL and LSE degrees awarded by University of London. Totals do not include honorary degrees.
b. Literature.
c. Medicine; botany.
d. Economic history; economics; philosophy; psychology; anthropology; geography.
e. Information in this table relates to 54 individuals with known details of having studied at postgraduate level. Some women took more than one course of study, sometimes at different universities.

Fifty-four women presented in this collection are known to have taken up higher degrees of some form or another, of whom many gained a doctorate for their academic work (Tables 5.8 and 5.9). Predictably, the largest group undertook advanced studies in the social sciences. I concentrate on this group of 42 women in the remainder of this section.

Table 5.8: Postgraduate institutions (all subjects)[a]

Oxford University: Winifred Blackman, Beatrice Blackwood, Violet Butler, Maria Czaplicka, Edith Deverell, Barbara Freire-Marreco, Julia Mann.

Cambridge University: Ellen McArthur, Mary Smith.

London School of Economics: Annie Abram, Vera Anstey, Mabel Atkinson, Mabel Buer, Alice Clark, Maria Czaplicka, Edith Deverell, Olive Dunlop, Lettice Fisher, Barbara Freire-Marreco, Dorothy George, Amy Harrison, Bessie Hutchins, Lillian Knowles, Ellen Leonards, Alice Murray, Hilda Ormsby, Dorothea Proud, Marion Phillips, Eileen Power, Margaret Read, Shena Simon, Caroline Skeel, Amber Blanco White.

University College London: Sophie Bryant, Clara Collet, Caroline Foley, Ada Heather-Bigg, Janet Lane-Claypon, Alice Lee, Marie Stopes, Frances Wood.

London, Other[b]: Florence Barrett, Janet Campbell, Winifred Cullis, Lucy Fildes, Agnes Foxwell, Janet Lane-Claypon, Hilda Oakeley, Phoebe Sheavyn, May Smith.

UK, Other[c]: Beatrice Edgell, Phoebe Sheavyn, May Smith, Margrieta Van der Veen, Martha Webb, Helen Wodehouse.

Non-UK[d]: Mabel Atkinson, Ethel Bentham, Beatrice Edgell, Victoria Hazlitt, Eileen Power, Marie Stopes.

Unknown: Lilian Dawson.

Notes:
a. Totals include those who started but did not necessarily complete an advanced degree. UCL and LSE degrees awarded by University of London. Totals do not include honorary degrees.
b. Bedford College; Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine; University of London School of Medicine for Women; Other.
c. University of Manchester; University of Birmingham; Birmingham Medical School; University College of Wales Aberystwyth.
d. USA; Germany; France; Belgium.

Table 5.9 shows the place of study for the 42 cases that were identified. The first thing to notice is that few women took a research degree in social sciences at either Cambridge or Oxford. Some generational differences are evident, with the most common place of study for the earlier cohort being London, typically UCL, while those born after 1871 tended to study at LSE. Maxine Berg has suggested two main reasons for this pattern. First, it reflected the more hostile research environment for women at the ancient universities, compared to the new institutions such as the University of London. The second explanation offered is that LSE, as she puts it, 'developed the social sciences, which University College had failed to do' (1992, p.317). While Berg's contribution centres on a close study of economic history, what follows is an analysis that covers a broad range of social science disciplines, shedding new light on an area where little research has been done before.

Table 5.9: Social science advanced degrees: decade started[a]

	Decade degree started						
	1880s	1890s	1900s	1910s	1920s	1930s	Total[b]
Oxford	-	1	2	4		-	7
Cambridge	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
UCL	4	1	-	1	-	-	6
LSE	-	9	6	5	3	1	24
Other, London	-	-	-		3	-	3
Other, E&W[c]	-	1	1	1	-	-	3
Non-UK				1			1
Total	**4**	**13**	**9**	**13**	**6**	**1**	**46**

Notes:
a. Totals include those who started but did not necessarily complete an advanced degree. UCL and LSE degrees awarded by University of London. Totals do not include honorary degrees.

b. Information in this table relates to 42 individuals with known details of having studied social science at postgraduate level. Several women took more than one course of study, sometimes at different universities.
c. England and Wales.

The London colleges. Jennifer Stevenson (1995) estimates that over a third of the students who passed through UCL before 1914 were women. Although this included a significant number of postgraduate and research students, options for the social sciences were relatively limited. University College is widely thought to have awarded the first DSc to a woman in England. Sophie Bryant had been one of the first two women to obtain a University of London BSc degree. Continuing her studies, she was awarded a DSc on mental and moral philosophy in 1884/1885, at the end of the examination era. She served as headmistress of North London Collegiate from 1895 until 1918, during which time she authored several books and articles on psychology and education, revealing academic interests in child development and a scientific approach to teaching (Rothman, 2003).

Three additional women who had registered as postgraduate students in the social sciences at UCL pursued different degrees. Awarded an MA in philosophy in 1889, Caroline Foley was on the board of the *Economic Journal*, from its inception in 1891 until 1895. Like Bryant, she had been a student of George Croom Robertson. Shortly after his death, she wrote an account of his teaching which was published in *Mind* (Foley, 1893) and edited a volume of his lectures, published in 1896. Later, she was appointed Lecturer in Indian Philosophy at Manchester University, 1910-13, and Lecturer in the History of Buddhism at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, 1918-33. Clara Collet, an early student of Professor Herbert Foxwell, was awarded the department's Joseph Hume Scholarship, founded in 1857. The University of London General Register records that she graduated with an MA from the Faculty of Arts in 1886, specialising in philosophy and economics. Another scholarship holder was Ada Heather-Bigg, a prominent suffragist who championed women's trade unionism and was a vigorous opponent of protection legislation applying to working women. Ten years after she was awarded the Hume Scholarship, the *Economic Journal* announced that she has been appointed by UCL to a Jevons Studentship, 'designed to encourage researches [*sic*] relating to the economic and social conditions of London' ('Current Topics', 1892, p.580).

These four women were among the small group of social scientists at UCL. They were all members of the Economic Club (known as the Junior Economic Club for the first year of its existence), formed at UCL in 1890 by Collet, Henry Higgs, and others, to discuss topics in social science. Higgs was Secretary until 1905 when Collet took over (Collet and Webster, 1940). Many eminent men and women in economics, statistics and social investigation attended its monthly meetings, including Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Charles Booth, Herbert Foxwell, Alfred Marshall, Francis Edgeworth, William Beveridge, Charles Loch and John Maynard Keynes (Groenewegen, 2003). One subject discussed in its early years was the future teaching of economics in London. William Stanley Jevons had urged an expansion of economics throughout his tenure at UCL, yet neither he nor his successor Herbert Foxwell made any significant progress, and it remained a minority subject that attracted few students. Collet felt strongly that UCL was the prime site for the study of economics in the capital and she reacted when LSE became part of the reconstituted University of London in 1900 after the reforms initiated by the University of London Act 1898 came into force. By 1902, LSE functioned as a school of the university's newly formed Faculty of Economics and Political Science. In December of that year, Collet wrote to the University Vice-Chancellor requesting an inquiry into the running of the new faculty, accusing Sidney Webb of misusing his powers as Chairman of the Board of Studies to ensure most of the new board appointments went to LSE members and to get a substantial grant from the LCC's Technical Education Board allocated to LSE rather than to the faculty, which 'meant that UCL got nothing' (Thomas, 2005, p.19). The foundation of LSE may, as the authors of a revised and updated history of UCL claim, have been 'a conscious reaction to the failure of the College to develop the social sciences' (Harte et al., 2018, p.116). However, Collet's efforts on behalf of UCL awaits detailed study.

By late 1896, the LSE had moved to 10 Adelphi Terrace, and it expanded rapidly through the early years of the twentieth century thanks partly to the donations of Charlotte Shaw. Although it was several years before LSE could offer formal methodological training, students had conducted research at LSE from its opening in 1895. When LSE began to award doctoral degrees shortly after it joined the reformed University of London, four of the first five went to women (LSE, 1934),

including Caroline Skeel and **Alice Murray** (1877-1951), both of whom had previously studied with Ellen McArthur at Girton College.

Economic history formed a major core of the LSE syllabus from the start, and the first doctorates, awarded from 1903, were in this subject. The early doctorate was the DSc(Econ), which was normally given based on submission of already-published work. With a University of London BA (Hons) external degree (1895), Amy Harrison came to LSE as a graduate student in 1898 and received two consecutive studentships in 1900 and 1901 to support her studies. She received her doctorate in 1903 for work co-written with Bessie Hutchins who had arrived at LSE in 1896 after studying at King's College for Women, London. Harrison won the Hutchinson Silver Medal for her contribution to the research (LSE 1934), which was published as a book, *A History of Factory Legislation* (Hutchins and Harrison, 1903). Providing a wealth of statistics and information about the development of nineteenth-century English labour laws affecting factory workers, including special regulations for women, this work was, as praised by Sidney Webb in his preface, the first detailed examination of the subject. By the time of the third edition published in 1926, it was considered the standard work on nineteenth-century factory legislation.

Given the focus of her thesis, Harrison would likely have attended classes held by the trade unionist and magistrate **Gertrude Tuckwell** (1861-1951), probably the first woman to lecture at LSE, and Beatrice Webb; both gave lectures on factory legislation. LSE archivist Sue Donnelly notes that 'Thursdays at 5pm were Beatrice's regular teaching slot. In 1898-1899 she taught on *Problems of Trade Unionism and Factory Legislation* and in 1899-1900 delivered a course on free competition in the labour market' (2015, p.1). Harrison was the second student to obtain the DSc(Econ) degree at LSE, and one of 19 women to be awarded a doctorate in the period 1895-1932 (LSE, 1934). She had benefitted from the various grants offered to attract research students, typically £100 annually for two years. These included the LSE Research Studentships awarded 'to promote the execution of definite pieces of original work relating to past or present economic or political conditions and to enable students to become trained investigators' (LSE, 1934, p.219), and the Shaw Scholarship set up in 1904 by Charlotte Shaw. Many of the early awards went to women, including 15 of 35 LSE studentships held before 1918

(LSE, 1934). Several early recipients had taken economic history as part of the History Tripos at Cambridge, choosing LSE as 'the more congenial ground for historical economics and for women' (Berg, 1992, p.316). Most were Girton alumni, including Lilian Knowles, Ellen Leonard, and Lettice Fisher.

The LSE calendar for 1904-05 indicates that anthropology, in the form of a course on ethnology, appeared for the first time that year as part of its new sociology degree, aimed at 'Civil servants destined for the tropical portions of the Empire, and Missionaries', among other groups (Steinmetz, 2014, p.324). It was not until the years following the Great War, however, that a graduate programme in anthropology was formed and the School's Department of Anthropology became firmly established as one of the world's leading anthropology research centres. Best known for her expeditions to Siberia, Maria Czaplicka briefly studied at LSE under Charles Seligman (appointed lecturer in ethnology in 1910), where she became friends with another young Polish émigré, Bronislaw Malinowski, before moving to Oxford in 1911 on Seligman's recommendation to take the postgraduate diploma (Larson, 2021). **Margaret Read** (1889-1991) studied history at Newnham College from 1908-1911 before she undertook missionary social work in Indian hill villages, where her experiences nurtured an academic interest in social anthropology. She was over 40 when she started her doctoral research at LSE. In 1930, she enrolled to study for a PhD in anthropology under Malinowski, by then a professor.[19] Malinowski taught 'many mature students, especially women', including leading anthropologists of the next generation (Whitehead, 2003, p.229). Read later specialised in ethnographic fieldwork research in Africa.

LSE created master's programmes and doctoral programmes in sociology but awarded few degrees until the late 1920s. Husbands (2019, p.259) maintains that only three DSc(Econ) awards in this period could be regarded as sociology ('by the criterion that the supervisor, or one of them, was a sociologist'), the first in 1927. Dorothea Proud is not among them, though her work might conceivably be credited to sociology. She arrived in London in 1913 having won the first Catherine Helen Spence Memorial Scholarship, founded by the Australian Government to promote

[19] Malinowski, who took up the Chair in Social Anthropology at LSE in 1927, promoted a new philosophical approach to anthropology, developing it as a fieldwork-based discipline in contrast to Oxford's predominantly museum-based curriculum (Lamphere, 2018).

the study of sociology among the women of South Australia. The thesis for which she received her doctorate investigated industrial conditions and welfare policies for female factory workers, earning her a DSc(Econ) in 1916. It is probable that her thesis had less relevance to sociology as the research progressed.

In the early years, there was no expectation at LSE that research students would be studying for a degree. Bessie Hutchins is a case in point. University records indicate many other cases where women abandoned a research degree before completion. For example, Barbara Freire-Marreco, Shena Simon and Amber Blanco White all registered at LSE under Hobhouse, probably with the goal of gaining a DSc(Econ). Ellen Leonards' name appears in the *LSE Register* as one of three women awarded an LSE research studentship in 1896, alongside Lillian Knowles and Edith Deverell. She appears to have continued as a research student until 1910 although there is no record of completion. Determining precisely why these women chose not to continue a programme of advanced study, or were unable to do so, is challenging. However, some evidently left when opportunities came up elsewhere. Julia Mann abandoned her LSE doctoral studies on the cotton industry after one year, taking up an appointment in 1923 as economics tutor and vice-principal of St Hilda's College (then St Hilda's Hall), Oxford.

Other colleges of the University of London made postgraduate awards in psychology during this period. **Lucy Fildes** (1884-1968) and May Smith, both of whom started out as schoolteachers, made major contributions to educational psychology and industrial psychology, respectively. In 1929, Fildes completed a doctoral thesis on word deafness in her mid-forties. Smith was older and already an established researcher when London University awarded a DSc in 1930. Having been trained alongside Cyril Burt and others by the Oxford experimental psychologist William McDougall, she published research on fatigue (Smith, 1916), the effects of drugs (McDougall and Smith, 1920), and nervous temperament (Culpin and Smith, 1930).

***Cambridge*.** The late arrival of doctoral degrees at Cambridge can be partly explained by the fact that the Tripos examinations were framed as a research degree for advanced students from other institutions such as London and Manchester (Forrester and Cameron, 2017). It was not until the 1890s that the

university proposed two new junior research degrees, a BLitt, and a BSc (officially titled LittB and ScB). Finally, a year after the establishment of what was then called the Board of Research Studies, the proposal for the PhD was approved in 1921 (Green, 2011).

Earlier work on the creation of a women's formal education system at Cambridge has shown that their route to research degrees in social sciences in this period was extremely difficult. Alfred Marshall's attitudes to the role of women, including their education, are well known. Peter Groenewegen's account tells this story in detail: Marshall's 'support for the sexual division of labour and the arguments on which that rested' was, he suggested, based on 'unscientific prejudice, and perhaps even something rather "selfish"' (2003, pp.233). This included Marshall's resistance to women progressing to advanced studies in economics at Cambridge, for instance by excluding them from scholarships. Consequently, it was economic history that provided important opportunities for the first generation of women interested in economic topics. William Cunningham, a noted critic of the nascent neoclassical economics propounded by Marshall and the Cambridge School, has been described as 'a champion of women's education in Cambridge' (Berg, 1996, p.8). He supervised Ellen McArthur while she taught at the women's colleges, although it was Trinity College Dublin that awarded the DLitt based on her publications (Erickson, 2018). Evidence points to one uncompleted doctorial registration at Cambridge**.** Mary Smith started a research degree under the direction of Charles Myers at the Cambridge Psychological Laboratory, although there is no indication that she received her doctorate.

Oxford. The University of Oxford had also traditionally focused on undergraduate teaching, with higher doctoral degrees, such as those in medicine and divinity, reserved for established scholars. The development of graduate-level research degrees under a supervisor began with the creation of the BSc and BLitt in 1895, mainly scholars with degrees from other universities (Simpson, 2009, p.58). Demand was initially poor. Rivière (2007) found across the whole of Oxford University in the period 1903-1906 fewer than 20 of these research degrees were awarded. Conceived as full doctorates, the DSc and DLitt found their way into the

statute books in 1900, and the degree of DPhil (the Oxonian term for the PhD) was finally established when the statute was passed in 1917 (Simpson, 2009).

For students interested in economics, a postgraduate BLitt was taught from 1895 and a postgraduate diploma in the subject followed in 1904; a combined diploma in economics and political science was introduced in 1909 (Allan, 2008). Violet Butler and Julia Mann completed the diploma in economics (distinction) at Somerville in 1907 and 1919, respectively. This course was the work of men such as Francis Edgeworth (Drummond Professorship of Political Economy at All Souls College), Arthur Smith (Master of Balliol), Sidney Ball (fellow of St John's College and Barnett House's first president) and Alexander Carlyle (Ruskin College lecturer and leading member of the Christian Social Union in Oxford), all of whom were 'active supporters of university reform in Oxford, attempting to steer the university to adopt economics, political science, and social studies' (Smith et al., 2014, p.19). Butler and Mann both belonged to liberal and academic families that had extensive ties to the university. Mann's mother was Amy Mann, the sister of Thomas Bowman, Warden of Merton College; her father, James Mann, was a classical scholar who had been a fellow of Trinity College. Butler was the daughter of Arthur Butler, a fellow of Oriel College; her uncle was Francis Edgeworth.

At Oxford, the tradition of postgraduate diplomas that offered training in research saw one created in anthropology from 1905, following government calls for training for all colonial officials (Rivière, 2007). At a time when the emerging discipline was still trying to get a foothold, the first student to register was a woman, Barbara Freire-Marreco, who went on to obtain the diploma in anthropology with distinction in 1907. From 1909 to 1911, she held the prestigious Somerville Research Fellowship, travelling to the United States to pursue ethnographical work while registered as a research student at the University of London, supervised by Professor Hobhouse at LSE from 1909 to 1913 (Scott, 2016). Although she seems not to have completed the doctorate, she was among the first anthropologists (male or female) to undertake intensive fieldwork, making two trips to the southwestern United States between 1910 and 1913. Freire-Marreco was the first of several female anthropologists from this era who attended Oxford University to study at graduate level, sustained by the encouragement of male university tutors in an academic

climate generally discouraging of female participation. London-born **Beatrice Blackwood** (1889-1975), who left Somerville College with a second-class degree in English language and literature in 1912, obtained her Oxford diploma in anthropology in 1918, having been introduced to anthropological research by her friend Maria Czaplicka who started graduate studies at Oxford in 1911. Winifred Blackman joined the following year.

Non-UK. Poor postgraduate provision in this period meant that, upon completing their first degree, some British graduates moved abroad to continue their studies, either to find research training not available at home, or because higher degrees were achievable within less time than at the ancient universities (Simpson, 2009, p.120). It was highly unusual for women to go abroad to obtain a doctorate but not impossible. I found two instances of women with overseas PhD qualifications, both awarded before this degree was introduced into Britain: Beatrice Edgell with a PhD in 1901 from University of Würzburg and Marie Stopes who received her PhD in botany from Munich in 1904, two years after a DSc from UCL. A travelling research fellowship from the University of Wales (her alma mater) had allowed Edgell to attend lectures of the experimental psychologist Oswald Kulpe at the University of Würzburg, where she was the first woman to receive a PhD.

Women studied abroad for different reasons, and not necessarily to gain further qualifications. **Victoria Hazlitt** (1887-1932), a student and subsequently a colleague of Beatrice Edgell, undertook postgraduate research in experimental psychology at the State University of Colorado between 1912 and 1914, before joining the staff of Bedford College where she pioneered work on university selection and animal behaviour (Wilson, 2003). Several women including Mabel Atkinson studied for a time at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. One of seven early women's colleges in the United States (given the name "the Seven Sisters" in 1927), Bryn Mawr was one of the first institutions to offer graduate degrees, including doctorates, to women (Horowitz, 1993). After gaining a first-class classification in both parts of her examinations at Girton, Eileen Power went on to pursue research at the École des Chartes in Paris before enrolling at the LSE to start her thesis. Her letters from Paris to her friend Margery Spring Rice reveal the close friendship that had begun at Girton, as well as her worries about LSE: 'While the letters are full of gossip about

their friends, Eileen also discusses her difficulties with finding the right subject for her thesis and Margery's decisions — and indecisions — about the future' (Pollard, 2020, p.29). Cambridge-educated women like Power were among the best placed to receive one of the travelling scholarships for advanced study that were created to give women a foothold into academia, and in recognition of the barriers against women being able to access mainstream academic funding (Dyhouse, 1995).

5.7 Concluding remarks

Around three quarters of the 188 women in this study benefitted from some form of advanced learning, at times leading to the award of an academic degree. Just over a quarter of the total took advantage of the opportunities afforded by the new social science courses, with those born after 1871 dominating this category. While it is possible that at least some of the women for whom no data are available accessed higher education, it is unlikely that this could greatly change the analysis. That so many had a college or university education is perhaps not surprising given the study's focus on women and intellectual inquiry. The women that feature here were generally middle class. Opportunities for women from working-class backgrounds to get to university were understandably limited. The trade union movement frequently offered these women a route to social science. Moreover, the absence of over 40 women from this chapter illustrates the potential to engage with social science without any formal higher education. Another striking feature is the determination of many of these early students not to go into school teaching. 'That they could avoid this destiny', Rosemary Auchmuty observed, 'indicates either sufficient family means or a stronger sense of an alternative direction' (2008, p.91). Those who received a university education learned also that marriage and motherhood were not necessarily the main purpose of women's existence. As observed elsewhere, they found that they could 'utilise their intellectual skills and a university qualification to secure work opportunities in a range of professional occupations' (Fitzgerald and Collins, 2011, p.29). The different ways in which women engaged in the social sciences during our period is the focus in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6. MAKING A WAY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: PURSUING CAREERS

How should we understand the social sciences around the turn of the twentieth century regarding gender? Whilst we know that their development was 'inextricably linked to the practice of social reform' (Goldman, 1987, p.171), we still do not know very much about the ways that women participated. What kinds of careers in social science were available? Were ambitions frustrated or supported by family? How did gender shape their responsibilities to family and opportunities in the work domain? Were women excluded from the academic sphere or did they follow a non-academic career path by choice? This chapter addresses these questions through an analysis of the career destinations of women active in the social sciences during their formative period. A new perspective helps reassess the historical significance of women who contributed to the production of social (scientific) knowledge from inside and outside the academy.

6.1 "If you compete with us, we shan't marry you"[20]

Feminist criticism of the institution of marriage and women's role within it was a feature of the late nineteenth century. One of the foremost challengers was Mona Caird. She came to prominence when her essay "Marriage" (1888), in which she argued that marriage was a patriarchal system, provoked over 27,000 responses upon its publication in the *Westminster Review*, leading some to describe it as 'the most famous newspaper controversy of the nineteenth century' (Richardson, 2003, p.180). Caird made herself heard but proponents of retaining the marital status quo were more numerous. Crucially, it was still the aim of most women of this generation to marry and have children. To remain single was, as the American historian of Victorian England Lilian Lewis Shiman puts it, to be 'considered superfluous in a society devoted to the nuclear family' (1992, p. 73). The economist Mary Marshall noted that, in the 1860s, 'the notion was common that if a girl did not marry or at any rate become engaged by twenty she was not likely to marry at all' (1947, p.10). Yet, although most women of this generation assumed they would marry and have children, not all women desired marriage. Furthermore, by the second half of the

[20] The quote comes from an exchange between Alfred Marshall and Beatrice Webb, described in *My Apprenticeship* (Webb, 1926, p.300).

century, many women were unable to marry, due to a demographic imbalance between the sexes. The 1851 census had revealed that over a quarter of the female population aged 20 to 40 in England were unmarried, with up to 400,000 more females than males (Worsnop, 1990). Inevitably, not all women would find husbands, a problem that continued into the new century when the First World War increased the gender gap by over a million (Nicholson, 2008).

Contemporary attitudes shifted over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century as the institution of marriage came under scrutiny. Many middle-class families still believed that higher learning would seriously lessen a young woman's chances of finding a suitable husband. At the same time, initial alarm at the growing numbers of unmarried women began to give way to the realisation by many that if daughters were not going to marry, they must be educated so that they could support themselves economically (Levine, 1989). By the turn of the century, parental support for female secondary and higher education was increasingly 'for practical as well as liberal and egalitarian reasons' (Robson, 2016, p.25). Campaigners for women's rights put forward similar arguments.

Unmarried lower-class women usually had no choice but to work outside the home. Married working-class women might have to return to the labour force if their husband's pay was low or if he became sick, disabled, or died, events that happened regularly (Bronstein, 2007). Unmarried women of a higher social class might work rather than rely financially on fathers or brothers, especially in families affected by the late Victorian economic downturn. However, there was a firm expectation that, should they go on to marry, resignation from their posts would immediately follow (Vicinus, 1985). The message to upper- and middle-class women was clear: either they pursued paid employment, or they married.

In the final decade of the century, only around a tenth of all married women worked outside the home. Whilst single women had gained more opportunities, albeit mainly in teaching and office work, feminist scholarship has shown us that married women were formally excluded from most professions and business occupations, curtailing career options. A recent study by Helen Glew (2016) has shown how marriage bars affected women's work in the Civil Service and London County Council, creating a disincentive for women to marry until they were ready to give up work; marriage

itself led almost certainly to withdrawal from the workforce. Research has also highlighted the low rate of marriage amongst women employed in university administration or teaching before the Second World War. Although few co-educational universities operated formal marriage bans in this period (exceptions include Liverpool and Royal Holloway), the expectations of resignation upon marriage were powerful and women lecturers were usually dismissed upon their engagement or immediately following marriage, a pattern that continued into the interwar years (Kirk, 2003).

When we turn to look at the domestic arrangements of the 188 women in this study, we find that marriage was an important stage in the life cycle for a significant number. Many remained unmarried, but it is striking that 60 per cent married at some point in their lives. The age of marriage was widely distributed, a pattern also observed in related studies (Perrone, 1993; Rendel; 1980). Besides, although a small number of the women managed to overcome the practical difficulties and prejudices against combining paid employment with marriage, only a handful attempted to combine a career and children. As detailed below, the overall figures mask wide-ranging motivations and timing of marriage and motherhood which were profoundly influenced by the gendered division of labour during this era as well as wider personal, social and economic circumstances.

At the time of her disastrous affair with Joseph Chamberlain, one of Britain's leading politicians, Beatrice Webb had thought marriage for many women was, at best, a 'speculation in personal happiness' or, at worst, 'another word for suicide' (diary entry, 1 December 1890; Mackenzie and Mackenzie, 1982, p.345). Social and political activist Margaret Harkness, a second cousin of Webb, was one of several women to turn down offers of marriage. Others remained single all their life not by choice. Mary Sheepshanks' autobiography suggests that she was unhappy at not being married and struggled to resign herself to lifelong spinsterhood. Alice Ravenhill's father terminated her engagement three days before the wedding, and she never married.

At least ten members of the group decided against marriage because of their career. Others married only in late middle age so that they could carry on with professional activities for as long as possible. Janet Campbell and Janet Lane-

Claypon were among those affected by restrictive policies regarding the employment of married women. In 1923, Lane-Claypon resigned from King's College for Women to join the Civil Service as an Investigation Officer in the Ministry of Health. She married in 1929 at the peak of her influential career, whereupon she was immediately obliged to resign. Marriage also ended the professional career of the reformer and civil servant, **May Tennant** (1869-1946), who wrote a book on factory legislation in 1896, *The Laws Relating to Factories and Workshops, Including Laundries and Docks* (under her maiden name, Abrahams). In her case, although forced to relinquish her post in 1897 shortly before the birth of her first son, she did not entirely give up her involvement in social investigation or reform and continued to work in a largely voluntary capacity to improve conditions for industrial workers.

It is of little surprise that, while several of the women were married more than once, few were divorced. Because of strict divorce laws, it was extremely difficult for a woman to escape a marriage contract in this period. The Matrimonial Causes Act 1857 had made divorce possible for ordinary people, but it was still prohibitively expensive half a century later. Stigma associated with divorce led couples to consider their social standing (Kha and Swain, 2016). The few cases that I came across appear late in the interwar period. Margery Spring Rice and her second husband were divorced in 1936 (her first husband had died on the Somme). A decade earlier, in 1924, one biographer suggests, it had been the 'stresses at home' in the early years of her second marriage that had led Rice to look for something to 'absorb her considerable energies' (Pollard, 2020, p.77). That year, she began her involvement with the issues of working-class poverty and health and later helped found the National Birth Control Council, which changed its name to the National Birth Control Association in 1931.

Divorce may then have been far more unusual than it is today, but this did not preclude the possibility of marital non-conformity amongst couples of all social classes, as claimed by Ginger Frost's book-length study of cohabitation in nineteenth-century England, *Living in Sin*. According to Frost, growing numbers of women and men throughout the period had begun to form partnerships that 'threw into disarray the traditional definition of marriage' (2008, p.2). Like spinsterhood and

celibacy, cohabitation could be a reaction against the constraints of marriage and the traditional female sphere (Delamont, 1978). Of the women included in this survey who had unconventional personal lives, only a few went so far as to set themselves apart from dominant religious custom and live together without marrying. **Evelyn Sharp** (1869-1955), a Manchester Guardian journalist for over four decades, had a decades-long love affair with Henry Nevinson, the radical journalist whom she eventually married after his wife died. In 1944, aged 68, the Anglican feminist Maude Royden, who wrote on gender politics in books such as *Sex and Common Sense* (1922) and *Beauty and Religion* (1923), married the recently widowed Reverend Hudson Shaw. Her long association with the couple was recounted in the autobiographical memoir, *A Threefold Cord* (1947). As a woman of faith, and unable to marry the man she loved, Royden had conducted an intense but platonic relationship for over forty years. Indeed, most couples in this period, whatever their reservations about the disabilities that marriage gave to women, preferred respectability above notoriety and chose to marry legally. Married status was claimed as a mark of respectability, which women risked if sexual activity outside of marriage became known (Frost, 2008).

Some women discussed here were exceptions to this rule. Various biographers have described the public scandal of the affair by Amber Reeves, as she was known then, and subsequent child, with the much older, and already twice married writer, H.G. Wells when she was 21 and her hurried marriage to a long-time admirer, George Rivers Blanco White. The episode features in the diaries and letters of fellow Fabian Beatrice Webb, who wrote in September 1909 (she discussed this affair before an entry on whether Lords will throw out the budget) of her outrage that Amber had apparently been seduced ‘within the very walls of Newnham, [Wells] having been permitted, as an old friend, to go to her room’ (pp.558-9). Dahrendorf mentions the affair in his history of the LSE since her father was Director of the School at the time, suggesting that Amber ‘almost broke her father’s heart in the process’ (1995, pp.110). Still, remembering this woman solely for her affair with Wells does not do her justice. Though a civil service career ended in 1922 when politicians demanded the resignation of women recruited during wartime, she lectured at Morley College for over 30 years. She wrote several books, both fiction and policy-oriented work on subjects as varied as popular psychology and monetary

theory. One of her most significant contributions, *Ethics for Unbelievers*, aimed to establish ‘a scientific system of morals’ (1949, p.1), independent of religious beliefs and aided by the advent of the social sciences, especially Freudian psychology.

Reeves’ hurried marriage to a long-standing admirer, George Blanco White, before her child by Wells was born suggests her commitment to the principles of free love, which were espoused by some (though certainly not all) Fabians, was short-lived. Other women openly shunned marriage in preference to life-long cohabitation. The abortion researcher and campaigner **Alice Jenkins** (1886-1967), author of *Law for the Rich* (1960), an important book that drew attention to how rich or educated women were getting round the law while poor women had to risk unsafe, illegal backstreet abortions, setting the case for the legalisation of abortion in 1967, remained in a lifelong common-law partnership with William Jenkins, an insurance manager, with whom she had three children. Like **Stella Browne** (1880-1955), a socialist reformer and prominent member of the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, Jenkins’ work was committed to reproductive healthcare reform as a central element of wider changes in attitudes to sex and morality. ‘That her own mother had been a single parent’, her ODNB biographer comments, ‘undoubtedly gave an added depth to Jenkins’ belief in sexual and moral reform’ (Brooke, 2008, p.1).

Often the disregard for propriety, Ginger Frost has argued, ‘was a part of a larger critique … by anarchists, socialists, or feminists’ (Frost, 2008, p.169). A case in point is **Dorothy Evans** (1889-1944), friend of Emmeline Parkhurst and a leading member of the Six Point Group from its launch in 1921. Choosing not to marry, she had a child with a married Labour Party London County councillor and remained a supporter of the rights of unmarried mothers throughout her life. Probably the foremost socialist free union of the late-nineteenth century was that between Eleanor Marx, and the (already married) freethinker Edward Aveling. Marriage, they had argued in an 1886 publication, was ‘worse than prostitution’ (as cited in Frost, 2008, p.205). The couple cohabited for fourteen years after meeting in the Reading Room of the British Museum in its central London location in Bloomsbury, where radical intellectuals including Clementina Black, Beatrice Webb, and Margaret Harkness spent much time researching and socialising (Bernstein, 2013).

That Marx should go as far as living out her politics regarding marriage provoked a spectrum of responses from those around her. Given Beatrice Webb's sexual conservatism, evident throughout her diary, it is unsurprising that she disapproved of Marx's relationship. Remarkably, several female members of the Men and Women's Club (1885-1889), a radical debating society founded by Karl Pearson to encourage scientific investigation of 'all matters … connected with the mutual position and relation of men and women', expressed their concern with regards to Marx becoming a member, in fear that her break with sexual conventions of the day would cast doubt on their own respectability (Porter, 2004). Writing on feminist cultural politics in 1880s London, Donna Hetherington (2014) records how the feminist theorist Olive Schreiner, one of South Africa's earliest major literary figures and author of the widely acclaimed *Women and Labour* (1911), raised her objections to Marx' membership in a letter dated 23 March 1886 to her friend and Club secretary, **Maria Sharpe** (1853-1928), Pearson's future wife. Sharpe, who wrote on prostitution, and whose paper on Henrik Ibsen was presented at one of the final meetings of the Club and published in the *Westminster Review* in June 1889, voiced strong opposition to her membership. Marx declined the invitation.

Another socialist who adopted an unconventional way of life was Grace Oakeshott, though she is hardly a typical example. In 1907, she left her husband of 11 years and gave up a varied career for the Women's Industrial Council by faking her own death and fleeing to New Zealand with her lover, Walter Reeve. It is hard to know why she chose neither to divorce her husband nor live openly with her lover, just as Eleanor Marx had done, but class likely played a role. Her biographer, Jocelyn Robson, suggests the decision was somehow linked to the couple's connections with the Fabian Society and New Fellowship, both of which at the time 'were seeking to establish themselves and attract wide support' within the working-class labour movement (2016, p.52). The respectable, lower-middle class members of these organisations, she argues, did not want to court controversy through toleration of divorce and non-marital cohabitation. Unconventional practices, it was felt, would bring the socialist movement into disrepute, and alienate those they sought to influence.

Childbearing was of central importance to the late-Victorian ideals of womanhood. Yet, while women all over Europe were marrying at a younger age, the number of childless marriages increased, and births decreased. It is estimated that, between the years c.1860-1920, the fertility rate had more than halved (Brookes, 1986). Around a third of my group of women (34 per cent) had children, which is somewhat lower than the general population in this period but higher than the Cambridge graduates studied by Pat Thane (2004). Examination of these women's lives reveals the complex dynamics between work and family across the life course. Amy Harrison and Olive Dunlop were among those who largely, if not completely, abandoned early careers in social science after the birth of their children. Other women engaged in the sorts of social science activities that could be arranged around children, such as researching and publishing privately. Mary Smith, Sybil Neville-Rolfe and **Dorothy Peel** (1868-1934) all fall into this category. A few women interrupted a social science career upon the birth of their first child, returning when the children were much older. For instance, **Mary Higgs** (1854-1937), one of the first women to attend the women's colleges at Cambridge, stayed on at Girton as a member of staff, but left teaching after marriage. She was in her fifties when she returned to social investigation, notably in the fields of unemployment and child development. The names of those who successfully managed to combine marriage and motherhood with a professional position, especially an academic career, are harder to find. LSE's Lillian Knowles, someone who was 'conscious of her almost unique position as a senior female academic in her field' (Berg, 2004, p.1), is notable among those of her generation.

It seems evident from the above that the women in this study rarely had radical views on work and family life. The figures for marriage and maternity are largely on a par with Perrone's (1993) estimates for women academics in England, 1870 to 1930. Relatively few kept diaries or other personal records so we currently know little about whether they chose to avoid or delay marriage for career reasons, or whether they saw this as a sacrifice. Without first-hand accounts it is difficult to analyse the way marital and family status impacted these women. Were career ambitions frustrated or supported by marriage and motherhood? Did women marry men who enhanced their opportunities for practicing social science? Past research on collaborating (social) scientific couples (e.g., Pycior et al., 1996; Oakley, 2021;

Yeo, 2012) has begun to explore such questions, emphasising the importance of a supportive marriage for many scholarly women. Although not discussed in detail here, this theme is touched upon in the next section which examines the variety of routes these women took to advance their interests in social science.

6.2 Career paths within and outside the academy: an overview

Some women pushed beyond the boundaries of traditional gender roles during the period under review. However, we should not underestimate the social constraints put in women's way. While the expansion of secondary and higher education for women and girls in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries created new possibilities, most recent authorities agree that career opportunities for female graduates and other educated women had not kept pace with their supply (Sutherland, 2015; Thane, 2004). University and college records (registers and calendars) make it clear, as earlier commentators have pointed out, that teaching remained a major career outlet for many early female graduates (Burstyn, 1980; Howarth and Curthoys, 1987).

Higher education for women arose, in part at least, out of the need to improve the education of female teachers. Teaching offered an accepted role for women, with growing opportunities as girls' secondary schooling expanded. Writing in 1914, Edith Morley, the first woman appointed to a chair at a British university-level institution (University College, Reading), regretted that so many women appeared to commit themselves to teaching because it appeared to be the only route to obtaining a grant for higher education, and there were few other professions to which they might aspire (Morley, 1914a). Later studies have confirmed that up to 70 per cent of women graduates entered the teaching profession (Sutherland, 2015; Tuke, 1939). At least 15 of the women discussed here taught in schools at some time, including Clara Collet, Eglantyne Jebb, May Smith, **Catherine Gasquoine Hartley** (1866/7-1928), **Winifred Mercier** (1878-1934) and **Margaret Noble** (1867-1911), better known as Sister Nivedita, who had ties with the sociologist Patrick Geddes. Some of these women were doubtless keen to resist teaching as an inevitable next step after graduation. This was true of Margaret Nevinson who recalled in her autobiography, *Life's Fitful Fever* (1926): 'The worst of all my struggle after knowledge was the fact that for young women of my day there was nothing but teaching' (1926, pp.58-9).

For those who sought alternative ways to pursue a life outside the home, teaching might form a significant part of their lives, only until a career opportunity within the social science field presented itself.

Most authorities agree that the work lives of women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries do not fit the modern definition of a career. I follow the example of Pat Thane who has argued that it 'can best be thought of as a series of adjustments in the relation between their private and public lives which enabled them to remain employed' (2004, p.210). As such, I use the term in its broadest sense to include not only full-time, paid positions in the social sciences, but also short-term, voluntary, informal, and freelance activities, paid or otherwise.

Examination of the women's work experiences reveals that their efforts to gain unpaid and paid employment in the social sciences met with varying degrees of success. Fundamentally, women's access in the decades either side of 1900 followed two main paths: within and outside the academy. For the first time, some gained an academic position; a few even went on to academic prominence. Many more women worked outside or, at best, on the margins of academic communities, pursuing their interests in different knowledge sites located beyond the university. While the work lives of earlier generations of women involved in the social sciences resist easy summary, we might say that there were four possible avenues for women at this time: academic social science, independent research, social reform and public service. Table 6.1 displays the distribution across these categories, with information on individual women provided in Appendix 7.

Table 6.1: Career paths (analysis by cohort and whole group)

	Cohort 1 1849-1871	Cohort 2 1872-1891	All
Academic and university[a]	23 (26%)	48 (49%)	71 (38%)
Outside academia	67 (74%)	50 (51%)	117 (62%)
Independent	*29 (32%)*	*12 (12%)*	*41 (22%)*
Social reform	*27 (30%)*	*24 (25%)*	*51 (27%)*
Public service	*11 (12%)*	*14 (14%)*	*25 (13%)*

Totals	90	98	188

Notes:
a. See the main text for the definition of these groupings.

The picture is more complex than the table allows, however, as the categories obscure the variety and complexity of work arrangements. Career was rarely a single distinct stage in the life cycle of this group of women. Different careers blurred and overlapped, and those women who changed careers over their lifetime, or held several positions at once, are especially difficult to place in this scheme. While the patterns that emerge may not be an entirely faithful representation, the comparisons are instructive, nonetheless. The remainder of this section examines the paths followed to illustrate the diversity of situations in which women worked.

6.3 Professionalisation of social science: women in the academic world

One of the most significant struggles of first-wave feminism was to secure access to education the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, 'the influx of women students into British universities', Carol Dyhouse has noted, 'was not matched by any commensurate increase in the appointment of women teachers in these institutions' (1995, p.134). While lack of data means it can be difficult to estimate exactly how many female academics there were in the early period, there is agreement that while women were successful in breaking into a wide range of subject areas in the academy, they constituted only a small minority of university staff (Brooks, 1997; Husbands, 2019; Perrone, 1993). Some limited progress was made by women in establishing themselves as part of a newly emerging profession of university teachers in the University of London and the women's colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, but universities in other parts of the British Isles were generally slower to appoint women. Charting the position of academic women in Scotland, Dyhouse found that 'women with formal teaching appointments are conspicuous mainly through their absence in the Scottish university calendars, at least before 1918'. The University of Edinburgh, she continued, 'does not seem to have appointed women to lectureships before the First World War' (1995, p.135). As well as lack of posts across Britain, women also had to contend with salaries, working environments, and pensions that were inferior to their male colleagues. Much depended, as Edith Morley observed during her study of university teaching

as a profession, on the ‘personal idiosyncrasy’ of department heads and the job title (1914, p.18).

6.3.1 Appointments, obstacles, and opportunities

We know from Maxine Berg’s work on economic historians that some of the first female appointments in higher education were in the social sciences. Extending her work to consider those participating in other emerging fields, I found 40 women who were employed in a college or university, 37 of whom spent most of their academic career at either Cambridge, Oxford, or LSE. Affiliations ranged from full members of staff with long-term formal appointments through to occasional staff often on insecure contracts. The actual tenure of many was rather short. Only a small number gained a secure appointment, and fewer still attained the highest position, that of professor in a co-educational institution. One case is that of Margaret Read, an early social anthropologist who in 1940 was awarded a Chair at the Institute of Education (IOE), University of London. From the Colonial Department at IOE, established in 1927, she worked closely with officials in the Colonial Office and participated in some of the early work of UNESCO and similar organisations (Aldrich, 2002). According to Clive Whitehead (2003), departmental members, including Read, were influential in shaping the British government’s post-war attitudes to colonial education and the health problems of developing countries.

It is worth noting that there was a shortage of positions in higher education for both men and women during the formative period of the social sciences, due in part to their slow development. Many teaching in this period ‘could not expect to draw a sufficient income from lecturing’ (Kadish and Tribe, 1993, p.5). Victor Branford, a central figure in attempts to build a broad-based sociological movement during the first three decades of the twentieth century, never secured a permanent post. He worked on the margins of academic society and, along with his second wife, Sybella Gurney, and Patrick Geddes, led a larger collaborative circle of writers and practical reformers who were committed ‘to the task of institutionalizing Geddes’s conception of sociology and civic action’ (Scott and Bromley, 2013, p.2). Although there were men who were ambiguously situated in the profession, what makes women different is that they were excluded or marginalised from the formal structures of academia purely because they were women. Despite their qualifications and the growing

opportunities due to university expansion, significant barriers to an academic career for women persisted throughout this period. Their difficulty in getting appointed might legitimately be due to the slow development and institutionalisation of their discipline (sociology being a case in point). For women who did find academic work, their unequal status, pay and employment conditions reflected expectations about gender roles and beliefs that women were financially supported by their husbands (Dyhouse, 1995). Whatever the reason for their exclusion, according to estimates obtained by Perrone (1993, p.347), 'few women academics held senior posts in any discipline during the period under review', and the proportion of professors in British universities who were female was negligible until mid-century.

Women were seeking academic appointments at a time the principles underpinning the appointment system began to change from personal patronage to merit and expertise. The shift to open competition, advertised posts and examination performance that took place in this period meant the 'criteria by which to judge quality and competence', Levine (1986, p.158) notes, 'were gradually standardised', although forms of privilege persisted. Personal relationships and connections, however, still brought significant advantages and could help facilitate access for those with the right networks. As Tamson Pietsch writes, 'To navigate the highly gendered terrain of early twentieth-century academia, female scholars frequently required the backing of male colleagues' (2013, p.18). The importance of recommendations is illustrated through Alfred Marshall's attempt to stop the appointment of Ellen McArthur at the University of Cambridge in 1893 by pleading to the Vice Chancellor provides only one example. In McArthur's case, he was unsuccessful at stopping women teaching male students, and she became the first woman lecturer accredited by the Cambridge Local Lectures Syndicate (Erickson, 2018).

Other male scholars demonstrated a more meritocratic attitude towards women graduates seeking an academic career in social science. The economist John Maynard Keynes, one of several men to play a crucial role regarding women's issues, supported Helene Reynard's appointment to a teaching post at King's College for Women. From 'the work that she has done for the *Economic Journal*', he wrote in 1922, 'I should judge her well suited for the post of Lecturer in Economic

and Business Affairs' (as cited in Komine, 2014, p.116). He also assisted Lynda Grier's promotion in 1915 to lecturer of economics at Newnham College. Grier had been encouraged to study the Economics Tripos by Mary Marshall after they met at the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS) and worked with her as a teaching assistant until 1913. 'Personalised systems of trust', Pietsch argues in her work on universities established in Britain's settler colonies in the decades either side of 1900, 'facilitated access to those with the right connections. It meant that … the recommendation of certain individuals could come to acquire especial weight' (2013, p.76). That argument could equally apply to women seeking academic appointments in Britain during this period.

There is not space here to examine all the women who secured a university post, but some cases had features of special interest. Ann Oakley's recent work on women associated with the 'early development of sociological research methods' (2020, p.292) at LSE in the early twentieth century, specifically its Ratan Tata Department, challenges assumptions about the historical record and women's methodological innovation as mixed-method researchers. **Maud Davies** (1876-1913), author of *Life in an English village* (1909), a ground-breaking sociological study of its day set in the Wiltshire parish of Corsley, Mildred Bulkley, Bessie Hutchins, Varvara De Vesselitsky, and Amy Harrison were all interested in what we would refer to today as the applied aspects of social science. 'Their work', Oakley observed, 'combined a sensitivity to social context and lived experience within a framework integrating the drive to social reform with a focus on scientific sociology' (2020, p.292). None of these five women became established academics in permanent roles. In that sense, their situation compared with women's marginal position in professional anthropology.

The first women to build a reputation in the anthropological community, notably Winifred Blackman, Beatrice Blackwood, Maria Czaplicka and Barbara Freire-Marreco, found opportunities in the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, despite barriers to research funding and career progression (Larson, 2021). Unlike most women in the present study, the academic interests of this group were, ostensibly, unconnected to contemporary concerns of public administration and social reform in Britain at the time. Blackman, for instance, spent much of the 1920s and 1930s conducting

ethnographic research in Egypt. Yet, they were not so far removed from the main expert networks and organisations in social reform as might first appear. This is evident in the case of Freire-Marreco. As a folklorist interested in the traditional artefacts of indigenous peoples, she worked for more than a quarter century with the Pitt Rivers Museum, travelling abroad to carry out fieldwork, and contributing to the knowledge about and understanding of the Native American Pueblo Indians (Blair, 2008). During the First World War, we find her working at Barnett House in Oxford and her name appears in the LSE Calendar as an occasional lecturer for courses in sociology (1911-12) and ethnology (1923-24; 1928-29). Of itself, that is unremarkable since sociology and social anthropology are closely related in many aspects. Moreover, although from 'quite early days' LSE anthropologists were 'seeking to emphasise their separateness from sociology', a split did not gather pace until the 1920s (Husbands, 2019, p.29). It is probable that her supervisor, Leonard Hobhouse (recently elected to the newly established Martin White Chair in Sociology), persuaded her to take on this work. Indeed, most teaching at LSE in the early twentieth century was by occasional staff: there was a practice, Husbands notes, 'of securing the services of whoever was available, willing and with a potentially interesting subject' (2019, p.50).

Violet Butler and Julia Mann were among a handful of women who made substantial contributions to Barnett House and research in its early years. Founded in memory of Canon Samuel Barnett, an Anglican clergyman and social reformer who had run Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement, in East London, from the 1880s to his death in 1913, Barnett House was 'not to be another settlement' (Smith et al., 2014, p.11). Rather, the goal was to insert social enquiry into the university curriculum as part of a much broader scheme of social reform, as outlined by **Henrietta Barnett** (1851-1936), Canon Barnett's widow, in the second edition of *Practicable Socialism* (Barnett and Barnett, 1915). Mann was the first woman president of Barnett House, a post she held for four years in the 1950s while also serving as Principal of St Hilda's College. In 1923, she had returned to Oxford from London to replace Elizabeth Levett, the university's first woman economic historian who was also Vice Principal for the institution then known as St Hilda's Hall from 1910 (Offer, 2021). Unlike Mann, Violet Butler was born in Oxford, residing for most of her adult life in the family home of her parents. She gave her time voluntarily to Barnett House for

over 30 years, overseeing the various diploma and certificate courses, among other things, which she did alongside paid undergraduate tutoring in economics at the Society of Oxford Home Students (St Anne's College). Oxford-educated **Grace Hadow** (1875-1940), a prominent figure within the Women's Institute and sister of the leading educationalist and civil servant William Henry Hadow, played a key role in Barnett House in the 1920s, where she implemented her distinctive vision of adult education, particularly for women, as a space for shaping democratic citizens. Some of her ideas are set out in an article published in the *Journal of Adult Education* in 1926, which also described the progress of the National Federation of Women's Institutes. In 1929, she moved on to take up the role of Principal of what would become St Anne's College.

6.3.2 Academic networks of support

Scholars have emphasised the varied strategies used by women to contest the institutional power that preventing them from succeeding in academic life. These include the important influence of women's networks and encouragement from individual scholars, both men and women, who were sympathetic to women's career ambitions in social science during the formative years (Berg, 1992; Delamont, 1978; Martin, 2016; Vicinus, 1985). Academic women at both the women's colleges and co-educational institutions relied on support and encouragement from a network of influential women. There is ample evidence of this if we look to the psychologists at Bedford College, anthropologists at Oxford's Pitt Rivers Museum, economists at UCL, economic historians at LSE, and the group of pioneers in domestic science at King's College, among others. It is also the case that they occasionally worked in close collaboration with male colleagues. Ellen McArthur's long working partnership with William Cunningham is one of the rare examples at the ancient universities (Erickson, 2018). Other cases are to be found in statistics, an academic discipline where I found only a small number of women. Born in 1858, Alice Lee gained her PhD under Karl Pearson's supervision at the turn of the century, before joining UCL's Biometric Laboratory where she worked for almost three decades, 'largely on a voluntary unpaid basis, at least after I907' (Love, 1979, p.152). She also collaborated with the epidemiologist and foremost medical statistician of the first half of the century, Major Greenwood, who had himself studied statistics under Pearson at UCL. From a later generation, we have Janet Lane-Claypon, a colleague of

Greenwood in the 1920s, and the little-known Frances Wood. Though I found no evidence that these three women worked together, it seems probable that they knew of each other's existence since much of their work took place at UCL, although at different times. Lee was connected also to Bedford College and its network of influential women, and Lane-Claypon to King's College for Women.

Frances Wood was a UCL chemistry graduate (BSc 1908) and elected fellow of the Royal Statistical Society. She left UCL to take up a post as research chemist at the Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine (informally known as the Lister Institute), publishing three first-author papers before 1912. In 1910, the institute (by then a school of the University of London) had recruited Greenwood to establish a statistics department. In 1911, Wood began working full-time in medical statistics (Farewell and Johnson, 2016). In October 1912, she became Grocers' Research Scholar at Lister, a post she retained until the outbreak of war. Although hired as a medical statistician, her academic interests were much wider, and she started a DSc project in 1913 to investigate the correlation between home conditions and the mental development of children in elementary schools. In 1913, she published two single-author articles, discussing the inadequacy of the index numbers used by the Board of Trade to measure time trends in rents, wages, and prices (Wood, 1913a; 1913b). She read the first paper, "The Course of Real Wages in London, 1900-12", before the Royal Statistical Society on 18 November 1913. A third article on the topic appeared in 1916, emphasising how the middle classes could accommodate rising food prices by changing the make-up or quality of their diet, whereas the working classes had no such flexibility (Wood, 1916). Since there are no first-hand accounts of her personal experiences of collaborating with male colleagues, we cannot say if she was treated less favourably due to her sex, but tributes written after her premature death, including one written by Greenwood on behalf of the Council of the Royal Statistical Society in the 1920 annual report, suggest that her academic work was highly respected by her male colleagues (M.G., 1920).

6.4 Careers beyond the university

As historian Stefan Collini (2006) reminds us, the received picture of intellectual life in Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially the prestige and authority enjoyed by the intellectual elite, has never been in doubt**.** Still, there

are knowledge(-bearing) institutions besides universities (Fuller, 2009) and one might want to question both the narrowness and gender-blindness of Collini's ideas. There are, Barbara Caine has argued, 'many and different ways in which the term "intellectual" can be understood and used' (2007, p.369). When we turn to look at the lives of women involved in early social science, we encounter an alternative understanding of the definition and role of the intellectual from that offered by Collini. This applies especially to those women who worked outside academic settings in this era and used other venues to pursue social science. Some women worked independently, often without any institutional affiliations or base; others made important contributions conducting research on behalf of social reform organisations or government agencies.

6.4.1 Independent

As shown here, it was relatively common in this period for women to work independently on scholarly projects that they often funded and published at their own expense. This disparate group of independent freelance researchers had the hallmarks of the amateurs of the mid-nineteenth century, of which the main male protagonists were the evolutionary philosopher Herbert Spencer and the industrialist and social reformer Charles Booth, those 'wealthy amateurs with careers elsewhere, academic deviants, or very old men' whom Philip Abrams (1968, pp.103) derided for their role in institutionalising sociology in the early decades of the twentieth century. Their research was conducted within the home or in public spaces like the British Museum's Reading Room, which had opened in 1857 to anyone who could show they were a serious researcher (Bernstein, 2013). They include such women as Barbara Hammond, Helen Bosanquet and Constance Naden, just to name a few, who were able to practice either because of a private income or through the financial support of family or husbands. Katherine Routledge was rich enough to finance her ground-breaking work on the giant stone statues on Easter Island (Rapa Nui) in Polynesia. Other women of this type depended on their writing for their livelihood, often publishing in the London popular press. Examples include Catherine Gasquoine Hartley, Dorothy Peel and **Ada Chesterton** (1869-1962). For married middle-class women, 'private platforms of this kind' (Wisselgren, 2021, p.134) might be the only opportunity to continue their research. Marriage bans, as

Carol Dyhouse (1995) and others have pointed out, meant that academic women were expected to remain unmarried.

Beatrice Webb published extensively on a variety of issues, utilising multiple research methods, and wrote about these in her autobiography (Webb, 1926) and elsewhere. Before collaborating with Sidney Webb in sociological treatises such as *Industrial Democracy* (1897), she had begun her journey as a social investigator a decade earlier, when she used the participant observation method, complete with note taking and informal interviewing, in Lancashire and London's East End (Ardis, 1990; Walsh, 1989). When investigating the tailoring trades for Booth's *Life and Labour*, she worked undercover as a seamstress in several East End workshops to produce an account of the experience. "Pages from a Work-Girl's Diary", published in the *Nineteenth Century* under her maiden name, addressed many of the themes that appear in the ethnographic work of her lesser-known contemporaries: Olive Malvery, Julia Varley, Mary Higgs, and **Martha Loane** (1852-1933), to name a few. Although their participant observation was generally rather short and often exaggerated or omitted important information, these women were among the first to conduct ethnographic studies, practicing the sort of social research that Ross McKibbin has called 'an unselfconscious cultural anthropology' (1990, p.188).

Unlike Webb, Ethel Tweedie has not been extensively studied. The daughter of the renowned Scottish physician, George Harley (of Harley Street, London), Tweedie adopted early ethnographic approaches, although is frequently described as a travel writer. An early member of the Royal Geographical Society, her journeys involved fieldwork research, as part of a 'varied body of writing which … takes travel as an essential condition of its production' (Rubies, 2002, p.244). Born into an early life of wealth and privilege and married to a man who was heir to a considerable fortune, her husband lost much of his money and his premature death in 1896 was followed by that of her father who died suddenly intestate (Tweedie, 1912). Left with no capital or other means of income and two young boys to raise, Tweedie rectified her financial situation through book sales (often writing under the name Mrs Alec Tweedie). Likely because of her own circumstances, she would become an enthusiastic advocate for women's rights, writing in her memoirs: 'It is a cruel thing to let a girl leave a home without a safeguard in proportion to the income of her

family…. Both boys and girls should be treated exactly alike' (1912, p.62). Inheritance laws are also described at some length in a book called *Through Finland in Carts* (1897), a study of Finnish life based on her experiences travelling around the country. A prolific writer, she had started travelling in her twenties and most of her fieldwork was carried out overseas. A notable exception is her an article on petticoat lane, a Sunday outdoor market in London's East End, published in *The Queen*, a weekly society magazine, in 1895. Here, she has more in common with most female ethnographers from this era who used ethnographic research methods to investigate working-class and vagrant life, living among the poor in the slums that blighted towns and cities across Britain, 'observing the underworld while, temporarily, participating in it' (Freeman, 2001, p.99).

6.4.2 Social science and social reform

The larger social reform movement provided another important venue and support for women's involvement in the social sciences in this period. Numerous studies have documented the strong presence of women within organised philanthropy and social reform movements in the nineteenth century, especially towards the end of the century as transport improved. According to historian Frank Prochaska's now classic book, philanthropy was so heavily in women's hands that it had become 'womanized' (1980, pp.223-4). Contemporary estimates suggested that, by the early 1890s, 'half a million women volunteers worked full time in charity and another 20,000 were paid officials in philanthropic societies' (Hubbard, 1893, p.364). Helen Blackburn, a feminist campaigner and an editor of *The Englishwoman's Review* from 1881 to 1890, was one of the first to respond to the demand for information on women's public activities. Among her publications were *A Handbook for Women Engaged in Social and Political Work* (Blackburn, 1881), which showed that a complex web of charities, pressure groups and networks existed for women seeking new forms of professional expertise. It was through such bodies that some women advocated the value of social scientific approaches, convinced that social investigation was a dominant means to achieve social change.

Foremost amongst the earliest organisations pursuing social inquiries was the Charity Organisation Society (COS), established in 1869 as the Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity. Women participated as

members of its board, as visitors who examined applicants for poor relief, and as social researchers (Lewis, 1995). It pioneered an approach to charity and welfare based upon the application of (social) science, with an emphasis on restoring the character of the individual and targeting relief on the "deserving" poor. Helen Bosanquet was one of several key female board members. Other women that, at one time or another, worked with the COS or local equivalents include Anne Cummins, Violet Butler, Margaret MacDonald, Nora Milnes, Margaret Nevinson, and **Cynthia Colville** (1884-1968). Bosanquet remained with COS for most of her life, but Beatrice Webb, Henrietta Barnett and others would end their support over pension reform and other disputes. COS continued to produce research and reports well into the twentieth century, many of them published in the *Charity Organisation Review*, edited from 1909 by Bosanquet.

The Women's Industrial Council (WIC) provided a different perspective on social problems and was a source of detailed investigations and associated publications on the lives of working women. Prominent members were Clementina Black, chair of its Social Investigations Committee; Clara James; Margaret MacDonald; Lucy Wyatt Papworth; and Edith Hogg. Members were often at the centre of other networks, providing important links between organisations (Hannam, 2007). Notable examples include Bessie Hutchins and Dorothea Zimmern (Fabian Society); **Catherine Webb** (1859-1947) (Women's Co-operative Guild); **Ishbel Hamilton-Gordon** (1857-1939) (Women's Liberal Federation); Lily Montagu (National Union of Women Workers); Margaret Bondfield (Women's Trade Union League); and **Mary Macarthur** (1880-1921) (National Federation of Women Workers). Chapter 8 explores the Council's social investigations in a case study from the history of minimum wage laws.

Many members also joined the Fabian Women's Group (FWG), co-founded in 1908 by Maud Pember Reeves and Charlotte Wilson, who before her marriage attended Merton Hall (later Newnham College). Both helped shape the group's ambitious research programme, described in *Fabian Women's Group: Three Years' Work* (FWG, 1911). Whereas the WIC prioritised employment issues (but not exclusively), Fabian women campaigned on a much wider range of equality issues (Alexander, 1995). Charlotte Shaw and Beatrice Webb were also active in the FWG from the start. Another important figure was Webb's niece **Barbara Drake** (1876-1963),

author of *Women in the Engineering Trades* (1917), an enquiry by a Joint Committee of the FWG and the Labour Research Department, in which Drake provided statistics on women's wartime activity and discussed the family wage controversy.

The university settlement movement, Brewis (2014) among others has shown, was instrumental in helping develop a wider culture of British social service in the years around 1900. Although social investigation in some form or another was part of its identity from the start, 'the combination of a focus on social work and a close university connection did not, apparently, favour the development of research' (Oakley, 2017, p.29). Referencing Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and social politics in Victorian London*, Oakley concludes that 'at its most radical, settlement philosophy was about dissolving class inequality; at its most conservative, it could be seen as an aspect of a middle-class "mania for slumming"' (2017, p.22). Women associated with settlement houses include, among others, Eleanor Rathbone, Mary Walker, Henrietta Barnett, Elizabeth Macadam, Mary Stocks, Mary Sheepshanks and **Lettice Jowitt** (1878-1962). Many were members of other bodies dealing with social questions; Clara Collet, for example, continued her association with the Women's University Settlement after her civil service appointment.

Other important reform organisations through which women pursued social inquiries include the Christian Social Union, an Anglican organisation founded in 1889 of which Gertrude Tuckwell was secretary from 1898, and the Glasgow Council for Women's Trades (GCWT). Like other women's organisations that campaigned for improvements in women's working conditions (notably, the Women's Industrial Council and the Women's Trade Union League), an important strategy used by the GCWT to effect change was to prepare draft legislation that could be introduced as a Private Member's Bill by backbench MPs. In 1899, for instance, the GCWT prepared a bill that would require employers to make seating available to their staff, citing research evidence collected by Margaret Irwin (GCWT secretary from 1895). Introduced by John Denny (Conservative MP), the bill passed on second attempt, resulting in the Seats for Shop Assistants Act 1899. Irwin outlines the background to the bill in her article, "The Shop Seats Bill Movement" (1899), published in the *Fortnightly Review*.

Many of these organisations relied heavily on wealthy patrons to finance their activities. Since investigators were predominantly unpaid, they tended to be middle-class women, for whom voluntary work was more socially acceptable than a paid job. Some, like the social welfare and education reformer Violet Markham, who in 1904 produced a report examining the Chinese labour question, were independently wealthy and able to live without a salary. Others were salaried social work professionals or committed to other professions. Ethel Bentham, for example, was one of several physicians who carried out social research. Perhaps her most enduring contribution lies in *Round About a Pound a Week* (Reeves, 1913), a pioneering sociological study based on a four-year investigation into the domestic lives of working-class families with new babies living in Lambeth in South London, carried out by members of the Fabian Women's Group's Motherhood Special Fund Committee, led by Maud Pember Reeves and Charlotte Wilson.

Some reformers who conducted social research had little or no formal social science training. Others had university qualifications in economics, psychology or another of the other emerging disciplines. Like many women entering higher education in the early 1870s, the FWG's Charlotte Wilson attended Cambridge without taking degree exams. Still, she left 'with a fluency in the language of positivist social science, an ability to engage in masculine discourse about economics and evolution that made hers one of the handful of female voices audible in radical debates' (Hinely, 2012, p.11). Evelyn Fox was among several university-educated women who would later qualify for a career in social science by training at one of the settlement houses.

There are several cases of social reformers building strong connections with universities. Helen Bosanquet was active in developing theoretical and practical training for social workers, including the syllabus of the COS's London School of Sociology and Social Economics, founded in 1902, which was absorbed into LSE's new Department of Social Science and Administration in 1912 (Bosanquet, 1914). Another case is that of Mary Walker. She helped establish the first social work programme run by the University of Dundee (St Andrews), involving a partnership between the university; the Dundee Social Union; and the Grey Lodge Settlement, the first residential settlement in Scotland that she established. The Dundee School of Social Studies opened in 1920 with seven students (Watson, 2001). It is also

significant that some of the women in this category had university appointments at some point in their lives. **Dorothy Keeling** (1881-1968), who Peter Fearon suggests 'dominated the social work profession' (2015, p.445) through the Liverpool Personal Service Society that she and Eleanor Rathbone founded in 1919, is one of many examples. She gave occasional lectures at Liverpool University and researched moneylending in the city in the early 1920s.

6.4.3 Expertise in and around government

The third type of arena relates to the state and its expanding structure of knowledge institutions. Martin Bulmer (1982) and subsequent commentators have documented how the new social legislation introduced between 1870 and 1920 increased the demand for trained social scientists in and around government. Despite wider recognition of the significance of these developments, and some research in this area (e.g., Harrison, 1998; Wheeldon, 2014; Zimmeck, 1988), the historical experiences of women who conducted social research after taking up expanding opportunities in statistical offices or higher levels of the Civil Service remain under-studied.

The Scottish political activist **Minna Cowan** (1878-1951) might be considered under this category. A graduate of Girton College, her MA was awarded by Trinity College Dublin when it offered *ad eundem* degrees. She later completed a social science diploma at the University of Edinburgh and spent much of her career as an educational administrator in the city. Few surviving records of her early life remain, but obituaries refer to an educational pioneer well-known in her day as the author of *The Education of the Women of India*, which proposed solutions 'on Indian and womanly lines' (Cowan, 1912, p.222). Memoirs by Rose Squire, Adelaide Anderson, Hilda Martindale, Clara Collet, and **Janet Courtney** (1865-1954) are amongst those that provide a window into attitudes to women's appointments and the changing role of knowledge and expertise in government in the decades around 1900, especially the statistical work of the Labour Department at the Board of Trade (Ministry of Labour) and in the Home Office.

Collet's diary for August 1910, for instance, records her thoughts on the way that Winston Churchill, then in a Cabinet role as President of the Board of Trade, and male civil servants treated her. At this time, she was working to ensure that

amendments were made to the Labour Exchange Bill to improve the provision for women within that legislation. ‘Mr Askwith’, she commented, ‘aims at treating me like a man … all the others treat me with a little more consideration because I am a woman, but quite rightly don’t put themselves out for me & [*sic*] treat me as a colleague’ (cited in McDonald, 2004, p.156). Though still relatively unknown today, Collet had been an influential force for government reforms on matters concerning women’s employment. ‘Throughout her active life it was to her that one naturally turned for help, if one was concerned with any problem of women’s work or wages’, was the praise given by Arthur Bowley, LSE’s first statistician and one of the consultants regularly employed by the Board of Trade (1950, pp.409-10).

Committees of inquiry were an important means by which social science could contribute to the practice of government during this period (Bulmer, 1980). Harrison (1998) has examined the work of women who participated in social investigations that were made within the royal commissions system. Relevant skills and expertise were essential requirements for these posts, as revealed in the announcement in the *Manchester Guardian* on 4 February 1892 of Clara Collet, Eliza Orme, May Tennant, and Margaret Irwin as the four women Assistant Commissioners appointed to investigate female employment for the 1892 Royal Commission on Labour. Their report was published the following year (Orme et al., 1893). All four women were, or had been, involved with the Women’s Protective and Provident League (later the Women’s Trade Union League), ‘although that was not the only determining factor in their appointments’ (Harrison, 1998, p.125). In the 1890s, there was what Girton educated Adelaide Anderson recalled in her memoirs, a ‘new movement for applying scientific knowledge’ (1922, p.18). Her first civil service job was as a clerk appointed to the Royal Commission on Labour. In 1894, she applied for a position as a factory inspector, and three years later was made Principal Lady Inspector and headed the Women’s Branch until its merger with the general Inspectorate in 1921. Following her attendance at the Thirteenth International Conference of Hygiene and Demography held in Brussels in 1903, she played an important part in institutionalising fatigue research in Britain, which as Blayney argues, was becoming ‘the basis of a new British science of work and of the working-class body’ (2019, p.314).

Several of those who practiced social science from inside government, including Glasgow-born **Mary Paterson** (1864-1941), one of the first female factory inspectors, exercised influence through work done in parallel and in dialogue with bodies such as the Women's Industrial Council. Some had strong connections to academia. Clara Collet, for example, maintained a long association with the University of London and was a Governor of Bedford College (McDonald, 2004). In common with other female civil servants, she published some of her work in scholarly journals. **Myra Curtis** (1886-1971) is another example. She wrote on public administration topics in the 1930s and 1940s, published mainly in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, and *Public Administration*, but is perhaps best known for leading an inquiry into children in public care, established as part of post-war reconstruction efforts. Influenced by 'broad insights from psychoanalytically informed child psychology' (Lynch, 2020, p.3), the recommendations of the Report of the Care of Children Committee (1946), more commonly known as the Curtis Report, were substantially implemented by the Children Act 1948, which established a comprehensive childcare service across Britain.

6.6 Concluding remarks

The short biographies in this chapter have highlighted the wide range of work undertaken by early women in social science. The careers of these women resist easy categorisation and not all of them fit neatly into categories. However, I suggest that women belonged to four broad groups of academics, independent scholars, social reformers and government researchers. Around a third of the oldest subjects (those born 1849-1871) were academics employed as university teachers or researchers; two thirds followed a non-academic path, pursuing social science as independent scholars, social reformers or government researchers. The pattern had changed by the time the later generation (those born 1872-1891) reached adulthood, with the academic and non-academic groups being roughly equal in size. The swing towards academic careers had almost entirely been the result of a decrease in the proportion of independent scholars. At the level of individual experience, women's involvement in social science blurred and undermined these categories and many can be understood as working across and beyond boundaries. A few women enjoyed a single occupational identity throughout their entire career, either inside or outside the academy. Many more experienced more than one career

over the course of their lives, of whom some worked in non-academic roles as a precursor to gaining an academic post. Women often worked across multiple institutions and locations, moving relatively freely between the sites open to them.

CHAPTER SEVEN: PRODUCING AND MOBILISING KNOWLEDGE

While there can be no doubt about the obstacles and exclusion facing women in the decades either side of 1900, it is apparent that there was agency in this period. Women promoted and engaged in social science in greater numbers than previously thought. During my research I sifted through nearly 800 names, and by the end I had created a searchable database with 188 biographical records in it. In addition to prominent women studied by previous scholars, some of whom are well known, though not necessarily for their interest in social science, my research identified many others who had until now been much less well-known.

This chapter gives attention to the scholarship activities and research conducted by these women, and the different communication channels used by writers to spread and share new knowledge with wider audiences. The major focus is on policy-oriented research, although the broad scope of the study inevitably limits the detail with which I am able treat individual texts. I draw on important work on research utilisation, to emphasise relationships, collaborations and other interactive mechanisms relied upon to influence different policy actors (Weiss, 1979; Gough and Boaz, 2017). The chapter concludes with some closing remarks.

7.1 Producing knowledge

What is perhaps surprising is that women included in this survey contributed extensively to scholarship during the formative years, a time when number of publications, and especially academic journals, did not play the dominating role in professional career structures that they do today. The majority appear to have had publication careers that were limited and short, but at least 20 women had ten or more publications during the period. At the other end of the spectrum, over 100 women had fewer than three references during this period. The average was around two publications, when all co-authors for multi-authored works get equal credit. Among those that appear at this stage in the research to have authored a single (social science) publication are Ellinor Black, Alice Clark, Myra Curtis, Dorothy Thurtle, **Elizabeth Abbott** (1884-1957), **Rachel Crowdy** (1884-1964), **Mary Sargant Florence** (1857-1954), **Cicely Hamilton** (1872-1952) and **Dorothy Tennant** (1855-1926). Another is **Agnes Foxwell** (1871-1957), author of *Munition*

Lasses (1917), who studied at Bedford College and UCL and was awarded an MA in literature by the University of London in 1910 and a DLitt in 1914. The earliest publications appeared in the 1880s, written by Beatrice Webb, Margaret Harkness, Eleanor Marx, Clementina Black, Sophie Bryant, Ada Heather-Bigg, Maria Sharpe and Henrietta Barnett. None of these women held a formal academic position. Six women were still publishing in the 1960s: Barbara Freire-Marreco, Alice Jenkins, Vera Anstey, Helena Wright, Dorothy George and Margaret Read.

Some women are now known to have contributed to research but were not given credit. **Ella Pycroft** (1854-1943) comes to mind. A Devonshire doctor's daughter who became a lifelong friend of Beatrice Webb, she is not listed as an author of Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People in London*, undertaken between 1886 and 1903. Investigations by Kevin Bales have identified that she did contribute to Booth's inquiry into the working classes, 'particularly by supplying the data collected for the Poverty Series on the Katherine Buildings and by conducting an extensive questionnaire on the buildings' (1996, p.130). The issue of authorship credit also emerges for research carried out by women's organisations. A good example would be a book authored by Violet Butler, *Domestic Service: An Enquiry by the Women's Industrial Council*, published in 1916. Butler wrote about the methods of this four-year investigation into the conditions of women's labour in the preface, adding that 'almost the whole burden' of the enquiry fell on Barbara Drake, Hon. Secretary to the Education Committee as well as 'to Miss M.G. Skinner, Miss W. Rintoul, Miss Catherine Webb and Miss H.G. Hale, who spent much time in examining, collecting and sorting the unwieldy material' (1916, p.6). Despite their contributions, none of these women are credited with authorship. Likewise, Evelyn Sharp is among those whose contribution to research conducted by the Council is revealed in personal accounts rather than authorship. She recorded in her autobiography, *Unfinished Adventure*, that, alongside 'spasmodic excursions into philanthropy', she had 'helped the Women's Industrial Council in one of their investigations' (2009 [1933], p.129).

Although not all the women included in this survey published, it is clear from even a relatively cursory survey that most did. To provide greater visibility to these women and their research, Appendix A.6 presents a working bibliography of relevant works

authored by the women. This is not a comprehensive survey. A more complete list for women who wrote on economics topics is available in Madden et al. (2004) and for female anthropologists in Larson (2021). The considerable output of Beatrice Webb is brought together in LSE's digital library, *Webbs on the Web Bibliography* (http://webbs.library.lse.ac.uk/). For an unknown number of women, the items presented almost certainly under-represent the actual number of publications. Nonetheless, the list reveals the breadth of publication subject matter and that many women were fairly prolific in the field. Details on where they published also indicates the varied avenues open to (and used by) women to share and spread new knowledge in this period.

The women discussed here championed a diversity of methods of enquiry in a changing environment that saw the successful penetration of more scientific approaches to social questions**.** Empirical research that relied on the gathering of statistical data, qualitative fieldwork evidence, primary historical materials, government documents, or some combination of these sources of evidence, dominated, although the writings of some women were more theoretical or interpretative than empirical in content. Women used the latest methods in statistics, including procedures introduced by Karl Pearson: the phi coefficient for discrete variables and the chi-squared goodness-of-fit test (Higgs, 2000). Some pioneered new approaches. The epidemiologist Janet Lane-Claypon, for example, conducted what was probably the first major cohort study, investigating the growth of babies in London and Berlin, reported to the Local Government Board. Based on the findings, she advocated adopting Kindersyl, the German welfare policy for children (1912).

Of those that showed a marked historical or philosophical bent in their writing, few were interested in history or theory for its own sake. In 1901, the *Contemporary Review* published a theoretical essay by Helen Bosanquet on popular reading. Some of Janet Courtney's work might fall into the same class. *Freethinkers of the Nineteenth Century*, which finds inspiration in the radical, secular freethinkers of this period, sets out to explore the roots of liberty and democracy (Courtney, 1920). Women were among the first to challenge tenets of Alfred Marshall's vision of neoclassical economics (Pande and Roy, 2021). Madden and Persky found that activists from the Women's Co-operative Guild 'generated key theoretical insights'

on topics that ‘few traditional economics considered at all’ (2018, p.166). Beatrice Webb made several important contributions on worker cooperatives and defined the notion of collective bargaining, first used in 1891. Webb described Marshall’s reaction to her proposed enquiry at length in a diary entry dated March 8, 1889: ‘There are any number of men who could write a history of Co-operation, and would bring to this study of a purely economic question far greater strength and knowledge than you possess ... A book by you on the Co-operative Movement I may get my wife to read to me in the evening to while away the time, but I shan’t pay any attention to it’ (Webb, 1926, p.301).

As attention turned to standards of living in the late nineteenth century, economics also began to show increased interest in the role consumers play in the world economy (Trentmann, 2006). In 1871, William Stanley Jevons, then Cobden Professor of Political Economy at Owens College, Manchester, had published his *Theory of Political Economy*. ‘The theory of economics’, he wrote, ‘must begin with a correct theory of consumption’ (Jevons, 1970 [1871], p.103). Professional economists were not alone in showing interest in consumption and consumer activism (so-called ethical consumerism) in this period. Consumerism was conceived as a means of female empowerment by such women writers as Caroline Foley, Clementina Black and the almost-forgotten feminist theorist and activist Teresa Billington-Greig, who addressed the gendering of economics with an argument for stronger links between consumers and organised labour. Billington-Greig’s inspiration came from Charles Gide, the French economist. ‘The nineteenth century has been the century of producers,’ Gide told his students in 1898: ‘Let us hope that the 20th century will be that of consumers’ (as cited in Trentmann, 2016, p.18). In emphasising the vital role that women consumers play in the world economy, Billington-Greig’s inquiry, *The Consumer in Revolt* (1912), advocated a feminist liberation through consumer direct action and a greater role for women in public office: ‘the economic reorganisation of the world’, she wrote, ‘can only come when woman is active and free’ (1912, p.61). Writing about the history of women’s participation in consumer politics in the *Historical Journal*, Matthew Hilton has noted that the vision of a ‘feminine public sphere of consumption’ advocated by Billington-Greig ‘mirrors much recent historical investigations of the marketplace which explore

the range of interactions between women consumers and political issues' (2002, p.105).

While one could potentially make a case for ground-breaking contributions by individual women in every emerging social science discipline, it would be impossible to cover everything in a single chapter. It is difficult to make a clear assessment, however, since women often did not describe how they conducted their investigations (Beatrice Webb is the most notable exception). Ann Oakley's recent evaluation of research produced by the Women's Industrial Council refers to trailblazing methodology: 'they trialled many innovative methods that are taken for granted as methodological tools today: surveys, interviews, questionnaires, personal and household budgets, participant observation, covert ethnography, and secondary data analysis' (2019, p.374). Recent analysis of the writings of the Women's Co-operative Guild is more critical: 'objectivity and representativeness of the data can be questioned in Guild writing…. Samples were not random, questionnaires were often biased, historical observations were idiosyncratic, and conclusions were readily drawn' (Madden and Persky, 2018, p.514). It is important to remember that women's scholarly work was not so different from men in this respect. As others have noted, many of the debates generated by Booth and Rowntree's investigations were methodological and there have been waves of criticisms against their work (Acosta, 2017; Bulmer, 1981; Freeman, 2001; Yeo, 1996). The statisticians of the Royal Statistical Society were critical in their reception of Booth's work, as were Simey and Simey (1960) writing half a century later who thought it 'repetitive and diffuse' (cited in Bales, 1999, p.157). Rosemary O'Day concluded that Booth's fieldwork methodology raised 'the whole issue of bias and of the nature of the interaction of interviewer and interviewed' (1989, p.375). In the 1920s, despite the pioneering work of Arthur Bowley on representative sampling, 'even within the Royal Statistical Society, the drawing of a biased sample was accepted as a "fact of life"' (Ayrton, 2017, p.11).

Early women writers operated within the limit of social science at the time. They could be vigilant in noting study limitations and some explicitly downplayed claims to scientific rigour. Beatrice Webb, for instance, was conscious of criticisms directed at Booth's use of informants for *Life and Labour*, what she termed 'wholesale

interviewing', noting in a diary entry that this method 'blocked the working of personal bias'. Every individual that came to the interview 'had doubtless his own predilections', she explained, but 'with so large a group of witnesses … different types of prejudice cancelled out' (Webb, 1926, pp.196-8). Several women acknowledged that their evidence was insufficient for statistical generalisations. In 1917, for instance, the *Sociological Review* published Nora Milnes's study of families in the East End of London, "Some Aspects of the Infant Welfare Question", in which the author stated: 'It is admitted that the conclusions drawn in this article are obtained from but a slight basis of statistics. But it is hoped their publication may encourage others who have at their disposal information similar to that here used, to examine it critically' (1917, p.123). Janet Campbell, a highly respected public health specialist who had helped in preparing the 1923 Hadow Report, *Differentiation of the Curriculum for Boys and Girls Respectively in Secondary Schools*, wrote an introduction to *Working-Class* Wives by Margery Spring Rice and the Women's Health Enquiry Committee (WHEC) in which she emphasised that that the quantitative evidence was for illustrative purposes only: 'The WHEC does not claim that the evidence collected provides sufficient material for a statistical report'. Rather, she noted, 'the stories … describe in the words of the women themselves, most poignantly and movingly, the life which is the lot of many' (Rice, 1939, p.xii). This may also suggest WHEC's recognition that research need not be perfect to be useful, though it does need effective communication to reach a wider audience.

7.2 Mobilising knowledge and connections

Nowadays, it is often taken for granted that publication in a scientific journal is the recognised way to communicate research findings. Through to the early twentieth century, however, different communication channels were open and 'other modes of publication and dissemination were equally acceptable' (Leonards and Randeraad, 2010). Writing about the 'shifting forms and functions of the scientific journal' in the nineteenth century, Sally Shuttleworth and Berris Charnley describe how they formed part of a 'web of interactions between different printed forms', written correspondence or other personal communications, and 'the spoken word and performance' at different venues including professional organisations, learned societies, and congresses (2016, p.298).

As noted by Kristine Larsen, ‘excluding women from the official roles and meetings of scientific societies in Britain was the norm in the nineteenth century’ (2017, p.20). It was not until 1913 that the Royal Geographical Society finally admitted women, after the ‘conclusion of a protracted debate extending over twenty years’ (Bell and McEwan, 1996, p.295). Another notable case is the Royal Society (founded in 1660), the UK’s national academy dedicated to scientific research, which did not elect the first female Fellows until 1945. ‘Acrimony’, Claire Jones has shown, ‘was not unusual when the question of women’s admission to societies was raised’, and heated arguments could spill over into the public domain, appearing on the letters page of *The Times*. Women’s exclusion, she continued, ‘hindered women’s access to networks, libraries, grants and collaboration, and made the career landscape very different for women than for men’ (2019, p.240).

Even so, women were active in several societies and professional associations founded as platforms for the growing interest in, and professionalisation of, the social sciences: the Royal Statistical Society and the Royal Anthropological Institute, among others. In some cases, women took key roles in these bodies. For instance, Sybella Gurney was a founding member of the Sociological Society (1903-), formed to promote the establishment of the subject and the *Sociological Review*, originally the *Sociological Papers* (Scott and Bromley, 2013). LSE academic Eileen Power was the core of the Economic History Society from its foundation in 1926 (Berg, 1992). In 1930, Beatrice Edgell became the first woman president of the British Psychological Society. It had accepted women from its formation in 1901 following a gathering of nine men and one woman, Sophie Bryant, at UCL (Jackson, 2019).

UCL was also the setting for the inaugural meeting in 1890 of the British Economic Association, renamed the Royal Economic Society upon receiving a Royal Charter in 1902. Convened by Cambridge Professor Alfred Marshall, and ‘influenced by foreign models, such as the German body Verein für Socialpolitik, founded in 1887, and the American Economic Association inaugurated in 1885’, this meeting brought together 200 people from disparate backgrounds, including leading academics, politicians, social philanthropists, and journalists (Winch, 1990, p.7). At least ten women were in the audience, five of whom are in this study: Sophie Bryant, who a decade later would help establish the psychological society, Mary Marshall, Clara

Collet, Ada Heather-Bigg and Caroline Foley. Among other women present were the leading suffragist Millicent Fawcett, and Octavia Hill, social reformer who built improved housing and campaigned to preserve open spaces (Preston, 2018). Despite their small numbers, women were clearly thought important enough to be personally invited by Marshall, and their names included in a list of around a third of all persons present, in a report of the proceedings at the Association's inaugural meeting, published in the first issue of the *Economic Journal* (The Editor, 1891, p.3). Formal admission of suitably qualified women into the newly founded Association and Journal was another matter. Despite initial resistance from some of the economic elite, women eventually gained access to both. Collet later served on the Royal Economic Society Council, from 1918 to 1940 (McDonald, 2004). The Association initially had limited objectives, being formed 'for the advancement of economic knowledge by the issue of a journal and other printed publications', as recorded in the first resolution put before the inaugural meeting (The Editor, 1891, pp.3-5). It was slow to establish itself in other areas. Perhaps most surprising, as Bob Coats highlights, there was 'a curious reluctance to hold periodic meetings or conferences with formal papers and discussions' (1968, p.362) like the Royal Statistical Society.

Founded in 1834, the Royal Statistical Society was one of the first professional bodies to admit women. On 16 March 1909, over fifty years after Florence Nightingale became the Royal Statistical Society's first female member, Bessie Hutchins' paper, "Statistics of Women's Life and Employment", was read and discussed before fellows and their guests. Subsequently published in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, her discussion paper was, as she put it, 'an endeavour to show what information can be gleaned from the statistics now available as to the position of women … in regard to life, employment and the family, with special attention to the comparative numbers of men and women' (Hutchins, 1909, p.205). The article signals that, of the eight respondents, four were women: Margaret MacDonald, Clementina Black, Gertrude Tuckwell, and **Constance Smith** (1859-1930). MacDonald spoke at the meeting about how Hutchins' paper had raised the important issue of the Census and ways in which it was unsatisfactory for studying women.

It took much longer for the first women to be elected as Fellows of the British Academy, the UK's national academy for the humanities and social sciences since 1902. Beatrice Webb was the first woman to be admitted, nominated by the economist John Maynard Keynes, who first raised the issue of female membership in January 1930 in a letter to William Robert Scott, the Adam Smith Professor of Political Economy at Glasgow University. Referring to a list of fellowship candidates including LSE economic historian Richard Tawney and William Beveridge, then Director of the LSE, Keynes remarked: 'one or other of the Webbs (are women eligible for the Academy?) is … the most eminent worker in the field not yet recognized in this way. Mrs Webb ought to be given O[rder] of M[erit] and is perhaps the most eminent Englishwoman living' (cited in Winch, 2014, p.765). Keynes' nomination was rejected but he proposed Webb again the following year: 'On grounds of Eminence in Economic Science and more particularly in Economic Institutional and Local Government History and influence on the politico-economic thought and practice of her time through her writings, her personality and her membership of numerous Royal Commissions and Government Commissions' (cited in Thane 2020, p.148). Despite opposition (Herbert Foxwell, for example, was hostile in part due to disagreements between UCL, where he was Professor of Political Economy, and LSE) Webb was elected in 1931. Although, as Pat Thane has noted, she gave little time to the Academy, Webb's election as the first female Fellow signaled her contemporary reputation as a social scientist.[21]

A proficient and prolific author, Webb contributed to numerous pamphlets, reports, published lectures, periodicals, and books. She is notable not only for the number of publications, but for having researched for, or on behalf of, many different organisations. The cultivation of a wider audience for her ideas was partly accomplished through use of various modes of publication and dissemination to package research insights for academic and policy audiences as well as 'those in the wider society who would or could listen' (Barker, 2014, p.42). For the reading public especially, periodicals played a greater role than books in shaping their understanding of (social) scientific ideas and developments (Cantor et al., 2004). A

[21] That no other women were elected until the mid-1940s, when Gertrude Caton-Thompson (archaeologist) and Helen Cam (historian) were elected, illustrates the challenges experienced by women to attain recognised success.

main publication outlet was scholarly journals, but they had to compete with other periodicals such as magazines, proceedings, and transactions of learned societies (Csiszar, 2018). Until well into the twentieth century, however, there was no clear division between different types of periodicals; most provided broad authorial access and had different if partly overlapping readerships (Coats, 1993).

Though their share of authorships never was large, women authors were present in the major founding journals of the modern social sciences in the English language, often from their earliest years. These include *The Economic Journal* (1901-present); *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (1838-present); *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (1886-present); *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1872-present); *Economic Review* (1891-1914), *Sociological Review* (1903-present); *Eugenics Review* (1909-1968); *Folklore* (1890-present); *Economic History Review* (1927-present); *Economica* (1921-present); *Mind* (1876-present); *Public Administration* (1923-present). The following examples give readers a brief insight into the diverse aspects of their scholarly work.

Women were among the earliest contributors to the *Economic Journal,* edited in its early years by Francis Edgeworth, appointed Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford University in 1891 and noted now as one of the earliest econometricians. The journal was at the forefront of the British Economic Association's activities from its early years. It had appeared after some delay in March 1891, two months after a rival periodical, the *Economic Review*, edited in Oxford by a group of social reformist clerical dons, appeared as the first economics quarterly in Britain. As a major contribution to the analysis of women in wage labour, Clara Collet's research article on women, work and wages in Leeds, largely in the textile industry, was published in Volume 1 of the *Economic Journal*, appearing alongside articles by leading male figures, including William Cunningham, Leonard Courtney, and F.W Maitland. Another three former UCL students, all of whom had also been at the inaugural meeting of the British Economic Association, also had articles published in its early issues, on the economics of fashion (Foley, 1893), educational finance (Bryant, 1894), and wives' economic contribution to family income (Heather-Bigg, 1894). Sophie Bryant's economic analysis of school funding, which was published the year before she succeeded Frances Buss as headmistress

of North London Collegiate School, suggested that ‘achievement of fair pay for women in teaching might help in encouraging broader equalisation of pay through society’ (Preston, 2018, p.21). Bryant and Heather-Bigg did not write again for the *Economic Journal*, but Foley later wrote an article on conditions in ancient India, published under her married name (Rhys Davids, 1901). All four women began teaching economics in one form or another. In the academic year 1902-03, for example, Collet delivered three lectures at UCL on “Economic Questions Requiring Medical Answers” as part of a programme that also included Arthur Pigou and George Yule, as UCL adapted to the reorganisation of the University of London as a teaching body and the founding of the London School of Economics, which was now by and large ‘dictating the development of the social sciences in Britain’ (Maloney, 1993, pp.32-3). Of the four women, only Foley ever held an academic position, joining Victoria University (today University of Manchester) in 1910 and the School of Oriental Studies, later renamed the School of Oriental and African Studies, in 1918.

The principle institutional rival to Cambridge economics was *Economica*, a quarterly publication of the London School of Economics, which was launched in 1921**.** In its early years, it covered all aspects of faculty work (Coats, 1993), and featured articles such as Morris Ginsberg’s work on the scope of sociology, published in 1927 (two years before he succeeded Hobhouse to the Martin White Professorship). In 1921, Minnie Haskins published an article on the foundations of industrial welfare with another female researcher in LSE’s Ratan Tata Department which promoted ‘a spirit of co-operation’ between the ‘employer on the one side and the vast army of workers who are employed on the other’ (Haskins and Kelly, 1921, pp.116-121). In the same journal issue is an article on trade depression by **Mabel Buer** (1881-1942), then lecturer in economics at University College, Reading. The geographer Hilda Ormsby published three reviews of books in the early 1930s. Each of these women (Haskins, Buer, Ormsby) had studied and then taught at LSE in the first half of the twentieth century. Other regular female contributors to *Economica* are from a later generation and so fall outside the scope of this study. Nonetheless, they offer useful insights into the significance of the women considered here. The economist Eveline Burns provides one example. Born in 1900, she had earned her PhD at LSE in 1926 before emigrating to the US where she joined the School of Social Work,

Columbia University (Kasper, 2012). An expert in labour economics and social security policy, her published work acknowledged the contributions of Eleanor Rathbone to the economics of family endowment for the US (Burns, 1925).

The British media landscape at that time also included a wide variety of more peripheral, though sometimes highly influential, political and literary periodicals aimed at general readers, many of which had existed for decades by the time women wrote for them, and all of which shaped the reading habits of an emerging mass audience (Coats, 1993). These included feminist periodicals that emerged in this period, notably the *Englishwoman's Review of Social and Industrial Questions,* published in England from 1866 to 1910, the highly politicised *Quarterly Review* (1809-1967) and its main rival the Whig-supporting *Edinburgh Review* (1802-1929), as well as the *Westminster Review* (1824-1914), a Benthamite product founded to promote the philosophy and policy proposals of the Philosophical Radicals and Utilitarians.

Several authors discussed here were associated with academic journals (some with a specific publication), but many other women tried to reach wider audiences aimed to draw the government's attention to reform objectives. Examples of published campaign advocacy include a series of influential articles by Irish-born **Anna Martin** (1858-1937) published in *The Nineteenth Century and After*, a monthly review magazine founded as *Nineteenth Century* in 1877, which 'acted as an open forum for writers and authors, and printed stories about national and international affairs' (Knüsel, 2012, p.17). Martin, a social worker associated with the Bermondsey Settlement founded by Methodist minister John Scott Lidgett in 1892, wrote about the women of Rotherhithe from, as she put it, 'the point of view of someone whose knowledge of the subject … comes from many years' close intercourse with poor working-women living in a London waterside district' (1913, p.56). Although the methodology lacks rigour, her two-part article, "Working-Women and Drink" (1915; 1916) provided timely evidence to attack government measures to monitor the wives of sailors and soldiers who received separation allowances from the War Office.

Research produced by women appeared also in the form of whole books, book chapters, articles in anthologies, reports, tracts, and pamphlets published by major as well as smaller publishers, including Duckworth and Co.; George Allen and

Unwin; and Longmans, Green and Co. There are numerous studies connected with non-academic organisations such as the Fabian Research Department; the Scottish Council for Women's Trades in Glasgow; and the Women's Industrial Council, which had branches in London and in the provinces, including Liverpool. Reports of the WIC's social investigations were published in book form and in its own quarterly publication, *Women's Industrial News*, edited for a time by Bessie Hutchins. To reach broader audiences, some women went on to publish the work carried out by (or on behalf of) bodies like the WIC as articles in academic journals. This could bring attention to a researcher and may have been a conscious decision to help an individual progress through their field. To illustrate, Dorothea Zimmern, sister of the political scientist Alfred Eckhard Zimmern, published the results of a WIC inquiry into women and the Civil Service in the *Political Quarterly*, an academic journal that first appeared from 1914 to 1916 (Zimmern, 1916).[22]

The internationalisation of intellectual activities, Julian Vincent notes, 'reached a crucial phase after 1870', which he linked to 'a growing interest in comparing the dissimilar economic performance of industrial countries, the introduction of new communication technologies, and the specialisation and professionalisation of knowledge' (2007, p.200). An important aspect of the global circulation of ideas was the emergence of an increasingly professionalised industry of translating and reviewing of foreign-language books. According to Vincent, 'lack of awareness of foreign scholarship became unthinkable' by the latter end of the nineteenth century (2007, p.200). Against this background, women built and manipulated international contracts throughout this period, publishing translations of works by European social theorists, economists, and others. Caroline Foley, for example, translated several articles for the *Economic Journal* from German, French, and Italian, including a translation of *On the Origins of Money* by Carl Menger, founder of the Austrian School of Economics. For multilingual Alice Zimmern, Clementina Black, Eleanor Marx, and other women for whom commercial writing provided a necessary income, linguistic ability gained from learning languages at an early age meant they could undertake paid commissions translating and reviewing foreign-language books.

[22] Publication was suspended at the end of 1916 due to wartime constraints. The journal title was revived in 1930.

Eleanor Marx was raised in a household where family members spoke different languages and there were extended visits from political emigres who had, like her parents, reached Britain after the wave of revolutions that swept across most of the Continent (Holmes, 2014). It is hardly surprising that she was a gifted translator of political texts, including the *History of the Paris Commune of 1871* by Prosper-Olivier Lissagaray (Transl., 1886) and *Anarchism and Socialism* by Georgi Plekhanov (Transl., 1895). Marx and others may have undertaken commissions out of financial necessity, but we should not see this activity solely in economic terms. As scholars such as Flore Janssen have demonstrated, 'translation work could also be explicitly politicized', providing 'not only an income but also a platform for their work and the ideas their work contained' (2020, pp.524-6). As pointed out earlier by Sherry Simon, 'Translations are a form of engagement when the necessary partiality of translation becomes *partisan*, when translators adopt advocacy roles in situations of socio-cultural inequalities' (2005, p.11, emphasis in original).

A substantial number of review articles were written by women discussed in this collection. Pinzón-Fuchs, Chassonnery-Zaïgouche and Herfeld (2019, p.7) have noted that 'various types of reviews were, in fact, the bulk of journals before the Second World War'. When it first appeared, the *Economic Journal* was divided into five main sections: "Articles", "Reviews", "Notes and Memoranda", "Current Topics" and "Recent Periodicals and New Books". 'Until the 1920s', Keith Tribe remarks, 'many items of interest are concealed in the "Book Reviews" and in the "Notes", and thus tend to be overlooked by a reader used to looking to articles for significant contributions' (1992, p.36). Caroline Foley and Mary Marshall reviewed several times for the *Economic Journal*. Some of Lillian Knowles and Violet Butler's major contributions are reviews of the major works available on economics in the 1890s and early 1900s rather than original research articles. Reviews were particularly common for women who had heavy teaching loads or otherwise limited opportunities for conducting original research**.** In 1920, for example, Helene Reynard, a relatively regular contributor to the *Economic Journal*, reviewed *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* by Alice Clark, at a time when she was taking a break from college administration. Violet Butler wrote several review articles a year, including reviews of books in other languages, mainly French and Italian. The *Sociological Review* also published book reviews written by women in this

period. One such example is the economist Vera Anstey, a teaching-focused academic at LSE and noted expert on the economy of India, who contributed over seventy book reviews to journals (mainly to the *Economic Journal* and *Economica*, but also the *Sociological Review*) as well as writing books and articles (Madden, Seiz and Pujol, 2004). One of four book reviews published in 1934 was her appraisal (Anstey, 1934) of *Child Marriage: The Indian Minotaur*, a book written by Eleanor Rathbone, then a Member of Parliament for the Combined English Universities, to support her campaign work in India.

Also of significance is the way book reviews in this period provided a platform to advance the reviewer's political beliefs and social activism. We see this in Clementina Black's (1910) two-page review of work first published in French in 1904, *Les Sociétés Coopératives de Consommation (Consumers' Co-operative Societies),* by Charles Gide, an eminent economics professor and leading figure in the French cooperative movement during the early part of the twentieth century. Published in the *Economic Journal*, the first sentence of her review of the extended 1910 edition of Gide's book explains its relevance to English readers. The author's 'Coopératives de Consommation' are, she wrote, 'the equivalent of the English "Distributive Co-operation" … of which the initial step is the association of a group of consumers for the purpose of supplying their personal demand' (1910, p.69). Although Gide's work would not be translated into English until 1921, she concludes that 'emphatically it is a book not to be read about but to be read' (p.71).

Scholarly collaborations played a significant role in the scientific work of some of the women. While academic collaboration and co-authorship of journal articles was rare, multi-authored books and reports were relatively common. The Newnham educated **Susan Lawrence** (1871-1947), an early Labour politician, and close friend of Beatrice Webb and Mary Macarthur, produced *Labour Women on International Legislation* (1919) in partnership with Marion Phillips and Gertrude Tuckwell. Organisations such as the Women's Industrial Council and Women's Co-operative Guild fostered an ethos of research collaboration. Kevin Bales notes that Charles Booth's *Life and Labour* was not only 'the first known example of an organised team assembled for the purpose of social research' (1994, p.211), but also the first large-scale cross-gender research collaboration. He found that five (possibly six) female

investigators, making up one quarter of the listed contributors to Booth's survey of working-class East London, had contributed. Later investigations in other parts of the country, many led by women, would follow the model pioneered by Booth. As an illustration, we can take the example of Eleanor Rathbone's investigation into Liverpool dock workers' domestic conditions, *How the Casual Labourer Lives* (1909). Started in 1907, the year of her evidence to the Poor Law Commission of 1905-09, this collaborative project had involved six organisations in a 'Joint Research Committee': the 'Liverpool branches of the Christian Social Union, the Fabian Society and the National Union of Women Workers; Liverpool Economic and Statistical Society; the Liverpool Women's Industrial Council; and the Victoria Settlement' (Pedersen, 2004, pp.104-5). The input of committee members could add authority to a piece of social investigation. Working cooperatively in large teams could also be significant in terms of helping researchers gain access to sites for research. Writing about inquiries undertaken by middle-class members of the Women's Co-operative Guild, Madden and Persky explain how 'their connection through the Guild to working-class households of the co-operatives gave them entry and insights other observers would be hard pressed to achieve' (2018, p.151).

Collaborating women writers would sometimes select people unrelated to the research itself, often someone highly respected in government, to write a foreword. This might be done to add credibility to a book, but the practice is also an indication of women's relationships within, and involvement in, extended networks. For example, the Labour MP David James Shackleton, who at the time was also chair of the Trades Union Congress and later became a senior civil servant, wrote the preface to a collection of essays by Gertrude Tuckwell and others entitled *Women in Industry, From Seven Points of View* (1908). Written to explain the need to raise woman's position in industry and covering a variety of topics including child labour and infant mortality, the publisher reissued the volume in 1910 at a lower price. An enthusiastic review of the reprinted book in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, most likely written by Bessie Hutchins, hoped that a 'reduction of price … will make the book accessible to a wider public' (B.L.H., 1910, p.99). David Lloyd George contributed an enthusiastic foreword to Dorothea Proud's *Welfare Work*, a book which went into three editions and urged an expansion of welfare provisions throughout industry including female restrooms.

Ada Heather-Bigg was one of several contributors (the others all male) to a volume on educational administration containing a series of lectures delivered to the managers of the London board schools with the object of showing how to improve elementary schooling (Bousfield et al., 1890). Published in 1890, when the effects of the Education Acts of 1870, 1876 and 1880 had affected an entire generation, the chapter written by Heather-Bigg, entitled "Evenings of Amusement for Board-School Children", advocated what she called 'happy evenings' which provided children with opportunities for play, nurturing their well-being and learning to reverse the erosion of childhood. In 1900, an unusually well-funded study of 'the economic effect of legislation regulating women's work' got underway following the allocation of a £15,000 grant from the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS), financed mainly by the Hutchinson Trust (BAAS, 1903, p.315). The context was the series of Factory Acts passed in the closing decades of the nineteenth century to regulate the conditions of industrial employment (specifically, legislation of 1878, 1891 and 1895 that reduced daily hours of work and night work for women and considerably extended earlier safety regulations).[23] Intended as the first of a series of investigations on women's work, *Women in the Printing Trade: A Sociological Study* was published in 1904. BAAS had selected the printing trade, then a booming industry and a large employer of women, because, as one committee member put it, it illustrated 'the main problems of women's labour under ordinary modern conditions' (MacDonald et al., 1904, p.xvi).

The 1904 BAAS report was a massive collaborative undertaking involving a group of women and men from academia, government, and organisations including the Royal Statistical Society and the Royal Economic Society. Women organisers, social workers and philanthropists were included in the project. Names listed on the title page give part of the story. Sir Edward Brabook, prominent civil servant, statistician, and president of the anthropology section of the BAAS, was nominated chair of the committee initiated by the Women's Industrial Council, which led the investigation. Committee members included Margaret MacDonald, secretary of the WIC's legal and statistical committee, Clara Collet, Arthur Bowley, Charles Booth, Sydney Chapman, Alfred Flux, Langford Price and William Smart. The labour politician and

[23] Factory Acts: a series of 21 laws passed from 1802-1961, 18 in the period to 1901 (Dumbill, 2021).

future Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, edited the report and it had a substantial preface written by Professor Francis Edgeworth, as the ‘representative from the Royal Economic Society’ (1904, p.xiv). Members of the Women’s Industrial Council, especially Barbara Hammond, Grace Oakeshott, Amy Harrison and Margaret Irwin, undertook the investigations, collecting data in cities across Britain. Hammond was ‘mainly responsible for the work done in London’, and Irwin had ‘charge of the Scottish enquiries’ (1904, p.xv).

7.3 Concluding remarks

These examples, taken from the hundreds of publications listed in Appendix A.6, provide a snapshot of developments in social science research by women in this period. Just a selection is included in this chapter, and the list itself is not exhaustive, but it is clear women included in this study produced a significant body of work. It was predominantly empirical and spanned a wide range of diverse fields. Some women distanced themselves from public policy, but a substantial number of their works bear a strong link to pressing policy concerns of the day concerning women’s labour and wages, unmarried mothers, infant mortality, protective legislation, industrial welfare, and trade unionism, to name only a few. While concern for social activism and reform was true also of some male social scientists in this period, as noted by others, women researched topics which men tended to avoid. Various strategies were also used to try to influence public and political opinion, and shape local or national government. These include using key political figures to write book prefaces; publishing evidence summaries in newspapers or pamphlets; other targeted communication; presenting findings at events; giving evidence to government enquiries; working in large teams; working in collaborative partnerships. The question of whether the research conducted by these women, aided by the strategies that individual figures and organisations adopted to increase its reach and significance, had a wider impact beyond academia is explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER EIGHT: PROMOTING AND SUPPORTING POLICY CHANGE

In this chapter, I examine the nature of the relationship between research and policy in three exploratory case studies that differ in scale of research and influential reach. Chronologically, they show successively higher profiles of social science in public debate and reform processes: first, in 1905, through a local study and subsequent response; second, in 1909, through a politically timely study and national campaign; and third, during and immediately following the First World War, through sustained government demand for social science. These case studies provide examples of how the research-policy relationship operates and draw out the contributions of early women in social science in the decades around 1900. I begin with a summary of important debates about evaluating and evidencing impact from research.

8.1 Evaluating influence and contributions to policy development

In her recent book, *Dreamers of a New Day*, Sheila Rowbotham argues that the 'extraordinary "awakening" of women' from the 1880s up to the First World War 'constituted an uncontestably creative force for change' (2010, p.234). My thesis shows that these women had a great deal to offer and that most of what they did has a continuing relevance today. At the same time, it is evident that not all the women discussed here maintained productive careers or were of extraordinary scholarly significance, which leads to a question about how to measure their success and achievements. Specifically, how should we approach the question of whether the new knowledge produced by early women in social science had any impact on the proliferation of legislation in this period?

Influence and contributions to policy impacts are easy to assert but difficult to demonstrate. Causal relationships are hard to disentangle at the best of times, but with policy processes 'inescapably anchored in political values, persuasion, and negotiation' (Head, 2016, p.472), the task of ascertaining the broader, societal impacts from research is all the harder. We are beginning to realise that there are significant methodological challenges in trying to link research findings to specific policy outcomes (Bornmann, 2017). Research-based knowledge is typically only one factor amongst many at play, and other variables such as policymakers'

personal values, experience, and ideologies, must also be accounted for (Boswell and Smith, 2017). An added complexity is that it often takes time for research to have an impact, and its influence may only be measurable after several years. Even well-established scientific evidence can be ignored (or not acted upon) by governments for a long time, as in the case of stronger tobacco controls, which were not introduced until the mid-2000s in the UK, despite available evidence on the harmful effects of smoking from the 1950s (Cairney, 2007).

In some situations, notably in medicine, the influence of scientific research is direct and tangible, and it has a clear role in driving forward policy and practice. Identifying evidence to corroborate impact claims relating to clinical research is challenging but feasible. Outside clinical care, however, where research findings seldom align with the immediate needs of policymakers, the linear model of research use is a rare phenomenon. Commentators increasingly point out that the direct application of research-based knowledge in policy interventions, typically referred to as the "instrumental" or "problem-solving" function of evidence, bears little relation to how policymakers make use of research. As observed by the late Carol Weiss, a leading figure in this field, policymakers at different levels of government most frequently use research, not to act upon a situation, such as implementing a solution to a specific problem, but rather to inform their decision-making process. She labelled this the "enlightenment" model of knowledge use. The process, in her words, 'is not one of linear order from research to decision but a disorderly set of interconnections and back-and-forthness that defies neat diagrams' (1977, p.14). Research, she concluded, drawing from many years of studying this phenomenon in situ, 'is seldom used to affect decisions deliberately. Rather it fills in the background, it supplies the context, from which ideas, concepts, and choices derive' (Weiss and Bucuvalas, 1980, p.155). Scholars continue to report this to be 'closer to the reality of how knowledge enters the policy debate and contributes to policy outcomes' (Newson et al., 2018, p.16).[24]

The situation was no different for early social researchers. Kevin Bales reached this conclusion when he evaluated the policy impact of Booth's *Life and Labour* on

[24] There is a rich body of literature theorising the relationship between research and policy. For a useful summary of the different models, see Boswell and Smith (2017).

political activity at the time, having identified that ‘actual political statements or acts which explicitly name the Policy Survey as a starting point are not to be found’ (1999, p.162). A similar point was made by Lucinda Platt who used the example of Eleanor Rathbone to illustrate ‘the problematics of research influence’ (2005, p.119). Rathbone’s arguments and analysis in *The Disinherited Family* (1924), she observed, ‘convinced many influential persons, including the economist John Maynard Keynes, and William Beveridge, the architect of post-war social insurance and social assistance’; however, ‘as long as economic and political argument rendered family allowances inexpedient’, the policy was ‘resisted at government level’ (2005, p.22).

A historical understanding of the ways in which social knowledge, and the women making knowledge claims, may have influenced policy developments is an important element to grasping a matter of much current interest to policymakers. Setting aside the “causal attribution problem” (briefly discussed above), writing a compelling account of the impact of research would require detailed research in government and newspaper archives, which I did not set out to do. Instead, this chapter attempts to shed light on the complexity of the relationship between research and policy based on existing secondary work, not all of it well-known.

8.2 Case study: Child poverty and its alleviation

In the decades around 1900, children became figures of political importance, leading to intervention by the voluntary sector and the state to reduce infant mortality rates and to improve the health of school children (Davin, 1978; Dwork, 1987; Lewis, 1980). Early state measures included the Education (Provision of Meals) Act 1906; Notification of Births Act 1907; the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act 1907; and the Children and Young Persons Act 1908. Throughout Britain, Myra Baillie has observed, children were ‘weighed, measured, investigated, medically inspected and fed’ (1996, p.91). The attention of social researchers from across the political spectrum increasingly turned to child poverty research, enabling innovations in empirical work and the rise of the social survey (Martin, 2018; Platt, 2005).

In 1896, Helen Bosanquet published an article, “The Burden of Small Debts”, in the *Economic Journal*. Influenced by the social philosophy of the Charity Organisation

Society, she condemns the slum mother's use of credit and pawnshops, arguing that her precarious circumstances are due to lack of foresight rather than low income. The activities of Margaret McMillan, best known for her advocacy of child welfare in Bradford and London, included research into child labour and the half-time system (1896) and the feeding of London's children (1909). Barbara Drake (1933) and Mildred Bulkley (1914) also took special interest in this issue. Apart from a brief period spent teaching social science and administration during 1915-16, Bulkley worked as a research assistant throughout her career, initially for the Webbs.

These studies were part of a tradition of women's social investigation into the domestic circumstances facing many working-class families, much of which emphasised the relationship between women's and children's welfare. This case turns the attention now to Scotland and the influence of a large-scale sociological study, *Report on Housing and Industrial Conditions and Medical Inspection of School Children* (DSU, 1905).

Working within a Social Enquiry Committee formed in 1904 by the Dundee Social Union (DSU), Mary Walker and her close friend and professional colleague Mona Wilson, who became superintendent of the enquiry, were the first to gather statistical evidence on conditions in Dundee, a city distinctive for its disproportionate dependence on cheap female labour within the textile industry (Whatley et al., 2011). The results laid bare the terrible living conditions of Dundee's working class, including the poor health of many children attending Board Schools in the city. The chapter on "Housing Conditions" revealed that many homes lacked bathrooms and running water, and in some houses 'refuse of every kind was kept all day and put out in a "backet" at night' (DSU, 1905, p.16). The chapter on "Women's Labour and Infant Mortality" showed that Dundee had a staggeringly high infant mortality rate, by far the highest rate of all large Scottish towns. Using the 1901 Census, Walker and Wilson estimated that around one in five infants born in the city died before their first birthday, which they attributed to a combination of premature birth, improper feeding, physical demands late in pregnancy, and the employment of women a few weeks after childbirth (DSU, 1905). The strongest blame for infant deaths fell on married women's work: 'The obligation to support a family … is an unnatural

condition of life, which leads to the usual consequences - broken-down mothers in early life, and ill-nourished, rickety children. who develop into weedy, unhealthy men and women' (1905, p.xii). Medical inspection of 1000 school children from different social classes revealed 'large numbers of badly nourished and undersized children' in the city's poorer schools that implied 'some defect in nutrition – partly accounted for no doubt by the general unsanitary conditions associated with city life … and partly by improper or insufficient feeding' (1905, pp.20-1).

The DSU was a voluntary, largely non-political, organisation established in 1888 'to promote the well-being of the inhabitants of the town' (Valentine, 1920, p.2). The enquiry followed the model established by Charles Booth; therefore, its main purpose, as stated in the preface, was not to offer solutions. Rather, it was to describe 'certain social evils as a disgrace and national peril ... it is better that the larger reforms required should spring from a public enlightened by data gathered from many enquiries prosecuted along similar lines' (DSU, 1905, p.vii). The report attracted attention within the academic community. The economist Lettice Fisher, who had returned to Oxford in 1902 to teach history at St Hugh's College, wrote a review, published in the *Economic Journal*. Though the DSU study involved a survey of almost 6000 homes in the city, Fisher thought 'the scope and duration of the inquiry … not sufficiently large to enable the reader to draw very definite conclusions'; nonetheless, it was a 'useful piece of work', she concluded, and provided 'much food for thought' (1905, p.553). The response of Dundee's citizens to the DSU report was first seen in the local press, the *Dundee Courier and Argus* and the *Dundee Advertiser*, where the evidence suggests that it was successful in heightening awareness of social problems in the city, 'drawing middle-class attention to the circumstances of working-class life' (Baillie, 1996, p.99). The Union was backed by respected citizens, and the investigating team, led by Walker and Wilson, 'saw themselves', Jean Young explains, 'as qualified experts and collected information in a way which made the facts they collected difficult to challenge' (1991, p.653). Yet, despite the reassurance gained by the inquiry's collaborative partnership between a voluntary organisation (DSU) and various civic authorities (School Board; Town Council and Medical Officer of Health), there are strong indications that the reception of the report was largely critical. Dundee's middle class might not be able to dispute the report's accuracy, but its bleak portrayal of

their city upset many. On 30 March 1906, for instance, the *Dundee Advertiser* reported that ‘some looked on [it] as an opprobrium upon the city’ (cited in Baillie, 1996, p.100).

Some historians have assessed the influence of the DSU inquiry. In her thesis on housing in Dundee between 1868 and 1919, Young has concluded that it was ‘difficult to imagine’ the slum clearance campaigns in Dundee in 1916 ‘apart from the growing respectability of social science and the widespread acceptance of the findings in the 1905 Dundee Social Union Report’ (1991, p.534). Other studies have found very limited evidence that the local authorities in Dundee acted on the report. According to Baillie, the report was ‘conveniently forgotten’ by the School Board and achieved ‘only small measures of success with the Town Council’ (1996, p.102). Finding evidence for indirect uses of research (especially specific research findings) is known to be challenging. However, there are some indications that the report made an indirect contribution to practice locally. It achieved this by stimulating further interest in the work of the DSU and the Grey Lodge Settlement. With the resulting increase in funds and workers, Walker initiated new services for working-class women in the years immediately after publication of the report, including after school clubs and restaurants for nursing mothers. In time, the local authorities expanded and took over these measures, led often by the Medical Office of Health, Charles Templeman. The report also raised Walker’s profile as a recognised authority on living and working conditions in Dundee. In 1907, she gave evidence before the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws. Later that year, she was one of two DSU delegates invited to the National Conference on Sweated Industries, held in Glasgow’s Charing Cross Hall in October 1907 under the auspices of the Scottish Council for Women’s Trades (Watson, 2001). Finally, several historians have identified use of the report at a national level, citing House of Commons debates where it has been used to support politicians' arguments for the state feeding of school children (Baillie, 1996; Levitt, 1988; Small, 2013; Watson, 2001). Speaking in 1907 on the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill, future Labour Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald stated: ‘so far as Dundee was concerned, the report issued by the Dundee Social Union on housing and social conditions furnished sufficient evidence for the application of this measure’. His seconder, Alexander

Wilkie, Labour MP for Dundee, ‘also relied greatly upon the [DSU] report to establish his case’ (cited in Baillie, 1996, p.103).

This example of a local research study can be seen to have shaped the environment in which policy decisions are made, with some (mainly indirect) influence at a local level. Despite claims to the contrary, there is insufficient evidence to support arguments that it had a direct impact on the passage or substance of legislation.

8.3 Case study: Sweated industries and the minimum wage campaign

While working conditions of factory workers were increasingly regulated through the Factory Acts, many workers around the turn of the century still worked in ‘sweated’ industries, typified by excessive working hours, dangerous or unhealthy working conditions, and the minimum of pay. Sweatshops relied heavily on home workers whom, Bessie Hutchins of the Fabian Society argued, ‘either by reason of sex, age, infirmity or want of organisation and support … have to let their work go cheap’ (1907, p.4). As part of a larger anti-sweatshop movement working on behalf of those who were not covered by national safety and hours legislation, many of whom were women, the very active campaigning by the Women’s Industrial Council, Fabian Women’s Group, Women’s Co-operative Guild and others built upon, and contributed to, a mass of research on women’s employment, some of it discussed below. They developed theoretical responses to the problem of sweated labour and sought to assemble empirical evidence to influence policy. In doing so, they challenged the way in which women’s economic and social activities, paid and unpaid, were undervalued and underestimated.

An early volume of the *Fortnightly Review,* which appeared in 1886, provides an example of the type of work published in the early years. It featured an article by Ada Heather-Bigg, a prominent activist in the Women’s Provident and Protective League (later renamed the Women’s Trade Union League), and in the Society for the Promotion of the Employment of Women, established in 1859 by Jessie Boucherett and others (Livesey, 2004). Presenting data on changes in female labour in the nail trade, Heather-Bigg used the evidence to argue against restrictions on women’s work, objecting to a Bill then being debated before Parliament that would have seen women kept out of certain trades (1886, p.830). Another of

Heather-Bigg's concerns was the issue of productive activity in relation to reproductive work. Acknowledging housework as work in an 1894 article on the wife's contribution to family income in the *Economic Journal*, she argued that it was only through wage earning that women's work had become visible. As she put it, when men opposed women's employment, 'what they object to is the wage-earning not the work of wives' (1894, p.55). Heather-Bigg campaigned vigorously against measures to restrict women's employment. Others supported protective legislation for women, including Constance Smith who had studied at King's College, London. Initially a novelist, with several works published between 1889 and 1901, her interests had turned to labour issues, and she later joined the Women's Inspectors' Branch of the Home Office Factory Department. Volume 15 of the *Economic Review* published her findings on dangerous trades, the results of a participant observation and interview study of sweatshop workers (Smith, 1905). The article provided detailed data on characteristics of workers, including age and sex, ending with a plea for policy changes to alleviate unsafe and inhumane working conditions.

Although her earlier writings on sweating (1892) make no mention of a minimum wage, Beatrice Webb would eventually be convinced that government regulatory policy was the solution to the problem of sweated trades. The Webbs had advanced the idea of a statutory minimum wage in their book *Industrial Democracy*, albeit in a footnote (1897, p.777), following the failure of the House of Lords Select Committee on Sweating under Lord Dunraven, to which Beatrice provided a testimony (Potter, 1890).[25] From 1906, having reversed her opposition to feminism, she increasingly advanced a feminist analysis of the labour market, and worked with women's organisations, notably the Fabian Women's Group and the Women's Industrial Council (Nyland and Rix, 1998). Annual Reports of the Women's Industrial Council make clear that social investigation was regarded as the key to reform: 'For without full investigation it is impossible either to legislate or to organise wisely. This means visitation, with systematised enquiry of employers, factories, workshops, home-workers, employees, trade union and other officials and then the drawing-up of a report' (cited in Goodman, 1998, p.305). By 1912, according to Joyce Goodman's

[25] The House of Lords Select Committee on Sweating prepared the ground for the 1891-94 Royal Commission on Labour.

estimates, this body had ‘conducted 118 enquiries into women’s trades, as well as collaborating with other organizations on similar undertakings’ (1998, p.305).

Historians have highlighted ways in which anxiety about labour issues, especially in the sweated industries, influenced the growth of professional opportunities for women at the Board of Trade and the Factory Inspectorate (Livesey, 2004; Spurgeon, 2012; Wheeldon, 2014). The 1891-1894 Royal Commission on Labour, set up under Lord Salisbury’s Conservative Government to investigate labour questions, Wheeldon has noted, ‘proved the stepping stone to a professional life for Clara Collet, May Abraham, Mary Paterson and Adelaide Anderson united by shared experiences in women’s issues’ (2014, p.13). Importantly, the appointment of women as government factory inspectors was one of the Women’s Industrial Council’s main campaigns and details of known breeches in the labour laws identified through their investigations were forwarded to the women factory inspectors. Collet published widely both before and after she began a long career of public service at the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, having been appointed in 1893 as Chief Investigator for Women’s Industries. Noted for her work on women’s pay and employment, she researched such related issues as “Prospects of Marriage for Women” (1892).[26] As one of the most frequent women contributors to the *Economic Journal*, especially in its early years, she contributed sixteen articles of one sort or another between 1891 and 1940, including studies on “The Expenditure of Middle-Class Working Women” (1898) and “Wages Boards in Victoria” (1901). Her contributions to the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* extended from 1898 to 1945. She is notable among the women discussed here for having published in Harvard’s *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* the oldest professional journal of economics in the English language: “Wages and the Standard of Living” (1891).

The idea of a minimum wage as a solution to labour exploitation had initially attracted few supporters; notably, Alfred Marshall dismissed it as economically unsound (Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, 2018). In 1903, Bessie Hutchins and Amy Harrison had confidently concluded in *A History of Factory Legislation* that ‘opinion

[26] Like Beatrice Webb, Collet had gained experience working on Charles Booth’s pioneering statistical project to map social conditions in London, contributing two chapters on women’s work (1891).

is not yet converted to the legal regulation of wages, nor likely to be for a considerable time yet' (1966 [1903], p.216). Yet, within three years, as Sheila Blackburn, among others, has noted, 'the problem of sweating, previously the concern of a few interested bodies, emerged as the centre of public conversation' (1991, p.55). Historians have attributed this shift to a series of events in 1906. These include the Board of Trade's *Earnings and Hours Enquiry*, to which Clara Collet had contributed; the landslide election of the Liberal Party; and the creation of the National Anti-Sweating League, founded as a direct result of the Exhibition of Sweated Industries sponsored by the *Daily News*, owned by Liberal businessman George Cadbury, that ran for six weeks at Queen's Hall, London (Blackburn, 2007). In 1907, the growing pressure for reform resulted in the government establishing a Select Committee on Home Work; the same year, the Home Office appointed Ernest Aves, a social analyst at the Board of Trade, to investigate the operation of wages boards in Australia and New Zealand (Rickard, 1979).

The Women's Industrial Council was one of the most active women's organisations to campaign to regulate wages in sweated industries. To ensure this issue received wide publicity, 'it published books and pamphlets … arranged conferences, conducted campaigns, and also gathered data … from other countries (Blackburn, 1997, p.278). Several undertakings were by Clementina Black. Her article, "London Tailoresses", was published in the *Economic Journal* in 1904. *Sweated Industries and the Minimum Wage* (1907), a book with chapters on home workers; workers in factories and workshops; shop assistants; transport workers; and wage-earning children, set out a case for legal minimum wages somewhat on the lines of that adopted in New Zealand. In 1908, the Council began a one-year national investigation, *Makers of Our Clothes: A Case for Trade Boards* (1909), led by Clementina Black and Adele Meyer. Seeking to take advantage of the opportunity to influence policy within a short, discrete time window, the report was, the authors recorded, conducted 'primarily for a special purpose' (1909, p.2), which was to influence the Sweated Industries Bill introduced in February 1908 by Arthur Henderson on behalf of the Labour Party. The investigative focus would be those industries that 'seemed likely to be first instituted' by the legislative commitment, namely tailoring, dressmaking, and underclothing trades (Meyer and Black, 1909, p.2). Based on research undertaken by a team of investigators, involving interviews

with both employees and employers, the report described the terrible working and living conditions of women in these trades. Importantly, Meyer and Black offered a bold theoretical analysis of the problem: ‘under-payment is the real root of evil from which women workers (and many male workers, too) chiefly suffer … Extreme under-payment is a result of unlimited competition … Only by setting a barrier to the downward trend of wages can we hope to remedy that kind of poverty which is produced not by the vice, the drunkenness, or the idleness of the sufferers, but by their industry, patience and abstinence’ (1909, p.32). The authors sought also to address the widespread belief that state regulation would reduce the demand for women’s labour, challenging “laissez-faire” views on labour legislation.

Several factors may have affected policymakers’ use of evidence from this study. Perhaps most significantly, the findings were likely to be trusted since the Women’s Industrial Council was a recognised authority in the field of women’s employment and in social investigation. Like their other inquiries, *Makers of Our Clothes: A Case for Trade Boards* was a large-scale collaborative effort. Researchers worked from a position of influence, since the Council was an organisation to whom national policymakers, as well as local bodies such as the London County Council, turned for advice and expertise (Goodman, 1998). Black and Meyer themselves were both accomplished at cultivating a wider audience for their ideas, using innovative tactics to disseminate the findings from their investigations and persuade audiences. For instance, the authors dedicated the book to Winston Churchill, the President of the Board of Trade. At least one historian who has examined the circumstances which led to the Sweated Industries Bill receiving its second reading has argued that ‘Churchill's arrival at the Board of Trade in April 1908 … was crucial’ (Rickard, 1979, p.591). Black undertook a great deal of public speaking based on investigations carried out on behalf of the Council, including giving evidence at parliamentary inquiries. Activists abroad kept a close eye on the Council’s campaign developments and referred to her work to lend authority to their proposed schemes (Janssen, 2018).

The most salient barrier to the uptake of this work was that publication coincided with the introduction of Britain’s first minimum wage policy. The 1909 Trades Board Act set up an institutional structure to address the problem of low wages,

establishing boards to negotiate minimum hourly wages in four of the most exploited industries, where rates of wages were ‘exceptionally low’ (tailoring trades, paper box making, lace finishing and chain-making). Notably, this legislation ‘went beyond women homeworkers to include factory hands, and encompassed both males and females’ (Blackburn, 1997, p.279). Additional industries, including embroidery, sugar confectionery and food preserving, came under the regulation of trade boards in subsequent years, including wholly factory trades (Deakin and Green, 2009).

Many historians have concluded that pressure groups such as the Women’s Industrial Council and the Women’s Trade Union League (WTUL) were a key factor in the campaign for a national minimum wage (e.g., Blackburn, 1997; Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, 2018; Holloway, 2005; Mappen, 1985). J.R. Hay, for example, described the Trade Boards Act of 1909 as ‘the result of pressure from women’s organisations; individual politicians, including Ramsay MacDonald and Sir Charles Dilke ... and a public campaign mounted by the *Daily Mail*’ (1983, pp.52-3). Vivien Hart, however, has argued that the Women’s Industrial Council was unimportant after 1906: ‘legislation was certain to pass … the action had moved elsewhere’ (1994, p.28). She and others highlight that many other bodies were advocating for wage boards, including the newly established National Anti-Sweating League, an all-party organisation that Mary Macarthur, trade union organiser and WTUL secretary, helped establish in 1906. It is also the case that others were conducting research aimed at this policy issue. Constance Smith, for instance, published *The Case for Wages Boards* in 1908, on behalf of National Anti-Sweating League.

Had crucial decisions been taken by the government before the research that led to the publication of *Makers of Our Clothes: A Case for Trade Boards* was completed, and its results disseminated? The precise motivations for Black and Meyer to start the investigation in 1908 remain unclear. One possible explanation is that the authors may have been motivated by a desire to maintain momentum and add weight to the Women’s Industrial Council campaign. Significantly, several previous bills had not been acted upon. For instance, a Wages Board Bill, introduced in Parliament by Sir Charles Dilke and others, had been submitted annually since the

start of the century but never debated (Blackburn, 1991).[27] Major disagreements amongst the Council leadership on this issue are another consideration. Black led a group that advocated a legal minimum wage, while a licensing scheme was favoured by Margaret MacDonald among others (Blackburn, 1997). The question of whether *Makers of Our Clothes: A Case for Trade Boards*, or earlier social investigations by the Council, had an immediate and direct impact on policy, in terms of changing the substantive content of the enacted legislation, or simply helped create the momentum for reform, remains unanswered.

8.3 Case study. Mobilising social knowledge and connections for war work

An important point at this stage of the argument is the shifting identities and porous borders between domains traditionally seen as entirely academic or entirely non-academic. As seen in earlier chapters, many of those involved in social science moved relatively freely across, in between, or beyond traditional boundaries. To further illustrate the complex interactions between the academic and non-academic world in this period, a brief analysis is made of the mobilisation of social knowledge and connections during the Great War.

As noted elsewhere, even as the professionalisation of social science progressed, one of the most important forces outside of the academy to actively strengthen its links with policy was war (Desch, 2019, p.26). At the outbreak of hostilities on 4 August 1914, the Women's Social and Political Union and the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies immediately threw themselves behind the war campaign. With agitation for the vote largely suspended, women were urged to support the national effort, and many responded. 'The war revolutionised the industrial position of women', proclaimed Millicent Fawcett, leader of the constitutional women's suffrage movement, in 1919; 'it found them serfs and left them free' (as cited in Thom, 1998, p.1). More recently, the assumption of the war as a turning point for women has been questioned. Instead, as Patricia Fara explains in *A Lab of One's Own: Science and Suffrage in the First World War,* based on a study following the trajectories of women scientists during the war, many

[27] Dilke wrote in 1908 that he considered Gertrude Tuckwell of the WTUL 'the real author of the Bill' (cited in Hart, 1994, p.24).

historians now ‘interpret it as a temporary opening up of opportunities before the door clanged shut again’ (2018, p.11).

Elizabeth Macadam and subsequent commentators have observed that war unexpectedly stimulated the social sciences (1925, p.86). It is the case that those women to be offered positions when men left to serve their country had benefitted only temporarily. Maria Czaplicka, for instance, was made lecturer in ethnology (anthropology) at Oxford University in 1916, becoming the first appointed female lecturer in Oxford. In 1917, Theodora Keith secured a post at Glasgow University when Professor Robert Rait was on leave of absence at the War Trade Intelligence Department. Both women had to resign their position when the incumbent postholders returned, as did others. However, despite its failure to permanently change the gendered and classed cultures of British academia, the war provided a wide range of new opportunities for women, by exploiting and enhancing the existing informal and formal networks that were fundamental to women’s engagement with social science at the time.

The British government and military authorities were initially slow to make use of scientific and industrial expertise, but gradually they recognised the role that universities and their employees might play, and eventually turned to outside specialists as a source for ‘the kind of expertise that the war now demanded’ (Pietsch, 2013, p.130). The Department of Scientific and Industrial Research was created in July 1915 and played a key role in coordinating government aid to university research (Heath and Heatherington, 1946). Another new organisational initiative was the Ministry of Munitions, established in May 1915 following the formation of the coalition government, with the Liberal Party politician David Lloyd George appointed Minister. It quickly enlisted experts from both inside and outside government for war-related work (including research). In the process, it challenged common notions of scientific and professional expertise.

This assimilation of women into a predominantly male world was repeated across policy sectors, bringing significant changes to the nature of work for women within the British Civil Service and society at large. With many men in the armed forces, large numbers of women entered employment for the duration of the war and ‘took over men’s jobs in factories, laboratories, in hospitals and in the armed forces, in

museums and transport' (Fara, 2018, p.6). By April 1916, the female labour force had grown by an estimated 600,000, bringing the total number of women employed to six million (Winter, 1985, p.46). Many women worked in roles previously considered inappropriate, including heavy industry (Braybon, 2012). Widespread concern about the hazardous nature of munitions' work heightened anxieties about maternal and child welfare, 'bringing the question of industrial fatigue', and the social sciences more generally, 'to national attention in Britain' (Blayney, 2019, p.320).

The Ministry of Munitions had responsibility for a large non-military workforce, many of whom were untrained women, employed at thousands of factories under direct government control, or working under contract, for the manufacture of armaments (Wightman, 1999, p.49). The way it responded to wartime challenges had a 'profound influence on future ideas of "welfare" in government' (Smith et al., 2014, p.33). Intended initially to maintain levels of shell production, the newly constituted Ministry appointed a Health and Munition Workers Committee (HMWC) to investigate conditions in factories. Rose Squire and May Tennant were both members. In late December 1915, promoted by the findings from initial HMWC investigations, it established a Welfare Department under the direction of Seebohm Rowntree (Hartesveldt, 2001). Government-sponsored research into workers' health, fatigue and efficiency followed (Blayney, 2019). Many studies were conducted by civil servants who were at the disposal of government and international committees set up in response to war. For instance, Janet Campbell from the Board of Education, and later Medical Officer for maternal and infant welfare, led an HMWC inquiry undertaken in 1915-16 into the health of female munition workers, based on a sample of 1,326 women employed at eleven factories (Campbell and Wilson, 1917).

The intellectual resources of outside experts were also appropriated for the war effort. LSE graduate Dorothea Proud was a recognised expert in her field, having published a book from her PhD thesis, *Welfare Work,* in 1916. She was appointed to assist Rowntree in the Welfare Department (and his successor, Edward Collis, Medical Inspector of Factories) and held a senior position organising factory investigations to ensure the health and output of female workers, as the national

focus shifted to securing maximum industrial efficiency. Violet Butler, a social researcher and educator at Barnett House in Oxford, was recommended for a post in 1916 by William Adams, a key figure in the early days of Barnett House who had taken up war duties at the Ministry of Munitions. Grace Hadow resigned her Lady Margaret Hall lectureship (as an English tutor) to begin work organising the female welfare superintendents in the department, an experience that had apparently fired her interest in social studies and would lead to her joining Barnett House after the war (Deneke, 1946). As later recalled by Rose Squire and her long-term colleague, Adelaide Anderson, there were tensions between welfare officers and factory inspectors at the Home Office due to 'overlapping responsibilities of the two departments' (Squire, 1927, p.178; Anderson, 1922). Members of the women's factory inspectorate, Anne Spurgeon has pointed out, had 'resented direction from the Ministry of Munitions and considered that welfare should have fallen within the remit of the Home Office' (2012, p.127). 'The mere association of war and welfare sounds incongruous', wrote Squire in her 1927 memoir reflecting on thirty years in public service (1927, p.34). Yet, she was persuaded to join the Welfare Department on secondment in 1918, after a long conversation with Churchill (1927, p.179). Eventually a permanent Industrial Fatigue Research Board (Industrial Health Research Board, from 1923) was established in July 1918 to continue the work already carried out by the Health of Munitions Workers' Committee. The psychologist May Smith was hired as an investigator in 1920 and remained in post until 1944.

Faced with a lack of experienced social and public health workers to assume welfare and management roles in war-related industries, the Ministry of Munitions turned to the universities to develop training for their staff and funded students onto the newly emerging courses (Chapman, 2007). LSE was at the forefront of these developments. In late 1917, it appointed **Agatha Harrison** (1885-1954), an early advocate for the welfare of factory workers, to the first academic post in Britain concerned with industrial welfare (LRE, 1934). After the war, she continued her research career at the Young Women's Christian Association before serving in the late 1920s as an assistant to **Beryl Power** (1891-1974), who at the time was working for the Royal Commission on Labour, chaired by John Henry Whitley, inquiring into labour conditions in India (Whitley, 1931). Dorothy Peel is listed as an

occasional lecturer in economics at LSE, 1917-18. Described by social historian John Burnett as ‘the doyenne of writers on domestic economy’ (1989, p.265), Peel was well-known for her manuals on household management and cookery, written under the name of Mrs C.S. Peel (Straker, 2016). Works included *Marriage on Small Means* (1914) and *The Labour Saving House* (1917), a book that called for the application of ‘modern methods to the working of our households, in which they are needed as much as in the office or factory’ (1917, p.26). The Women’s University Settlement in South London also played a prominent role in the various training courses developed during the war (Beauman, 1996). In 1916, Elizabeth Macadam, then a social work lecturer at the University of Liverpool (and occasional lecturer at LSE), took leave from the university to help develop training for welfare workers on behalf of the Ministry of Munitions (Cree, 2019).

Trained women from outside the Civil Service were seconded to various ministries. Avril Maddrell (2008) identifies several women who used their geographical knowledge and experience in the war effort. One was Hilda Ormsby; she made military maps for the Naval Intelligence Division of the Admiralty in addition to a heavy teaching load at LSE’s geography department. After gaining LSE’s Social Science Certificate in 1915, Julia Mann’s war service included clerical work in the Admiralty (1915-18) and later the Foreign Office (LSE, 1934). Anthropologists Barbara Freire-Marreco and Maria Czaplicka were also among the university-trained women employed by the Foreign Office (Aitken, 1921, p.61). The feminist Mary Stocks, who during the war moved from Oxford to London to teach at LSE and King’s College while her husband was serving in Europe, describes in her autobiography (1970) how she had to search German newspapers for information on their economy. Statistician Alice Lee contributed to the war effort on secondment to the Munitions Inventory Department and the Admiralty (Love, 1979). In October 1916, Frances Wood transferred from the Board of Trade — where she had worked as a special investigator of employment statistics since her secondment from the Lister Institute — to the Central Statistical Department of the Ministry of Munitions headed by Major Greenwood (Farewell and Johnson, 2016). There, she spent the remainder of the war years undertaking statistical investigations on highly sensitive data supplied by the War Office, remaining in post until she resigned in March 1919 because of her pregnancy (Cole, 2018).

At the Ministry of Food, established under the New Ministries and Secretaries Act 1916, to regulate the supply and consumption of food, two women with specialist knowledge and skills from outside of the academic world, Dorothy Peel and Maud Pember Reeves, were appointed as Co-Directors of Women's Services. First published in 1912 as a Fabian Tract, Pember Reeves' *Round About a Pound a Week* (1913) became a bestseller when it was republished the following year by George Bell & Sons. Extensive coverage in the popular press as well as favourable academic reviews boosted Pember Reeves' national profile and was 'probably the reason', Alison Penn (2016, p.8) suggests, why she joined the Board of Trade inquiry into food costs and later the Ministry of Food. A third edition by Virago Press in 1979 led to its "re-discovery" by second-wave feminists, who used it to build the history of the infant and child welfare movement in England (Dwork, 1987; Lewis, 1980).

Government officials also included women and women's knowledge in the work of reconstruction. Philip Abrams has argued that 'the most appropriate qualification' for women involved in government work during wartime was 'marriage to men already prominent in government or business' (1963, p.60). Although Pember Reeves' husband was Director of the LSE from 1908-1919, this claim seems generally to be unsupported. Krista Cowman's analysis of the Women's Housing Sub-Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction, established in early 1918, suggests a more complex picture. 'Government officials', she argues, 'had become aware of the range of women's expertise to be found in the women's movement … organisations concerned with both women's issues … and with reshaping the domestic environment to promote social change' (2015, p.359). Accordingly, members of the Sub-Committee included working-class women, representing the Women's Labour League, Women's Co-operative Guild and other bodies, who added to the largely middle-class expert voices brought in to investigate housing conditions. The latter included Sybella Gurney, housing reformer and sociologist with expertise in the techniques of regional survey pioneered by Frédéric Le Play; Janet Lane-Claypon, medical scientist and advocate for childcare reform who introduced new statistical procedures to the field of epidemiology; and Dorothy Peel.

Although missing from many historical accounts, involvement in government work during wartime is a recurring theme for women in this study. Organisational and gender boundaries blurred as both university-trained women and those without formal qualifications were recognised as sources of authoritative knowledge.

8.4 Concluding remarks

The three examples given here throw light on the dynamics behind the relationship between research and policy. Firstly, they share several features. Each shows the scale and richness of women's social research in this period; the mechanisms used to gain purchase with different sets of policy actors; the integration of women in policy processes; the importance of collaboration; and the achievements of dynamic groups, more so than individuals. Secondly, they suggest different ways in which in which social knowledge, and the individuals, groups and organisations making knowledge claims, can contribute to policy change.

The first example, that of Mary Walker and Mona Wilson's *Report on Housing and Industrial Conditions and Medical Inspection of School Children* (DSU, 1905), illustrated the potential for a local study to influence local debate and provoke local change (albeit indirectly), as well barriers to the acceptance of this work. By contrast, the authors of *Makers of Our Clothes: A Case for Trade Boards* (Meyer and Black, 1909) sought to exploit a "window of opportunity" for policy change. In 1908, when the study commenced, tackling the issue of sweated labour was an immediate priority. The public and policymakers were already convinced on the need for action. Meyer and Black were probably attempting to influence the substantive content of the proposed law, to ensure it benefitted women. Unlike the first two examples, the third case study did not focus on specific research outputs. Analysis revealed a larger and more heterogenous set of players, as well as the complex interactions between academic and non-academic social science in this period. Here, a political project was driving the production and use of knowledge.

Without recourse to primary sources, it is impossible to draw conclusions about causal relationships between specific research findings and policy change. Of course, this assumes an overarching causality between the two systems, which some dispute. It has been suggested that 'assessments aiming to trace the impact of research on particular policy outcomes are likely to miss a potentially broader,

more diffuse kind of conceptual influence' (Boswell and Smith, 2017, p.4). However, to question whether policy decisions derived directly from the research and conclusions of specific research outputs is not to downplay the women's research or their political campaigns. It is simply to outline some problems of research influence. Lucinda Platt also makes this point: 'If we reflect back on the relationship between research and policy over the last 200 years, one message that comes over … is that there exists an oblique relationship between the two' (2005, p.118).

CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION

Knowledge of the relationship between women, social science and social policy in the decades around 1900, a period when significant obstacles hindered the public participation of women, has previously been confined to a relatively small number of individuals, mainly prominent figures. This study attempted to make a survey of all women involved. A collective biographical approach was used to gather and analyse a dataset of 188 individuals, which enabled me to describe and contextualise these women's lives within broader social processes. This closing chapter brings together the findings of the thesis to demonstrate its important contribution to our understanding of early women in social science, the influences and motives that led them to pursue this path, and their role in the making of modern social policies. It offers conclusions relating to the empirical findings, followed by observations on the reasons for these women's neglect. I also reflect on the research experience itself, to reveal something of the disorderliness of the research process and likely consequences for the knowledge claims. Finally, I consider areas for further research revealed by this study.

9.1 Women and early social science: an assessment

Built on the foundation laid by feminist scholarship from the 1970s, I have used a contextual biographical approach as a way of reinstating women who are largely absent from existing accounts, and to reveal a new story from the analysis of many lives. These women and their ideas have not been wholly neglected, but the significance of their contribution has not been fully appreciated. The analysis reconstructs the lives and collective contribution of 188 women, belonging to two different generations, to argue for the importance of taking social knowledge, and the women who created or mobilised that knowledge, seriously in accounts of the development of modern social policies in Britain.

Scholarship since the 1980s shows that the period between 1870 and 1920 was crucial to both social science and social policy. Most research so far has focused on individual figures or is based on case studies of small groups of women, often further limited to a specific discipline or institution. While other studies have chosen a narrow focus, this thesis is the first attempt to recover all women who contributed

to social scientific knowledge in this period, focusing on those born 1849-1891. Included are the familiar and famous names, including Helen Bosanquet and most notably Beatrice Webb, who are emblematic of women's vision of the reform-oriented purposes of social science, as well as some who have been recently rediscovered, like Clara Collet and Margaret Harkness. Lesser known but equally inspiring women for whom it is more difficult to find information are also included, from Nettie Adler to Helen Wodehouse. During her research on Jane Addams and the Chicago School of Sociology, Mary Jo Deegan wrote about her 'utter amazement' at finding 'not one but dozens of early women sociologists' (as cited in Reinharz, 1992, p.45). I experienced similar feelings of excitement on identifying so many of Addams' British counterparts. It must be conceded that the work for this thesis has only begun to scratch the surface and more needs to be done to build on achievements so far. Although frustrating that I had to apply a strict end date for the search, which means that 188 names is certainly an underestimation, knowledge that there are other stories out there waiting to be found increases the urgency in moving on to postdoctoral research.

The first major contribution of this study relates to the decision to try and identify every woman who participated in social science in the formative years. It is only because I examine 188 biographies across and beyond academic social science that I could see the group dynamics in action and reveal the shifting identities and porous borders between domains traditionally seen as entirely academic or entirely non-academic. It is the scale and breadth of this research that made it possible to identify the diversity in the women's backgrounds and of the work that they did, as well as the value of personal and professional relationships and collaborative ties between individuals and organisations. Diversity, networking and collaboration were three major features of the women's lives which are threaded through the individual biographies outlined in previous chapters. The general observations that follow give a sense of the varied experiences of the women studied here.

It ought to come as no surprise that most of the women were drawn from comfortable middle-class families. It is well documented that family was an important influence in the politicisation of middle-class women in the nineteenth century (Banks, 1986; Hannam, 1996; Holton, 1996; Martin and Goodman, 2003).

Liberal upbringings, well-connected relations, and politically active backgrounds set many women on the path to social science. The origins of an interest in social science are easy to find in Beatrice Webb if we bear in the mind the importance of her informal education through the philosopher Herbert Spencer, a friend of her parents. Family members were important too, including her elder sister, Kate (Catherine Courtney). 'Casting about for some way of observing the life and labour of the people', Webb noted in her diary, she had followed her sister into charitable work as voluntary rent collector in the East End of London. 'This occupation', she continued, 'was certainly well fitted to form part of my apprenticeship as a social investigator' (Webb, 1926, p.223). Parents often played an important role. In some families it was mainly the mother who was the dominant influence. Dorothea Proud and Margaret Llewelyn Davies, among others, benefited from independent-minded mothers. A few women came from homes where the case not only for feminism or social reform, but for social investigation itself, was presented to them while they were still young. Very little material remains of the early life of Nora Milnes, though it is easy to imagine the encouragement of her father, Alfred Milnes, Professor of Political Economy. She acknowledged a debt to him in the introduction to her manuscript, *The Economics of Wages and Labour* (1926). Families could be especially important as a source of intellectual stimulation for working-class women interested in the social sciences, and those without university qualifications.

The increasing accessibility of higher education for women was another important factor affecting women's engagement in social science, but the ways in which it shaped and directed individual trajectories might depend on whether women's interest in social science developed before, during or after her years as a university student. First, there were women whose interests in the social sciences had formed before they arrived at university to study courses such as Cambridge's Moral Sciences Tripos or the diploma awarded by the National Health Society in London. Although they did not necessarily have a career already in mind, women were prominent among the early applicants to the new disciplines as they emerged in an institutionalised form. Avril Maddrell rightly emphasises that it was the 'tenuous status' of social science that resulted in women students being welcomed, 'if initially only to supplement otherwise small class numbers' (2009, p.154). Formative childhood influences were often an important variable in women's access. It is not

without significance that many early students were products of the new secondary schools, several of which were closely linked to women's university colleges. Their academically orientated curricula may well have included Millicent Fawcett's hugely popular introductory economics textbook, *Political Economy for Beginners* (1870), already in a fourth edition by 1876 (Henderson, 2004). A second group of women developed an interest in social science during their university years, having arrived to study a different subject. We saw above that Mary Sheepshanks, a language student, stayed at Cambridge for a fourth year to study moral sciences. Helen Wodehouse arrived on a scholarship to study mathematics but changed to moral sciences upon being influenced by the philosophy of Bernard Bosanquet. For others, including natural sciences student Mary Walker, it was involvement in wider activities during their time at university, often study groups or settlement work where they witnessed poverty at first hand, perhaps for the first time, that set them on a social science career path. Finally, a third group had studied for a non-social science degree and developed an interest only after their university studies ended. Often it was later connections with various knowledge communities that shaped careers related to social science. In this respect, the Glasgow Council for Women's Trades was significant for Scottish arts graduate and labour activist Margaret Irwin, and the Women's University Settlement for history student Hermia Durham, later a civil servant.

Women's access to and participation in social science in the years around 1900 was not one of neat, linear progression. The 'notion of career' for the women in this study, like those in other accounts, 'included shifting combinations of paid employment, voluntary activity and domestic and familial responsibilities' (Goodman et al., 2011, p.179; Thane, 2004). Most showed flexibility and diversity in their career paths. Continuous, full-time paid work was highly unusual and almost entirely limited to women without children. Those with children typically worked part-time or not at all, and movement between different occupational arrangements over the life course was common. It is well known that the academic world in this period was beset with complex mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that made higher education less welcoming for women and hindered their advancement. Universities were predominantly male and run almost entirely by men; as such, they cannot, as others have noted, 'be understood in isolation from the central fact of women's marginality'

(Fitzgerald, 2007, p.250). This is not to say, however, that changes were not taking place. Among the examples cited in previous chapters were women who broke the pattern and had university careers, even if their experiences were uneven and unequal. This research also observed that a network of non-academic institutions and organisations, often working in parallel and in dialogue with universities, provided an alternative set of opportunities for women to enter social science.

For the first time, women entered the academic world of social science, despite the significant gender-related barriers and constraints faced by those seeking professional careers. In this attempt, they were partially successful. It is the case, for instance, of Margaret Read, awarded a Chair at the Institute of Education, University of London in 1940); Lillian Knowles, LSE's first female professor, teaching economic history; Beatrice Edgell, the first woman to earn a professorship in psychology at a British university; and Helen Wodehouse, the first female Chair at the University of Bristol. However, these women almost unique in their generation to reach the top of their profession. The obstacles to progressing an academic career remained significant throughout this period. Most women were marginalised within the job market and never gained any permanent academic position. The biographies of such women as Helene Reynard, Barbara Freire-Marreco and Margaret McKillop support Margaret Rossiter's assertion that 'even though women could claim … that they had "opened the doors of science", it was quite clear that they would be limited to positions just inside the entryway' (1982, p.xvii). Academic women were disproportionally concentrated at the separate women's colleges in London, Oxford and Cambridge, as well as the co-educational London School of Economics after it opened doors to university qualifications in the social sciences from 1895. Access to university courses in the social sciences made it possible for some women to get an academic post, though not necessarily in the same department. Lack of a doctorate was rarely an obstacle to appointments, as it was for later cohorts (Simpson, 2009). Some areas were easier than others for women to gain access. Psychology's lack of prestige in the early twentieth century might open doors for women seeking an academic career, but the economics profession erected significant barriers.

Other women, including some who had gained formal university qualifications in social science subjects, followed a quite different career trajectory. For a variety of

factors, they chose (or were obliged to choose) work outside university settings. Margaret Harkness, Martha Loane and Ethel Tweedie were among the numerous scholars who pursued their intellectual interests in social science as independent researchers. For women forced to abandon professional employment upon marriage, this frequently provided an alternative opportunity to continue research. University settlement houses and bodies like the Women's Industrial Council, Christian Social Union and Charity Organisation Society also played a crucial role in providing mechanisms for women to enter social science. Lettice Jowitt, Dorothy Keeling and Charlotte Wilson are just some of the women who carried out social investigation of one kind or another on their behalf. A third major cluster of non-academic scholars came from knowledge institutions within local and national government. Adelaide Anderson, Rose Squire and Lucy Streatfeild are among those who worked as government social researchers.

Similar observations regarding career patterns for early women in social science have been made in other contexts. Per Wisselgren studied a cohort of nine female social researchers in Sweden, concluding that 'it was the internal dynamics and the lively traffic of participants and ideas' that gave coherence to the expanding field of social knowledge production in this period (2021, p.138). Insights from this thesis also support his claim that non-academic social research 'should be understood not as peripheral but as central and intermediary for the formation of the social knowledge field' (2021, p.125). My research demonstrates also that non-academic settings could offer more than a 'counterbalance to women's marginality in academia', suggesting commonalities with Gianna Pomata's analysis of women historians of the first half of the twentieth century for whom, she argues, 'the amateur tradition offered … a source of positive values and models for their participation in intellectual life' (2013, p.209). In social reform organisations especially, there is evidence that women expanded the domain of social science. Despite a lack of secure research positions, doing social science in contexts other than academia did not rule out recognition and influence during their lifetime. Several women published works that are still in print and among the examples cited above are women who were appointed to prominent positions within the various government bodies given responsibility for guiding research during the First World

War. Finally, there are cases of women deliberately choosing a career at the research-policy interface over an academic job.

Early women in social science embraced a wide range of activities, with organisational affiliations and intellectual preoccupations often centred on an interest in the application of social science. They often researched the lives of marginalised people, especially women, children and the socially deprived, as well as social structures and mechanisms of social exclusion. Some of the topics covered are access to the labour market; wages and wage differentials; employment patterns across occupations; childbirth, childrearing and reproductive health; and domestic circumstances and household budgeting. Thus, the patterns are consistent with earlier work on female contributions to economic thought (Dimand, 1999; Groenewegen and King, 1994; Madden, 2002). Although I did not explicitly compare British men and women, my results appear to support previous work which found that women were more likely to write empirical articles and to write about subjects that few male social scientists in this period considered (Grant et al., 2002; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998).

Whilst there are examples of feminist concerns within the women's writings (notably, a shared assumption that economic discrimination is critical to women's oppression), a complex set of attitudes and values are at work. Others have noted an acceptance of the sexual division of labour in the first-wave women's movement. Social investigations by bodies like the Women's Industrial Council, therefore, 'conceptualized women's labour almost exclusively in relation to household survival' (McCarthy, 2016, p.271). Some studies from this period did try to take account of women's own views and experiences, but direct quotations from working-class female sources are uncommon. Notable exceptions include Margaret Llewelyn Davies' *Maternity: Letters from Working Women* (1915), based on research carried out to support the Women's Co-operative Guild's campaigns for improved health and welfare provision for mothers and their children. This edited collection of letters from Guild members details the, often terrible, experiences of childbirth and childrearing in working-class families. 'These letters give the facts', stated the Right Hon. Liberal MP Herbert Samuel, a politician closely associated with the Fabians, particularly the Webbs and Graham Wallas, in the preface, 'not by medical men or

social students, but by the sufferers themselves, in their own words' (1915, p.v). Helen McCarthy has noted how the 'mode of seeing married women's employment as a "social problem" began to change in the 1940s' (2016, p.275). Female researchers such as Pearl Jephcott, she observed, 'helped to reframe what had been understood as a social problem stemming from the unemployment, incapacity or absence of a male breadwinner into a sociological fact rooted in women's material aspirations and social and psychic needs' (2016, p.272).

There is other evidence that the women's movement, notably its concern with the education and employment of middle-class women, was important in shaping women's research interests in the decades around 1900. The distinctive nature of women's early research had been observed by LSE sociologist Viola Klein in 1946, leading her to consider 'the peculiar affinity between the fate of women and the origins of social science'. It was, she argued in *The Feminine Character*, one of the first theoretical explorations of the theme of gender ideology, 'no mere coincidence that the emancipation of women should have started at the same time as the birth of sociology' (1946, p.17). Since then, many others have built on Klein's observations, notably feminist standpoint theorists who call attention to the idea that knowledge is socially situated and women's lives as privileged sites of knowledge production (Harding, 1986; Smith, 1987). An emblematic figure in this respect is the civil servant Clara Collet, a profile author whose pioneering work challenged central questions in labour economics. In *Educated Working Women* (1902), a collection of six essays that had first appeared elsewhere, Collet drew on both economic theory and her own (gendered) social experiences when she assessed, among other things, the overstocked labour market and marriage prospects for professional women. Many of her contemporaries were also researching issues relating to the economic position of women workers in the middle classes, among them **Alice Gordon** (1854-1929), who published "The After-Careers of University-Educated Women" in 1895, and **Louise Creighton** (1850-1936), a lifelong friend of Beatrice Webb. In a review of Collet's essays, Mary Paley Marshall commended the work as the 'outcome of trained economic thought working on a wide experience of life'. The author, she argued, 'is not holding a brief for women, but evidently wants to get at the truth, whether it tells for or against them … she is not inclined to consider their

work as a thing apart, but in close relation to the present and future well-being of society' (Marshall, 1902, p.252).

There are links between the women in this study and earlier generations who participated in the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (NAPSS). Several observations stand out. First, my women differed from those who came before in that most were university educated and trained. Second, there is some evidence of continuity in women's scholarly work. NAPSS women focused mainly on 'what could be called women's subjects, and … women's rights'; unlike my women, however, their primary concern 'was with middle rather than lower-class women' (1982, p.58). Third, NAPSS women were almost all liberals whereas the women in my study came from diverse social and political backgrounds, including families affiliated to labour and socialist movements. Both groups of women, however, appear to have been well connected with government through family, marriage and friendships. Fourth, there are strong indications that my women, especially the earlier cohort, were aware of prominent NAPSS women. To give just one example. In 1911, Alice Zimmern wrote an entry on the educational and social reformer Mary Carpenter, the first woman to have a paper published by the Statistical Society of London, in Volume 5 of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, this study identified multiple personal connections and overlapping networks, with women frequently linked through bodies affiliated with NAPSS, such as the Society for Promoting the Employment of Women, which continued after the former officially disbanded. Tracing intellectual legacies, as others have noted, is important: 'the ideas of those who came before and after … matter because they form a thread linking past to present' (McCarthy, 2016, p.305).

The second major contribution of this thesis is to use a historical approach to add to recent debates about the complicated nature of the relationship and interaction between research and policy, a matter of much current interest to policymakers (Boswell and Smith, 2017). The scale and breadth of this study helped show that women were producing social knowledge to a degree not appreciated previously, much of it going beyond disciplinary boundaries in efforts to advance public recognition of social problems and effect policy and societal change. Participation in parliamentary committees, lectures, research partnerships and political lobbying

were among the mechanisms used by women to communicate research and encourage its uptake by end-users. Perhaps most significantly of all, they built beneficial relationships across research and policy communities.

This research has exposed previously unknown connections between individuals, groups and organisations. Publication data (co-authorship) was useful in identifying the range of interactions and instances of collaboration at individual and institutional levels. There is clear evidence that networks were significant in enabling, nurturing and legitimising women's early participation in social science. Networks were advantageous also to the exchange of intellectual ideas, within and between research and policy communities. As noted by Berridge and Thom, 'policy and science do not belong to completely separate, autonomous spheres but are linked through networks of influence and policy communities where information and ideas are constantly reviewed and exchanged' (1996, p.24). Today, collaboration between individuals and between organisations is increasingly seen as central to research and the creation of new knowledge (Mills and James, 2020; Stephens and Cummings, 2021). This study found that many pioneering women were embedded in a collaborative system of knowledge production and exchange that spanned institutional boundaries. Whilst lack of time prevented in-depth examination of the complex web of interrelationships in the main part of the thesis, it is clear from emerging evidence that networks and collaborative partnerships of one form or another extended beyond the "golden triangle" of elite universities in Oxford, Cambridge and London. To give an example outlining avenues for future research: amongst the visiting speakers that addressed the Dundee Social Union in the decade after 1905, following publication of its sociological study of industrial conditions, were Beatrice Webb, Louise Creighton and Gertrude Tuckwell (Baillie, 1996).

Drawing from the wider literature on this topic, case studies relating to minimum wage policy, child welfare, and policymaking in wartime explored the problematic relationship between research and policy. Together, they capture significant factors that affected decision-makers' use of research, with political factors and the wider decision-making system identified as particularly important. While the broader question of whether social knowledge produced and distributed by women had a

direct impact on the proliferation of social legislation in this period remains largely unanswered, this research has shed light on the significant contribution made by women to the creation of a policy agenda for women.

9.2 Gender and the politics of memorialisation

The early participation of women in social science was an important development and yet it often goes unrecognised. The persistent absence of some names in existing accounts (including the ODNB), many of whom one would have expected to have been recorded and acknowledged, calls for closer examination. Why have the efforts of so many women within the early history of social science been forgotten? What keeps us from remembering them? Why do some individuals receive significant attention while others are overlooked? Might their historically subordinate position in social science been due to lack of merit, in the form of study flaws or lack of originality? Although such a claim for some of their work may be warranted, the situation is more complex than it first appears. Here I suggest a combination of factors likely to have contributed to the intellectual neglect of these women. These have consequences for future scholarship in this area.

The first consideration is that it is not always easy to find women of this era in the public record. It is not only that their historical documents tend to be incomplete and dispersed throughout collections. Like others of their generation, the women discussed here were frequently reluctant to seek public recognition for their work and consequently did not deposit their papers in public archives. Amy Erickson makes the same point in her biography of Ellen McArthur, suggesting that a reluctance to seek the limelight ‘may have contributed to her obscurity’, though adds that ‘it cannot be the whole explanation because Cunningham did not leave his papers for posterity either’ (2018, p.47). A related problem is that women’s archives may offer more in the way of official documents connected to their public works rather than personal material in the form of letters, diaries, or other first-hand testimony. I came across this when researching the feminist Dorothea Zimmern who carried out investigations on behalf of the Women’s Industrial Council, collaborating often with Lucy Wyatt Papworth, prior to her appointment in 1914 as Lady Inspector of the Board of Trade. She is recorded as the first person to deposit an archive with

the Fawcett Library (now the Women's Library), in March 1933.[28] Her file consists primarily of her notes accumulated for articles on women's wages published in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*.

Another reason women tend to be absent is because they were women. Research shows how patriarchal attitudes regarding appropriate roles for men and women in society have worked to obscure women's intellectual achievements and contributions, leading many scholars studying gender discrimination in science to cite the so-called Matilda Effect, a phrase coined by Margaret Rossiter to capture the consistent under-recognition of female scientists due to biases based on gender stereotypes. Women's invisibility, she wrote in the first volume of her ground-breaking history, was not accidental: 'It was due to the camouflage intentionally placed over their presence in science' (1982, p.10). Since then, others have considerably substantiated Rossiter's early observations.

Whilst it is well documented that early social science had a social reform dimension, women's neglect appears also to be related to the fact that mainstream histories of social science are still prone to downplay the significance of contributions made outside academia. There is no shortage of examples to illustrate this point. In an article published in *Sociological Theory*, Mary Jo Deegan called out Richard Hamilton's 'limited definition of the discipline', noting that he is 'distressed by the fact that knowledge changes with different perspectives, authors, and historical moments' (2003, p.298; Hamilton, 2003). Deegan refers to him ignoring or distorting the scholarship of founding women in sociology, especially Martineau. There is also an element of this in Scott and Bromley's 'sociological project of Victor Branford, Patrick Geddes, and their circle' (2013, p.ix). Sybella Gurney (Bradford's second wife), although introduced by the authors as the 'third figure in the core of the collaborative circle' (p.2), is not seen as important enough to include in the book's subtitle alongside both male figures.

We must ask also whether the writing out of these women was part of the politics of knowledge within the social sciences: as others have put it, the 'distorting lens of

[28] Description of 'Papers of Dorothea M Barton, c.1900-1920. Women's Library Archives. GB 106 7DMB' on the Archives Hub website: https://archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk/data/gb106-7dmb. Date accessed: 17/01/2019.

current concerns' (Oakley, 2019, p.374). One aspect of this concerns the extent that the academy, or at least some elements of it, attaches importance to theory-building and conceptual contributions over empirical research and methodological innovation (Abrams, 1968; Luo et al., 2018). It is important also to consider 'the division between qualitative and quantitative research within and without feminism' (Hughes and Cohen, 2012, p.1; Oakley, 1998). The second wave feminist orthodoxy that feminists use qualitative methods, with corresponding opposition to quantitative approaches rooted in realist and positivist frameworks, may well have impacted the writing of disciplinary history and contributed to the under-representation of women in early accounts.

It could be said that a narrow interpretation of social science has led to the erasure of women from the historical record. It is, Bernard noted, 'nothing new for physical and biological scientists to be involved in social science research' (2012, p.20798). We see this crossing of disciplinary boundaries and genres reflected in current programmes of research at the interface between social sciences, public health and medicine (Greenhalgh, 2018; Greer et al., 2021). Challenging mainstream constructions of the past, recent research has recognised the social theorist Harriet Martineau for her contribution to the sociology of medicine, health and illness (Collyer, 2010; Sanders and Weiner, 2017). Ann Oakley has examined the use of 'fiction as a vehicle for transmitting accounts of social conditions' in the work of Clementina Black and Margaret Harkness. 'Their works', she observed, 'belong to a forgotten history of how "mixed methods" in social research developed in synergy with the use of both fact and fiction to highlight social problems' (2019, p.360). Traditional accounts, however, still tend to foreground historical figures whose roles in social science have been easier to define.

Finally, there is a danger in taking a narrow view of the policy process that views the passage of legislation in and of itself as successful policy change (Kenney, 2003). Conceptualising "success" in this manner has serious implications for our ability to understand women's early relationship with social science and contributions to reform. Through their involvement (and this could be funding, conducting, disseminating, or using research) many women played an important role in helping to get issues that affected women on the public agenda and to the forefront of

policymakers' attention. Most importantly, these women recognised that gender data gaps make possible the persistence of inequalities. They produced much needed sex-disaggregated data and information that reflected the diverse realities of women's lives. To overlook the influence of agenda-setting is to misunderstand the nature of policy change and the women themselves.

9.3 Reflections on my research journey

Assessment of knowledge claims is essential if findings are to be trusted and used. Though writers from different epistemological and methodological positions define concepts such as validity, reliability and generalisability differently, and many have questioned whether they are relevant for attaining rigour in research using qualitative methods, they remain important considerations in the evaluation of all research (Hammersley, 1987; Kuper, Lingard and Levinson, 2008; Rolfe, 2006). Writing about the status of biographical scholarship, scholars have observed that this type of analysis will always be mistrusted by some, going on to note that most recently it has come under attack from a younger generation influenced by postmodernist theories (Merrill and West, 2009). Many feminist researchers assert that 'what is important … is being aware of the implications of what we do or do not do' during the research process (Letherby, 2003, p.113). In support of this and drawing on a range of work including Lässig (2004) and Leavy and Harris (2019), I have implemented several strategies to ensure rigour and support the knowledge claims being made in this investigation.

Importantly, these strategies are inherent in the research process itself, and not undertaken once a study is completed (Morse et al., 2002). I disclose my own experiences to acknowledge the ways in which my personal background, beliefs and assumptions may have shaped the research process and interpretations (Chapter 1). I document as fully as possible my way of constructing and writing this thesis (Chapter 3). Finally, I reflect critically on the process and consider the implications of acknowledged shortcomings (Chapter 9).

The remainder of this section considers methodological and practical issues that may have affected the quality and interpretation of the evidence presented in earlier chapters. This is followed by a brief discussion of the challenges related to my

positioning of this work as feminist research and the authorial presence in my writing as I grappled with the role of my personal biography in the research process.

9.3.1 Methodological and practical issues that arose during the research

Keeping the human record straight, wrote the American sociologist Charles Wright Mills, 'is indeed a deceptively simple statement of aim'. Source material in the form of memoirs, letters and public documents may constitute, as he puts it, 'a great file indispensable to all social science', but it is a 'messy' file full of holes and misrepresentations (1959, p.161). Moving through the research process, I thought continually about the various theoretical and practical decisions that I had made, and I have no doubt that several made along the way are open to challenge. I discuss these below and reflect on their likely consequences for the knowledge claims. Priority is given to methodological issues relating to the selection of the ODNB and other biographical dictionaries for prosopographical studies.

Deciding whom to count. In research such as this, when the demarcation of the target group is subjective and 'closely connected with the ideological paradigm of the researcher' (Verboven et al., 2007, p.51), it is of fundamental importance to make explicit, and clearly justify, who belongs to the social group and who does not. One strength of this study is the use of formal selection criteria to minimise the potential for bias, by generating a systematic basis for determining the group of women to be included in the analysis.

Since one of the main aims was to recover missing voices and analyse them alongside well-known figures, limiting the investigation to those at the top academic level or even those who claimed to be a social scientist would be too narrow a definition of the population. I chose six criteria for inclusion (taught; researched; published; funded; self-identified; identified by others) designed to capture the many facets of women's engagement with social science. Only one needed to be fulfilled for a woman to be seen as having contributed to social science ideas and practices. Some readers may question whether providing money to support activities is at all the same as undertaking social research or producing publications. I chose this approach to capture both the indirect and direct ways that women might carve out a space for themselves in social science and contribute to the stock of social scientific

knowledge. By exploring outwards, we can find a better, fuller picture of early women in social science.

Identifying individuals. At the start of my research, only the names of a few women who engaged in social science were already known to me, mainly renowned figures such as Beatrice Webb plus some of the women I had studied during my master's programme, notably Eleanor Rathbone and Eva Hubback. Identifying additional women who met my definition was considerably more complex and time-consuming than I had anticipated. It might have been relatively straightforward if the focus were on a well-defined observable group, for instance Oxford students who graduated between two dates, because there would likely be a readily available document or register able to provide a definitive list of candidates. As it was, it was left to me to design a suitable compilation method.

My starting point was the ODNB, which has the advantage over other bibliographical reference works of being updated regularly. A major limitation of this source, however, is its potential for selection bias. As noted elsewhere, without evidence of the criteria governing the editors' selection of entries, subsequent analyses are most likely 'subject to distortion' (MacLeod and Nuvolari, 2006, p.762). Once you move away from a tightly defined group it becomes highly unlikely that the ODNB will either have comprehensive coverage or a random or representative sample of the target population. For that reason, several additional sources were searched. I might otherwise have missed learning about **Maud Brereton** (1871-1946), former teacher turned domestic science expert who moved in same social and circle as Hilda Oakley, Alice Zimmern and Marie Stopes.

Not relying exclusively on the ODNB to generate the initial list of names is an important strength of the research design. However, time constraints resulted in two decisions that may be seen as limitations to this work, which can be explored further in future research. First, I prioritised time-efficient sources. I had intended to examine back issues of relevant periodicals not covered by Dimand et al. (2000) and Madden et al. (2004). I started searching *Social Services Review* and *Nineteenth Century* but ran into difficulties upon finding that contributing authors were frequently listed by initials and surname only, followed the convention of using their husband's name, or wrote under a male pseudonym. Confirming the identity of

such individuals was extremely challenging and labour intensive. Since my initial efforts were largely unsuccessful, I decided the best recourse would be to discontinue the plan to search periodicals and look to other sources that might yield better results in the time available. Second, I specified an end-date for adding names to the longlist, after which no further sources, regardless of how relevant they looked, would be searched. A list of potentially relevant sources discovered after this deadline are detailed in Appendix A.8.

It was not a condition of inclusion in this study that the women had to already have been 'recovered' in sense that an existing biography was available, but a minimum level of information was necessary to determine eligibility. One of the few cases where my perseverance paid off related to a woman that I came across during the early stages of my research, a Mrs Boyd Dawson. I initially struggled to identify her by way of birth and marriage records, which often contain little to no biographical information. Eventually, thanks to Margaret Cole's autobiography *Growing up into Revolution* (1949), she was identified as **Lilian Dawson** (1874-?), member of the Fabian Women's Group, and author of Fabian Tract no. 205, *Co-operative Education* (1923), though her database entry remains quite minimal.

Significantly, I was unable to confirm the year of birth for many women on the longlist, nor could I locate other personal details that would allow me to approximate the date with any degree of certainty. Often no information could be located beyond details of their published writings, and in some cases institutional affiliation. They include women like Mary Phillips who were linked to the Research Committee of the Christian Social Union (CSU). Phillips wrote a paper on the working of wages boards published in 1909 in *The Economic Review*, a quarterly periodical associated with the Oxford University branch of the CSU. Another woman excluded due to lack of reliable information on year of birth is Helen Blagg who, along with Charlotte Wilson, wrote *Women and Prisons (Fabian Tract No 163)* from material collected during 1910-11 by a committee of the Fabian Women's Group. The largest single group for whom the search for biographical information has so far been unsuccessful is formed of women known to have taught for a short period at the London School of Economics. At the time of writing, I have few details beyond a short record of their employment, illustrating 'how quickly women become invisible if

they do not write their own memoirs, publish diaries or contribute to periodicals' (Sloane, 2020, p.38). I suspect several of these women are within the scope of my research, but they must await further investigation.

Sources. Many scholars have remarked that one of the greatest challenges in writing a women's biography remains the incomplete record of their lives and work. Despite advances in feminist scholarship over recent years, the ways in which we approach biographical inquiry are constrained by, as Martin (2001, p.170) puts it, the 'politics of historical survival'. The long struggle of the Women's Library, the oldest and most extensive collection on women's history in Britain, to establish a permanent home for its archives is a good case in point. Even when women's papers do find their way into archives, the available material is often fragmentary, and collections may be poorly classified, or documents scattered over various locations.

This project took a prosopographical approach that required relatively small amounts of data on nearly 200 women. Nevertheless, the search for biographical information was time-consuming and rarely straightforward. Heavy reliance on the ODNB for this research project can be justified as the dictionary entries are based on formal archival research but it is important not to overlook its limitations. Most importantly perhaps, its content is driven by someone else's personal preferences. As noted by Ruth Watts (2010a), entries vary in length according to how the editorial team perceive the importance of the person. For instance, the ODNB entry for Beatrice Webb runs to nearly 24,000 words, but few other women in the dictionary qualify for anything like this length. Many of the entries I consulted were under 800 words, somewhat shorter than the average word length (c.1000 words). Shorter entries invariably provide less scope for comprehensive biographical information. A related problem for researchers using the ODNB is that they are reliant on whatever information the contributing authors thought important to include. Thus, I judged early in the research process that the ODNB alone would be unable to furnish all the biographical information for the analysis and consulted other sources. Still, I found sources for several women to be particularly sparse, including **Eleanor Kirkman Gray** (1864-?). She co-edited her deceased husband's unfinished manuscript *Philanthropy and the State* (1908), with her friend Bessie Hutchins.

To address the limitations of prioritising secondary sources, and because the records kept by universities and colleges are often confusing or incomplete, I cross-checked and corroborated information with other sources. This took up a significant amount of time, and it is important to emphasise that this process is still in progress. Also, I ended up identifying many more sources than it was possible to examine in the time frame. Both the unfinished nature of the data collection and the limitations of relying heavily on secondary sources are important considerations. There are huge opportunities for primary and archival research that I have not yet taken up.

A final point to make relates to the heavy reliance on secondary literature for the exploratory case studies in Chapter 8. There are scholarly disagreements that I have not been able to resolve. Whilst greater understanding might be gained by inspecting primary sources, this would require 'quite resource-intensive methodologies' (Boswell and Smith, 2017, p.6).

Human error or bias. Research, as Norris (1997, p.173) notes, 'is a human activity subject to the same kinds of failings as other human activities. Researchers … make mistakes and get things wrong'. While there are no procedures which if followed will eliminate sources of bias and error completely, I took several important steps to reduce this problem, including developing explicit selection criteria. It was a massive challenge applying them, however, since the categorisation of women, as either meeting the criteria or not, involved a subjective reading of their published works and other activities. I also often agonised over decisions about whom to include in situations where there was limited biographical information on which to base a decision (for example, when faced with conflicting evidence on dates of birth). There is the possibility that errors of judgement led to some individuals on the longlist being incorrectly processed.

***Implications*.** Both my theoretical and practical decisions are open to question, and it is probably inevitable that other researchers would obtain different results. I cannot claim to have identified everyone and there may be individuals in this study that some readers did not expect to find. There is no way of knowing if the group I identified is representative of the whole or skewed in a particular direction. The records are complete only for a small number of individuals. Nearly half of my women were not prominent enough to be included in standard biographical sources

which meant casting the net much wider to identify information. Many of these attempts were unsuccessful or yielded little. This of course reveals something of the nature of the group. As observed by Clare Anderson, ‘the absence of genealogical details … in many of these biographies reminds us of the multiple silences that penetrate deep into the writing of marginal lives’ (2012, p.18).

Given more time and resources, it is likely that further research will fill some of these gaps. In the meantime, it is important to consider the likely consequences for the knowledge claims. In statistical terms, I did not have a complete list of all members of the population of interest, and this meant limited use of descriptive and summary statistics. I expect some observers to question why I did not track down the entire population of interest before proceeding with the analysis. I have explained that there were limitations to what I could achieve within available resources. More importantly perhaps, in completing my thesis I came to understand that I did not need to find every individual to create a balanced impression of earlier generations of women working in the social sciences. I am confident that most of the women meeting the selection criteria are accounted for, and that I have offered a sound rationale for the subjects chosen so that readers are not in doubt as to why these 188 lives have been brought together.

The lack of a representative sample and gaps in the dataset have prevented a robust statistical analysis of the data, and some readers may object to the tables that were included in the main text. I have been careful, however, not to draw any far-reaching conclusions from potentially spurious patterns in the quantitative data, a problem associated with Charle’s prosopographical analysis of nineteenth-century French academics (Raemdonck, 2000).

Biographers, as Victoria Glendinning succinctly puts it, have a tendency towards ‘ancestor-worship, even when we demystify and demythologise’ (1988, p.61). As feminist researchers faced with a desire to find role models among women of the past, it is important that we heed the cautionary advice against the seduction or temptation to rewrite lives to serve our own purpose. While I am confident that my account of this group of women reflects with reasonable certainty what it is intended to represent, it must be emphasised that it was never the purpose of this research to provide a complete account of earlier generations of women working in the social

sciences. Although there is a growing body of studies attesting to the possibilities of using biographical evidence, it is also clear that this methodology cannot provide definitive answers to socio-historical problems. 'It may be', as sociologist Michael Erben contends, 'that we must recognise and admit the unknowable, it may be that we can rehearse only an approximation of what our earlier social ancestors pondered and reflected upon' (1996, p.57).

9.3.2 Negotiating the authorial self and self-reflexivity in my writing

Putting together this thesis presented challenges related to my positioning of this work as feminist research and the authorial presence in my writing. Feminist theorists have been and continue to be imperative in shifting the academic culture from, as Judith Gill and her colleagues put it, 'the objective … depersonalised subject of "the researcher", to a … stance that insists on the subjective element being a part of any research enterprise, regardless of the methodology adopted' (2008, p.251). I have personally found writing a reflexivity statement to be a powerful professional and personal exercise. It gave me space to explore issues surrounding my own voice and develop self-awareness of the lens through which I have approached the topic. As many others have argued, and Rahel Wasserfall succinctly puts, 'reflexivity is certainly epistemologically useful: the researcher becomes more aware of constructing knowledge and of the influences of her beliefs, backgrounds and feelings in the process of researching' (1993, pp.24-25).

All the same, as someone who has spent years working in traditional academic social science, with a positivist approach to methods and a depersonalised writing style, I found it difficult to write in the first person and was reluctant to include anything beyond a few elements of my own autobiography in the body of the thesis. I am not alone in this regard. In a recent article, Jen Rinaldi, whose work engages with issues of disability**,** argued that the sharing of personal information and the disclosure of identity is 'not only difficult, uncomfortable, and invasive, but is sometimes useless' (2013, p.1). Other writers to caution against excessive reflexivity in research have expressed concern that, by turning the lens inward, we take something away from those who ought to be the centre of attention (Robertson, 2000). As Oakley reminded scholars some time ago, the point is not to 'exhibit a

purely private history' (1984, pp.2-3). It is the arguments of these writers that most resonate with me.

9.4 Implications and recommendations for future research

The learning process involved in conducting the research for this thesis has implications generally for my professional work and has already inspired me to greater intellectual curiosity about my own profession identity. Looking to the future, the thesis itself has implications for further research and related activities that either I or someone else might do. The lives, careers and achievements of this group of 188 women deserve more intensive scrutiny. There is material stored in the database that remains to be explored (e.g., influence of religion) and doubtless there are names that are yet to be uncovered. A further priority is harnessing the power of digital tools and methods to provoke new ways of thinking about and investigating women in social science, and to enhance uptake of what we already know. Recommendations urging specific actions are made below.

Coverage. A first recommendation is to expand the database through improvements to the research design and compilation method. Additional searches are needed to identify biographical information for the incomplete records in the database. Archival research may be necessary. To provide insight into the lives of women with few surviving documents, one line of enquiry could be to consult other people's archives. For instance, I am aware that Ellinor Black's correspondence with Professor Thomas Simey of the University of Liverpool, when she was acting head of the Department of Social Science during his absence, are deposited in his archive. Another task would be to continue the search for eligible women, starting with the names and sources that I did not have time to follow up (Appendix A.8). This would almost certainly lead to new women for any future study.

There are also strong grounds for extending the eligibility criteria to cover all women who were active in the social sciences prior to the 1940s, rather than setting boundaries by year of birth. Women who would fall within the scope of future research, if such a change were made, include Jane Marcet (1769-1858) and Maria Edgeworth (1768-1849), as well as women born in the early nineteenth century, notably Harriet Martineau, Mary Carpenter, Helen Blackburn, Emily Davies, Lydia Becker, Jessie Boucherett, and Isa Craig, appointed NAPSS assistant secretary in

1857. Millicent Garrett Fawcett (1847-1929) fell just outside the scope of this study. Among the women who would be included if eligibility were extended to the generation that reached maturity during the interwar period are Enid Charles (1894-1972), pioneer in demography and population statistics; Margaret Simey (1906-2004), the first woman to be awarded a bachelor's degree in sociology at Liverpool's School of Social Science; and Viola Klein (1908-1973), a Jewish refugee born in Vienna who completed a doctoral thesis under Karl Mannheim at LSE during the war (Lyon, 2007). Expanding the scope to include women born either side of the current birth cohorts would stimulate new research questions and provide a stronger basis on which to examine commonalities and differences between the different generations, as well as transmission of ideas across generations.

Interdisciplinary approaches. A second recommendation is to explore the use of theories and methods from the field of network science, specifically the approach of quantitative social network analysis (SNA), to statistically map and analyse women's early engagement in social science. As Boissevain states, 'network analysis asks questions about who is linked to whom, the content of the linkages, the patterns they form, the relation between the patterns and behaviour, and the relation between the pattern and other social forces' (1979, p.392). Using a network analysis and visualisation software package, such as the open-source NodeXL for Microsoft Excel, to analyse the activities of the women would provide two main benefits for researchers and research users, respectively (Borgatti, Everett and Freeman, 2002). First, reconstructing social networks statistically would provide researchers with the means to qualify and quantify how important individual women may have been in their respective networks; map personal and professional relationships as they evolved over time; and analyse large and highly complex networks, revealing patterns and networks of interaction that might otherwise be missed. Second, visual representation would allow readers of any subsequent publications to get a clearer and more immediate sense of the networks and social interaction.

Possibly the earliest example of feminist work applying network analysis was an article published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1985 by Naomi Rosenthal (1985) and her associates that examined the organisational affiliations of prominent women reformers in nineteenth-century New York State. More recently, these

techniques have been used to analyse the personal networks of British militant suffragettes (Crossley et al., 2012; Edwards, 2014), including the use of an ego-net approach centred on Helen Kirkpatrick Watts and her personal contacts to better understand the diffusion of militant tactics by members of the Women's Social and Political Union (Edwards and Crossley, 2009). The first author explains the benefits of integrating different types of data: 'not only relational data for quantitative network analysis about the structure of these networks, but rich, narrative accounts about the meaning of ties over time and the perception of the network from those within it' (Edwards, 2010, p.20). While there are likely to be challenges when using mixed method approaches to social network analysis working with historical evidence, their use in earlier studies suggest they hold considerable promise for future research analysing the role of personal, professional, and intellectual relationships among my group of women.

Digitised archives. My third recommendation is for a digital archive that makes the bio-bibliographical material gathered as part of this thesis more widely available in a searchable format. This would address one of the central contributions of feminist scholarship, that of reaching beyond the university to make research-based knowledge more accessible to broad non-academic audiences (Leavy and Harris, 2019). This has been done elsewhere. For instance, Stephanie Green has written of the value of creating a digitised archive concerning the lives and work of Charlotte and Marie Stopes. Tapping into the digital cultural sphere, she says, can give 'greater flexibility and accessibility to the way key resources are shared and recruited, both for academic and non-academic researchers, with fluency and immediacy' (2017, p.732).

A two-phase approach is recommended to support wider use of the biographical and bibliographic information on the 188 women currently stored in the relational database. The initial phase would involve creating a web interface to the underlying database, allowing scholars and other users to access and navigate through the material in an intuitive way. This type of digital project is well documented by relevant examples. These include the *Orlando* project on women's writing in the British Isles (http://orlando.cambridge.org), one of the original, feminist digitised archival projects, founded in 1995 at the University of Alberta, Canada; the

Collective Biographies of Women project directed by Alison Booth (2009) at the University of Virginia, USA (http://womensbios.lib.virginia.edu/); and *Corvey Women Writers on the Web*, a collection of material by Romantic women writers held at Sheffield Hallam University in the UK (https://www2.shu.ac.uk/corvey/CW3/). The second phase, whilst requiring substantial financial investments, would offer much greater potential for inter-disciplinary and collaborative working. SNA techniques could be used to reconstruct the women's social networks statistically. Then, by incorporating these into the database, digital technologies could be used to develop a tool for creating rich interactive data visualisations. Constructing a dynamic dataset would allow scholars and other users from all over the world to not only trace individual women and their social networks, but also contribute new information on people and associations to the database.

There are sophisticated and fascinating examples of existing projects that are either partially or entirely dependent on user-generated content. For example, the *Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* project (http://www.sixdegreesoffrancisbacon.com/) maps and reconstructs Britain's early modern (c.1500-1700) social networks using data mined from the ODNB and currently contains around 14,000 people connected by some 200,000 relationships (Warren et al., 2016). Other pioneering projects include *Visualizing Historical Networks* created by a team at Harvard University (https://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~histecon/visualizing/graphing/ economists.html). This features a series of stand-alone projects, including one led by Ian Kumekawa exploring the connections between 136 (predominantly male) early twentieth-century economists at Cambridge University. Whilst acknowledging the conceptual and methodological challenges of the digital revolution, feminist scholarship has also shown us the democratising effect of digitisation, highlighting its capacity for increasing 'access for those traditionally excluded from more conventional means of history-making' (Hamilton and Spongberg, 2017, p.673). Interactive digital archives (e.g., https://riseupfeministarchive.ca/) that offer a platform for dialogue and debate have the added potential for encouraging feminist action and advocacy.

Infrastructure. A final recommendation is for widening access to primary source materials to support study into women's intellectual pasts. I undoubtedly benefited from the digitisation of census data and other resources in my research. Part-time

study limited my ability to travel to libraries to consult widely dispersed materials and I probably could not have done my thesis without electronic access. While few would dispute the potential of the ODNB to stimulate both the pursuit of new questions and the application of new theoretical and methodological approaches (Raven, 2007), it was only partially effective at identifying names and biographical information for my study. An improved editorial policy over recent decades has increased women's representation in the ODNB (Baigent et al., 2005), but much work remains. Several scholars including Bode (2017) and Warren (2018) warn of the dangers of taking digital resources for granted. To quote Bonnie Mak, we need to scrutinise more closely these 'infrastructures of knowledge-making' (2014, p.1519).

There is a place also for specialised databases to support scholarship on women from the past. One of the challenges I faced in my research was identifying where women had studied, and the subjects taken. Although many university colleges now provide digitised master-lists of former students, some institutional records are not very accessible (for example, those relating to nineteenth-century students attending UCL). The value of creating a consolidated electronic database of the earliest cohorts of female social science students is evident. Equivalent projects elsewhere include *Mathematical Women in the British Isles, 1878-1940* (http://www-groups.dcs.st-and.ac.uk/ ~history/Davis/info.html) a dataset maintained by the University of St Andrews. This archive lists all the British women (c. 2500) who are known to have obtained an honours degree in mathematics before 1940, sorted by university, year, and class of degree, and linked to biographical material and bibliographic evidence, where available (Davis, 2017). Creating a similar database on the first women to study social science would benefit future scholarship, enabling researchers to do so much more, and faster.

9.5 A final comment about the future

To bring this thesis to a conclusion I offer a final comment about women, social knowledge and public policy in the twenty-first century. It is over a century since the women that feature in this thesis developed and sustained the emerging social sciences. For many, though certainly not all the women discussed here, the object was to create and mobilise knowledge to help get gender on the mainstream policy

agenda. That there has been significant progress in the UK on gender equality and women's rights is due in part to their efforts. Yet, for all the gains made, inequalities of position and power persist. The gender pay gap remains one of the clearest examples of inequality. Office for National Statistics figures suggest that, unless action is taken now, the gender pay gap will not close until 2069 (Deloitte, 2016). Perhaps most worryingly, 'what has been achieved appears easily dismantled' (Gender Institute, 2016, p.3). The question of what role the social sciences should play in society in the future has never been more important. Many stakeholders acknowledge that solving the world's most pressing issues requires thinkers who can transcend traditional boundaries, between disciplines as well as between academia and the non-academic world. Given the serious threats faced by the social sciences today, including widespread scepticism and misinformation about data and experts, understanding more about their early history is a good place to begin.

APPENDIX A.1: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REFORMS

Chronology of labour regulations and social spending measures, 1870-1948[a]

1870	Elementary Education Act – set the framework for compulsory schooling of all children aged between five and 12 in England and Wales.
1874-91	Factory Acts – series of acts passed to regulate conditions of industrial employment.
1872-75	Public Health Acts – rationalised sanitary authorities throughout the country and forced councils to carry out improvements, including the provision of clean water and proper drainage and sewage systems.
1875	Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act – allowed local councils to buy up areas of slum dwellings, to clear and then rebuild them.
1880-93	Education Acts – extended earlier legislation.
1894	London Building Act – embodied the first effective building code regulating the standard and quality of construction.
1895-01	Factory and Workshop Acts – legislation to regulate conditions of industrial employment.
1897	Worker's Compensation Act – secured benefits for injured workers.
1902	Midwives Act – first step in the registration and certification of midwives.
1902	Education Act (Balfour Act) – provided for the funding of secondary schools out of local rates with helps of grants from central government.
1905	Unemployed Workmen Act – allowed local Distress Committees to help unemployed workers with small cash handouts or temporary work.
1905	Aliens Act – introduced immigration controls and registration.
1906	Worker's Compensation Act – extended the 1897 legislation to cover industrial diseases and more occupations.
1906	Education (Provision of Meals) Act – permitted local authorities to feed needy children out of the local rates (school meals service).
1907	Education (Administrative Provisions) Act – introduced compulsory medical inspection of schoolchildren.
1908	Coal Mines Act – granted miners an eight-hour day.
1908	Children Act – introduced state protection of children (e.g., outlawed child begging).
1908	Old Age Pensions Act – provided for the first UK state pensions, financed out of central taxation.
1909	Labour Exchanges Act – established labour exchanges to help the unemployed find work.
1908-16	Finance Acts – legislation containing multiple provisions including introduction of a graduated income tax.
1909	Trade Boards Act – established boards to negotiate minimum hourly wages for selected low-paid trades (e.g., tailoring and chain making) but no attempt made to define what a 'minimum wage' was.
1909	The Housing and Town Planning Act – introduced measures to limit urban overcrowding and pollution.
1910	Education (Choice of Employment) Act – initiated careers guidance for school-leavers and other juveniles.
1911	National Insurance Act Part I – provided sickness and unemployment benefits for certain groups of industrial workers; maternity benefits were available for the wives of covered workers, as well as for the few women workers covered by the scheme.

1911	National Insurance Act Part II – provided time-limited unemployment benefits for insured workers; restricted to certain industries and no provision for dependents.
1911	Shops Act – set maximum working week of 60 hours, and weekly half-day holiday for shop assistants.
1912	Miner's Minimum Wage Act – established the principle of a statutory minimum wage for select groups of workers.
1912-21	Trade Boards Acts – extended Trade Boards to cover 63 occupations.
1915	Notification of Births Act – an important contribution to the improvement of infant care.
1916	National Insurance Act – extension of the unemployment insurance scheme to cover munition workers.
1918	Maternity and Child Welfare Act – compelled local authorities to implement national standards of heath care by establishing maternity clinics and health visitors.
1918	Education Act – raised the school leaving age to 14 and established state-run secondary schools.
1919	Housing and Town Planning Act – gave subsidies to local authorities to help finance the construction of 500,000 houses within three years.
1920	Unemployment Insurance Act – extended unemployment benefits to cover manual workers who earned less than £250.
1921	Unemployment Insurance Act – introduced the 'Seeking Work Test', which stated that to receive full unemployment benefit there had to be evidence the recipient was looking for work.
1921	Unemployed Workers' Dependents Act – added benefits for spouses and children.
1924	Housing (Financial Provisions) Act – gave substantial grants to local authorities to build housing for rent for low paid workers.
1925	Widows, Orphans, and Old Age Contributory Pensions Act – created an additional contributory system of old-age coverage, with widow's pensions providing dependent benefits for the widows and orphans of contributing workers.
1926	Midwives and Maternity Homes Act – introduced the registration of maternity homes and measures to address the problem of uncertified women acting as midwives.
1927	Unemployment Insurance Act – allowed all persons covered by the various systems of health insurance to participate in unemployment insurance, while reintroducing means testing for some benefits.
1930	Unemployment Insurance Act – reformed the benefits system and abolished the rule that those claiming benefits must genuinely be seeking work.
1930	Housing Act – subsidised local councils to clear remaining slum housing and replace with new buildings.
1930	Coal Mines Act – introduced a system of quotas in the coal mining industry.
1932	Import Duties Act – introduced a general tariff of 10% on most imports.
1934	Special Areas Act – gave aid to the areas of Britain which had the highest unemployment rates in the 1930s.
1934	Unemployment Insurance Act – established two bodies to separate benefits payable to the unemployed: one to deal with unemployment benefits earned by NI payments when in work, and the other to provide means-tested payments for those not entitled.
1935	Housing Act – required every local authority to submit a programme of building and demolition aimed at eliminating slums from their area.
1935	British Shipping (Assistance) Act – subsidised the British shipping industry.

1936	Cotton Industry (Reorganisation) Act – introduced a compulsory levy on cotton machinery.
1936	Midwives Act – entitled expectant mothers to attendance by a trained midwife and a doctor, if required, paid for by the local authority.
1937	Special Areas (Amendment) Act – introduced concessions on taxes and rents to encourage businesses to set up in certain locations.
1939	Cotton Industry (Reorganisation) Act – established the Cotton Board and was responsible for streamlining the industry by closing 'surplus' factories.
1945	Family Allowances Act – provided a regular sum for second and subsequent children to be paid to the mother.
1946	National Health Service Act – provided a free and fully comprehensive health service.
1948	National Insurance Act – established the welfare state as recommended by the Beveridge Report of 1942, with compulsory contributions to cover unemployment, sickness, maternity, widows, old age benefits, and funeral grants.

Note: Does not represent a complete list of legislation or their provisions. Detailed information on individual policies can be found in Fraser (2003), Harris (2004) and Thane (1996).

APPENDIX A.2: DATA SOURCES

Notes: This appendix lists sources used to identify research subjects and/or in the preparation of the biographical entries. They are grouped by category for easy reference. Some of these sources were consulted in far greater depth than others. Sources that provide more general information on the context of the individuals are cited in the main bibliography (Appendix A.9).

Biographical dictionaries and other reference works

Electronic versions

Matthew, H.C.G. and Harrison, B. (Eds.) (2004). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com. (Accessed: 13 July 2016).

Royal Economic Society. Economists' Papers. Available at: http://www.economistspapers.org.uk/. (Accessed: 20 October 2016).

Printed versions

Aldrich, R.J. and Gordon, P. (1989). *Dictionary of British educationalists*. London: Woburn Press.

Banks, O. (1985). *The biographical dictionary of British feminists, Vol. 1. 1800-1930*. New York & London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Banks, O. (1990). *The biographical dictionary of British feminists, Vol. 2. A supplement, 1900-1945*. New York & London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Bellamy, J.M. and Saville, J. (Eds.) (1993) *Dictionary of labour biography,* Volume 9. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Crawford, E. (1999). *The women's suffrage movement: a reference guide 1866-1928*. London: UCL Press.

Deegan, M.J. (Ed.) (1991). *Women in sociology: a bio-bibliographical sourcebook*. Westport, C.T.: Greenwood.

Dimand, R.W., Dimand, M.A. and Forget, E.L. (2000). *A biographical dictionary of women economists*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Hartley, C. (2003). *A historical dictionary of British women*. London: Routledge.

Doughan, D. and Gordon, P. (2001). *Dictionary of British women's organisations, 1825-1960.* ADD.

Law, C (2000). *Women: a modern political dictionary*. London: IB Tauris and Co.

Madden, K., Seiz, J.A. and Pujol, M. (2004). *A bibliography of female economic thought to 1940*. London: Routledge.

Rappaport, H. (2001). *Encyclopedia of women social reformers,* Volume 1. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Autobiographies, memoirs, and diaries

Anderson, A.M. (1922). *Women in the factory: an administrative adventure, 1893 to 1921*. London: John Murray.

Bondfield, M.G. (1948). *A life's work*. London: Hutchinson.

Chesterton, A. (1941). *The Chestertons.* London: Chapman & Hall.

Colville, H.C. (1963). *Crowded life. The autobiography of Lady Cynthia Colville*. London: Evans Bros.

Dunlop, O.J. (1907). *Leaves from a Cambridge notebook*. Cambridge: Heffer & Sons.

Hamilton, C. (1935). *Life errant*: London: J.M. Dent.

Higgs, M.K. (1954). *Mary Higgs of Oldham.* Wells: Printed for private circulation by Clare, Son and Co.

Keeling, D.C. (1961). *The crowded stairs: recollections of social work in Liverpool*. London: National Council of Social Service.

Markham, V.R. (1953). *Return passage: the autobiography of Violet R. Markham.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, M.P. (1947). *What I remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martindale, H. (1944). *From one generation to another, 1839-1944: a book of memoirs*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Maynard, C. (1933). *Autobiography*. Unpublished autobiography held in the archives at Queen Mary, University of London.

Morley, E. (2016 [1944]). *Before and after: reminiscences of a working life*. Edited by B. Morris. Reading: Two Rivers Press.

Nevinson, M.W. (1926). *Life's fitful fever: a volume of memories*. London: A. & C. Black.

Oakeley, H.D. (1939). *My adventures in education*. London: Williams & Norgate.

Peel, C.S. [C.D.E. Peel] (1933). *Life's enchanted cup: an autobiography, 1872-1933.* London: Wildside Press.

Picton-Turbervill, E. (1939). *Life is good: an autobiography*. London: F. Muller Limited.

Ravenhill, A. (1951). *Memoirs of an educational pioneer.* Toronto: Dent.

Royden, A.M. (1947). *A threefold cord*. London: Gollancz.

Scharlieb, M.A. (1924). *Reminiscences*. London: Williams & Norgate.

Sharp, E. (2009 [1933]). *Unfinished adventure: selected reminiscences from an Englishwoman's life.* London: Faber and Faber.

Sheepshanks, M. (n.d.). *The long day ended*. Unpublished autobiography. Typescript held in the Women's Library.

Squire, R.E. (1927). *Thirty years in the public service: an industrial retrospect*. London: Nisbet & Co.

Smith, M. (1949). 'An autobiography', *Occupational Psychology*, 23, pp.74-80.

Stocks, M. (1970). *My commonplace book*. London: P. Davies.

Stocks, M. (1973). *Still more commonplace*. London: P. Davies.

Swanwick, H.M. (1935). *I have been young*. London: Gollancz.

Tuckwell, G. (n.d.) *Reminiscences*. Unpublished manuscript. Typescript held in the TUC Library.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1912). *Thirteen years of a busy woman's life*. London: John Lane.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1932). *Me and mine: a medley of thoughts and memories*. London, Hutchinson & Co., Ltd.

Webb, B. (1926). *My apprenticeship*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Webb, B. (1948). *Our partnership*. Edited by B. Drake and M. Cole. London: Longmans.

Wilkinson, E. (1938). *Myself when young: by famous women of to-day*. Edited by M. Asquith. London: F. Muller.

Books, book chapters, reports and pamphlets

Alberti, J. (1996). *Eleanor Rathbone*. London: Sage.

Alexander, S. (Ed.) (1988). *Women's Fabian tracts*. London: Routledge.

Ardis, A.L. (1990). 'Beatrice Webb's romance with ethnography', *Women's Studies*, 18(2-3), pp.233-248.

Bain, G.S. and Woolven, G.B. (1979). *A bibliography of British industrial relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnsley, T. (2011). *Breaking their chains: Mary Macarthur and the chainmakers' strike of 1910.* London: Bookmarks Publications.

Bartley, P. (2014). *Ellen Wilkinson: from red suffragist to government minister*. London: Pluto Press.

Berg, M. (1996). *A woman in history: Eileen Power, 1889-1940.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blair, M.E. (2008). *A life well led: the biography of Barbara Freire-Marreco Aitken, British anthropologist*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press.

Blaszak, B.J. (2000). 'Margaret Llewelyn Davies: a woman with a mission'. (Chapter 4). In *The matriarchs of England's cooperative movement: a study in gender politics and female leadership, 1883-1921*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Blaszak, B.J. (2000). *Matriarchs of the movement: female leadership and gender politics within the English cooperative movement.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Bradburn, E. (1976). *Margaret McMillan: framework and expansion of nursery education*. Redhill: Denholm House Press.

Bradburn, E. (1989). *Margaret McMillan: portrait of a pioneer*. London: Routledge.

Caine, B. (1986). *Destined to be wives: the sisters of Beatrice Webb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaloner, W.H., Farnie, D.A. and Henderson, W.O. (1990). *Industry and innovation: selected essays*. London: Frank Cass.

Church, R.J.H. (1981). 'Hilda Ormsby, 1877–1973'. In T.W. Freeman (Ed.), *Geographers' Bio-bibliographical Studies.* London: International Geographical Union, pp.95-7.

Cohen, S. (2010). *Rescue the perishing: Eleanor Rathbone and the refugees.* London: Valentine Mitchell & Co. Ltd.

Cole, M. (1945). *Beatrice Webb*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Cole, M. (Ed.) (1949). *The Webbs and their work*. London: Frederick Muller Ltd.

Cole, M. (Ed.) (1952). *Beatrice Webb's diaries, 1912-1924.* London, New York & Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.

Cole, M. (Ed.) (1956). *Beatrice Webb's diaries, 1924-1932*. London, New York & Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.

Collette, C. (1989). *For labour and for women: the Women's Labour League, 1906-1918*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Collette, C. (2009). *The newer Eve: women, feminists and the Labour Party*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Debenham, C. (2018). *Marie Stopes' sexual revolution and the birth control movement*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Zwart, M.L. (2016). *Alice Ravenhill: never say die*. Vancouver, B.C.: Ormsby Review Press.

Deneke, H.C. (1946). *Grace Hadow*. London: Oxford University Press.

Donovan, S. and Rubery, M. (Eds.) (2012). *Secret commissions: an anthology of Victorian investigative journalism*. London: Broadview Press.

Drabble, M. (2014). 'Amber Reeves (1887-1981)'. In B. Passmore (Ed.), *Breaking bounds six Newnham lives*. Cambridge: Newnham College, pp.41-51.

Dunbar, J. (1963). *Mrs. G.B.S. A portrait*. London: Harper & Row.

Englander, D. and O'Day, R. (Eds.) (1995). *Retrieved riches: social investigation in Britain 1840-1914*. Aldershot: Scholar Press.

Evans, B. (1984). *Freedom to choose: the life and work of Dr Helena Wright, pioneer of contraception*. London: Bodley Head.

Fleming, L. (Ed.) (1986). *Eleanor Rathbone: the disinherited family*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Fletcher, S. (1989). *Maude Royden: a life*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Fry, R. (1992). *Maud and Amber: a New Zealand mother and daughter, and the women's cause, 1865-1981*. Christchurch: Canterbury University Press.

Fuller, E. (1953). *She championed children: the story of Eglantyne Jebb*. London: Edinburgh Howe Press.

Gahan, P. (2017). *Bernard Shaw and Beatrice Webb on poverty and equality in the modern world, 1905-1914*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garnett, R. (1991). *Constance Garnett: a heroic life*. London. Faber and Faber.

Giardiello, P. (2013). *Pioneers in early childhood education: the roots and legacies of Rachel and Margaret McMillan, Maria Montessori and Susan Isaacs.* London: Routledge.

Glage, L. (1981). *Clementina Black, a study in social history and literature*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Glew, H. (2016). *Gender, rhetoric and regulation. Women's work in the Civil Service and the London County Council, 1900-55*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gordon, P. (1978). 'Edith Mary Deverell: an early woman inspector', *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 22, pp.6-12.

Gordon, P. (1988). 'Kathleen Bathurst: a controversial woman inspector', *History of Education*, 17(3), pp.193-207.

Goronwy-Roberts, M. (2000). *A woman of vision: a life of Marion Phillips, MP.* Wrexham: Bridge Books.

Graves, P. (1994). *Labour women: women in British working-class politics, 1918-39*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, S. (2013). *The public lives of Charlotte and Marie Stopes*. London: Pickering & Chatto.

Grier, L. (1937). *Life of Winifred Mercier*. London: Oxford University Press.

Judge, T. (2018). *Margaret Bondfield: first woman in the Cabinet*. London: Alpha House.

Hamilton, M.A. (1924). *Margaret Bondfield*. London: Leonard Parsons.

Hamilton, M.A. (1925). *Mary Macarthur: a biographical sketch*. London: Leonard Parsons.

Hamilton, M.A. (1933). *Sidney and Beatrice Webb: a study in contemporary biography.* London: Sampson Low, Marston.

Hannam, J. (1989). *Isabella Ford*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harrison, B. (1987). *Prudent revolutionaries: portraits of British feminists between the wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, I. (1956). *Agatha Harrison: an impression by her sister*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Harrison, R. (2000). *The life and times of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, 1858-1905: the formative years*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holmes, R. (2014). *Eleanor Marx: a life*. London: Bloomsbury.

Hooper, B. (1996). *Mary Stocks, 1891-1975: an uncommonplace life*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.

Hopkinson, D. (1954). *Family inheritance: a life of Eva Hubback*. London and New York: Staples Press.

Hughes, W.R. (1890). *Constance Naden: a memoir*. London: Bickers & Son.

Israel, K. (2002). *Names and stories: Emilia Dilke and Victorian culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janssen, F. and Robertson, L.C. (Eds.) (2018). *Margaret Harkness: writing social engagement 1880-1921.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

John, A.V. (2009). *Evelyn Sharp: rebel woman, 1869-1955*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ker, I. (2011). *G.K. Chesterton: a biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koven, S. (2004). *Slumming: sexual and social politics in Victorian London*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kubica, G. (2015). 'Maria Czaplicka and her 284Siberian expedition, 1914-1915: a centenary tribute', *Arctic Anthropology*, 52(1), pp.1-22.

Lewis, J. (1991a). The place of social investigation, social theory and social work in the approach to late Victorian and Edwardian social problems: the case of Beatrice Webb and Helen Bosanquet. In M. Bulmer, K. Bales and K. Kish Sklar (Eds.), *The social survey in historical perspective 1880-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.148-169.

Lewis, J. (1991b). *Women and social action in Victorian and Edwardian England*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Lowndes, G.A.N. (1960). *Margaret McMillan. The children's champion.* London: Museum Press.

MacDonald, J.R. (1912). *Margaret Ethel MacDonald*. London and New York: Hodder and Stoughton.

MacKenzie, J. (1979). *A Victorian courtship: the story of Beatrice Potter and Sidney Webb.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mappen, E. (1985). *Helping women at work: the Women's Industrial Council, 1889-1914*. Gale Cengage.

Markham, V.R. (1949). *May Tennant: a portrait*. London: Falcon Press.

Markham, V.R. (1956). *Friendship's harvest*. London: M. Reinhardt.

Martindale, H. (1938). *Women servants of the state: a history of women in the civil service, 1890-1928*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Martindale, H. (1948). *Some Victorian portraits and others*. London: Books for Libraries Press.

McBriar, A.M. (1987). *An Edwardian mixed doubles: the Bosanquets versus the Webbs. A study of British social policy 1890-1929*. Oxford: Clarendon.

McDonald, D. (2004). *Clara Collet 1860-1948: an educated working woman*. London: Woburn Press.

McFeely, M.D. (1988). *Lady Inspectors: the campaign for a better workplace, 1893-1921*. Oxford: Oxford Blackwell.

McLachlan, H. (1935). *Records of a family, 1800-1933: pioneers in education, social service and liberal religion*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Meeres, F. (2014). *Dorothy Jewson – suffragette and socialist.* Cromer: Poppyland Publishing.

Michie, H. (2006). *Victorian honeymoons: journeys to the conjugal*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, J. (2003) *Relations*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Mitchell, D. (2018). *Against all odds: the life and work of Helena Swanwick*. Bristol: Silverwood Books.

Morgan, C.E. (2001). *Women workers and gender identities, 1835-1913: the cotton and metal industries in England*. London: Routledge.

Muggeridge, K. and Adam, R. (1967). *Beatrice Webb: a life, 1858-1943*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Nord, D.E. (1985). *The apprenticeship of Beatrice Webb*. London: Allen and Unwin/ Palgrave Macmillan/Cornell University Press. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

O'Day, R. and Englander, D. (1993). *Mr Charles Booth's inquiry: life and labour of the people in London reconsidered*. London: Hambledon Press.

Oldfield, S. (1984). S*pinsters of this parish: life and times of FM Mayor and Mary Sheepshanks*. London: Virago.

Paterson, M.M. (Ed.) (1935). *Mary Lily Walker of Dundee: some memories*. Dundee.

Pearson, E.S. (1938). *Karl Pearson: an appreciation of some aspects of his life and work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedersen, S. (2004). *Eleanor Rathbone and the politics of conscience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Perry, M. (2015). *'Red Ellen' Wilkinson*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Radice, L. (1984). *Beatrice and Sidney Webb: Fabian socialists*. London: Macmillan.

Rayner-Canham, M.F. and Rayner-Canham, G. (2008). *Chemistry was their life: pioneering British women chemists, 1880-1949*. London: Imperial College Press.

Reynolds, M. (2016). *Infant mortality and working-class child care, 1850-1899*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richards, D. (1958). *Offspring of the Vic: a history of Morley College.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Robson, J. (2016). *Radical reformers and respectable rebels: how the two lives of Grace Oakeshott defined an era.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Romano, M.A. (1998). *Beatrice Webb (1858-1943): the socialist with a sociological imagination*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.

Ross, E. (1993). *Love and toil: motherhood in outcast London, 1870-1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ross, E. (Ed.) (2007). *Slum travelers: ladies and London poverty, 1860-1920*. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press.

Sanger, C. (1995). *Malcolm MacDonald: bringing an end to empire*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Scott, G. (1998). *Feminism, femininity and the politics of working women: the Women's Co-operative Guild, 1880s to the Second World War*. London: UCL Press.

Seymour-Jones, C. (1992). *Beatrice Webb: woman of conflict*. London: Allison and Busby.

Shils, E. and Blacker, C. (Eds.) (1992). *Cambridge women: twelve portraits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simey, M. (1951). *Charitable effort in Liverpool in the nineteenth century*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Simey, M.B. (1974). *Eleanor Rathbone 1872-1946. A centenary tribute*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool.

Simon, J. (1986). *Shena Simon: feminist and educationist*. Privately printed.

Singer, D.W. (1955). *Margrieta Beer, 1871-1951: a memoir*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Skidelsky, R. (1967). *Politicians and the slump: the labour government of 1929-1931*. London: Macmillan.

Small, E. (2013). *Mary Lily Walker: forgotten visionary of Dundee*. Dundee: Dundee University Press.

Smith, D. (Ed.) (1997). *Nutrition in Britain: science, scientists and politics in the twentieth century*. London. Routledge.

Spence, J., Aiston, S. and Meikle, M.M. (Eds.) (2010). *Women, education, and agency, 1600-2000*. London: Routledge.

Steedman, C. (1990). *Childhood, culture, and class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860-1931.* London: Virago.

Stevinson, E. (1954). *Margaret McMillan: prophet and pioneer*. London: University of London Press.

Stocks, M.D. (1949). *Eleanor Rathbone, a biography*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Stokes. J. (Ed.) (2000). *Eleanor Marx: life, work, contacts*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Straker, V. (2016). *Bicycles, bloomers and Great War rationing recipes: the life and times of Dorothy Peel OBE*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword.

Strong-Boag, V. (2015). *Liberal hearts and coronets: the lives and times of Ishbel Marjoribanks Gordon and John Campbell Gordon, the Aberdeens*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Spurgeon, A. (2016). *Women and children in the factory: a life of Adelaide Anderson (1863-1936)*. Worcestershire, Aspect Design.

Summers, A. (2017) 'A dear good "god-mother" to her': Margaret MacDonald and Lily Montagu. In A. Summers, *Christian and Jewish Women in Britain, 1880-1940: living with difference*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.87-112.

Talbot, C.M. (2011). *The amazing Mary Higgs*. Oldham: OWC.

Tuckwell, G. (1931). *Constance Smith: a short memoir*. London: Duckworth.

Valentine, E.R. (2006). *Beatrice Edgell: pioneer woman psychologist*. New York: Nova Science Publishers

Vernon, B.D. (1982). *Ellen Wilkinson: a biography*. London: Croom Helm.

Watkins, M. (2005). *Henrietta Barnett in Whitechapel: her first fifty years.* London: Micky Watkins and Hampstead Garden Suburb Archive Trust.

Weaver, S.A. (1997). *The Hammonds: a marriage in history.* Stanford University Press.

Whitelaw, L. (1990). *The life and rebellious times of Cicely Hamilton: actress, writer, suffragist*. London: The Women's Press.

Yeo, E.J. (2012). 'Social science couples in Britain at the turn of the twentieth century: gender divisions in work and marriage'. In A. Lykknes, D.L. Opitz and B. Van Tiggelen (Eds.), *For better or for worse? Collaborative couples in the sciences*. Basel: Birkhäuser Basel, pp.221-243.

Articles and essays

Alexander, S. (2007). 'Eleanor Marx's political legacy—self sacrifice or self-realisation?', *Women's History Review*, 16(4), pp.595-616.

Bales, K. (1996). 'Lives and labours in the emergence of organised social research, 1886-1907', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 9(2), pp.113-138.

Black, C. (1964). 'Alice Ravenhill, D.Sc.', *Canadian Home Economics Journal*, 14(2), pp.56-57.

Berg, M. (1992). 'The first women economic historians', *Economic History Review*, 45(2), pp.308-29.

Bourke, H. (2006). 'Pavy, Emily Dorothea (1885-1967)'. In Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. Available at: http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/pavy-emily-dorothea-7987/text13913. (Accessed: 12 March 2018).

Bradley, K. (2017). 'Saving the children of Shoreditch: Lady Cynthia Colville and needy families in East London, c.1900-1960', *Law, Crime and History*, 7(1), pp.145-163.

Cameron, M. (1892-3). 'Clementina Black: a character sketch', *Young Woman*, 1, pp.315-16.

Clendinning, A. (1998). 'Gas and water feminism: Maud Adeline Brereton and Edwardian domestic technology', *Canadian Journal of History Annales Canadiennes D'Histoire*. 33(1), pp.1-24.

Cole, M. (1961). 'The Webbs and social theory', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 12(2), pp.93-105.

Creedon, A. (2002). 'A benevolent tyrant? The principles and practices of Henrietta Barnett (1851-1936), social reformer and founder of Hampstead garden suburb', *Women's History Review*, 11(2), pp.231-252.

Curran, M.B. (1927). 'Ellen Annette McArthur, 1862-1927', *Girton Review*, 75, pp.2-4.

Daniels, C.E.J. and Bayliss, R.A. (1985). 'Alice Ravenhill, home economist, 1859-1954', *Westminster Studies in Education*, 8(1), pp.21-36.

Daugherty, B. (2016). 'Mary Sheepshanks, Virginia Stephen, and Morley College: learning to teach, learning to write'. In J. Vandivere and M. Hicks (Eds.), *Virginia Woolf and her female contemporaries*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, pp. 69-75.

De Leeuw, S. (2012). 'Alice through the looking glass: emotion, personal connection, and reading colonial archives along the grain', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 38(3), pp.273-281.

Downes, K.A. (1995). 'The medical student days of an Edwardian lady', *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273(9), pp.748-49.

Field, F. (2005). 'Eleanor Rathbone and the politics of citizenship', *The Political Quarterly*. 76(2), pp.171-180.

Freeman, M. (2001). 'Journeys into poverty kingdom: complete participation and the British vagrant, 1866-1914', *History Workshop Journal,* 52, pp.99-121.

Gordon, P. (1988). 'Katherine Bathurst: a controversial woman inspector', *History of Education*, 17, pp.193-207.

Groenewegen, P.D. and King, S. (1994). *Women as producers of economic articles: a statistical assessment of the nature and the extent of female participation in five British and North American journals 1900-39*. University of Sydney Working Papers in Economics no. 201.

Harris, W. (2002). 'H. W. Nevinson, Margaret Nevinson, Evelyn Sharp: little-known crusaders', *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*, 45(3), pp.280-305.

Harrison, B. (1976). 'Miss Butler's social survey'. In A.H. Halsey (Ed.), *Traditions of social policy: essays in honour of Violet Butler*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.27-72.

Hill, C.E. (2006). 'A radical in retirement: Clara Collet, 1920-1948', *Women's History Review*, 15(5), pp.681-700.

Hunt, C. (2013). 'Gertrude Tuckwell and the British Labour Movement, 1891-1921: a study in motives and influences', *Women's History Review*, 22(3), pp.478-496.

James, C.L.R. (1943). 'Beatrice Webb, reformist', *The New International*, 9(5), pp.133-134.

John, A.V. (2003). ''Behind the locked door': Evelyn Sharp, suffragette and rebel journalist', *Women's History Review*, 12(1), pp.5-13.

Legg, S. (2010). 'An intimate and imperial feminism: Meliscent Shephard and the regulation of prostitution in colonial India', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. *28*(1), pp.68-94.

Martin, J. (2003). 'Shena D. Simon and English education policy: inside/out?', *History of Education*, 32(5), pp.477-494.

McDermid, J. (2010). 'Blurring the boundaries: school board women in Scotland, 1873-1919', *Women's History Review*, 19(3), pp.357-373.

Melchior-Yahil, L. (2017). ‘Eleanor Marx viewed through the lens of a twenty-first century feminist’, *Socialism and Democracy*, 31(2), pp.145-163.

Nyland, C. (1995). ‘Beatrice Webb as feminist’, *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work,* 6(2), pp.67-85.

O’Day, R. (1993). ‘Before the Webbs: Beatrice Potter’s early investigations for Charles Booth’s inquiry’, *History*, 78(253), pp.218-42.

Oakley A. (2019). Fact, fiction and method in the early history of social research: Clementina Black and Margaret Harkness as case-studies, *Women’s History Review*, 28(3), pp.360-379.

Oakley A. (2020). ‘Women, the early development of sociological research methods in Britain and the London School of Economics: a (partially) retrieved history’, *Sociology*, 54(2), pp. 292-311.

Pedersen, S. (1994). ‘Eleanor Rathbone (1872-1946). The Victorian family under the daughter’s eye’. In P. Mandler and S. Pedersen (Eds.), *After the Victorians: private conscience and public duty in Modern Britain*. London: Routledge, pp.107-128.

Pedersen, S. (1996) ‘Rathbone and daughter: feminism and the father at the fin-de-siècle’, *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 1(1), pp.98-117.

Platt, L. (2007a). ‘Helen Bosanquet’. In J. Scott (Ed.), *Fifty key sociologists: the formative theorists*. London & New York. Routledge, pp.17-21.

Platt, L. (2007b). ‘Beatrice Webb’. In J. Scott (Ed.), *Fifty key sociologists: the formative theorists*. London & New York. Routledge, pp.199-203.

Rothman, P. (2003). ‘‘So work the honey bees……building roofs of gold’: the story of Sophie Bryant’, *The London Mathematical Society Newsletter*, 311, pp.14-16.

Rayner-Canham, M.F. and Rayner-Canham, G. (2011). ‘The rise and fall of domestic chemistry in higher education in England during the early 20th century’, *Bulletin for the History of Chemistry*, 36(1), pp.35-42.

Simey, T.S. (1961). ‘The contribution of Sidney and Beatrice Webb to sociology’, *The British Journal of Sociology*. 12(2), pp.106-123.

Smith, P.E. and Smith, S.M. (1977). ‘Constance Naden: late Victorian feminist poet and philosopher’, *Victorian Poetry*, 15, pp.367-70.

Thomas, E. (2015). ‘Hilda Oakeley on idealism, history and the real past’, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 23(5), pp.933-953.

Valentine, E.R. (2001). ‘Beatrice Edgell: an appreciation’, *British Journal of Psychology*, 92, pp.23-36.

Valentine, E.R. (2010). ‘Women in early 20th-century experimental psychology’, *The Psychologist,* 23(12), pp.972-974.

Walsh, S. (1989). ‘Beatrice Webb and Bacup’, *Manchester Region History Review*, 3(2), pp.9-14.

Unpublished theses and dissertations

Blakestad, N.L. (1994). *King's College of Household and Social Science and the household science movement in English higher education, c.1908-1939.* Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.

Bruce, L. (2012). *Scottish settlement houses from 1886-1934.* Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Glasgow.

Cohen, S. (1997). *The life and works of M. Loane*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middlesex University.

Harrison, E. (1998). *Women members and witnesses on British Government ad hoc Committees of Inquiry 1850-1930, with special reference to Royal Commissions of Inquiry*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Holloway, G. (1995). *A common cause? Class dynamics in the industrial women's movement, 1888-1918*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sussex.

Manoff, R.J. (1998). *Rethinking maternalism: the Women's Industrial Council and the making of the British welfare state*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California.

Wheeldon, C.E. (2014). *'Pioneers in the corridors of power': women civil servants at the Board of Trade and the Factory Inspectorate, 1893-1919*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Goldsmiths College, University of London.

Hinely, S.D. (1987). *Charlotte Wilson: anarchist, Fabian and feminist*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.

Thurlow, J. (2001). *'With the women': the life and times of Julia Varley, 1871-1952, a trade union leader*. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, Sussex University.

Widdowson, M. (1991). *Pioneers of women's education at University College London: The Seminal Decade, 1870-1880*. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of London.

Obituaries

Anon. (1927). 'In memoriam: Mrs. Branford (Sybella Gurney)', *The Sociological Review*, a19, pp.134-152.

Anon. (1931) 'Ethel Bentham, M.D., M.P', *British Medical Journal*, 1, p.161.

Anon. (1948). 'Prof. Beatrice Edgell', *Nature*, 162, p.363.

Anon. (1949). 'Obituary notice: Beatrice Edgell, 1871-1948', *British Journal of Psychology*. General Section, 39(3), p.121.

Anon. (1951). 'Obituary – Dr Martha Beatrice Webb', *British Medical Journal*, I, pp.590-91.

Anon. (1952). 'Hazel Haward Chodak Gregory', *Lancet*, 1(6700), p.218.

Anon. (1956). 'In memoriam: Ellinor I. Black, 1891-1956', *Social Service Review*, 30(2), p.192.

Anon. (1964). 'Mrs Dorothy Stephen. Former Labour M.P. for Norwich', *The Times*, 3 March 1964, Issue 55950, 14, col. B.

Clapham, J.H. (1940). 'Eileen Power, 1889-1940', *Economica*, 7(28), pp.351-9.

Geddes, P. (1913). 'A tribute from Professor Geddes', *Sociological Review*, a6(3), pp.253-256.

Goldman, P. (1949). 'Mrs Eva Hubback obituary', *Eugenics Review,* 41(3), pp.141-142.

Gollancz, V. (1946). 'Eleanor Rathbone', *AJR Information*, 2, p.13.

Hamilton, M.A. (1943). 'Beatrice Webb obituary', *Spectator,* 7 May, pp.423-424.

Harding, D.W. (1968). 'May Smith, 1879-1968', *Occupational Psychology*, October, pp.255-257.

Hume, W.M. (1948). 'Miss Anne Cummins', *The Almoner*, 1(1), p.26.

Keynes, J.M. (1944). 'Mary Paley Marshall (1850-1944)', *Economic Journal*, 54(214), pp.268-284.

M.G. (1920). 'Frances Wood, 1883-1919', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 83(1), pp.178-180.

Marett, R.R. (1921). 'Obituary: Marie A. de Czaplicka: Died May 27th, 1921', *Man. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 21(60), p.105.

Murphy, M.E. (1943). 'In memoriam: Beatrice Webb, 1858-1943', *American Journal of Sociology*, 48(6), pp.765-766.

Nicholson, H. (1946). 'Marginal comment. Tribute to Eleanor Rathbone', *The Spectator*, 11 January, p.34.

P.C.M. (1948). 'Clara Elizabeth Collet', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. Series A (General), 111(3), pp.252-254.

Ratcliffe, S.K. (1913). 'Margaret Noble (Sister Nivedita)', *Sociological Review*, a6(3), pp.242-252.

R.S. (1962). 'Lettice Jowitt', *African Affairs*, 61(244), p.235.

Wolters, A.W. (1933). 'Victoria Hazlitt, 1887-1932', *British Journal of Psychology. General Section*, 23, pp.205-208.

Archives and manuscript collections

National archives of England and Wales

Births Marriages and Death data for England and Wales.

Census returns for England and Wales by household (1881, 1891, 1901, 1911).

Accessed via the following site: http://www.genesreunited.co.uk

National archives of Scotland

Births Marriages and Death data for Scotland.

Accessed via the following site: http://www.scotlandspeople.gov.uk/

College registers

Bedford College List of Students 1849-1949. Privately printed document in RHUL archives, c.1950.

Bedford College Register 1877-1885 BC/AR.

Girton College Register 1869-1946. Privately printed, Cambridge: 1948.

ACAD (A Cambridge Alumni Database): http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/acad/enter.html

Newnham College Register: Vol. I: 1871-1923; Vol. II: 1924-1950.

LSE Register of Students, 1895-1919 (3 volumes of registers of all students who paid fees for courses).

LSE Register of Students, 1895-1932 (all students who completed full courses leading to degrees, diplomas and certificates).

University College London Calendar.

University College School, London: alphabetical and chronological register for 1831-1891.

University of London Calendar (-1931).

- View/download the searchable PDF (46.8Mb)

University of London General Register Part I (published 1890).

- View/download the searchable PDF (2.17Mb)
- View/download the non-searchable PDF (13.8Mb)

University of London General Register Part II (published 1899).

- View/download the searchable PDF (2.16Mb)
- View/download the non-searchable PDF (10.3Mb)

University of London General Register Part III (published 1901).

- View/download the searchable PDF (4.61Mb)
- View/download the non-searchable PDF (20Mb)

University of London Historical Record (1836-1912).

- View/download lists of students' examination results until 1912
- View/download the searchable PDF (36.3Mb)

University of London Historical Record (1836-1926).

- View/download the searchable PDF (43.2Mb)
- View/download the non-searchable PDF (26Mb)
- View/download the searchable PDF of the Historical Record (147Mb)

Examination registers 1838-1889

- http://archives.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/resources/examinationregisters.pdf

Biographical articles in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

Alderman, G. (2004, September 23). Adler, Henrietta [Nettie] (1868–1950), social worker and Jewish political activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Alderman, G. (2004, September 23). Montagu, Lilian Helen [Lily] (1873–1963), feminist and social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Alexander, S. (2004, September 23). Reeves [née Robison], Magdalen Stuart [known as Maud Pember Reeves] (1865–1953), suffragist and socialist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Alexander, S. (2015, January 08). White, Amber Blanco [née Amber Reeves] (1887–1981), writer and civil servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2004, September 23). Anderson, Dame Adelaide Mary (1863–1936), civil servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2004, September 23). Bryant [née Willock], Sophie (1850–1922), educationist and suffragist. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Anon. (2004, September 23). Butler, (Christina) Violet (1884–1982), social work trainer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2004, September 23). Fox, Dame Evelyn Emily Marian (1874–1955), mental health worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2004, September 23). Hubback [née Spielman], Eva Marian (1886–1949), social reformer and feminist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2006, May 25). Campbell, Dame Janet Mary (1877–1954), medical officer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2006, September 28). Swanwick [née Sickert], Helena Maria Lucy (1864–1939), suffragist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Anon. (2008, October 04). Crowdy, Dame Rachel Eleanor (1884–1964), social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Baraclough, J. (2011, January 06). Cummins, Anne Emily (1869–1936), social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Beckerlegge, G. (2007, May 24). Noble, Margaret Elizabeth [known as Sister Nivedita] (1867–1911), writer on Hindu culture and supporter of Indian nationalism. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Begg, T. (2004, September 23). Cour, Ethel Maud De la (1869–1957), college head and soroptimist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Berg, M. (2004, September 23). Knowles [née Tomn], Lilian Charlotte Anne (1870–1926), economic historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Berg, M. (2005, September 22). Power [married name Postan], Eileen Edna Le Poer (1889–1940), economic historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Blackford, C. (2004, September 23). Evans, Dorothy (1888–1944), activist and organizer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Blakestad, N. (2004, September 23). Ravenhill, Alice (1859–1954), educationist and promoter of the household science movement. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Blakestad, N. (2007, May 24). Rucker [née Story-Maskelyne], Thereza Charlotte, Lady Rucker (1863–1941), promoter of household science teaching. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Bowden, R., & Bowden, R. (2004, September 23). Cullis, Winifred Clara (1875–1956), physiologist and educationist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Brewis, G. (2018, August 09). Matheson, (Marie) Cécile (1874–1950), settlement warden and social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Brooke, S. (2008, January 03). Thurtle [née Lansbury], Dorothy (1890–1973), campaigner for contraceptive and abortion rights. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Brooke, S. (2008, May 24). Jenkins [née Glyde], Alice Brook (1886–1967), abortion campaigner. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Bryant, M. (2004, September 23). Mercier, Winifred Louise (1878–1934), educationist and college head. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Caine, B. (2011, May 19). Strachey [née Costelloe], Rachel Pearsall Conn [Ray] (1887–1940), feminist activist and writer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Carnall, G. (2004, September 23). Harrison, Agatha Mary (1885–1954), industrial welfare reformer and unofficial diplomat. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Chadwick, R. (2004, September 23). Higgs [née Kingsland], Mary Ann (1854–1937), social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Cohen, S. (2004, September 23). Loane, Martha Jane (1852–1933), nurse and social commentator. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Cole, T. (2018, July 12). Wood [née Chick], Frances (1883–1919), medical statistician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Collins, D. (2004, September 23). Czaplicka, Marya Antonina [Marie Antoinette] (1884–1921), anthropologist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Covert, J. (2004, September 23). Creighton [née von Glehn], Louise Hume (1850–1936), social activist and writer of popular history and biography. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Davis, J. (2008, May 24). Webb [née Potter], (Martha) Beatrice (1858–1943), social reformer and diarist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

den Otter, S. (2004, September 23). Naden, Constance Caroline Woodhill (1858–1889), poet and philosopher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Doughan, D. (2004, September 23). Collet, Clara Elizabeth (1860–1948), civil servant and promoter of women's education and employment. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Doughan, D. (2004, September 23). Varley, Julia (1871–1952), trade unionist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Dunkley, S. (2004, September. 23). Rice, Margaret Lois [Margery] Spring [née Margaret Lois Garrett] (1887–1970), advocate of birth control. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Erickson, A. (2006, May 25). McArthur, Ellen Annette (1862–1927), historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Fletcher, S. (2004, September 23). Royden, (Agnes) Maude (1876–1956), suffragist and preacher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Gordon, E., & Lloyd, C. (2004, September 23). Irwin, Margaret Hardinge (1858–1940), women's labour activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Gordon, P. (2004, September 23). Bathurst, Katherine (1862–1933), inspector of schools. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Gordon, P. (2015, September 17). Marvin [née Deverell], Edith Mary (1872–1958), inspector of schools. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Grenier, J. (2008 October 04). Black, Clementina Maria (1853–1922), political activist, suffragist, and writer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Grenier, J. (2008, October. 04). Black, Clementina Maria (1853–1922), political activist, suffragist, and writer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Griffiths, C. (2004, September 23). Bentham, Ethel (1861–1931), physician and politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Hall, L. (2006, September 28). Wright [née Lowenfeld], Helena Rosa (1887–1982), family planning practitioner and sex therapist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Hall, L. (2011, September 22). Browne, (Frances Worsley) Stella (1880–1955), feminist and abortion law reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Hall, L. (2015, September 17). Stopes [married name Roe], Marie Charlotte Carmichael (1880–1958), sexologist and advocate of birth control. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Hannam, J. (2004, September 23). Ford, Isabella Ormston (1855–1924), socialist propagandist and suffragist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Hannam, J. (2004, September 23). Jewson, Dorothea [Dorothy] (1884–1964), feminist and politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Hannam, J. (2015, May 28). MacDonald, Margaret Ethel Gladstone (1870–1911), socialist and feminist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harris, J. (2004, September 23). Bosanquet [née Dendy], Helen (1860–1925), social theorist and social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, B. (2004, September 23). Jebb, Eglantyne (1876–1928), philanthropist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, B. (2004, September 23). Rackham [née Tabor], Clara Dorothea (1875–1966), suffragist and political activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, B. (2004, September 23). Wilkinson, Ellen Cicely (1891–1947), politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, B. (2010, September 23). Phillips, Marion (1881–1932), first Labour Party woman organizer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, E. (2008, January 03). Wilson, Mona (1872–1954), civil servant and author. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, E. (2016, May 26). Power, Beryl Millicent Le Poer (1891–1974), civil servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, E. (2018, November 14). Streatfeild, Lucy Anne Evelyn Deane (1865–1950), factory inspector and social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Holloway, G. (2007, October 04). James, Clara Grace [Claire] (1866–1954), trade unionist and community activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Holton, S. (2004, September 23). Clark, Alice (1874–1934), campaigner for women's rights. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Hooper, K. (2011, September 22). Hartley [married names Gallichan; Lewis], Catherine Gasquoine (1866/7–1928), author and art historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Howarth, J. (2009, May 21). Oakeley, Hilda Diana (1867–1950), educationist and author. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Howell, D. (2015, May 28). Lawrence, (Arabella) Susan (1871–1947), politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Innes, S. (2004, September 23). Atkinson, Mabel (1876–1958), feminist and socialist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Innes, S. (2006, September 28). Cowan, Minna Galbraith (1878–1951), social worker and educational administrator. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Joannou, M. (2004, September 23). Hamilton [née Hammill], (Mary) Cicely (1872–1952), writer and campaigner for women's rights. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

John, A. (2004, September 23). Bell [née Olliffe], Florence Eveleen Eleanore, Lady Bell (1851–1930), author, social investigator, and playwright. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

John, A. (2004, September 23). Macarthur [married name Anderson], Mary Reid (1880–1921), women's labour organizer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

John, A. (2006, May 25). Tuckwell, Gertrude Mary (1861–1951), trade unionist and social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

John, A. (2006, September 28). Nevinson [née Jones], Margaret Wynne (1858–1932), women's rights activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

John, A. (2009, October 08). Sharp [married name Nevinson], Evelyn Jane (1869–1955), children's writer and suffragette. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, B. (2008, May 24). Simon [née Potter], Shena Dorothy, Lady Simon of Wythenshawe (1883–1972), politician and educational reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, E. (2009, October 08). Sheavyn, Phoebe Ann Beale (1865–1968), literary scholar and feminist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, H. (2004, September 23). Markham, Violet Rosa (1872–1959), public servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, H. (2004, September 23). Martindale, Hilda (1875–1952), civil servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, H. (2004, September 23). Paterson, Mary Muirhead (1864–1941), factory inspector and philanthropist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Jones, H. (2004, September 23). Squire, Rose Elizabeth (1861–1938), factory inspector. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Kelly, S. (2006, September 28). Meyer [née Levis], Adele, Lady Meyer (1862/3–1930), campaigner for social reform. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Kelly, S. (2009, October 08). Tennant [née Abraham], Margery Mary Edith Josephine Pia [May] (1869–1946), factory inspector. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Knight, M. (2014, January 09). Chesterton [née Jones], Ada Elizabeth (1869–1962), journalist and philanthropist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Knowles, C. (2010, January 07). Blackwood, Beatrice Mary (1889–1975), anthropologist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Koven, S. (2013, October 03). Barnett [née Rowland], Dame Henrietta Octavia Weston (1851–1936), social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Law, C. (2004, September 23). Morley, Edith Julia (1875–1964), literary scholar and suffragette. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Lovie, P., & Lovie, A. (2004, September 23). Edgell, Beatrice (1871–1948), psychologist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Lovie, A., & Lovie, P. (2004, September 23). Smith, May (1879–1968), industrial psychologist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Lucas, J. (2005, May 26). Harkness, Margaret Elise (1854–1923), author and journalist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Maddrell, A. (2004, September 23). Ormsby [née Rodwell Jones], Hilda (1877–1973), geographer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Malone, C. (2007, May 24). Hutchins, Elizabeth Leigh (1858–1935), social investigator and socialist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

McLellan, D. (2004, September 23). Marx [known as Marx-Aveling], (Jenny Julia) Eleanor (1855–1898), socialist writer and activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Moore, L. (2004, September 23). Ainslie, Charlotte Edith (1863–1960), headmistress and educationist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Moyse, C. (2009, January 08). Fisher [née Ilbert], Lettice (1875–1956), social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Oldfield, S. (2012, October 04). Sheepshanks, Mary Ryott (1872–1960), educationist, feminist, and internationalist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pedersen, S. (2004, September 23). Keeling, Dorothy Clarissa (1881–1967), social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pedersen, S. (2004, September 23). Macadam, Elizabeth (1871–1948), social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pedersen, S. (2004, September 23). Reynard [formerly Reinherz], Helene (1875–1947), economist and college administrator. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pedersen, S. (2004, September 23). Turbervill, Edith Picton- (1872–1960), social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pedersen, S. (2011, January 06). Rathbone, Eleanor Florence (1872–1946), social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Perkins, B. (2014, September 25). Petty, Florence (1870–1948), cookery writer and broadcaster. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Perrone, F. (2006, September 28). Mann, Julia de Lacy (1891–1985), economic historian and college head. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pottle, M. (2004, September 23). Durham, Frances Hermia (1873–1948), civil servant. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pottle, M. (2004, September 23). George [née Gordon], (Mary) Dorothy (1878–1971), historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pottle, M. (2004, September 23). McKillop [née Seward], Margaret (1864–1929), scientist and university teacher. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Pottle, M. (2007, May 24). Malvery [married name Mackirdy], Olive Christian (1876/7–1914), social observer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Reynolds, K. (2004, September 23). Colville [née Crewe-Milnes], Lady (Helen) Cynthia (1884–1968), courtier and social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Reynolds, K. (2012, October 04). Haskins, Minnie Louise (1875–1957), author and industrial welfare promoter. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Richardson, A. (2004, September 23). Rolfe, Sybil Katherine Neville- [née Sybil Burney] (1885–1955), social hygienist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Ryan, D. (2004, September 23). Peel [née Bayliff], Constance Dorothy Evelyn (1868–1934), journalist and writer on household management. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Scott, G. (2007, May 24). Webb, Catherine (1859–1947), co-operative movement activist and writer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Smith, A. (2014, January 09). Webb, (Martha) Beatrice (1863–1951), medical practitioner. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Smith, T (2004, September 23). Hadow, Grace Eleanor (1875–1940), college head and social worker. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Sondheimer, J. (2004, September 23). Abram, Annie (1869–1930), historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Sondheimer, J. (2007, May 24). Skeel, Caroline Anne James (1872–1951), historian. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Steedman, C. (2004, September 23). McMillan, Margaret (1860–1931), socialist propagandist and educationist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Stott, M. (2006, September 28). Davies, Margaret Caroline Llewelyn (1861–1944), campaigner for women's causes. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Sutherland, D. (2004, September 23). Stocks [née Brinton], Mary Danvers, Baroness Stocks (1891–1975), women's activist and college head. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thom, D. (2004, September 23). Drake [née Meinertzhagen], Barbara (1876–1963), political activist and author. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thom, D. (2004, September 23). Greig, Teresa Mary Billington- (1876–1964), suffragette and political theorist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thomas, G. (2004, September 23). Zimmern, Alice Louisa Theodora (1855–1939), educationist and suffragist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thomas, G. (2015, May 28). Hogarth [married name Courtney], Janet Elizabeth (1865–1954), writer and encyclopaedia editor. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thomas, J. (2004, September 23). Anstey [née Powell], Vera (1889–1976), economist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Thomas, M. (2004, September 23). Curtis, Dame Myra (1886–1971), civil servant and college head. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Tullberg, R. (2004, September 23). Grier, (Mary) Lynda Dorothea (1880–1967), educational administrator. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Tullberg, R. (2006, September 28). Marshall [née Paley], Mary (1850–1944), economist. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Tullberg, R. (2007, January 04). Keynes [née Brown], Florence Ada (1861–1958), social and political activist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Walker, L. (2010, January 07). Bulley [married name Brooke], (Agnes) Amy (1852–1939), promoter of women's education and women's trade unionism. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Walter, N. (2004, September 23). Wilson [née Martin], Charlotte Mary (1854–1944), anarchist and feminist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Warnock, M. (2004, September 23). Wodehouse, Helen Marion (1880–1964), philosopher and college head. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Whitehead, C. (2008, January 03). Read, Margaret Helen (1889–1991), social anthropologist and colonial educationist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Williamson, P. (2011, January 06). Bondfield, Margaret Grace (1873–1953), trade unionist, campaigner for women's interests, and politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Winkelstein, W. (2008, January 03). Claypon, Janet Elizabeth Lane- [married name Janet Elizabeth Forber, Lady Forber] (1877–1967), physiologist and epidemiologist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Worley, M. (2008, January 03). Reckitt, Eva Collet (1890–1976), founder of Collet's bookshop. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

APPENDIX A.3: SELECTION OF SUBJECTS

Over 800 women were considered for inclusion in this study. Table A.3.1 provides details of the reasons for excluding women on the initial list. The most common reasons for excluding women were that they were not active in Britain or were not involved in social science.

Table A.3.1: Selection process detailing reason for exclusion

Reason for exclusion	Initial list: total
Exclude 1: Not active in Britain	208
Exclude 2: Not born 1849-1891	147
Exclude 3: Insufficient data	64
Exclude 4: Not involved in social science	220
Include: Meets all criteria	188
No. of women considered for inclusion: TOTAL	827

Table A.2.2 provides an overview of the sources used to identify the women included on the initial longlist (n=827) and in the study (n=188). There was considerable overlap, with many sources citing the same names. In total, 98 of the 188 women included in the study were identified from a single source.

Table A.3.2: Sources used to identify research subjects

Code	Source	Initial list (n)	Included in study (n)	Unique to source (n)
a	Banks (1985)	99	21	2
b	Banks (1990)	62	11	1
c	Law (2000)	228	39	8
d	Dimand et al. (2000)	120	9	1
e	Deegan (1991)	115	2	0
f	Royal Economic Society (2015)	23	7	0
g	Aldrich and Gordon (1989)	0	0	0
h	Alexander (1988)	56	32	8
i	Holloway (1995)	59	16	3
j	Berg (1992)	24	12	1
k	Wheeldon (2014)	9	7	2
l	Ross (2007)	24	13	6
m	ODNB (online edition)	90	37	9
n	LSE (1934)	101	25	0
o	Groenewegen & King (1999)	30	12	1
p	Other	36	22	18

Notes:

Table A.3.3 details the initial list of names, the sources used to identify each entry, and the outcome of the screening process – including reason for exclusion, where relevant. For reasons of space, the names of 208 women excluded on the grounds that they were not active in Britain, although part of the longlist, are not detailed here.

A note on presentation

Individuals are listed by the name(s) they were generally known by in their career, surnames appearing first. Parenthesis and closed brackets in name headings have specific meanings. Parenthesis () enclose preferred forenames, including where a nickname or shorter version is preferred, and official titles. Maiden names, pseudonyms and any other names used appear in closed brackets []. For example: Denman, Gertrude (Trudie) Mary [née Pearson]. Explanation of the codes used in column 5 (Exclusion criteria) and 6 (Source) can be found in Tables A.3.1 and A.3.2. In a small proportion of cases, it proved impossible to determine dates of birth and/or death. This is represented by (?).

Table A.3.3: Initial list of names

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Abbott, Wilhelmina Hay (Elizabeth) [née Lamond]	1884	1957			c
Abram, Annie	1869	1930			m,o
Adam, Nancy	1895	1982		2	c
Adamson, Janet (Jennie) Laurel [née Johnson]	1882	1962		4	b,c
Adler, Henrietta (Nettie)	1868	1950			c,h
Ainslie, Charlotte Edith	1863	1960			m
Aldridge, Olive	?	?		3	c
Allen, Mary Sophia	1878	1964		4	c
Allies, Mary Helen Agnes	1852	1927		4	m
Amberley, Katherine Louisa (Lady)	1842	1874		2	a
Anderson, Adelaide Mary	1863	1936			b,c,h,k,m
Anderson, Elizabeth Garrett	1836	1917		2	a,i
Anderson, Louisa Garrett	1873	1943		4	c
Anstey, Vera [née Powell]	1889	1976			f,j,m,n,o
Archdale, Helen Alexander [née Russel]	1876	1949		4	c
Archdale, Helen Elizabeth (Betty)	1907	2000		2	c
Ashton, Margaret	1856	1937		4	b,c
Astor, Nancy Witcher [née Langhorne]	1879	1964		4	b,c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Atkinson, Mabel [m. Palmer]	1876	1958			h,m,n
Auerbach, Helena	?	?		4	c
Ayrton, Phoebe Sarah (Hertha) [née Marks]	1854	1923		4	a,c
Ayrton-Gould, Barbara Bodichon [née Ayrton]	1886	1950		4	b,c
Bacon, Alice Martha	1911	1993		2	c
Baker, Hannah Jane (Jennie) [née Elcum]	1864	1939		4	c
Balfour, Frances [née Campbell] (Lady)	1858	1930		4	a,c
Bamber, Mary [née Little]	1874	1938		4	c
Bannon, Dorothy Edith	1885	1940		4	m
Barlow, Anna Maria Heywood [née Denman] (Lady)	c.1874	1965		4	c
Barmby, Catherine Isabella	c.1817	1853		2	a
Barnes, Annie	1887	?		4	a
Barnett, Henrietta Octavia Weston [née Rowland]	1851	1936			p
Barrett, Florence Elizabeth [née Perry; m. Willey] (Lady)	1867	1945			c,n
Barrett, Rachel	1874	1953		4	m
Barrow, Florence Mary	1876	1964		4	m
Barry, Florence Antoinita	1885	1965		4	c
Barton, Eleanor (Nellie) [née Stockton]	1872	1960		4	c
Bateson, Mary	1865	1906		4	j
Bathurst, Katherine	1862	1933			m
Beale, Dorothea	1831	1906		2	a
Beaumont, Florence Margaret	1876	1929		4	c
Bebb, Gwyneth Marjory [m. Thomson]	1889	1921		4	m
Becker, Lydia Ernestine	1827	1890		2	a,i
Behrend, Hilde	1917	2000		2	d
Beilby, Emma Clark [née Newman] (Lady)	1858	1936		4	c
Bell, Florence Eveleen Eleanore [née Olliffe] (Lady)	1851	1930			m
Belloc, Bessie Rayner	1829	1925		2	a
Benest, Cleone de Heveningham [pseud. C. Griff]	1880	1963		4	c
Bennett, Victoria Evelyn May	1864	1956			c
Benson, Mary Eleanor (Nelly)	1863	1890		4	m
Bentham, Ethel	1861	1931			b,c,h,i
Besant, Annie	1847	1933		2	a,h,l,l
Bethune-Baker, Edith [née Furneaux Jordan]	c.1863	1949		4	c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Bevington, Sheila Macfarlane	1895	?		2	n
Bideleux, Hilda	1871	1960		4	c
Billington-Greig, Teresa Mary [née Billington]	1877	1964			a,i
Black, Clementina Maria	1853	1922			d,h,l,l,o
Black, Ellinor Isabella	1891	1956			p
Blackburn, Helen	1842	1903		2	a,i
Blackman, Winifred Susan	1872	1950			p
Blackwood, Beatrice Mary	1889	1975			p
Blathwayt, Mary	1879	1962		4	a
Bodichon, Barbara Leigh Smith	1827	1891		2	a,d,i
Bondfield, Margaret Grace	1873	1953			a,c,h,l,n
Bonham-Carter, Helen Violet [née Asquith] (Lady)	1887	1969		4	c
Born, Helena	1860	1901		4	b
Bosanquet, Helen [née Dendy]	1860	1925			d,e,h,l,m
Bosanquet, Rosalie	c.1877	1957		3	n
Bosanquet. Theodora	1880	1961		4	c
Bottomley, Alice Thistle [née Robinson] (Lady)	1884	1961			n
Boucherett, Emilia (Jessie)	1825	1905		2	a,d,i
Boucicault, Nina [Mrs D. Innes-Smith]	1867	1950		4	c
Bourne, Adeline	1873	1965		4	c
Bowley, Marian	1911	2002		2	d,f
Boyle, Constance Antonia (Nina)	1865	1943		4	c
Brereton, Maud Adeline Cloudesley [née Ford]	1871	1946			c
Bright, Edith Heywood [née Turner]	1861	1929		4	c
Bright, Ursula	c.1830	1915		2	a
Brittain, Vera Mary	1893	1970		2	b,c
Brocklehurst, Nellie [m. Brooman]	1885	1963		4	c
Brooke, Emma Frances	1844	1926		2	p
Brown, Mary	1847	1935		2	b
Brown, Sybil Clement	?	?		3	n
Browne, Frances Worsley (Stella)	1880	1955			a
Brunner, Elizabeth	1920	1983		2	f
Bryant, Sophie [née Willock]	1850	1922			p
Buer, Mabel Craven	1881	1942			j,n

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Bulkley, Mildred Emily	1880	1958			j,n
Bulley, Agnes (Amy) [m. Brooke]	1852	1939			p
Burton, Elaine Frances (Baroness)	1904	1991		2	c
Buss, Frances Mary	1827	1894		2	a
Butler, Christina (Violet)	1884	1982			m
Butler, Josephine	1828	1906		2	e,h
Butler, Joyce Shore	1910	1992		2	c
Butts, Mary Francis [m. Rodker; Aitken]	1890	1937		4	m
Cadbury, Elizabeth (Elsie) Mary [née Taylor] (Dame)	1858	1951		4	c
Cam, Helen	1885	1968		4	j,n
Campbell, Janet Mary [m. Heseltine]	1877	1954			c,n
Campbell, Sybil	1889	1977		4	m
Carlin, Mary	1873	1939		4	c
Carpenter, Mary	1807	1877		2	a
Carr, Elspeth	?	?		3	h
Carus-Wilson, Eleanora Mary	1897	1977		2	f,j,n
Cashmore, Hilda	?	?		3	n
Castle, Barbara Anne [née Betts] (Baroness)	1910	2002		2	c
Castlereagh, Edith Helen Vale-Tempest (Viscountess)	1879	1959		4	b
Cavendish-Bentinck, Ruth	1867	1953		4	h
Cazalet-Kier, Thelma [née Cazalet]	1899	1989		2	b,c
Challoner, Phyllis Crawhall	1888	1966		4	c
Chance, Janet [née Whyte]	1885	1953		4	c
Chappellsmith, Margaret	1806	1883		2	a
Charles, Dorothy (Enid)	1894	1972		2	p
Chesterton, Ada Elizabeth [née Jones]	1869	1962			c
Chew, Ada Nield	1870	1945		4	a,i
Chodak-Gregory, Hazel Haward [née Cuthbert]	1886	1952			n
Christie, Mary	?	?		3	n
Clark, Alice	1874	1934			h,j,m
Clark, Hilda	1881	1955		4	c
Clarke, Edith	?	?		3	n
Clough, Anne Jemima	1820	1892		2	a
Coates, Alice Schofield	1881	1975		4	c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Cobbe, Frances Power	1822	1904		2	a,i
Cohen, Ruth	1906	1991		2	f,o
Coleman, Winifred Mary (m. Jones)	?	?		3	n
Cole, Margaret Isabel [née Postgate]	1893	1980		2	d,h,j
Collet, Clara Elizabeth	1860	1948			d,f,h,k,m
Collier, Dorothy Josephine	1894	1973		2	p
Collingwood, Ethel Winifred [née Graham]	1885	1973			n
Collisson, Marjorie Chave	1887	1982		4	c
Colville, Helen (Cynthia) [née Crewe-Milnes] (Lady)	1884	1968			c
Cons, Emma	1838	1912		2	b
Cooper, Selina	1864	1946		4	a,i
Corbett, Marie [née Gray]	1859	1932		4	c
Corbett Ashby, Margery Irene [née Corbett]	1882	1981		4	b,c
Cour, Ethel Maud De la	1869	1957			m
Courtney, Janet Elizabeth [née Hogarth]	1865	1954			c,p
Courtney, Kathleen D'Olier	1878	1974		4	b,c
Cousins, Margaret [née Gillespie]	1878	1954		4	c
Cowan, Minna Galbraith	1878	1951			m
Craig, Edith Ailsa Geraldine	1869	1947		4	b
Creighton, Edith	?	?		3	n
Creighton, Louise Hume [née von Glehn]	1850	1936			c,m
Crewe, Margaret (Peggy) E.H. [née Primrose] (Lady)	1881	1967		4	c
Crosby, Edith Elizabeth	1878	1939		4	c
Crosthwaite, Agnes Alice [née Aitken]	1876	1965			n
Crowdy, Rachel Eleanor [m. Thornhill]	1884	1964			c
Cullis, Winifred Clara	1875	1956			c,n
Cummins, Anne Emily	1869	1936			m,n
Cunningham, Barbara	?	?		3	n
Curtis, Myra	1886	1971			o
Czaplicka, Marya (Maria) Antonina	1884	1921			m,n
Dalton, Florence (Ruth) [née Hamilton Fox] (Lady)	1890	1966		4	m
Dane, Clemence [b. Winifred Ashton]	1888	1965		4	c
Davenport-Hill, Florence	1829	1919		2	p
Davidson, Frances Joan [née Dickinson] (Lady)	1894	1985		2	c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Davies, Margaret Caroline Llewelyn	1861	1944			a,c,i
Davies, Mary E. [m. Lewis]	c.1882	1967		4	c
Davies, Maud Frances	1876	1913			h
Davies, Sarah Emily	1830	1921		2	a,i
Davison, Emily Wilding	1872	1913		4	a
Dawson, Agnes	1875	1963		4	c
Dawson, Lilian Augusta [m. Boyd Dawson]	1874	?			c,h
Deakin, Evelyn	?	1942		4	c
Dendy, Mary	1855	1933		4	p
Denman, Gertrude (Trudie) Mary [née Pearson]	1884	1954		4	b,m
Despard, Charlotte [née French]	1844	1939		2	a,c,i
Dessauer, Marie	1901	1996		2	d
De Vesselitsky, Varvara[29]	1872/3	1927			p
Deverell, Edith Mary [m. Marvin]	1872	1958			m
Dickensen, Sarah [née Welsh]	1868	1954		4	a,i
Dilke, Emilia (Lady)	1840	1904		2	a,i
Douie, Vera Ruth Gordon	1894	1979		2	c
Drake, Barbara [née Meinertzhagen]	1876	1963			b,h
Drummond, McKinnon Flora [née Gibson]	1878	1949		4	a
Dunlop, Olive Jocelyn	1883	1970			h,j
Durham, Frances (Hermia)	1873	1948			k
Durham, Mary (Edith)	1863	1944		4	m
Durrie Mulford, Rosetta Elizabeth [née Gardiner]	?	?		4	c
Dutt, Elna	?	?		3	n
Earle, Edith	?	?		3	n
Eckenstein, Lina Dorina Johanna	1857	1931		4	h
Eckhard, Edith Verena	1885	1952			n
Edgell, Beatrice	1871	1948			m
Egerton, George [b. Mary Chavelita Dunne Bright]	1859	1945		4	b
Eliott-Lynn, Sophie Catherine T.M. [née Pierce-Evans]	1897	1939		2	c
Elliot, A.I.M.	?	?		3	n
Elliott, Dorothy Mary [Mrs J.D. Jones]	1897	1980		2	c
Emmet, Evelyn Violet Elizabeth	1899	1980		2	c

[29] The family surname is variously spelt (e.g., her father is often recorded as ‘de Wesselitsky’).

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Emmott, Mary Gertrude [née Lees] (Lady)	1866	1954		4	c
Eustace, Violet	1875	?		4	c
Evans, Dorothy	1893	?		2	c
Evans, Dorothy Elizabeth	1889	1944			c
Fairfield, Josephine Letitia Denny	1885	1978		4	c
Faithfull, Emily	1835	1895		2	a,i
Faithfull, Lilian Mary	1865	1952		4	m
Fawcett, Millicent Garrett	1847	1929		2	a,c,d,h,l,o
Fawcett, Philippa Garrett	1868	1948		4	c
Fildes, Lucy Gratia	1884	1968			n
Fisher, Lettice [née Ilbert]	1875	1956			m,n,o,p
Florence, Emma (Mary) [née Sargant]	1857	1954			b
Foley, Caroline Augusta [m. Rhys Davids]	1857	1942			d,o
Ford, Hannah	?	?		3	i
Ford, Isabella Ormston	1855	1924			a,i
Fox, Evelyn Emily Marian	1874	1955			h,n
Foxwell, Agnes Kate	1871	1957			l
Frampton, Rosina	?	?		4	c
Franklin, Henrietta (Netta) [née Montagu]	1866	1964		4	c
Fraser, Helen	?	?		3	c
Freire-Marreco, Barbara Whitchurch [m. Aitken]	1879	1967			n
Friel, Sophia Seekings	1873	1954		4	c
Froud, Ethel Elizabeth	1880	1941		4	b,c
Gardiner, Alice	?	?		3	h
Gawthorpe, Mary	1881	1973		4	a
George, Mary (Dorothy) [née Gordon]	1878	1971			j,m,o
Glasier, Katherine Bruce [née St John Conway]	1867	1950		4	b,c
Glasier, Madeline Grace	?	?		3	n
Glover, Mrs Arnold	?	?		3	n
Godwin, Beatrice Anne	1897	1992		2	c
Goodered, Gladys [née Rogers]	?	?		4	c
Gordon, Alice Mary [née Brandreth; later Butcher]	c.1850	1929			p
Gordon, Maria (May) Matilda [née Ogilvie]	1864	1939		4	c
Gore-Booth, Eva Selina	1870	1926		4	a,h,i

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Gowing, Margaret Mary	1921	1998		2	f
Grand, Sarah [b. Frances Elizabeth Bellenden Clarke]	1854	1943		4	b
Grant, Clare Ellen	1867	1949		4	l
Grant, J.F.	?	?		3	o
Graves, F.M.	?	?		3	n
Gray, Sarah (Eleanor) Kirkman [née Stone]	1864	?			p
Green, Alice Stopford	1847	1929		2	j
Grey, Maria Georgina	1816	1906		2	a
Grice-Hutchinson, Marjorie	1909	2003		2	d
Grier, Mary (Lynda) Dorothea	1880	1967			f,m,o
Grimstone, Mary Leman	c.1790	?		2	b
Gurney, Sybella Catherine Nino [m. Branford]	1870	1926			p
Gwynne-Vaughan, Helen Charlotte Isabella [née Fraser]	1879	1967		4	c
Hadow, Grace Eleanor	1875	1940			c,n
Haldane, Elizabeth Sanderson	1862	1937		4	b
Halpin, Kathleen Mary	1903	1999		2	c
Hamilton, Mary (Cicely) [née Hammill]	1872	1952			a,m
Hamilton, Mary (Molly) Agnes [née Adamson]	1882	1966		4	b,c,m
Hamilton-Gordon, Isabel M. [née Marjoribanks] (Lady)	1857	1939			c
Hammond, Lucy (Barbara) [née Bradby]	1873	1961			d,j
Hancock, Florence May	1893	1974		2	c
Hardie, Agnes Agnew [née Pettigrew]	1874	1951		4	c
Harkness, Margaret Elise	1854	1933			l
Harraden, Beatrice	1864	1936		4	c
Harris, Lilian	1866	1950		4	c
Harris, Tegan	?	?		3	h
Harrison, Agatha Mary	1885	1954			m,n
Harrison, Amy [m. Spencer]	1874	1970			j,n
Harrison-Bell, Florence Nightingale [née Harrison]	1865	1948		4	c
Hart, Judith Constance Mary [née Ridehalgh]	1924	?		2	c
Hartley, Catherine Gasquoine [m. Gallichan; Lewis]	1866/7	1928			h
Hartley, Christiana	1872	1948		4	c
Haskins, Minnie Louise	1875	1957			m,n,o
Haslett, Caroline Harriett	1895	1957		2	b,c
Haswell, Margaret	1917	?		2	f

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Hayden, Mary Teresa	1862	1942		4	c
Hazlitt, Victoria	1887	1932			p
Head, Mildred	1911	?		2	c
Heather-Bigg, Ada	1855	1944			h
Hewart, A. (Beatrice)	?	?		3	n,o,p
Hewitt, Annie Gertrude	1880	1953		4	c
Hicks, Amelia (Amie) Jane [née Cox]	1839	1917		2	a,i
Hicks, Frances Amelia [m. James][30]	1861	c.1909			i
Hicks, Grace [née Gillmark]	?	?		3	n
Hicks, Margaretta Emily	1867	?		3	i
Hicks, Ursula Kathleen [née Webb]	1896	1985		2	d,f,o
Higgs, Mary [née Kingsland]	1854	1937			c,l
Hill, Eveline [née Ridyard]	1898	1973		2	c
Hobbs, Mrs	?	?		4	c
Hobson, Eileen Isabel [née Keyser]	?	?		3	n
Hodge, Esther	1908	1994		2	c
Hogg, Edith Frances [née Pittis]	1856	1900			h,l
Hogg, Margaret Hope	1894	1935		2	n,o
Hollond, Marjorie [née Tappan]	1895	1977		2	f,n,o
Holmes, Verena Winifred	1889	1964		4	c
Holtby, Winifred	1898	1935		2	b,c
Hood, Eleanor Dagleas [née Smith]	1865	?		4	c
Horsburgh, Florence Gertrude	1889	1969		4	c
Hoster, Constance [née Kalisch]	1864	1939		4	c
Housman, Clemence Annie	1861	1955		4	b
Howard, Rosalind Frances (Countess)	1845	1921		2	b
Howse, Edith Helen	1883	1955		4	c
Hubback, Eva Marian [née Spielman]	1886	1949			a,c,m
Huffinley, Beryl [née Sharpe]	1926	?		2	c
Hughes, Margaret L.V.	?	?		3	c,n
Hunkins-Hallinan, Hazel	1890	1982		4	b,m
Hunt, Winifrede [m. Whale]	?	?		3	n

[30] Some sources suggest she went by the name Amy. I have used Frances since she published under than name.

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Hurlbatt, Ethel	1866	1934		4	m
Hutchins, Elizabeth (Bessie) Leigh	1858	1935			b,d,h,j,m,n,o
Innes, Kathleen Elizabeth [née Royds]	?	1967		4	c
Irwin, Margaret Hardinge	1858	1940			b,f
Jackson, Barbara May [née Ward] (Baroness)	1914	1981		2	f
James, Clara Grace	1866	1954			i
Jameson, Anna Brownell	1794	1860		2	a
Jastrow, Henriette	?	?		3	p
Jebb, Eglantyne	1876	1928			m
Jenkins, Alice Brook [née Glyde]	1886	1967			b
Jewson, Dorothea (Dorothy) [m. Tanner Smith; Stephen]	1884	1964			a,c
Jex-Blake, Sophia	1840	1912		2	a
Jones, D.H.	?	?		3	n
Jones, Emily Elizabeth Constance	1848	1922		2	p
Jones, M.G.	?	?		3	j
Jowitt, Lettice	1878	1962			n
Keeling, Dorothy Clarissa	1881	1967			m
Keith, Theodora [m. Pagan]	1882	1930			p
Kenney, Annie	1879	1953		4	a
Kent-Parsons, Jessy Eugenie [née Usher]	c.1882	1966		4	c
Keynes, Florence Ada [née Brown]	1861	1958			m
Kitson-Clark, Georgina (Ina) [née Bidder]	1864	?		4	c
Klein, Melanie [née Reizes]	1882	1960		4	m
Klein, Viola	1908	1973		2	e
Knight, Anne	1792	1862		2	a
Knight, Elizabeth	c.1870	1933		4	b,c
Knox, Isa [née Craig]	1831	1903		2	i
Knowles, Lillian Charlotte Anne [née Tomn]	1870	1926			f,j,m,n,o
Kydd, Jess	1905	?		2	n
Lanchester, Edith	1871	1966		4	b
Lane-Claypon, Janet Elizabeth (m. Forber) (Lady)	1877	1967			c,n
Laski, Winifred (Frida) Mary [née Kerry]	1884	1977		4	p
Law, Harriet Teresa	1831	1897		2	a
Lawrence, Arabella (Susan)	1871	1947			b,c,h

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Lawrence, Evelyn Mary	1892	?		2	n
Layton, Eleanor Dorothea [née Osmaston] (Lady)	1887	1959		4	m
L'Estrange, Malone Leah [née Kay (Klingenstein)]	1886	1951		4	c
Le Sueur, Violet Mary Winifred [née Marks]	1888	1954		4	c
Lee, Alice Elizabeth	1858	1939			n
Leigh, Eleanor M.	1896	?		2	n
Leonards, Ellen Marianne	1866	1953			p
Levett, Ada (Elizabeth)	1881	1932			j
Levetus, Amelia Sarah	1853	1938			p
Levy, Amy	1861	1889		4	l
Lewin, Octavia Margaret Sophia	1869	1955		4	c
Loane, Martha Jane	1852	1933			p
Lockwood, Betty	1924	?		2	c
Lomas, Sophie Crawford	?	?		3	n
Long, Constance	?	?		4	h
Longman, Mary [married name?]	1881	1926		3	i
Loughlin, Anne	1894	1979		2	c
Lowe, Eveline Mary [née Farren]	1870	1956		4	c
Lumsden, Louisa Innes	1840	1935		2	b
Lytton, Constance Georgina (Lady)	1869	1923		4	a
Macadam, Elizabeth	1871	1948			c,m,n
Macarthur, Mary Reid [m. Anderson]	1880	1921			a,c,h,i
MacDonald, Margaret Ethel [née Gladstone]	1870	1911			a,i
MacKenzie Miss	?	?		3	o
Mackower, Helen	1910	1998		2	f,o
Macmillan, Chrystal	1872	1937		4	b,c
Macpherson, Mary Fenton	?	?		3	i
MacSwiney, Mary Margarite	1872	1942		4	b
Maguire, E. Christine (Molly)	?	?		4	c
Mair, Lucy	?	?		3	n
Malim, Margaret F.	?	?		3	n
Malleson, Elizabeth	1828	1916		2	a
Malvery, Olive Christian [m. Mackirdy]	1871	1914			l
Manicom, Kate Zilpah	1893	1937		2	c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Mann, Jean [née Stewart]	1889	1964		4	c
Mann, Julia de Lacy	1891	1985			f,j,m
Manning, Elizabeth (Leah) [née Perrett]	1886	1977		4	b,c
Marcet, Jane	1769	1858		2	d
Markham, Violet Rosa [m. Carruthers]	1872	1959			n,p
Marland, Ann (Annie) Bucklie [m. Brodie]	1861	1947		4	i
Marsden, Dora	1882	1960		4	a
Marshall, Dorothy	1900	1984		2	j,o
Marshall, Mary [née Paley]	1850	1944			d,f,m
Marten, Honor	?	?		3	l
Martin, Anna	1858	1937			l
Martin, Emma	1812	1851		2	a
Martindale, Hilda	1875	1952			c,k,m
Martindale, Louisa	1839	1914		2	b
Martindale, Louisa	c.1872	1966		4	b,c
Martineau, Harriet	1802	1876		2	a,d,e,f
Martyn, Edith [née How]	1875	1954		4	b,c,m
Marx, Jenny Julia (Eleanor) [later Marx Aveling]	1855	1898			i
Mason, Bertha	c.1853	1939		4	c
Matheson, Hilda	1888	1940		4	c
Matheson, Marie (Cécile)	1874	1950			p
Mathews, Mabel Lucy	?	?		4	c
Mathews, Vera Laughton [née Laughton]	1888	1959		4	c
Mayo, Winfred Alice [née Monck Mason]	1870	1967		4	c
McArthur, Ellen Annette	1862	1927			j,n
McDonald, Edith	?	?		3	c
McLaren, Laura Elizabeth [née Pochin]	1855	1933		4	b,h
McKechnie, Margaret	?	?		3	n
McKillop, Margaret [née Seward]	1864	1929			m
McKisack, May	1900	1981		2	j
McMillan, Margaret	1860	1931			l
Melly, Florence Elizabeth	1856	1928		4	h
Mercier, Winifred Louise	1878	1934			m
Meyer, Adele [née Levis] (Lady)	1862	1930			l

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Micholls, Elsie	?	?		3	n
Middleton, Mary	?	?		3	i
Mill, Harriet Taylor [née Hardy]	1807	1858		2	a,d
Miller, Florence Fenwick	1854	1935		4	a
Mills, Ernestine [née Bell]	1871	1959		4	h
Milne, Mary Elizabeth Gordon	1891	1972		4	m
Milnes, Nora	1882	1972			n
Mitchell, Hannah Maria [née Webster]	1871	1956		4	a
Moir, Margaret Bruce [née Pennycook] (Lady)	1864	1942		4	c
Montagu, Lilian (Lily) Helen	1873	1963			l,n
Montefiore, Dorothy (Dora) Frances [née Fuller]	1851	1927		4	a
Moore-Guggisberg, Lilian Demica [née Moore]	1871	1964		4	c
Morley, Edith Julia	1875	1964			h
Morrison, Frances	1807	1898		2	a
Murdoch, Mary Charlotte	1864	1916		4	b
Murray, Alice Effie (m. Radice)	1877	1951			n
Murray, Flora	1869	1923		4	c
Murrell, Christine Mary	1874	1933		4	c
Naden, Constance Caroline Woodhill	1858	1889			m
Neal, Mary Clara Sophia	1860	1944		3	i
Neilans, Alison Roberta Noble	1884	1942		4	c
Nesbit, Edith [m. Bland]	1858	1924		4	h
Nettlefold, Lucy Frances (Nancy)	1891	1966		4	c
Neville-Rolfe, Sybil Katherine [née Burney; later Gotto]	1885	1955			m
Nevinson, Margaret Wynne [née Jones]	1858	1932			a,c,l
Nicholl, Elizabeth Pease	1807	1897		2	a
Nightingale, Florence	1820	1910		2	a,h
Noble, Margaret Elizabeth [known as Sister Nivedita]	1867	1911			m
Normanton, Helena Florence	1883	1957		4	c
Norton, Caroline	1808	1877		2	a
Nutting, Helen [née Ogilvy] (Lady)	1890	1973		4	c
O'Brien, Sophie [née Raffalovich]	1860	1960		4	m
O'Kell, Lizzie Marguerite	1868	1960		4	c
Oakeley, Hilda Diana	1867	1950			m,n

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Oakeshott, Grace Marion [née Cash; later Reeve]	1872	1929			p
Oldham, Alice	1850	1907		1	m
Orme, Eliza	1848	1937		2	i
Ormsby, Hilda [née Rodwell Jones]	1877	1973			m,n
Osborn, Christabel	1868	1933		3	p
Palmer, Beatrix Maud [née Cecil] (Countess)	1858	1950		4	c
Pankhurst, Adela	1885	1961		4	p
Pankhurst, Christabel	1880	1958		4	a,i
Pankhurst, Emmeline [née Goulden]	1858	1928		4	a,c,h,i
Pankhurst, Estelle (Sylvia)	1882	1960		4	a,l,l
Papworth, Lucy Julia Wyatt	1874	1921			p
Parkes, Bessie Rayner [m. Belloc]	1829	1925		2	i
Parnell, Nancy Stewart	1901	1975		2	c
Parsons, Katherine [née Bethell] (Lady)	1859	1933		4	c
Parsons, Rachel Mary	1885	1956		4	c
Partridge, Margaret Mary	1891	1967		4	c
Paterson, Emma Anne [née Smith]	1848	1886		2	i
Paterson, Mary Muirhead	1864	1941			k
Peel, Constance (Dorothy) Evelyn [nee Bayliff]	1868	1934			n,p
Penrose, Edith Elura Tilton	1914	1996		2	f
Pethick-Lawrence, Emmeline [née Pethick]	1867	1954		4	a,c,i
Petty, Florence	1870	1948			l
Phillips, Juanita Maxwell [née Comber]	?	?		4	c
Phillips, Marion	1881	1932			a,c,h,l,m,n
Phillips, Mary	?	?		3	h
Phillipson, Mabel Hilton [née Russell]	1887	1951		4	c
Phipps, Emily Frost	1865	1943		4	c
Picton-Turbervill, Edith	1872	1960			a,c
Pinchbeck, Ivy	1898	1982		2	f,j
Posthuma, Margaret	?	?		3	n
Power, Beryl Millicent Le Poer	1891	1974			j,m
Power, Eileen Edna Le Poer [m. Postan]	1889	1940			f,j,m,n,o
Power, Jennie Wyse [née O'Toole]	1858	1941		4	c
Proctor, Adelaide Anne	1825	1864		2	a,i

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Proud, Emily (Dorothea) [m. Pavy]	1885	1967			n
Pycroft, Ella	1854	1943			p
Quaile, Mary	1886	1958		4	c
Rackham, Clara Dorothea [née Tabor]	1875	1966			c,n
Ranyard, Ellen Henrietta	1810	1879		2	l
Rathbone, Eleanor Florence	1872	1946			a,c,d,m,o
Ravenhill, Alice	1859	1954			h,m
Read, Margaret Helen	1889	1991			m
Reckitt, Eva Collet	1890	1976			m
Reddish, Sarah	1850	1925		4	a,i
Reeves, Magdalen (Maud) Stuart Pember [née Robison]	1865	1953			b,h,l,n
Reid, Helena Maude	?	?		3	n
Reynard, Helene [formerly Reinherz]	1875	1947			m,o
Rice, Margaret (Margery) Spring [née Garrett; m. Jones]	1887	1970			p
Richards, Audrey	1899	?		2	n
Richardson, Eveline Mabel [m. Burns]	1900	1985		2	n
Richardson, Mary Raleigh	1882/3	1961		4	b
Rigby, Edith Rayner	1872	1949		4	a
Robins, Elizabeth	1862	1952		4	a
Robinson, Annot (Annie) Erskine [née Wilkie]	1874	1925		4	b
Robinson, Joan Violet [née Maurice]	1903	1983		2	d,f,o
Rogers, Annie Mary Anne Henley	1856	1937		4	m
Rolls, Eleanor Georgina [m. Shelley]	1872	1961		4	c
Roper, Esther Gertrude	1868	1938		4	i
Routledge, Katherine Maria [née Pease]	1866	1935			
Royde-Smith, Naomi Gwladys	1875	1964		4	n
Royden, Agnes (Maude) [m. Hudson Shaw]	1876	1956			a,c
Rucker, Thereza C. [née Story-Maskelyne] (Lady)	1863	1941			m
Russell, Dora [née Black]	1894	1986		2	b
Rust, Tamara [née Kravetz]	?	?		4	c
Ryland, Beryl Stratheden [née Campbell]	1885	?		4	c
Scharlieb, Mary Ann Dacomb [née Bird]	1845	1930		2	c
Schreiner, Olive Emilie Albertina	1855	1920		1	a,m
Seear, Beatrice Nancy	1913	1997		2	c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Sharp, Evelyn Jane [m. Nevinson]	1869	1955			a
Sharpe, Maria [m. Pearson]	1853	1928			h
Sharples, Elizabeth	1804	1861		2	a
Shaw, Charlotte Frances [née Payne-Townshend]	1857	1943			h
Sheavyn, Phoebe Ann Beale	1865	1968			p
Sheepshanks, Mary Ryott	1872	1960			b,m
Shirreff, Emily Anne Elizabeth	1814	1897		2	a
Sidgwick, Eleanor Mildred [née Balfour]	1845	1936		2	a
Sieff, Rebecca Dora	1890	1966		4	m
Silcock, Helen [m. Fairhurst]	1865	?		3	i
Simcox, Edith Jemima	1844	1901		2	i
Simm, Elizabeth (Lisbeth) Emma [née Dodds]	?	?		4	c,i
Simon, Shena Dorothy [née Potter]	1883	1972			a,m
Skeel, Caroline Anne James	1872	1951			m
Smith, Constance Isabella Stuart	1859	1930			c,h,n
Smith, Ellen	?	?		3	h
Smith, Emily (Mary) [m. Bartlett]	1886	1974			n
Smith, Katie C.	?	?		3	n
Smith, Mary	1822	1889		2	a
Smith, May	1879	1968			n
Smyth, Ethel Mary	1858	1944		4	a
Snowden, Ethel [née Annakin]	1881	1951		4	a,c
Soddy, Winnifred (Moller) [née Beilby]	1885	1936		4	c
Solomon, Daisy Dorothea	?	?		4	c
Solomon, Georgiana Margaret [née Thompson]	1844	1933		2	c
Spurgeon, Caroline Francis Eleanor	1869	1942		4	c
Squire, Rose Elizabeth	1861	1938			b,k
Stacy, Enid	1868	1903		4	a
Stanley, Maude Aletha	1833	1915		2	l
Stockman, Margaret [née Smith]	?	?		4	h
Stocks, Mary Danvers [née Brinton]	1891	1975			a,c,m,n,o
Stopes, Marie Charlotte Carmichael [m. Gates; Roe]	1880	1958			a
Strachey, Philippa (Pippa)	1872	1968		4	a,c
Strachey, Rachel (Ray) Pearsall Conn [née Costelloe]	1887	1940			a,c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Streatfeild, Lucy Anne Evelyn [née Deane]	1865	1950			c,h
Summerskill, Edith Clara	1901	1980		2	b,c
Summerskill, Shirley Catherine Wynne	1931	?		2	c
Sutherland, Mary Elizabeth	1895	1972		2	c
Swanwick, Helena Maria Lucy [née Sickert]	1864	1939			a,c
Symons, Madeleine Jane [m. Robinson]	1895	1957		2	c
Tabor, Mary	?	?		3	p
Tate, Maybird (Mavis) Constance [née Hogg]	1893	1947		2	b,c
Tavener, Grace	?	?		4	c
Taylor, Helen	1831	1907		2	i
Taylor, Isabel	?	?		3	k
Tennant, Dorothy [m. Stanley; Curtis] (Lady)	1855	1926			l
Tennant, Margery (May) Mary E.J.P. [née Abraham]	1869	1946			b,l,k
Tennant, Winifred Margaret C. [née Pearce-Serocold]	1875	1956		4	c
Thomas, Margaret Haig [m. Mackworth] (Viscountess)	1883	1958		4	a,c,m
Thomas, Nancy Gertrude	?	?		3	n
Thompson, Edith Marie	1879	1961		4	c
Thomson, Ruby	?	?		3	n
Thurtle, Dorothy [née Lansbury]	1890	1973			b
Tillard, Margaret	?	?		3	p
Towers, Catherine	?	?		3	n
Townsend, Caroline	?	?		4	h
Traquair, Phoebe Anna [née Moss]	1852	1936		4	m
Troughton, Miss	?	?		3	n
Tuckwell, Gertrude Mary	1861	1951			a,c,l,n
Turing, Fanny Jean [m. Trustram Eve] (Lady)	1864	1934		4	c
Turner, Ethel Margaret (Madge)	1884	1948		4	c
Tweedie, Ethel Brilliana [née Harley]	1862	1940			l
Tweedy, Hilda [née Anderson]	1911	?		2	c
Twining, Louisa	1820	1911		2	a
Underwood. Florence Ada	1875	1942		4	c
Unwin, Emma (Jane) Catherine [née Cobden]	1851	1947			m
Van der Veen, Margrieta Johanna [m. Beer]	1871	1951			p
Varley, Julia	1871	1952			b,c

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Vaughan-Sawyer, Ethel	?	?		4	h
Veitch, Marion [m. Barnie]	1913	1973		2	c
Venturi, Emilie Ashurst	c.1820	1893		2	a
Vickers, Joan Helen	1907	1994		2	c
Vickery, Alice Drysdale	1844	1929		2	a
Wakefield, Priscilla	1751	1832		2	d
Walker, Jane Harriett	1859	1938		4	c
Walker Mary Lily	1863	1913			p
Walker, Melvina	?	?		3	i
Wallas, Ada [née Radford]	1859	1934		4	p
Wallas, Katharine Talbot	1864	1944		4	m
Wallas, May Graham	1898	1972		2	n
Walton, Cecile	1891	1956		4	m
Wake, Joan	1884	1974		4	m
Warburton, Katherine (Kate) Anne Egerton	1840	1923		2	l
Ward, Barbara	1914	1981		2	d
Ward, Irene Mary Bewick (Baroness)	1895	1980		2	b,c
Ward, Maud	?	?		3	i
Watson, Alexandra (Mona) Mary C.C. [née Geddes]	1872	1936		4	c
Weaver, Harriet Shaw	1876	1961		4	m
Webb, Catherine	1859	1947			i
Webb, Martha (Beatrice) [née Potter]	1858	1943			d,e,h,l,l,m,n,o
Webb, Martha Beatrice[31]	1863	1951			p
West, Rebecca	1892	1983		2	b,h
Whately, Mary (Monica)	1889	1960		4	c,m
Wheeler, Anna	1785	1848		2	a
White, Amber Blanco [née Reeves]	1887	1981			c,h,m
White, Eirene Lloyd [née Lloyd Jones]	1909	1999		2	c
Whitmore, Dorothy	1881	1955?			n
Whitty-Webster, May	1865	1948		4	c
Wilcox, G.M.	?	?		3	n
Wilkinson, Ellen Cicely	1891	1947			a,c

[31] Some sources suggest she went by her middle name, Beatrice. However, I refer to her as Martha to distinguish her from Beatrice Webb (née Potter).

Name	DoB	DoD	I	E	Sources
Wilkinson, Jeannette Gaury	1841	1886		2	i
Williams, Ethel Mary Nucella	1863	1948		4	c
Williams, Gertrude [née Rosenblum]	1897	?		2	n
Willson, Laura Ann	1878	1942		4	c
Wilson, Charlotte Mary [née Martin]	1854	1944			h
Wilson, Elizabeth	?	?		3	h
Wilson, Emelye Ethelreda	?	?		4	c
Wilson, Mona	1872	1954			k,o
Wintringham, Margaret [née Longbottom]	1879	1955		4	b,c
Witcop, Rose [b. Rachel Vitkopski]	1890	1932		4	b
Wodehouse, Helen Marion	1880	1964			m
Wollstonecraft, Mary	1759	1797		2	e
Wolstenholme-Elmy, Elizabeth Clark	1834	1918		2	a
Wood, Ethel Mary [née Hogg]	1876	1970		4	n
Wood, Frances [née Chick]	1883	1919			p
Wood, M.E.	?	?		3	n
Woolf, Adeline (Virginia) [née Stephen]	1882	1941		4	b,h,m
Wootton, Barbara Frances [née Adam]	1897	1988		2	d,f,o
Wragge, Muriel	?	?		3	n
Wright, Frances	1795	1852		2	a
Wright, Helena Rosa [née Lowenfeld]	1887	1982			p
Younghusband, Eileen Louise	1902	1981		2	n
Zangwill, Edith Chaplin Ayrton [née Ayrton]	1875	1945		4	c
Zimmern, Alice Louisa Theodora	1855	1939			p
Zimmern, Dorothea Margaret [m. Barton]	1883	1982			n,o,p
Zimmern, Elsie Mary	?	?		4	c

APPENDIX A.4: DATA COLLECTION TOOL

A. Basic Biographical Data

- Life dates
  - ☐ Date of birth *(add details)*
  - ☐ Date of death *(add details)*
- Marital status
  - ☐ Married *(add details in section B)*
  - ☐ Not married
  - ☐ Not known
- Other names
  - ☐ Maiden name, if relevant *(add details)*
  - ☐ Married name(s), if relevant *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other (e.g., preferred first name) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
- Place of birth
  - ☐ Known *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
- Place of death
  - ☐ Known *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known

B. Personal and Family Life

- Inherited socio-economic position (social origins)
  - ☐ Gentry *(add details)*
  - ☐ Professional *(add details)*
  - ☐ Business *(add details)*
  - ☐ Clergy *(add details)*
  - ☐ Working class *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected
- Inherited political beliefs (political origins)
  - ☐ Staunch supporter of main party *(add details)*
  - ☐ Elected MPs, or stood for election *(add details)*
  - ☐ Radical politics *(add details)*
  - ☐ Women's rights (campaigns for vote, education, employment, etc.) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Humanitarian issues (philanthropy, social work, etc.) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected
- Geographical information
  - ☐ Place of birth *(add details)*
  - ☐ Place of residence (childhood) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Place of residence (later life) *(add details)*

☐ Not known

- Family relationships
  - ☐ Parents *(add details)*
  - ☐ Siblings *(add details)*
  - ☐ Extended family *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
- Formative experiences
  - ☐ Childhood *(add details)*
  - ☐ Caring for parents *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
- Husband
  - ☐ N/A (not married)
  - ☐ In civil partnership (answer remaining questions as if married)
  - ☐ Married more than once *(add details)*
  - ☐ Husband's name & date of marriage *(add details)*
  - ☐ Husband's social background *(add details)*
  - ☐ Husband involved in politics (e.g., MP) (add details)
  - ☐ Husband and wife in a research partnership *(add details)*
  - ☐ Husband in academia, but not research partnership with wife *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other information about husband *(add details)*
  - ☐ No known details about husband
- Children
  - ☐ N/A (not married)
  - ☐ In civil partnership (answer remaining questions as if married)
  - ☐ Yes *(add details)*
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ Not known (select only if woman married)
- Material position (personal and family)
  - ☐ Independently wealthy (known to have private income, capital, etc.) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Member of aristocracy (at birth or through marriage) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected

C. Religious Denomination and Faith

- Denominational allegiance
  - ☐ Anglican *(add details)*
  - ☐ Roman Catholic *(add details)*
  - ☐ Jewish *(add details)*
  - ☐ Presbyterian *(add details)*
  - ☐ Christian (no further info)
  - ☐ Non-conformist (Unitarian, Quaker, Congregational, Methodist, Christian Science, Evangelicalism, etc.) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*

- ☐ Agnostic
- ☐ Not known *(add details)*
- ☐ Multiple codes selected

- Religious conviction
  - ☐ Religious faith linked to political activity *(add details)*
  - ☐ Experienced loss of faith
  - ☐ Other
  - ☐ Not known

D. Educational Capital/Experiences

- Schooling
  - ☐ No schooling
  - ☐ Formal schooling *(add details)*
  - ☐ Educated at home/privately *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected

- Further/higher education
  - ☐ No further/higher education
  - ☐ Some further/higher education (bachelor's degree or lower) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Postgraduate studies (master's or Ph.D., completed or started) *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected

- University/college attended

- *Select all that apply. Distinguish between graduate and postgraduate studies.*
  - ☐ N/A (no further/higher education)
  - ☐ Oxford *(add details)*
  - ☐ Cambridge *(add details)*
  - ☐ London *(add details)*
  - ☐ Civic *(add details)*
  - ☐ Scotland *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other UK *(add details)*
  - ☐ Non-UK *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected

- Academic subjects studied

- *Select all that apply. Distinguish between graduate and postgraduate studies.*
  - ☐ N/A (no further/higher education)
  - ☐ Arts and Humanities *(add details)*
  - ☐ Medicine *(add details)*
  - ☐ Mathematics *(add details)*
  - ☐ Sciences *(add details)*
  - ☐ Moral/social sciences *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected

- Motivations (for attending school, college, university)

- ☐ Known *(add details)*
- ☐ Not known

- Other information relevant to preparation for professional life
  - ☐ Details

E. Professional Life

Include all relevant dates if known (to determine age in the different phases), as well as details of employers and any noteworthy colleagues.

- School teaching
  - ☐ Yes *(add details)*
  - ☐ No/not known/unclear
- Settlement work
  - ☐ Yes *(add details)*
  - ☐ No/not known/unclear
- Lecturing
  - ☐ Yes, university lecturing *(add details)*
  - ☐ Yes, other lecturing *(add details)*
  - ☐ No/not known/unclear
- University lecturing positions
  - ☐ N/A (no known university lecturing)
  - ☐ Oxford *(add details)*
  - ☐ Cambridge *(add details)*
  - ☐ London *(add details)*
  - ☐ Civic *(add details)*
  - ☐ Scotland *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other UK *(add details)*
  - ☐ Non-UK *(add details)*
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected
- Other work/professional activities (paid, unpaid, voluntary)
  - ☐ Known *(add details)*
  - ☐ No/not known/unclear

F. Political Beliefs and Activities

- Political affiliation
  - ☐ Labour *(add details)*
  - ☐ Conservative *(add details)*
  - ☐ Liberal *(add details)*
  - ☐ Independent *(add details)*
  - ☐ Other
  - ☐ Not known
  - ☐ Multiple codes selected
- Involvement in parliamentary politics
  - ☐ MP *(add details)*
  - ☐ Stood for election, but not elected *(add details)*
  - ☐ Involvement in Parliamentary Committees *(add details)*

☐ No/not known *(add details)*

- Involvement in feminist activities
  ☐ Details

- Involvement in other political activities (non-feminist)
- *For example, local politics or trade union activity*
  ☐ Details

G. Social science activities

- *For example, editorial positions.*
  ☐ Details

H. Inter-personal relationships

☐ Academic colleagues *(add details)*
☐ Family friends *(add details)*
☐ Sexual/romantic liaisons *(add details)*
☐ Friendships *(add details)*
☐ Other personal affiliations *(add details)*
☐ Not known

I. Social Milieu and Networks

- Organisational affiliations/membership in influential bodies

Select all that apply and provide details of involvement, plus information for any additional societies, clubs, campaign organising committees, research groups, professional associations, select committees, advisory/funding bodies, or other networks

☐ Adult Suffrage Society *(add details)*
☐ Association for Education in Citizenship *(add details)*
☐ Association for Moral and Social Hygiene *(add details)*
☐ Central Committee on Women's Education *(add details)*
☐ Charity Organisation Society *(add details)*
☐ Children's Minimum Committee *(add details)*
☐ Christian Social Union *(add details)*
☐ Clubs Industrial Association *(add details)*
☐ Council of Married Women *(add details)*
☐ Economic Club at UCL *(add details)*
☐ English Anarchist Circle *(add details)*
☐ Equal Committee for War Injuries Committee *(add details)*
☐ Equal Pay Campaign Committee *(add details)*
☐ Eugenic Society *(add details)*
☐ Fabian Research Bureau *(add details)*
☐ Fabian Society *(add details)*
☐ Fabian Women's Group *(add details)*
☐ Family Endowment Committee *(add details)*
☐ Family Planning Association *(add details)*
☐ Guild Socialism *(add details)*
☐ Ideal Club *(add details)*
☐ Independent Labour Party *(add details)*
☐ International Congress of Women *(add details)*

☐ International Women's Co-operative Guild *(add details)*
☐ League of Nations *(add details)*
☐ Liverpool Social Science Department *(add details)*
☐ London County Council *(add details)*
☐ London Ethical Society *(add details)*
☐ London School of Economics *(add details)*
☐ London Society for Women's Suffrage *(add details)*
☐ London Trades Council *(add details)*
☐ Manchester and Salford Women's Trade Union Council *(add details)*
☐ Married Women's Association *(add details)*
☐ National Anti-Sweating League *(add details)*
☐ National Association for Maternal and Child Welfare *(add details)*
☐ National Association for the Promotion of Social Science *(add details)*
☐ National Association of Women's Lodging Houses *(add details)*
☐ National Birth Control Association *(add details)*
☐ National Birth Control Council *(add details)*
☐ National Council of Equal Citizenship *(add details)*
☐ National Council of Women *(add details)*
☐ National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child *(add details)*
☐ National Federation of Women Workers *(add details)*
☐ National Federation of Women's Institutes *(add details)*
☐ National Union of General and Municipal Workers *(add details)*
☐ National Union of Shop Assistants, Warehousemen, and Clerks *(add details)*
☐ National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship *(add details)*
☐ National Union of Women Teachers *(add details)*
☐ National Union of Women Workers *(add details)*
☐ National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies *(add details)*
☐ National Women Citizens' Associations *(add details)*
☐ Nuffield *(add details)*
☐ Open Door Council *(add details)*
☐ Pioneer Club *(add details)*
☐ Political and Economic Planning *(add details)*
☐ Royal Economic Society *(add details)*
☐ Royal Statistical Society *(add details)*
☐ Shop Assistants' Union) *(add details)*
☐ Six Point Group *(add details)*
☐ Social Democratic Federation *(add details)*
☐ Society for Cultural Relations *(add details)*
☐ Society for Promoting the Employment of Women *(add details)*
☐ Sociological Society *(add details)*
☐ St Joan's Social and Political Alliance *(add details)*
☐ Townswomen's Guilds *(add details)*
☐ Trades Union Congress *(add details)*
☐ Transport and General Workers' Union *(add details)*
☐ Union of Democratic Control *(add details)*
☐ Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues *(add details)*
☐ University settlement (other) *(add details)*
☐ Victoria Women's Settlement *(add details)*
☐ Women's Co-operative Guild *(add details)*

- ☐ Women's Employment Defence League *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Employment Federation *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Freedom League *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Group on Public Welfare *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Industrial Council *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's International League for Peace *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Labour League *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Liberal Federation *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Local Government Society *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's National Liberal Association *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Peace Council *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Protective and Provident League *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Social and Political Union *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Trade Union Association *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's Trade Union League *(add details)*
- ☐ Women's University Settlement (Blackfriars Settlement) *(add details)*
- ☐ Other *(add details)*

J. Recognition of distinction

- ☐ Honorary doctorates
- ☐ Official honours
- ☐ Awards
- ☐ Prizes
- ☐ Other *(add details)*

K. Publication record.

- ☐ Books and book chapters *(add details)*
- ☐ Reports and essays *(add details)*
- ☐ Journal and magazine articles *(add details)*
- ☐ Other *(add details)*
- ☐ Not known

APPENDIX A.5: WOMEN ARRANGED BY DATE OF BIRTH

Women are arranged by date of birth and the names they were generally known by in their career. Maiden and/or married names are listed where relevant. Further information on individual names is provided in Table A.2.3 (Appendix A.2).

Cohort (1849 – 1871)

Name	Dates		ODNB entry
Bryant, Sophie	1850	1922	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37237
Creighton, Louise	1850	1936	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38640
Marshall, Mary Paley	1850	1944	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39167
Bell, Florence	1851	1930	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41106
Barnett, Henrietta	1851	1936	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30610
Unwin, Jane	1851	1947	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38683
Bulley, Amy	1852	1939	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48686
Loane, Martha	1852	1933	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41104
Black, Clementina	1853	1922	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37196
Levetus, Amelia	1853	1938	
Sharpe, Maria [m. Pearson]	1853	1928	
Gordon, Alice	1854	1929	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/112192
Harkness, Margaret	1854	1923	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/56894
Higgs, Mary	1854	1937	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38523
Wilson, Charlotte	1854	1944	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45776
Marx [Marx Aveling], Eleanor	1855	1898	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40945
Ford, Isabella	1855	1924	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39084
Tennant, Dorothy	1855	1926	
Heather-Bigg, Ada	1855	1944	
Zimmern, Alice	1855	1939	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38621
Pycroft, Ella	1854	1943	
Hogg, Edith	1856	1900	
Florence [Sargant Florence], Mary	1857	1954	
Foley, Caroline [m. Rhys Davids]	1857	1942	
Hamilton-Gordon, Ishbel	1857	1939	
Shaw, Charlotte	1857	1943	
Naden, Constance	1858	1889	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19716
Nevinson, Margaret	1858	1932	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45464
Hutchins, Bessie	1858	1935	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69834

Martin, Anna	1858	1937	
Irwin, Margaret	1858	1940	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/54402
Lee, Alice	1858	1939	
Webb, Beatrice [née Potter]	1858	1943	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36799
Ravenhill, Alice	1859	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/51778
Webb, Catherine	1859	1947	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53250
Smith, Constance	1859	1930	
Bosanquet, Helen [née Dendy]	1860	1925	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37208
McMillan, Margaret	1860	1931	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34801
Collet, Clara	1860	1948	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39079
Hicks, Frances	1861	c.1909	
Bentham, Ethel	1861	1931	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50047
Davies [Llewelyn Davies], Margaret	1861	1944	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37681
Tuckwell, Gertrude	1861	1951	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36572
Keynes, Florence	1861	1958	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39171
Squire, Rose	1861	1938	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/49042
McArthur, Ellen	1862	1927	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48500
Bathurst, Katherine	1862	1933	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48585
Tweedie, Ethel [née Harley]	1862	1949	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45559
Meyer, Adele	1862	1930	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/58576
Ainslie, Charlotte	1863	1960	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52732
Anderson, Adelaide	1863	1936	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37113
Rucker, Thereza	1863	1941	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48425
Walker, Mary	1863	1913	
Webb, Martha	1863	1951	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/104435
Gray, Eleanor Kirkman	1864	?	
Swanwick, Helena	1864	1939	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38040
Paterson, Mary	1864	1941	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50741
Bennett, Victoria	1864	1956	
McKillop, Margaret	1864	1929	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/51779
Courtney, Janet [née Hogarth]	1865	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38617
Reeves [Pember Reeves], Maud	1865	1953	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41214
Sheavyn, Phoebe	1865	1968	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52388
Streatfeild, Lucy [née Deane]	1865	1950	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/49039
James, Clara	1866	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/60161
Leonards, Ellen	1866	1953	

Routledge, Katherine	1866	1945	
Hartley, Catherine Gasquoine	1866/7	1928	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/55594
Noble, Margaret	1867	1911	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95037
Barrett, Florence	1867	1945	
Oakeley, Hilda	1867	1950	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48502
Adler, Nettie	1868	1950	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/57022
Peel, Dorothy	1868	1934	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/56783
Abram, Annie	1869	1930	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61580
Chesterton, Ada	1869	1962	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39077
Cummins, Anne	1869	1936	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/75263
Sharp, Evelyn	1869	1955	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37950
Tennant, May [née Abraham]	1869	1946	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36457
Cour, Ethel De la	1869	1957	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52733
Gurney, Sybella [m. Branford]	1870	1926	
Knowles, Lillian	1870	1926	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45651
MacDonald, Margaret	1870	1911	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45462
Petty, Florence	1870	1948	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/106197
Malvery, Olive	1871	1914	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41107
Brereton, Maud	1871	1946	
Foxwell, Agnes	1871	1957	
Lawrence, Susan	1871	1947	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34434
Macadam, Elizabeth	1871	1948	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53582
Edgell, Beatrice	1871	1948	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52394
Van der Veen, Margrieta	1871	1951	
Varley, Julia	1871	1952	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42094

Cohort 2 (1872 – 1891)

Name	**Dates**		**ODNB entry**
Blackman, Winifred	1872	1950	
Deverell, Edith [m. Marvin]	1872	1958	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48586
Hamilton, Cicely	1872	1952	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38633
Markham, Violet	1872	1959	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34881
Oakeshott, Grace	1872	1929	
Rathbone, Eleanor	1872	1946	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35678
Skeel, Caroline	1872	1951	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45663

Wilson, Mona	1872	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70137
Sheepshanks, Mary	1872	1958	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38534
Picton-Turbervill, Edith	1872	1960	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45465
Durham, Hermia	1873	1948	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62141
Bondfield, Margaret	1873	1953	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31955
De Vesselitsky, Varvara	1872/3	1927	
Hammond, Barbara	1873	1961	
Montagu, Lily	1873	1963	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40837
Dawson, Lilian [m. Boyd Dawson]	1874	?	
Matheson, Cécile	1874	1950	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/107517
Fox, Evelyn	1874	1955	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33231
Harrison, Amy	1874	1970	
Papworth, Lucy Wyatt	1874	1921	
Clark, Alice	1874	1934	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38517
Cullis, Winifred	1875	1956	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32661
Hadow, Grace	1875	1940	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33630
Reynard, Helene	1875	1947	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48684
Haskins, Minnie	1875	1957	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/65946
Martindale, Hilda	1875	1952	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34912
Fisher, Lettice	1875	1956	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41132
Morley, Edith	1875	1964	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48617
Rackham, Clara	1875	1966	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48589
Crosthwaite, Agnes	1876	1965	
Davies, Maud	1876	1913	
Jebb, Eglantyne	1876	1928	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34165
Royden, Maude	1876	1956	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35861
Atkinson, Mabel	1876	1958	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69907
Drake, Barbara	1876	1963	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48587
Billington-Greig, Teresa	1877	1964	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39074
Campbell, Janet	1877	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32267
Lane-Claypon, Janet	1877	1967	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61714
Murray, Alice [m. Radice]	1877	1951	
Ormsby, Hilda	1877	1973	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62412
Mercier, Winifred	1878	1934	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/ 48685
Cowan, Minna	1878	1951	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48699
George, Dorothy	1878	1971	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45657

Jowitt, Lettice	1878	1962	
Freire-Marreco, Barbara [m. Aitken]	1879	1967	
Smith, May	1879	1968	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/58401
Macarthur, Mary	1880	1921	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30411
Browne, Stella	1880	1955	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39076
Bulkley, Mildred	1880	1958	
Wodehouse, Helen	1880	1964	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48473
Grier, Lynda	1880	1967	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48438
Stopes, Marie	1880	1858	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36323
Buer, Mabel	1881	1942	
Levett, Elizabeth	1881	1932	
Phillips, Marion	1881	1932	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37852
Keeling, Dorothy	1881	1968	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46438
Whitmore, Dorothy	1881	1955?	
Keith, Theodora [m. Pagan]	1882	1930	
Milnes, Nora	1882	1972	
Wood, Frances	1883	1919	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/112242
Dunlop, Olive	1883	1970	
Simon, Shena	1883	1972	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46396
Zimmern, Dorothea [m. Barton]	1883	1982	
Abbott, Elizabeth	1884	1957	
Bottomley, Alice	1884	1961	
Fildes, Lucy	1884	1968	
Butler, Violet	1884	1982	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37250
Crowdy, Rachel	1884	1964	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32647
Czaplicka, Maria	1884	1921	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46557
Jewson, Dorothy	1884	1964	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50050
Colville, Cynthia	1884	1968	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/51964
Collingwood, Ethel	1885	1973	
Eckhard, Edith Verena	1885	1952	
Harrison, Agatha	1885	1954	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47749
Neville-Rolfe, Sybil [m. Gotto]	1885	1955	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/76744
Proud Dorothea [m. Pavy]	1885	1967	
Chodak-Gregory, Hazel	1886	1952	
Curtis, Myra	1886	1971	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/40538
Hubback, Eva	1886	1949	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37578

Jenkins, Alice	1886	1967	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69835
Smith, Mary	1886	1974	
Hazlitt, Victoria	1887	1932	
Rice [Spring Rice], Margery	1887	1970	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74760
Strachey, Ray	1887	1940	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38017
White, Amber Blanco	1887	1981	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63956
Wright, Helena	1887	1982	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31859
Anstey, Vera	1889	1976	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61350
Power, Eileen	1889	1940	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35581
Evans, Dorothy	1889	1944	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63844
Blackwood, Beatrice	1889	1975	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45781
Read, Margaret	1889	1991	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72739
Thurtle, Dorothy	1890	1973	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69843
Reckitt, Eva	1890	1976	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68893
Wilkinson, Ellen	1891	1947	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36902
Black, Ellinor	1891	1956	
Power, Beryl	1891	1974	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45653
Stocks, Mary	1891	1975	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31721
Mann, Julia de Lacy	1891	1985	http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62347

APPENDIX A.6: SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS BY STUDIED WOMEN

Notes: Some women appear under more than one name – for example, maiden and married names – and may have published with their own or their husband's initials. In cases where the bibliography was extensive, selected publications are listed. They are grouped for easy reference.

Abbott, E. and Bompas, K. (1943). *The woman citizen and social security*. London: Bompas.

Abraham, M.E. (1896). *The law relating to factories and workshops, including laundries and docks.* Part I: Practical guide to the law and its administration. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Abram, A. (1909). The effects produced by economic changes upon social life in England in the fifteenth century. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.
Abram, A. (1913). *English life and manners in the later Middle Ages*. London: Routledge and Sons.
Abram, A. (1916). 'Women traders in medieval London', *Economic Journal*, 26(102), pp.276-285.
Abram, A. (1915). 'Newcastle'. In C. Black (Ed.), *Married women's work.* London: G. Bell and Sons, pp.195-203.

Adler, N. (1902). *Wage earning children in England*. London: Hazell.
Adler, N. (1903). 'Children as wage-earners', *Fortnightly Review*, 73, pp.918-927.
Adler, N. (1907-8). 'Child workers and wage earners', *Royal Society of Arts Journal*, 56, pp.738-747.
Adler, N. (1908). 'Child employment and juvenile delinquency'. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry from seven points of view*. London: Duckworth, pp.121-142.
Adler, N. (1915). 'Women's industry during and after the war', *Contemporary Review,* 108, pp.780-788.

Adler, N. and Tawney, R.H. (1909). *Boy and girl labour*. London: Women's Industrial Council.

Ainslie, C. (1911). 'Domestic science for girls in secondary schools', *Secondary School Journal*, 4(1), pp.3-5.
Ainslie, C. (1911). 'The education of girls and the position of women teachers in Scotland', *The School World*, 19, pp.87-91.

Aitken, B. (1959). 'Relocalization', *Folklore*, 70(4), pp.546-549.
Aitken, B. (1966). 'Surrey peat', *Folklore*, 77(1), pp.67-68.

Anderson, A.M. (1895). 'Joint associations of employers and employed in France and Belgium', *Economic Journal*, 5(20), pp.641-650.

Anderson, A.M. (1899). 'Truck legislation in England and on the continent', *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation*, 1(3), pp.395-406.
Anderson, A.M. (1900). *Legislation affecting the conditions of employment in homework and domestic industries in England*. London: Industrial Law Committee.
Anderson, A.M. (1908). 'Factory and workshop law'. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry from seven points of view*. London: Duckworth, pp.143-182.
Anderson, A.M. (1913). 'Women in public administration', *New Statesman* 2, Supplement (November 1), pp.xix-.
Anderson, A.M. (1918). *Memorandum on subsidiary health and kindred service for women*. London: H.M. Stationery Office.
Anderson, A.M. (1925). 'The recommendations of the Shanghai Child Labour Commission', *International Labour Review*, 11, pp.665-681.
Anderson, A.M. (1928). *Humanity and labour in China. An industrial visit and its sequel, 1923 to 1926*. London: Student Christian Movement.
Anderson, A.M. (1930). 'The employment of children in Egyptian industry', *International Labour Review*, 22, pp.723-751.

Anstey, V. (1929). *The trade of the Indian Ocean*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Anstey, V. (1929). *The economic development of India*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Anstey, V. (1934). 'Review: Child marriage: the Indian Minotaur by Eleanor Rathbone', *The Sociological Review*, 26(3), p.316.
Anstey, V. (1934). 'Review: Indian Labour in Rangoon by E. Andrew', *International Affairs*, 13(4), p.584.
Anstey, V. (1964). *Introduction to economics for students in India and Pakistan*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Ashley, A., Kirkaldy, A.W., Grier, L. and Renold, C.G. (1921). *British labour*. London and New York: I. Pitman & Sons.

Atkinson, M. (1903). 'The organization of local government in Scotland', *Political Science Quarterly*, 18(1), pp.59-87.
Atkinson, M. (1904). *Local government in Scotland*. Edinburgh. W. Blackwood & Sons.
Atkinson, M. (1904). 'Trusts and trade unions, and their mutual relations', *Political Science Quarterly*, 19(2), p.193.
Atkinson, M. (1910). 'The feminist movement and eugenics', *Sociological Review*, 3(1), pp.51-56.
Atkinson, M. (1914). *The economic foundations of the women's movement*. Fabian Women's Group Series, no. 4. Fabian Tract No.175. London: The Fabian Society.
Atkinson, M. (1930). 'Some problems of the transition from subsistence to money economy', *South African Journal of Science*, 27(1), 117-25.

Atkinson, M. and McKillop, M. (1911). *Economics, descriptive and theoretical*. London: Allman.

Aveling, E.B. and Marx, E. (1888). *The working-class movement in America*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Barnett, H. (1879). *The young women in our work houses*. London: Penny and Hull.
Barnett, H. (1881). *The work of the lady visitors: written for the Council of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants*. London: Penny and Hull.

Barnett, S. and Barnett, H. (1888). *Practicable socialism: essays on social reform*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
Barnett, S. and Barnett, H. (1909). *Towards social reform*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Barton, D. (1919). 'Equal pay for equal work?', *Women's Industrial News*, 22(82), pp.6-16.
Barton, D. (1919). 'The course of women's wages', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 82(4), pp.508-553.
Barton, D. (1921). 'Women's minimum wages', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 84(4), pp.538-575.

Bathurst, K. (1905). 'The need for national nurseries', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 57(339), pp.818-827.
Bathurst, K. (1906). 'The physique of girls', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 59(351), pp.825-833.

Bathurst, K. et al. [Women Inspectors of the Board of Education] (1905). *Reports on children under five years of age in public elementary schools*. London: HMSO.

Beer, M. (1901). 'Review: Le développement économique et social du Japon', *Economic Journal*, 11(43), pp.397-398.
Beer, M. (1938). 'Review: The struggle for religious freedom in Germany by the Dean of Chichester, *Blackfriars*, 19(222), pp.697-698.
Beer, M. (1948). 'Review: Straight on. Journey to Belsen and the road home by Robert Collis and Han Hogerzeil', *Blackfriars*, 29(335), pp.83-85.

Bell, F. (1907). *At the works: a study of a manufacturing town*. London: Edward Arnold.
Bell, F. (1908). *Down with the tariff: a tale of free trade*. London: A.L. Humphreys.
Bell, F. (1919). 'Women at the works – and elsewhere', *Fortnightly Review*, n.s. 106, pp.909-920.

Bennett, V.E.M. (1932). *The welfare of the infant and child*. London: Routledge.

Bennett, V.E.M. and Isaacs, S. (1931). *Health and education in the nursery*. London: Routledge.

Bentham, E., Despard, C., McMillan, M., Pember Reeves, M. and Women's Labour League. (1912). *The needs of little children. Report of a conference on the care of babies and young children*. London.

Bibby, M., Colles, E. and Petty, F. (Eds.) (1916). The pudding lady; a new departure in social work. London: National Food Reform Association.

Billington-Greig, T. (1911). 'The taxation of married woman', *Contemporary Review*, February, pp.210-17.
Billington-Greig, T. (1911). *The militant suffrage movement.* London, Frank Palmer.
Billington-Greig, T. (1911). *The consumer in revolt*. London: Stephen Swift.
Billington-Greig, T. (1913). 'The truth about white slavery', *The English Review*, 14, pp.428-46.
Billington-Greig, T. (1914). *Commonsense on the population question.* The substance of a lecture delivered to the Glasgow Clarion Scouts on December 13th, 1914. London: Women's Printing Society.

Black, C. (1889). 'A working woman's speech', *The Nineteenth Century*, 26(147), pp.667-71.
Black, C. (1889). 'The organisation of working women', *Fortnightly Review*, XLVI, pp.695-697.
Black, C. (1890). 'The chocolate makers' strike', *Fortnightly Review*, XLVII, pp.305-314.
Black, C. (1891). 'Matchbox making in the home', *English Illustrated Magazine*, August.
Black, C. (1891). 'The coming Factory Act', *Contemporary Review*, 59, pp.710-717.
Black, C. (1902). 'Some current objections to factory legislation for women'. In B. Webb (Ed.), *The case for the Factory Acts*. 2nd Edition. London: Grant Richards, pp.193-223.
Black, C. (1904). 'London tailoresses', *Economic Journal*, 14(56), pp.555-567.
Black, C. (1906). 'Trade schools for girls in London', *Economic Journal*, 16(63), pp.449-454.
Black, C. (1907). *Sweated industry and the minimum wage*. London: Duckworth & Co.
Black, C. (1908). 'Girl life in a slum', *Economic Review*, 18, pp.184-189.
Black, C. (1908). 'Legislative proposals'. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry from seven points of view*. London. Duckworth, pp.186-202.
Black, C. (1910). 'Review: Les Sociétés Coopératives de Consommation, by Charles Gide', *Economic Journal*, 20(77), pp.69-71.
Black, C. (1914). 'Review: Women, marriage and motherhood, by Dr. Elizabeth Sloan Chesser', *Sociological Review*, 7, p.165.
Black, C. (Ed.) (1915). *Married women's work: being the report of an inquiry by the Women's Industrial Council*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
Black, C. (1918). *A new way of housekeeping*. London: Collins Sons & Co.

Black, E.I. and Read, D.B. (1947). *Old people's welfare on Merseyside*. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool.

Blackman, W.S. (1916). 'The magical and ceremonial uses of fire', *Folklore*, 27(4), pp.352-377.
Blackman, W.S. (1918). 'The rosary in magic and religion', *Folklore*, 29(4), pp.255-280.

Blackman, W.S. (1918). ‘Traces in couvade (?) in England’, *Folklore*, 29(4), pp.319-321.
Blackman, W.S. (1924). ‘Some beliefs among the Egyptian peasants with regard to ‘afarit’’, *Folklore*, 35(2), pp.176-184.
Blackman, W.S. (1927). *The fellahin of Upper Egypt: their religious, social and industrial life to-day with special reference to survivals from ancient time*. London: G. Harrap.

Blackwood, B. (1927). *A study of mental testing in relation to anthropology. Mental measurement monographs 4*. Baltimore, Maryland: Williams & Wilkins.
Blackwood, B. (1935). *Both sides of Buka Passage: an ethnographic study of social, sexual and economic questions in the north-western Solomon Islands*. Oxford: Clarendon-Oxford University.

Blagg, H. and Wilson, C. (1912). *Women and prisons*. Fabian Tract No 163. London: Fabian Society.

Bond, M. and Cullis, W. (1935). *Body and its health*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Bondfield, M. (1899). ‘Conditions under which shop assistants work’, *Economic Journal*, 9(34), pp.277-286.
Bondfield, M. (1909). *Socialism for shop assistants*. London: Clarion Press.
Bondfield, M. (1914). *The national care of maternity*. London: Women’s Co-operative Guild.
Bondfield, M. (1928). ‘The meaning of trade’. In *Self and society. First twelve essays: social and economic problems from the neglected point of view of the consumer*. London: Ernest Benn.

Bosanquet, B., Bryant, S. and Ross, G. (1908). *The place of experts in democracy. A symposium*. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, 9, new series, pp.61-84.

Bosanquet, H. (1896). ‘The burden of small debts’, *Economic Journal*, 6(22), pp.212-225.
Bosanquet, H. (1896). *Rich and poor*. London: Macmillan.
Bosanquet, H. (1897). ‘The lines of industrial conflict’, *Economic Journal*, 7(28), pp.503-510.
Bosanquet, H. (1898). *The standard of life and other studies*. London: Macmillan.
Bosanquet, H. (1900). ‘Methods of training’, *Charity Organisation Review*, August.
Bosanquet, H. (1901). ‘Cheap literature’, *Contemporary Review*, 79, pp.671-681.
Bosanquet, H. (1902). ‘A study in women’s wages’, *Economic Journal*, 12(45), pp.42-49.
Bosanquet, H. (1902). *The strength of the people: a study in social economics*. London: MacMillan.
Bosanquet, H. (1906). *The family*. London: MacMillan.
Bosanquet, H. (1907). *The economics of women’s work and wage*. London: P.S. King & Son.
Bosanquet, H. (1909). *The Poor Law report of 1909*. London: Macmillan.
Bosanquet, H. (1914). *Social work in London, 1869-1912. A history of the Charity Organization Society.* London. John Murray.

Bosanquet, H. (1920). ‘The race for the Chinaman’s nightcap’, *Economic Journal*, 30(123), pp.308-320.
Bosanquet, H. (1924). *Free trade and peace in the nineteenth century*. London: Kristiania.

Bosanquet, H. and Bosanquet, B. (1897). ‘Charity organisation: a reply’, *Contemporary Review*, 71, pp.112-16.
Bosanquet, H., Creighton, L. and Webb, B. (1897). ‘Law and the laundry: commercial laundries’, *Nineteenth Century*, 41, pp.224-31.

Bousfield, W., Carpenter, W.L., Stanford, C.V., Onslow, G.M., Ricks, G., Heather-Bigg, A., and Grieve, W.H. (1890). *Elementary schools, how to increase their utility. Being six lectures delivered to the managers of the London board schools in 1889 and 1890*. London: Percival & Co.

Bradby, L.B. and Black, A. (1899). ‘Women compositors and the Factory Acts’, *Economic Journal*, 9(34), pp.261-266.

Branford, S. [Mrs V. Branford] (1913). ‘The revival of the village’, *Sociological Review*, 6(1), pp.43-46.
Branford, S. (1916-17). ‘The arts and crafts exhibition: I. What the city might do for the craftsman’, *Sociological Review*, 9(1), pp.49-52.

Branford, S. and Farquharson, A. (1924). *An introduction to regional surveys*. London: Leplay House Press.

Brereton, M.A.C. (1909). *The mother’s companion*. London: Mills & Boon.
Brereton, M.A.C. (1914). *The study of the problems of domestic economy as a factor in salesmanship*. Papers Delivered to the Second Annual General Meeting and Conference of the British Commercial Gas Association (BCGA). London October 1913.

Brereton, M.A.C. and Edden, H. (1913). *Cooking by G.A.S*. London: British Commercial Gas Association.

Browne, S. [F.W.S. Browne] (1917). ‘Women and birth control’. In E. Paul and C. Paul (Eds.), *Population and birth-control, a symposium.* New York: Critic and Guide Co, pp.247-260.
Browne, S. [F.W.S. Browne] (1916). ‘Review: Downward paths: an inquiry into the causes which contribute to the making of the prostitute by A.M. Royden’, *International Journal of Ethics*, 27(1), pp.112-113.
Browne, S. [F.W.S. Browne] (1917). ‘Women and the race’, *The Socialist Review*, 14(18), May-June.

Bryant, S. (1888). ‘On the nature and functions of a complete symbolic language’, *Mind*, 13(50), pp.188-207.
Bryant, S. (1894). ‘Educational finance’, *Economic Journal*, 4(13), pp.94-105.
Bryant, S. (1894). *The teaching of morality in the family and the school*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Bryant, S. (1897). 'Variety of extent, degree and unity of self-consciousness', *Mind*, n.s.6(1), pp.71-89.
Bryant, S. (1900). 'The double effect of mental stimuli: a contrast of types', *Mind*, n.s.9(36), pp.305-318.

Buer, M.C. (1915). 'Review: Die Bank von England by O. Hulftegger', *Economic Journal*, 25, pp.414-.
Buer, M.C. (1921). 'Review: The economics of welfare by A.C. Pigou', *Charity Organisation Review*, 291, pp.163-.
Buer, M.C. (1921). 'The trade depression following the Napoleonic Wars', *Economica,* 1, pp.159-79.
Buer, M.C. (1921 [1927,1935]). *Economics for beginners*. London: G. Routledge & Sons.
Buer, M.C. (1926 [1968]). *Health, wealth, and population in the early days of the industrial revolution*. London: G. Routledge & Sons
Buer, M.C. (1928). 'England to-day and yesterday', *Eugenics Review*, 20(1), pp.2-.
Buer, M.C. (1929). 'Health and prosperity in the nineteenth century', *Eugenics Review*, 21(3), pp.189-.
Buer, M.C. (1930). 'The reformed parliament and civil registration of births and deaths', *Public Administration*, 8(3), pp.323-.
Buer, M.C. (1932/3). 'Review: Nottinghamshire in the Eighteenth Century" by J.D. Chambers', *Economic History Review*, 4, p.365.

Buer, M.C. and Gun, W.T.J. (1931). 'The kin of genius III', *Eugenics Review*, 22(4), pp.253-.

Bulkley, M. (1914). *The feeding of school children*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
Bulkley, M. (1915). *The establishment of legal minimum rates in the boxmaking industry under the Trade Boards Act of 1909*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
Bulkley, M. (1922). *Bibliographical survey of contemporary sources for the economic and social history of the war*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bulley, A.M (1890). 'The political evolution of women', *Westminster Review*, 134(1), pp.1-8.
Bulley, A.M (1891). 'Domestic service: a social study', *Westminster Review*, 135(2), pp.177-186.
Bulley, A.M (1894). 'The employment of women. The Lady Assistant Commissioners' Report', *Fortnightly Review*, CCCXXV, pp.39-48.
Bulley, A.M (1896). 'The rise of women's conferences', *Englishwoman*, 4, pp.213-.

Bulley, A.M. and Whitley, M. (1894). *Women's work*. *With a preface by Lady Dilke.* London: Methuen.

Butler, C.V. (1907). 'Review: Capital. Vol. II. The process of circulation of capital by Karl Marx. Edited by Frederick Engels. Transl. from the 2nd German Edition by Ernest Untermann', *Economic Journal*, 17, p.558.
Butler, C.V. (1910). '"Public assistance" and organized charities in Oxford', *Economic Review*, 20(4), pp.404-422.
Butler, C.V. (1912). *Social conditions in Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butler, C.V. (1916). *Domestic service: an enquiry by the Women's Industrial Council*. London. Bell.
Butler, C.V. (1916). 'Review: Old Age Pensions by H.J. Hoare', *Economic Journal*, 26, pp.254-.
Butler, C.V. (1919). 'Review: Women in the engineering trades by B. Drake', *Economic Journal*, 29(114), pp.238-41.
Butler, C.V. (1924). 'Review: Principii di sociologia e politica by Amerigo Namias', *Sociological Review*, 16, pp.360-.
Butler, C.V. (1928). *Village survey-making: an Oxfordshire experiment*. Board of Education Pamphlets No.61. London: H.M. Stationery Office.
Butler, C.V. (1949). *The social services in action: some personal experiences*. Oxford: Oxonian Press.

Cadbury, E., Matheson, M.C. and Shann, G. (1906). *Women's work and wages: a phase of life in an industrial city*. London: T. F. Unwin.

Campbell, J. (1918). 'Appendix B (I): A further inquiry into the health of women munition workers'. In *Health of Munition Workers Committee, Final Report: industrial health and efficiency.* Cd. 9065. London: HMSO, pp.132-152.
Campbell, J. (1919). 'Memorandum: the health of women in industry'. In J.R. Atkin. *Women in industry. Report of the War Cabinet Committee on women in industry*. London: HMSO, pp.218-253.
Campbell, J. (1924). *Maternal mortality.* British Ministry of Health reports on public health and medical subjects. No.25. London: HMSO.
Campbell, J. (1927). *The protection of motherhood.* British Ministry of Health reports on public health and medical subjects. No.48. London: HMSO.
Campbell, J. (1929). *Infant mortality: international inquiry of the Health Organisation of the League of Nations, English section*. Statistical notes by P.L. McKinlay. London: HMSO.

Campbell, J., Cameron, I.D. and Jones, D.M. (1932). *High maternal mortality in certain areas.* British Ministry of Health reports on public health and medical subjects. No 68. London: HMSO.
Campbell, J. and Wilson, L.E. (1917) 'Inquiry into the health of women engaged in munition factories'. In *Health of Munition Workers Committee, Interim Report: industrial efficiency and fatigue*. Cd. 8511. London: HMSO, pp.110-119.

Cattrell, J.M. and Bryant, S. (1889). 'Mental association investigated by experiment', *Mind*, 14(54), pp.230-250.

Chandler, F., Lansbury, G., Wakefield, H.R. and Webb, B. (1909) *The Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission. Part I: The break up of the Poor Law.* London: National Committee to Promote the Break-up of the Poor Law.

Chesterton, A. (1926)**.** *In darkest London.* 2nd Edition. London: Stanley Paul & Co.
Chesterton, A. (1928). *Women of the underworld*. London: Stanley Paul & Co.
Chesterton, A. (1936)**.** *I lived in a slum.* London: V. Gollancz Ltd.

Chodak-Gregory, H. (1926). *Infant welfare for the student and practitioner*. London: Lewis.

Clark, A. (1919). *Working life of women in the seventeenth century*. London: Frank Cass & Company.

Collet, C. (1891) 'Women's work in Leeds', *Economic Journal*, 1(3), pp.460-473.
Collet, C. (1891). Women's work. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and Life of the People*. 3rd Edition. London: Williams and Northgate, pp.406-481.
Collet, C. (1891). 'Wages and the standard of living', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 5(3), pp.365-369.
Collet, C. (1891). 'Reports of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor on working women, 1870-1889', *Economic Journal*, 1(2), pp.398-405.
Collet, C. (1892). 'Prospects of marriage for women', *The Nineteenth Century*, 31(182), pp.537-552.
Collet, C. (1894). *Employment of women in England*: *Report by Miss Collet on the statistics of employment of women and girls*. London: HMSO. Report prepared under the aegis of the Board of Trade, Employment of Women (Labour Department). London.
Collet, C. (1895). 'Statistics of employment of women and girls', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 58(3), pp.522-525.
Collet, C. (1896). 'Review: Family budgets: being the income and expenses of twenty-eight British households, 1891-1894 by The Economic Club', *Economic Journal*, 6, pp.570-573.
Collet, C. (1898). 'The collection and utilisation of official statistics bearing on the extent and effects of the industrial employment of women', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* 61(2), pp.219-261.
Collet, C. (1898). 'The expenditure of middle class working women', *Economic Journal*, 8(32), pp.543-553.
Collet, C. (1899). *Money wages of indoor domestic servants*. London: H.M. Stationery Office by Darling & Son.
Collet, C. (1901). 'Wages Boards in Victoria', *Economic Journal*, 11(44), pp.557-565.
Collet, C. (1902). *Educated working women: essays on the economic position of women workers of the middle classes*. London: P.S. King.
Collet, C. (1903). 'Review: The strength of the people: a study in social economics by Helen Bosanquet', *Economic Journal*, 13(49), pp.81-84.
Collet, C. (1910). 'Review: Women in industry: a study in American economic history by Edith Abbott', *Economic Journal*, 20, pp.73-77.
Collet, C. (1911). *Women in industry*. London: Women's Printing Society.
Collet, C. (1915). 'The professional employment of women', *Economic Journal*, 25(100), pp.627-630.
Collet, C. (1916). 'Cost of food for an adult woman', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 79(3), pp.300-308.
Collet, C. (1919). 'Review: Life according to Jones by "Enlightened Selfishness"', Economic Journal, 29(113), pp.86-89.
Collet, C. (1919). 'Review: Scheme for a state bonus: a rational method of solving the social problem by E. Mabel and Dennis Milner', 29(114), *Economic Journal*, p.241.
Collet, C. (1923). 'Review: The charity organisation movement in the United States: A study in American philanthropy by Frank Dekker Watson', *Economic Journal*, 33(131), pp.410-413.

Collet, C. (1924). 'Review: Labour in Indian industries by G.M. Broughton and Welfare', *Economic Journal*, 34, pp.457-459.
Collet, C. (1939). 'Review: Women servants of the state 1870-1938: a history of women in the Civil Service by Hilda Martindale', *Economic Journal*, 49(193), pp.124-125.

Collier, D.J. and Hutchins, B.L. (1918). *The girl in industry*. London: Bell and Sons.

Collis, E.L., Smith, W.S and Squire, R.E. (1910). *Report upon the conditions under which bronzing is carried on in factories and workshops*. London: Darling & Son.

Colville, C. (1917). 'Infant welfare', *Charity Organisation Review,* 42(247), pp.6-15.
Colville, C. (1925). 'The position of the C.O.S. in 1925', *Charity Organisation Quarterly,* 14, pp.248-249.
Colville, C. (1932). 'Remand homes', *Probation*, 1(11), pp.165-165.
Colville, C. (1952). 'Presidential Address', *Journal of the Royal Sanitary Institute*, 72(5), pp.628-629.
Colville, C. (1954). *Social progress and the individual*. London: Clarke Hall Fellowship.

Colville, C. and Hill, D. (1957). 'British Epilepsy Association', *British Medical Journal,* 2(5056), p.1310.

Courtney, J.E. (1915). 'The war and women's employment', *Fortnightly Review*, 97(578), pp.239-248.
Courtney, J.E. (1920). *Freethinkers of the nineteenth century*. New York: Dutton & Company.
Courtney, J.E. (1933). *Countrywomen in council: the English and Scottish women's institutes, with chapters on the movement in the Dominions and on Townswomen's Guilds*. London: Milford.

Cowan, M. (1912). *The education of the women of India*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrie.
Cowan, M. (1926). 'Education'. In M. Rackstraw (Ed.), *A social survey of the city of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd for the Council of Social Service.
Cowan, M. (1933). *The Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1932: a manual of the acts relating to the protection and training of children and young persons in Scotland*. Edinburgh: W. Hodge.
Cowan, M. (Ed.) (1944). *Our Scottish towns. Evacuation and the social future*. A report by the Scottish Women's Group on Public Welfare. Edinburgh: William Hodge.

Creighton, L. (1889). 'The appeal versus female suffrage: a rejoinder', *The Nineteenth Century*, 26(150), pp.347-354.
Creighton, L. (1901). 'The employment of educated women', *The Nineteenth Century*, 50(297), pp.806-811.
Creighton, L. (1901). *The modern home*. Paper read at the Brighton Conference of the National Union of Women Workers. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.

Creighton, L. (1907). *The economics of the household*. Six lectures given at the London School of Economics. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
Creighton, L. (1908). 'Women's settlements', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 63(374), April.
Creighton, L. (1914). *The social disease and how to fight it: a rejoinder*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Crowdy, R.E. (1945). *Post-war Europe as a field for the traffic in women and children: introductory note on the legislative development of the international conventions against the traffic in women and children*. London: International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children.

Cullis, W. (1924). 'Industrial psychology: some ways of increasing output of work', *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, 2, pp.125-128.

Culpin, M. and Smith, M. (1930). *The nervous temperament*. Industrial Health Research Board Report no. 61. London: HMSO.

Cunningham, W. and McArthur, E.A. (1895). *Outlines of English industrial history*. London: Macmillan.

Curtis, M. (1932). 'American office management', *Public Administration*, 10(2), pp.179-.
Curtis, M. (1934). 'Treatment of suggestions from staff', *Public Administration*, 2(2), pp.168-.
Curtis, M. (1935). 'National income and expenditure and the measurement of savings [Notes and Memoranda]', *Economic Journal*, 45, pp.573-7.
Curtis, M. (1936). 'Review: general theory of employment, interest and money by J.M. Keynes', *Public Administration*, 14(2), pp.206-.
Curtis, M. (1937). 'Is money saving equal to investment?', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 15, pp.604-25.
Curtis, M. (1937). 'Measurement of staff output in clerical work', *Public Administration*, 15(3), pp.225-.
Curtis, M. (1939). 'Savings and investment: saving and savings', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 53(4), pp.623-6.
Curtis, M. (1946). *Report of the Care of Children Committee: presented by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education, to Parliament by command of His Majesty, September 1946*. Cmd. 6922 London: HMSO.

Czaplicka, M.A. (1914). *Aboriginal Siberia: a study in social anthropology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Czaplicka, M.A. (1916). 'Siberia and some Siberians', *Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society*, 32, pp.27-42.
Czaplicka, M.A. (1917). 'On the track of the Tungus', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 33, pp.289-303.
Czaplicka, M.A. (1918). *The turks of Central Asia in history and at the present day: an ethnological inquiry into the pan-turanian problem, and bibliographical material relating to the early turks and the present turks of Central Asia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Czaplicka, M.A. (1921). ‘History and ethnology in Central Asia’, *Man*, 21, pp.19-24.

Davies, M. [Llewellyn Davies] (1904). *The Women’s Co-operative Guild, 1883-1904*. Kirkby: Lonsdale Women’s Co-operative Guild.
Davies, M. [Llewellyn Davies] (Ed.) (1915). *Maternity: letters from working women*. London: G. Bell & Sons.
Davies, M. [Llewellyn Davies] (Ed.) (1931). *Life as we have known it, by co-operative working women*. London: Hogarth Press.

Davies, M.F. (1909). *Life in an English village. An economic survey of the parish of Corsley in Wiltshire*. London: T.F. Unwin.

Dawson, L.A. (1923). *Co-operative education*. Fabian Tract No. 205. London: Fabian Society.

Deane, L. (1899). ‘Report on the health of workers in asbestos and other dusty trades’. In H.M. Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, *Annual Report for 1898*. London: HMSO, pp.171-172.

De Vesselitsky, V. (1916). *The homeworker and her outlook: a descriptive study of tailoresses and boxmakers.* London: Bell & Sons.
De Vesselitsky, V. (1917). *Expenditure and waste a study in war-time.* London: Bell & Sons.

De Vesselitsky, V. and Bulkley, M.E. (1917). ‘Money-lending and the London poor’, *Sociological Review*, a9(3), pp.129-138.

Dendy, H. (1891). ‘The causes of poverty’, *Economic Journal*, 1(4), pp.808-810.
Dendy, H. (1893). ‘The Industrial Residuum’, *Economic Journal*, 3(12), pp.600-616.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘The children of working London’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.29-45.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘The position of women in industry’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.63-74.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘Marriage in East London’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.75-81.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘The industrial residuum’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.82-102.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘Old pensioners’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.118-125.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘The meaning and methods of true charity’ In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.167-179.
Dendy, H. (1895). ‘Origin and history of the English poor law’. In B. Bosanquet (Ed.), *Aspects of the social problem*. London: Macmillan, pp.195-225.

Deverell, E. (1898). ‘Shop benefit clubs’, *Economic Journal*, 8(30), pp.243-254.
Deverell, E. (1899). ‘Slate clubs’, *Economic Journal*, 9(34), pp.266-277.

Drake, B. (1908). ‘A study of infant life in Westminster’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 71(4), pp.678-86.
Drake, B. (1913). ‘The teashop girl’, *Women’s Industrial News,* 17(61), pp.115-129.

Drake, B. (1914). 'Barmaids', *Women's Industrial News,* 18(65), pp.221-238.
Drake, B. (1914). 'The girl worker and the opportunity of the juvenile advisory committee', *Women's Industrial News*, 18(66), pp.277-285.
Drake, B. (1914). 'Government contracts and the disenfranchised worker', *Women's Industrial News*, 18(64), pp.193-202.
Drake, B. (1915). 'The shop assistant', *Women's Industrial News*, 19(69), pp.321-344.
Drake, B. (1917). *Women in the engineering trades*. *A problem, a solution, and some criticisms*. Being a report based on an enquiry by a joint committee of the Fabian Research Department and the Fabian Women's Group. Trade Union Series, No. 3. London: Fabian Research Department/George Allen and Unwin.
Drake, B. (1920). *Women in trade unions*. London: Labour Research Department & Allen and Unwin (reprinted Virago, London, 1984).
Drake, B. (1933). *Starvation in the midst of plenty: a new plan for the state feeding of school children*. Fabian Tract No. 240. London: Fabian Society.
Drake, B. (1935/1936). *Nutrition: a policy of national health*. Fabian Society Research series, no. 31. London: New Fabian Research Bureau.
Drake, B. (1937). *State education: an immediate programme for a socialist government*. Fabian Society Research series, no. 35. London: V. Gollancz.
Drake, B. (1939). 'The Spens Report', *Political Quarterly*, 10, p.215.

DSU [Dundee Social Union] (1905). *Report on housing and industrial conditions and medical inspection of school children*. Dundee: John Leng & Co.

Dunlop, O.J. (1911). 'Some aspects of early English apprenticeship', *Royal Historical Society, Transactions*, 3(5), pp.193-208.
Dunlop, O.J. (1913). *The farm labourer: the history of a modern problem*. London: Fisher Unwin.

Dunlop, O.J. and Denman, R. (1912). *English apprenticeship and child labour: a history*. London: Unwin.

Durham, F.H. (1901). *Juvenile labour in Germany and how it is being dealt with*. Report No.1514. London: Education Committee of the London County Council.

Eckhard, E.V. (1921). *The mother and the infant*. London. G. Bell and Sons, Ltd.

Edgell, B. (1912). 'Imagery and memory', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 12(1), pp.188-215.
Edgell, B. (1916). 'The government as advertiser', *Sociological Review*, 9, pp.45-48.
Edgell, B. (1918). 'The implications of recognition', *Mind*, 27(106), pp.174-187.
Edgell, B. (1929). *Ethical problems an introduction to ethics for hospital nurses and social workers*. London: Methuen & Co.
Edgell, B. (1935). 'Conceptual recognition', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 36, pp.237-254.

Fildes, L.G. and Myers, C.S. (1921). 'Left-handedness and the reversal of letters', *British Journal of Psychology*, 12, pp.273–278

Fisher, L. (1899). ‘Labourers’ Dwellings’, *Economic Journal*, 9(36), pp.605-611.
Fisher, L. (1900). ‘Elements of the housing problem’, *Economic Review*, pp.434-445.
Fisher, L. (1901). ‘Review: The housing question in London: being an account of the housing work done by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the London County Council, 1855-1900 by C.J. Stewart’, *Economic Journal*, 11, pp.56-.
Fisher. L. (1902). ‘Local authorities and the housing problem in 1901’, *Economic Journal*, 12(46), pp.263-271.
Fisher. L. (1905). ‘The town housing problem’, *Economic Journal*, 15(57), pp.23-36.
Fisher. L. (1905). ‘Review: Report upon housing and industrial conditions and medical inspection of school children by Dundee Social Union’, *Economic Journal*, 15(60), pp.552-553.
Fisher. L. (1922). *Getting and spending: an introduction of economics*. London: Collins Clear Type Press.
Fisher, L. (1924). *The economic position of the married woman*. The Stansfeld Trust Lecture, University of London, 1924. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fisher, L. (1924). *Life and work in England: a sketch of our social and economic history*. London: E. Arnold and Co.
Fisher, L. (1924). ‘Family allowances’, *Quarterly Review* (July).
Fisher, L. (1925). ‘Review: wages and the family by P.H. Douglas’, *Economic Journal*, 35, pp.598-.
Fisher, L. (1925). *Then and now: economic problems after the war a hundred years ago*. London: Oxford University Press.
Fisher, L. (1926). ‘Review: My Apprenticeship by Beatrice Webb’, *Economic Journal*, 36(143), pp.444-447.

Foley, C.A. (1893). ‘Fashion’, *Economic Journal*, 3(11), pp.458-474.
Foley, C.A. (1893). ‘Review: Public assistance of the poor in France by Emily Greene Balch; Paris qui Mendie, Mal et remède by Louis Paulian’, *Economic Journal*, 3(12), pp.676-678.
Foley, C.A. (1893). ‘Review: Handbuch des socialismus by Carl Stegmann and Phil C. Hugo’, *Economic Journal*, 3(12), pp.675-676.
Foley, C.A. (1894). ‘Royal Commission on Labour. The employment of women’, *Economic Journal*, 4(13), pp.185-191.
Foley, C.A. (1894). ‘Review: Die frau und der sozialismus (die frau in der vergangenheit gegenwartund zukunft) by August Bebel; Woman: her position in the past, present and future by August Bebel and H.B. Admas Walther; The rights of women. a comparative study in history and legislation by M. Ostrogorski’, *Economic Journal*, 4(13), pp.90-93.
Foley, C.A. (1894). ‘Review: Primitive civilisations; or, Outlines of the history of ownership in archaic communities by E.J. Simcox’, *Economic Journal*, 4(16), pp.701-704.

Ford, I.O. (1893). *Women’s wages and the conditions under which they are earned*. Humanitarian League’s Publications, No. 8. London: Reeves.
Ford, I.O. (c.1898). ‘Women as factory inspectors and certifying surgeons’, *Women’s Cooperative Guild Investigative Papers*, IV. London: Women’s Cooperative Guild.

Ford, I.O. (1902-3). ‘Collecting information at the girls’ club: a sketch from life’, *Humanitarian Review*, pp.314-315.
Ford, I.O. (1903). *Industrial women and how to help them*. London: Humanitarian League.
Ford, I.O. (1904). *Women and socialism*. London: Independent Labour Party.
Ford, I.O. (1909). ‘Women workers in the wholesale clothing trade’, *Englishwoman*, 1(6), pp.637-645.

Fox, E. (1904). ‘Review: The history of contract labour in the Hawaiian Islands’, *Economic Journal*, 14(53), pp.95-97.
Fox, E. (1904). ‘Labour treaties’, *Economic Journal*, 14, pp.115-118.
Fox, E. (1938). ‘Modern developments in mental welfare work’, *Eugenics Review*, 30(3), pp.165-173.

Foxwell, A.K. (1917). *Munition lasses, six months as principal overlooker in danger buildings*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Freire-Marreco, B. (1909). ‘Notes on the hair and eye colour of 591 children of school age in Surrey’, *Man*, 9, pp.99-108.
Freire-Marreco, B. (1909). ‘Scraps of English folklore IV’, *Folklore*, 20(4), pp.488-491.
Freire-Marreco, B. (1910). ‘Scraps of English folklore V’, *Folklore*, 21(2), pp.222-227.

Furniss, A., Sanderson, D. and Phillips, M. (1920). *The working women’s house*. London: Allen and Unwin.

George, M.D. (1925). *London life in the XVIII century*. London: Paul.
George, M.D. (1936). ‘Revisions in economic history. IV. The Combination Laws’, *Economic History Review*, a6(2), pp.172-178.
George, M.D. (1967). *Hogarth to Cruikshank: social change in graphic satire*. New York: Walker and Company.

Gordon, A.M. [Mrs J.E.H Gordon] (1891). *Decorative electricity*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington.
Gordon, A.M. (1895). ‘The after-careers of university-educated women in the nineteenth century’, *The Nineteenth Century*, 37(220), pp.955-960.

Gotto, S. [Mrs A.C. Gotto] (1913). ‘The relation of eugenic education to public health’, *Journal of State Medicine*, XX1, pp.623-631.
Gotto, S. (1917). ‘The eugenic principle in social reconstruction’, *Eugenics Review*, 9(3), pp.183-203.
Gotto, S. (1918). The changing moral standard. *Reprinted from The Nineteenth Century and After*. London: National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases.

Gray, B.K., Gray, E.K. and Hutchins, B.L. (1908). *Philanthropy and the state: or, social politics*. London: P.S. King & Son.

Grier, L. (1925). ‘The meaning of wages’, *Economic Journal*, 35(140), pp.519-535.

Grier, L. (1926). ‘Review: The economics of private enterprise by J.H. Jones’, *Economic Journal*, 36, pp.610-613.
Grier, L. (1952). *Achievement in education. The work of Michael Ernest Sadler, 1885-1935*. London: Constable.

Gurney, S. (1898). *Sixty years of cooperation*. London: Labour Association for Promoting Co-operative Production based on the Co-partnership of the Workers.
Gurney, S. (1905). *Cooperative housing*. London: Labour Co-partnership Association.
Gurney, S. (1910). ‘Civic reconstruction and the garden city movement’, *Sociological Review*, 3(1), pp.35-43.

Hadow, G.E. (1926). ‘A woman’s movement for education’, *Journal of Adult Education*, 1, pp.90-1.

Hamilton, C. (1909). *Marriage as a trade*. New York: Moffat, Yard and Company.

Hamilton-Gordon, I. (1892). ‘Household clubs: an experiment’, *The Nineteenth Century*, 31, pp.391-398.
Hamilton-Gordon, I. (1899). ‘The International Council of Women in Congress’, *The Nineteenth Century*, 46, pp.18-25.
Hamilton-Gordon, I. (1899). ‘The Woman’s International Parliament’, *North American Review*, 169, pp.145-53.
Hamilton-Gordon, I. (Ed.) (1900). *Women in social life: the transactions of the Social Section of the International Congress of Women, London, July 1899*. London: T.F. Unwin.
Hamilton-Gordon, I. (Ed.) (1900). *Women in professions: being the Professional Section of the International Congress of Women, London, July 1899*. London: T. F. Unwin.

Hammond, B. (1904). ‘Equal pay for equal work’, *Women’s Industrial News*. September.
Hammond, B. (1908). ‘Recent evidence on home work’, *Women’s Industrial News*. March.
Hammond, B. (1931). Two towns’ enclosures. *Economic History*, 2, pp.258-266.
Hammond, B. (1928). ‘Urban death-rates in the early nineteenth century’, *Economic History*, 38(1), pp.419-428.

Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1911). *The village labourer, 1760-1832: a study in the government of England before the Reform Bill.* London: Longmans.
Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1917). *The town labourer, 1760-1832: the new civilisation*. London: Longmans.
Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1919). *The skilled labourer: 1760-1832.* London: Longmans.
Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1925). *The rise of modern industry*. London: Methuen & Co.
Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1930). *The age of the Chartists, 1832-1854: a study of discontent*. London: Longmans Green.

Hammond, J.L. and Hammond, B. (1934). *The bleak age*. London and New York: Longmans, Green.

Harkness, M.E. (1881). 'Women as civil servants', *The Nineteenth Century*, 10(55), pp.369-381.
Harkness, M.E. (1882). 'Railway labour', *The Nineteenth Century*, 12, pp.721-732.
Harkness, M.E. (1883). 'The municipality of London', *National Review*, 1, pp.395-407; 2, pp.96-.
Harkness, M.E. [as John Law]. (1889). *Toilers in London: or inquiries concerning female labour in the metropolis.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Harkness, M.E. [as John Law]. (1890). *A Manchester shirtmaker: a realistic story of to-day*. London: Authors' Co-operative Publishing Co.
Harkness, M.E. [as John Law]. (1891). 'A year of my life', *New Review*, 5(29), pp.375-384.
Harkness, M.E. [as John Law]. (1893). 'The children of the unemployed', *New Review*, 8(45), pp.228-236.
Harkness, M.E. [as John Law]. (1894). 'A week on a labour settlement', *Fortnightly Review*, n.s. 56(332), pp.206-213.

Harrison, A. (1901). 'The inspection of women's workshops in London: a study in factory legislation', *Economic Review*, 11(1), pp.33-.
Harrison, A. (1904). *Women's industries in Liverpool: an enquiry into the economic effects of legislation regulating the labour of women*. London: Williams & Norgate for the University Press of Liverpool.

Hartley, C.G. (1914). *The position of women in primitive society. A study in matriarchy*. London: Nash.

Haskins, M.L. and Kelly, E.T. (1921). 'Foundation of industrial welfare', *Economica*, 1(2), pp.116-131.

Hazlitt, V. (1919). 'The acquisition of motor habits', *British Journal of Psychology*, 9, pp.299-320.
Hazlitt, V. (1926). *Ability: a psychological study*. London: Methuen.
Hazlitt, V. (1930). 'Children's thinking', *British Journal of Psychology*, 20, pp.354-361.
Hazlitt, V. (1933). *The psychology of infancy*. London: Methuen & Co.

Heather-Bigg, A. (1886). 'Female labour in the nail trade', *Fortnightly Review*, 39(234), pp.829-838.
Heather-Bigg, A. (1889). 'Pocket-money wages. Paper read at the Denison Club, January 16', *Charity Organization Review*, 52(April), pp.164-169.
Heather-Bigg, A. (1891). 'Women and the glove trade', *The Nineteenth Century,* 30(178), pp.939-950.
Heather-Bigg, A. (1893). 'What is 'fashion'?', *The Nineteenth Century*, 33(192), pp.235-248.
Heather-Bigg, A. (1893). *On home work – the share of the woman in family maintenance*. Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 63rd Meeting, Nottingham.

Heather-Bigg, A. (1894). ‘The wife’s contribution to family income’, *Economic Journal*, 4(13), pp.51-58.
Heather-Bigg, A. (1894). ‘The cry against home work’, *The Nineteenth Century,* 36(214), pp.970-986.

Helgesen, H., Forchhammer, H. and Matheson, M.C. (1905/1907). *School training for the home duties of women*. London: Wyman & Sons.

Hicks, F.A. (1895). ‘Factory girls’. In A. Reid (Ed.), *The new party, described by some of its members*. London: Hodder, pp.315-326.
Hicks, F.A. (1896). ‘Dressmakers and tailoresses’. In F.W. Galton (Ed.), *Workers on their industries*. London: Sonnenschein, pp.13-31.

Higgs, M. (1904). *Five days and five nights as a tramp among tramps: social investigation by a lady*. Manchester: John Heywood.
Higgs, M. (1904). *The tramp ward*. Manchester: John Heywood.
Higgs, M. (1904). *How to deal with the unemployed*. London: S. C. Brown, Langham & Company, Ltd.
Higgs, M. (1904). ‘Tramps and wanderers’, *The Nineteenth Century and After,* 56(329), pp.55-66.
Higgs, M. (1905). *Three nights in women’s lodging houses*. Oldham: Women’s Charity of Oldham.
Higgs, M. (1905). ‘The geology of society’, *Contemporary Review*, 87, pp.552-.
Higgs, M. (1906). *Glimpses into the abyss*. London: P.S. King and Son.
Higgs, M. (1906). ‘Mankind in the making’, *Contemporary Review*, 89, pp.830-.
Higgs, M. (1914). *My brother the tramp: studies in the problem of vagrancy*. London: Student Christian Movement.
Higgs, M. (1924). *Down and out: studies in the problem of vagrancy*. Being a revised edition of: *My brother the tramp*. London: Student Christian Movement.
Higgs, M. (1928). *Casuals and their casual treatment*. Pamphlet. London: King.
Higgs, M. (1931). *Where shall he live?* London: P.S. King.

Higgs, M. and Hayward. E. (1910). *Where shall she live? The homelessness of the woman worker*. Written for the National Association for Women’s Lodging-houses. London: P.S. King.
Higgs, M. and Hayward, E. (1915). *The housing of the woman worker*. London: National Association for Women’s Lodging Homes.

Hogarth, J.E. (1896). ‘The German insurance laws’, *Economic Journal*, 6(22), pp.283-294.
Hogarth, J.E. (1897). ‘Review: Der arbeiterschutz by Dr. Kuno Frankenstein’, *Economic Journal*, 7(26), pp.252-253.
Hogarth, J.E. (1897). ‘The monstrous regiment of women’, *Fortnightly Review*, 62, pp.926-936.

Hogg, E.F. (1897a). ‘School children as wage earners’, *The Nineteenth Century*, 42, pp.235-244.
Hogg, E.F. (1897b). ‘The fur pullers of South London’, *The Nineteenth Century,* 42, pp.734-743.

Hogg, E.F. (1900). 'Wage-earning children', *Economic Review*, 10(3), pp.345-54.

Howarth, E.G. and Wilson, M. (Eds.) (1907). *West Ham: a study in social and industrial problems: being the report of the Outer London Inquiry Committee*. London: J.M. Dent.

Hubback, E.M. (1914). 'Women in industry', *New Statesman* (February 21).
Hubback, E.M. (1914). 'Women's wages', *New Statesman* (February 21).
Hubback, E.M. (1930). 'The problem of maternal mortality', *Nation and Athenaeum*, 47(20), pp.611-.
Hubback, E.M. (1931). 'Disinherited families', *Nation and Athenaeum*, 48(21), pp.656-.
Hubback, E.M. and Green, M. (1933). 'Family endowment II. A proposal for constructive eugenics in England', *Eugenics Review*, 25(1), pp.33-36.
Hubback, E.M. (1936). 'Children and unemployment assistance', *New Statesman and Nation*, 12(288), pp.280-.
Hubback, E.M. (1937). 'Family allowances in relation to population problems', *Sociological Review*, 29(3), pp.272-278.
Hubback, E.M. (1947). *The population of Britain*. London: Penguin.

Hutchins, B.L. (1899). 'Notes towards the history of London wages', *Economic Journal*, 9, pp.599-605.
Hutchins, B.L. (1900). 'Notes towards the history of London wages', *Economic Journal*, 10, pp.103-04.
Hutchins, B.L. (1901). 'Infant mortality and the occupation of married women', *British Medical Journal*, II, p.634.
Hutchins, B.L. (1902). 'The historical development of the Factory Acts'. In B. Webb (Ed.), *The case for the Factory Acts*. 2nd Edition. London: Grant Richards, pp.75-123
Hutchins, B.L. (1903). *History of the regulation of home work, 1864-1901*. Report of the Seventy-Second Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1902, London: Murray.
Hutchins, B.L. (1904). 'The employment of women in paper mills', *Economic Journal*, 14(54), pp.235-248.
Hutchins, B.L. (1904). 'A note on the distribution of women in occupations', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 67(iii), pp.479-490.
Hutchins, B.L. (1906). 'An inquiry into the salaries and hours of work of typists and shorthand writers', *Economic Journal*, 16(63), pp.445-449.
Hutchins, B.L. (1907). *Labour laws for women in France.* London: Women's Industrial Council.
Hutchins, B.L. (1907). *Home work and sweating: the causes and the remedies.* Fabian Tract No. 130. London: Fabian Society.
Hutchins, B L. (1907). 'The control of sweating', *Economic Review*, 17(4), pp.403-409.
Hutchins, B.L. (1908). 'Gaps in our factory legislation', *Economic Journal*, 18(70), pp.221-230.
Hutchins, B.L. (1908). 'The industrial position of women'. *Edinburgh Review*, 208(426), pp.367-389.
Hutchins, B.L. (1909). *The public health agitation*. London A.C. Fifield.

Hutchins, B.L. (1909). 'Statistics of women's life and employment', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* 72(ii), pp.205-237.
Hutchins, B.L. (1909). 'Woman's industrial career', *Sociological Review*, 2(4), pp.338-348.
Hutchins, B.L. (1909). *Public health agitation, 1833-48*. London: Fifield.
Hutchins, B.L. (1911). *The working life of women.* Fabian Tract No. 157. London: Fabian Society.
Hutchins, B.L. (1911). 'Suitable for women', *Englishwoman*, 10(28), pp.49-53.
Hutchins, B.L. (1913a). 'Fatigue and efficiency', *Sociological Review*, a6(1), pp.30-42.
Hutchins, B.L. (1913b). *Conflicting ideals: two sides of the woman's question*. London: Murby.
Hutchins, B.L. (1915). *Women in modern industry*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
Hutchins, B.L. (1916). *Interim report of the conference to investigate into outlets for labour after the war*. Report of the eighty-fifth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1915, London: Murray, pp.504-582.
Hutchins, B.L. (1917a). *Women in industry after the war*. London: Athenaeum.
Hutchins, B.L. (1917b). 'The development of opinion on the relation of women's employment to infantile and maternal mortality', *Women's Industrial News*, 21(79), pp.4-18.

Hutchins, B.L. and Harrison, A. (1903). *A history of factory legislation*. Westminster: British Law: Trades and Crafts.

Ilbert, L. (1897). 'Review: Lo Stato al suo Posto, ossia delle opinioni di Raffaele Mariano, intorno all' Economia Politica e alla libertà by Prof. L.M. Billia', *Economic Journal*, 7(28), pp.587-.
Ilbert, L. (1898). 'Review: Lectures on the principles of local government by G.L. Gomme', *Economic Journal*, 8(29), p.91.
Ilbert, L. (1899). 'Pioneers in housing', *Economic Review*, 9, pp.450-62.

Irwin, M.H. (1893). *The conditions of women's work in laundries: report of an inquiry conducted for the Council of the Women's Protective and Provident League of Glasgow.* Glasgow.
Irwin, M.H. (1895-96). *Women's industries in Scotland*. Proceedings of the Philosophical Society of Glasgow, XXVII.
Irwin, M.H. (1896a). *Women's employment in shops*. Report of an enquiry conducted for the Federated Council for Women's Trades. London: National Federated Council for Women's Trades.
Irwin, M.H. (1896b). *Home work amongst women (shirtmaking, shirtfinishing and kindred trades).* Report of an enquiry conducted for the Glasgow Council for Women's Trades. Glasgow: Council of the Women's Protective and Provident League.
Irwin, M.H. (1897). 'The problem of home work', *Westminster Review*, 148, pp.541-57.
Irwin, M.H. (1899). 'The Shop Seats Bill movement', *Fortnightly Review*, n.s. 66, pp.123-31.

Irwin, M.H. (1900). *Women's work in tailoring and dressmaking*. Report of an inquiry conducted for the Scottish Council for Women's Trades. Glasgow: Scottish Council for Women's Trades.
Irwin, M.H. (1901a). *The present position of woman as a worker*. Report of the seventy-first meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1901, London: Murray, pp.756-757.
Irwin, M.H. (1901b). *Women shop assistants: how they live and work*. Glasgow: Scottish Council for Women's Trades.
Irwin, M.H. (1904). *Report of an enquiry into women's work in laundries*. Glasgow: Scottish Council for Women's Trades.
Irwin, M.H. (1910). 'The bitter cry of the Irish home worker', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 68, pp.70-.

Irwin, M.H. and Smith, G.A. (1902[1903]). *The problem of home work*. Glasgow: Davidson.

Isaacs, S., Fildes, L.G., Chesters, G. and the Inter-Clinic Committee of Great Britain (1936). *Child guidance. Suggestions for a clinic playroom*. London: Child Guidance Council.

Jebb, E. (1906). *Cambridge: a brief study in social questions*. Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes.

Jenkins, A. (1938). *Conscript parenthood? The problem of secret abortion*. London: George Standring.
Jenkins, A. (1943). 'Deterrents to parenthood', *Eugenics Review* 35(3-4), pp.96-.
Jenkins, A. (1946). 'Is Britain over-populated?', *Eugenics Review*, 38(2), pp.105-.
Jenkins, A. (1959). 'Abortion in the United States: report of a conference sponsored by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America', *Eugenics Review*, 50(4), pp.267-.
Jenkins, A. (1960). *Law for the rich – the case for reform*. London: Gollancz.

Jewson, D. (1912). *The destitute of Norwich and how they live: a report by the committee of investigators on the administration of out relief.* Norwich: Jarrold & Sons.
Jewson, D. (1926). *Socialists and the family. A plea for family endowment*. London: ILP Publication.

Jowitt, L. (1909). *The British Isles: descriptive geographies from original sources*. London: Adam and Charles Black.

Keith, T. (1909). 'The economic causes for the Scottish union', *English Historical Review*, 24(93), pp.44-60.
Keith, T. (1910). *Commercial relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707*. Preface by W. Cunningham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Keith, T. (1914). *A bibliography of Scottish economic history*. Edinburgh.

Keynes, F.A. (1944). *The office of High Steward of the borough of Cambridge: an enquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knowles, L. (1904). Review: Industrial organisation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by George Unwin', *Economic Journal*, 14, p.579.
Knowles, L. (1907). Review: The economic development of a Norfolk manor, 1086-1565 by Frances Gardiner Davenport', *Economic Journal*, 17(66), pp.267-9.
Knowles, L. (1915). Review: Economic history of England by M. Briggs', *Economic Journal*, 25, p.402.
Knowles, L. (1919). 'Review: The decline of the chartist movement by P.W. Slosson', *Economic Journal*, 29, p.202.
Knowles, L. (1921). *The industrial and commercial revolutions in Great Britain during the nineteenth century*. London: Routledge.
Knowles, L. (1922). 'Review: A social and industrial history of England before the Industrial Revolution by M.D. Harris', *Economic Journal*, 32(125), pp.86-9.
Knowles, L. (1924). *The economic development of the British overseas empire, 1763-1914*. London: Routledge.
Knowles, L. (1932). *Economic development in the nineteenth century – France, Germany, Russia, and the United States*. London: Routledge.

Lane-Claypon, J.E. (1909). 'The waste of infant life', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 65, pp.48-.
Lane-Claypon, J.E. (1910). 'Poor Law babies in London and Berlin', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 68, pp.450-.
Lane-Claypon, J.E. (1917). 'State midwifery service', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 81, p.895.
Lane-Claypon, J.E. (1920). *The child welfare movement*. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd.

Lawrence, S. (1919). 'The prevention of unemployment'. In G.M. Tuckwell, M. Phillips and S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Labour women on international legislation*. London: Labour Party.
Lawrence, S. (1935). 'The civil servant and the elected person', *Public Administration*, 13(2), pp.111-.
Lawrence, S. (1940). 'The New Poor Law', *Fabian Quarterly*, 26.

Lee, A. (1903). 'On the relation between rates, expenditure on remunerative works, and rate of increase of population in fifty-eight British municipalities', *Economic Journal*, 13, pp.424-9.
Lee, A. (1908). 'On the manner in which the percentage of employed workmen in this country is related to the import of articles wholly or mainly manufactured', *Economic Journal*, 18, pp.96-191.

Leonard, E.M. (1898). 'Relief of the poor by state regulation of wages, 1629-40', *English Historical Review*, 13(49), pp.91-3.
Leonard, E.M. (1900). *The early history of English poor relief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Re-printed in 1965.
Leonard, E.M. (1905). 'The inclosure of common fields in the seventeenth century', *Royal Historical Society Transactions*, 19, pp.101-146.

Levett, A.E. (1927). 'The financial organization of the manor', *Economic History Review*, 1, pp.65-86.
Levett, A.E. (1929). *English economic history*. London: E. Benn.

Levett, A.E. (1930). ‘The consumer in history’. In Sir P. Redfern (Ed.), *Self and society: second twelve essays: social and economic problems from the hitherto neglected point of view of the consumer*. Manchester: Ernest Benn Ltd.
Levett, A.E. (1932). ‘Note on the statutes of labourers’, *Economic History Review*, 4, pp.77-80.
Levett, A.E. (1938). *Studies in manorial history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Levett, A.E. and Ballard, A. (1916). *The black death on the estates of the See of Winchester*. *Oxford studies in social and legal history, Vol. V*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Levetus, A.S. (1897). ‘Working women in Vienna’, *Economic Journal*, 7(25), pp.101-109.
Levetus, A.S. (1905). *Imperial Vienna: an account of its history, traditions and arts*. London: Lane.

Loane, M. (1905a). *The Queen’s poor: life as they find it in town and country.* London: Edward Arnold.
Loane, M. (1905b). *The incidental opportunities of district nursing.* London: Edward Arnold.
Loane, M. (1905c). *Simple sanitations: the practical application of the laws of health to small dwellings.* London: Scientific Press.
Loane, M. (1907). *The next street but one*. London: Edward Arnold.

Macadam, E. (1925). *The equipment of the social worker*. New York: Holt.
Macadam, E. (1934). *The new philanthropy: a study of the relations between the statutory and voluntary social services*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
Macadam, E. (1945). *The social servant in the making: a review of the provision of training for the social services*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Macarthur, M. (1908). ‘Trade Unionism’. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry from seven points of view*. London: Duckworth and Co, pp.61-84.
Macarthur, M. (1911). ‘Women and state insurance’, *Women’s Trade Union Review*. July.
Macarthur, M. (1913). ‘The working of the Trade Board Acts’, *Englishwoman*, Sept.
Macarthur, M. (1918). The woman trade-unionists point of view. In M. Phillips (Ed.), *Women and the Labour Party*. London: Headley Bros.
Macarthur, M. (1919a). ‘American health insurance bill better than British act’, *American Labor Legislation Review*, 9, pp.204-.
Macarthur, M. (1919b). ‘Women workers of England’. In M. Bondfield, E. Barton, and M. Macarthur (Eds.), Engl*ish women in the labor and co-operative movements: three speeches delivered before the Seventh Biennial Convention of the National Women’s Trade Union League*, Philadelphia, June 2-7, 1919. Chicago: Women’s Trade Union League of America.

MacDonald J.R. (Ed.) (with Mrs J.L. Hammond, A. Black, Mrs H. Oakeshott, A. Harrison, M. Irwin, and others). (1904). *Women in the printing trade: a sociological study*. London: P.S. King and Son.

MacDonald, M. (1902). *Women in the printing trades*. London: P.S. King.
MacDonald, M. (1906). *Interim report of an inquiry by the investigating committee: home industries of women in London*: London: Women's Industrial Council.
MacDonald, M. (1908). 'Sweated industries and wage boards', *Economic Journal*, 18(69), pp.140-145.

Mahler, E. and Rathbone, E.F. (1911). *Payment of seamen: the present system*. Liverpool: C. Tinling.

Malvery. O. (1907). *Baby toilers*. London: Hutchinson.
Malvery. O. (1907). *The soul market, with which is included 'The heart of things'.* London: Hutchinson & Co.
Malvery. O. (1908). *Thirteen nights*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Malvery. O. (1912). *The white slave market*. 7th Edition. London: St. Paul & Co.
Malvery. O. (1912). *A year and a day*. London: Hutchinson.

Mann, J. (Ed.) (1931). 'The teaching of economic history in universities. Part I', *Economic History Review,* 3, pp.197-218.
Mann, J. (Ed.) (1932). 'The teaching of economic history in universities. Part II', *Economic History Review*, 3, pp.325-45.

Markham, V. (1904). *The new era in South Africa, with an examination of the Chinese labour question*. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.
Markham, V. and Hancock, F. (1945). *Report on post-war organisation of private domestic employment, Cmd. 6650.* London: HMSO.

Marshall, A. and Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1879). *Economics of industry*. London: Macmillan.

Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1893). 'Review: Ladies at work, with an introduction by Lady Jeune', *Economic Journal*, 3(12), pp.679-680.
Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1895). 'Review: Viertehalb monate fabrikarbeiterin. Eine praktische studie by Mina Wettstein-Adelt', *Economic Journal*, 5(19), pp.401-404.
Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1896). 'Conference of women workers', *Economic Journal*, 6, pp.107-109.
Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1902). 'Review: Educated working women by Clara E. Collet', *Economic Journal*, 12(46), pp.252-257.

Martin, A. (1911). *The married working woman: a study*. London: NUWSS.
Martin, A. (1910/11). 'The married working woman. A study', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 68, pp.1102-18; and 69, pp.108-22.
Martin, A. (1913). 'The mother and social reform', *The Nineteenth Century and After*. 73, pp.1060-79; and 73, pp.1235-55.
Martin, A. (1915/16). 'Working-women and drink', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 78, pp.1378-94; and 79, pp.85-104.
Martin, A. (1918/19). 'The irresponsibility of the father', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 84, pp.1091-103; 85, pp.548-62; and 85, pp.956-70.

Martindale, H. (1901). *Methods of dealing with state children in Australasia*. Unknown binding.
Martindale, H. (1938). *Women servants of the state 1870-1938*. *A history of women in the civil service.* London. Allen and Unwin.

Marx, E. (Transl.) (1886). *History of the commune of 1871, by Prosper Lissagaray*. London: Reeves and Turner.
Marx, E. (1888). *Shelley's socialism: two lectures*. London: Printed for private circulation.
Marx, E. (Transl.) (1893). *Ferdinand Lassalle as a social reformer, by Eduard Bernstein.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
Marx, E. (Transl.) (1895). *Anarchism and Socialism, by Georgii Valentinovich Plekhanov*. Minneapolis: New Times Socialist Publishing Co.

Marx, E. and Aveling, E.B. (1885). *The factory hell*. London: Socialist League.
Marx, E. and Aveling, E.B. (1886). 'The woman question: from a socialist point of view', *Westminster Review*, 125, pp.207-222.

Matheson, M.C. (1910). *The medical inspection of school children and after*. Birmingham: Cornish Bros.
Matheson, M.C. (1921). 'The meeting of the International Congress of Women', *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*. 3rd series, 3(1), pp.112-115.
Matheson, M.C. (1930). *Indian industry, yesterday, to-day and to-morrow*. London: H. Milford/Oxford University Press.

Matheson, M.C. and Martin, H. (Eds.) (1917). *Citizenship: an introductory handbook*. London: Student Christian Movement.

McArthur, E.A. and Cunningham, W. (1895). *Outlines of English industrial history*. London: Macmillan.

McDougall, W. and Smith, M. (1921). 'Effects of alcohol and some other drugs during normal and fatigued conditions', *Journal of the Institute of Brewing*, 27(3), pp.119-120.

McKillop, M. (1909). *Progress of 'home and social science' at King's College*. Somerville Students' Association Report, 48.
McKillop, M. (1916). *Food values*. New York: E.P. Dutton; expanded and republished as M. McKillop (1922). *Food values: what they are, and how to calculate them*. London: Routledge.

McKillop, M. and McKillop, A.D. (1917). *Efficiency methods: an introduction to scientific management.* London: Routledge.

McMillan, M. (1891). 'The woman's labour day', *Westminster Review*, 136, pp.517-26.
McMillan, M. (1896). *Child labour and the half-time system*. London: Clarion Newspaper Co.

McMillan, M. (1897). ‘Means and ends in education’. In E. Carpenter (Ed.), *Forecasts of the coming century*. Manchester: Labour Press Society.
McMillan, M. (1903). *Co-operators and the labour platform*. London: City of London Branch of the Independent Labour Party. Manchester: National Labour Press.
McMillan, M. (1907). *Labour and childhood*. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. Ltd.
McMillan, M. (1911). *The child and the state*. The Socialist Library Series, IX. Manchester: The National Labour Press Ltd.
McMillan, M. (1917). The care of child life. In W.H. Dawson (Ed.), *After-war problems*. New York: Macmillan.
McMillan, M. (1918). The nursery of tomorrow. In M. Phillips (Ed.), *Women and the Labour Party*. London: F. Matthews.

McMillan, M. and Cobden-Sanderson, A. (1909). *London’s children: how to feed them and how not to feed them*. London: ILP Publications.

Mercier, W. (1909). *An experiment in the teaching of history*. Leaflet No. 17. London: Historical Association.

Mess, H.A. and Keeling, D.C. (1932). *Economic insecurity and the family.* London: Le Play House.

Meyer, A. and Black, C. (1909). *Makers of our clothes: a case for Trade Boards*. Being the results of a year’s investigation into the work of women in London in the tailoring, dressmaking, and underclothing trades. London: Duckworth and Company.

Milnes, N. (1917). ‘Some aspects of the infant welfare question’, *Sociological Review*, a9(3), pp.121-128.
Milnes, N. (1917). ‘Mint records in the reign of Henry VIII’, *English Historical Review*, 32, pp.270-.
Milnes, N. (1921). *Child welfare from the social point of view*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.
Milnes, N. (1926). *The economics of wages and labour*. London: P.S. King & Son.
Milnes, N. (1929). ‘Difficulties in recruiting and training workers in a social case agency’, *Charity Organisation Quarterly*, 3(1), pp.21-.
Milnes, N. (1931). ‘Public health and the family’, *Charity Organisation Quarterly*, 5(4), pp.148-55.
Milnes, N. (1932). ‘Social aspects of British health insurance’, *Social Service Review*, 6(1/4), pp.581-.
Milnes, N. (1936). *A study of industrial Edinburgh and the surrounding area, 1923-1934*. London: P.S. King & Son.
Milnes, N. (1937). ‘Edinburgh – an industrial study’, *Charity Organisation Quarterly*, 11(3), pp.207-.
Milnes, N. (1948). ‘The position of voluntary social services in 1918’. In H. Mess (Ed.), *Voluntary social services since 1918*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, pp.8-27.

Montagu, L. (1896). ‘The condition of the individual in a socialistic state’, *Westminster Review*, 146, pp.439-45.

Montagu, L. (1904). 'The girl in the background'. In R.J. Urwick (Ed.), *Studies of boy life in our cities*. London: J.M. Dent, pp.233-254.

Morley, E.J. (Ed.) (1914). *Women workers in seven professions: a survey of their economic conditions and prospects*. London: Routledge.

Murray, A.E. (1903). *History of the commercial and financial relations between England and Ireland from the period of the restoration*. London: P.S. King and Co.

Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1924). *The mercantile marine and the problem of venereal disease*. London: British Social Hygiene Council.
Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1925). *The relationship between venereal disease and the regulation of prostitution*. London: British Social Hygiene Council.
Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1934). *Poverty and prostitution. Comprising economic conditions in relation to prostitution*. London: British Social Hygiene Council.
Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1935). *Why marry?* London: Faber and Faber.
Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1949). *Social biology and welfare*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (Ed.) (1949). *Sex in social life*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.

Noble, M.E. (Sister Nivedita). (1904). *The web of Indian life*. London: Heinemann.

Oakeley, H. (1922). 'On the meaning of value', *Philosophical Review*, 31, pp.431-448.
Oakeley, H. (1926-7). 'The world as memory and as history', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 27, pp.291-316.
Oakeley, H. (1928). *A study in the philosophy of personality*. London: Williams & Norgate.
Oakeley, H. (1931-2). 'The status of the past', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 32, pp.227-250.
Oakeley, H. (1934). *History and the self*. London: Williams & Norgate.
Oakeley, H. (1946-7). 'The philosophy of time and the timeless in McTaggart's Nature of Existence', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 47, pp.105-128.

Oakeshott, G. (1900). 'Women in the cigar trade in London', *Economic Journal*, 10(40), pp.562-572.
Oakeshott, G. (1902). 'Women polishers', *Women's Industrial News*, pp.285-92.
Oakeshott G (1903). 'Artificial flowermaking: an account of the trade and a plea for municipal training', *Economic Journal*, 13(49), pp.123-131.
Oakeshott G (1903). 'The need for social investigation: its practical bearing on the work of the WIC', *Women's Industrial News*, 23, p.360.
Oakeshott, G. (1908). *Reports on women's trades*. London: London County Council.
Oakeshott, G. (1908). *Women's trades. Report of the education committee of the London County council, submitting report by the chief inspector presenting reports on women's trades*. London: Southwood, Smith & Co., Ltd.

Ogden, C.K. and Florence, M. [Sargant Florence] (1915). *Militarism versus feminism: an enquiry and a policy demonstrating that militarism involves the subjection of women*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Orme, E., Collet, C.E., Tennant, M. and Irwin, M.H. (1893). *The employment of women. Royal Commission on Labour*. London: Printed for H.M. Stationery Office by Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Ormsby, H.R. (1924). *London on the Thames: a study of the natural conditions that influenced the birth and growth of a great city*. London: Sifton, Praed & Co.
Ormsby, H.R. (1931). *France: a regional and economic geography*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company.
Ormsby, H.R. (1932). 'Review: Economic geography of Europe by W.O. Blanchard and S.S. Vischer', *Economica*, 12, p.276.
Ormsby, H.R. (1933). 'Review: The geography of the Mediterranean region by E.C. Semple', *Economica*, 13, p.108.
Ormsby, H.R. (1933). 'Review: South Europe, a regional and economic geography of the Mediterranean lands by M.I. Newbigin', *Economica*, 13, p.108.

Pagan, T. (1926). *The convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland*. Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, for the Convention of Royal Burghs.
Pagan, T. (1926). 'Review: A discourse upon usury by way of dialogue and orations, for the better variety and more delight of all those that shall read this treatise by T. Wilson', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 23(90), p.148.

Palmer, M. (1916). *Life-saving in wartime. Compiled for the Infant-Welfare Propaganda Committee of the National League for Physical Education and Improvement.* London: C. Arthur Pearson.

Papworth, L. [Wyatt Papworth] (1907). 'Laundry work and legislation', *Month: A Catholic Magazine*, 109(515), pp.468-.
Papworth, L. [Wyatt Papworth] (1914). 'The Women's Industrial Council: a survey', *Women's Industrial News*, 18(64), pp.204-211.

Papworth, L. [Wyatt Papworth] and Zimmern, D. (1912). *The clothing and textile trades*. London: Women's Industrial Council.
Papworth, L. [Wyatt Papworth] and Zimmern, D. (1914). *The occupations of women: according to the census for England and Wales, 1911*. London: Women's Industrial Council.
Papworth, L. [Wyatt Papworth] and Zimmern, D. (1915). *Women in industry: a bibliography*. London: Women's Industrial Council.

Peel, D. (Mrs C.S.) (1914). *Marriage on small means*. London: Constable.
Peel, D. (Mrs C.S.) (1917). *The labour saving house*. London: Bodley Head.

Petty, F. (1923). 'The cook as empire builder', *Journal of the Royal Sanitary Institute*, 44(7), pp.267-270.

Phillips, M. (1906). 'Review: Colonial administration by Paul S. Reinsch', *Economic Journal,* 16(61), pp.123-5.
Phillips, M. (1906). 'Review: Il Regime e la concessione delle terre nelle colonie moderne by Marco Fanno', *Economic Journal,* 16(61), pp.121-3.
Phillips, M. (1906). 'Review: L'Espansione commercial e coloniale degli stati moderni by Marco Fanno', *Economic Journal,* 16(63), pp.418-22.

Phillips, M. (1916). Working women and the problems of the war. *Labour Woman*. February.
Phillips, M. (Ed.) (1918). *Women and the Labour Party*. London: Headley Bros.
Phillips, M. (1919). The employment of children. In G.M. Tuckwell, M.G. Phillips, and S.A. Lawrence (Eds.), *Labour women on international legislation: proposals for international legislation*. London: Labour Party.
Phillips, M. (1922). *Women and children in the textile industry: an international survey of hours of work and age of entry*. Amsterdam: International Federation of Trade Unions.
Phillips, M. (1927). *Women and the miners' lockout: the story of the women's committee for the relief of the miners' wives and children*. London: Labour Publishing Company.
Phillips, M. (1927). 'Labor and poor-law reform in England', *Social Service Review*, 1(1/4), pp.581-.

Picton-Turbervill, E. (1937). 'Minority Report'. In W.W. Woods and E. Picton-Turbervill, *Commission on Mui Tsai in Hong Kong and Malaya. Report of the Commission*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, pp.124-49.

Potter, B. (1886). 'A lady's view of the unemployed at the East', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 6530, February 18.
Potter, B. (1887). 'The dock life of East London', *The Nineteenth Century*, 22(128), pp.483-499. Also published as B. Potter (1887). *The dock life of East London.* London: Gale Cengage Learning.
Potter, B. (1888). 'East London labour', *The Nineteenth Century*, 24(138), pp.161-183.
Potter, B. (1888). 'Pages from a work-girl's diary', *The Nineteenth Century*, 24(139), pp.301-314.
Potter, B. (1889). 'The docks'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.184-208.
Potter, B. (1889). 'The tailoring trade'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.209-240.
Potter, B. (1889). 'The Jewish community'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.564-590.
Potter, B. (1890). 'The Lords and the sweating system', *The Nineteenth Century*, 27, pp.885-905.
Potter, B. (1891). *The co-operative movement in Great Britain*. London: Swann Sonnenschein.

Proud, E.D. (1916). *Welfare work: employers' experiments for improving working conditions in factories*. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd.

Rackham, C. (1936). 'Matrimonial Jurisdiction of Justices: [Part I of the Social Service Committee's Report]', *Probation Journal*, 2(6), pp. 83-84.
Rackham, C. (1938). *Factory law*. London: Nelson and Sons.
Rackham, C. (1940). *Education in Norwich: an independent survey 1920-1940*. Norwich: Printed and published by Roberts Printers, for the Norwich Branch of the W.E.A.
Rackham, C. (1948). *Unemployment insurance*. London: published for the Fabian Society by George Allen & Unwin.

Rathbone, E. (1898). 'Review: Forecasts of the coming century by A.P. Wallace et al.', *International Journal of Ethics,* 8(2), pp.257-8.
Rathbone, E. (1899). 'Review: A study of Mary Wollstonecraft and the Rights of Woman by E.R. Clough', *International Journal of Ethics,* 9(3), pp.407-8.
Rathbone, E. (1900). 'Women cigar makers in a large provincial town', *Women's Industrial News*, (Sept.), pp.185-90.
Rathbone, E. (1904). *Report of an inquiry into the conditions of dock labour at the Liverpool docks*. Liverpool: Northern Publishing Company.
Rathbone, E. (1909). *How the casual labourer lives: report of the Liverpool joint research committee on the domestic condition and expenditure of the families of certain Liverpool labourers*. Liverpool: Northern Publishing Co.
Rathbone, E. (1912). *The problem of women's wages*. *An enquiry into the causes of the inferiority of women's wages to men's.* Transactions of Liverpool Economic Society. Liverpool: Northern Publishing Co.
Rathbone, E. (1913). *Report on the condition of widows under the Poor Law in Liverpool*. Liverpool: Liverpool Women's Industrial Council/Lee and Nightingale.
Rathbone, E. (1917). 'The remuneration of women's services', *Economic Journal*, 27(105), pp.55-68.
Rathbone, E. (1920). *Equal pay and the family. A proposal for the national endowment of motherhood.* London: National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship.
Rathbone, E. (1920). 'The New South Wales scheme for the grading of wages according to family needs', *Economic Journal,* 30(120), pp.550-3.
Rathbone, E. (1921). *Wages plus family allowances*. London: Family Endowment Committee.
Rathbone, E. (1924). *The disinherited family: a plea for the endowment of the family*. London: Edward Arnold & Co.
Rathbone, E. (1925). *Royal commission on the coal industry: memorandum of evidence by Miss Eleanor Rathbone, on behalf of the Family Endowment Society*. Official Publications DISO RC 68 & 69, 1925.
Rathbone, E. (1925). 'Family endowment and its bearing on the question of population', *Eugenics Review*, 16(4), pp.270-275.
Rathbone, E. (1927). *The ethics and economics of family allowances*. London: Epworth Press.
Rathbone, E. (1930/1). 'Child marriage in India', *Hibbert Journal,* 29, pp.609-.
Rathbone, E. (1931). 'The case for university representation', *Nation and Athenaeum,* 48(14), pp.452-.
Rathbone, E. (1933). The political status of Indian women. *Asiatic Review,* 29(98), pp.303-.
Rathbone, E. (1934). *Memorandum on the scale of needs suitable for adoption by the Unemployment Assistance Board in assessing assistance to applicants under Part II of the Unemployment Act*. London: Children's Minimum Campaign Committee.
Rathbone, E. (1938). *War can be averted: the achievability of collective security*. London: V. Gollancz.
Rathbone, E. (1939). 'The economics of the family', *Fortnightly Review,* 146, pp.552-60.
Rathbone, E. (1940). *The case for family allowances*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Rathbone, E. (1940). 'The waste of woman-power', *New Statesman and Nation,* 19(486), pp.743-.
Rathbone, E. (1940). 'Women in dangerous services', *New Statesman and Nation,* 20(489), pp.8-.

Ravenhill, A. (1897). *The health of the community: how to promote it.* Public Health Papers, no. 1. Manchester: Women's Co-operative Guild.
Ravenhill, A. (1898). *Elements of sanitary law*. London: Sanitary Publishing Co.
Ravenhill, A. (1898). *How the law helps to healthy homes*. Women's Co-operative Guild Series: The Housing of the People, no. 1. Manchester: Co-operative Newspaper Society.
Ravenhill, A, (1905). *The teaching of 'domestic science' in the United States of America*. Special Reports on Education, 15. London: HMSO.
Ravenhill, A. (1907). *Lessons in practical hygiene for use in schools.* Leeds & Glasgow: E.J. Arnold.
Ravenhill, A. (1907). 'Idola Pulpitorum: the pitfalls of a practical teacher: domestic science and the domestic arts', *Journal of Education*, 29, pp.775-777.
Ravenhill, A. (1908). '*Moral instruction and training in girls' elementary schools in England (with summarised evidence collected in an inquiry)'.* In M.E. Sadler (Ed.), *Moral instruction and training in schools: report of an international inquiry*. London: Longmans Green, pp.256-.
Ravenhill, A. (1908). *Eugenic education for women and girls. National Conference on Infantile Mortality*. London: P.S. King and Son.
Ravenhill, A. (1908). *Some characteristics and requirements of childhood*. Leeds: Arnold.
Ravenhill, A. (1909). 'The teaching of hygiene'. In F. Hodson (Ed.), *Broad lines in science teaching*. London: Christophers, pp.49-63.
Ravenhill, A. (1910). 'Eugenic ideals for womanhood', *Eugenics Review*, 1(4), pp.265-274.
Ravenhill, A. (1912). *Household arts in education. A Cyclopaedia of Education*, Vol. 3. New York: MacMillan.
Ravenhill, A. (1912). *Labor-saving devices in the household*. Logan: Utah Agricultural College.

Ravenhill, A. and Schiff, C.J. (Eds.) (1910). *Household administration, its place in the higher education of women.* London: G. Richards.

Read, M. (1931). *The Indian peasant uprooted: a study of the human machine*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
Read, M. (1953). *Africans and their schools*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
Read, M. (1955). *Education and social change in tropical areas*. London: Nelson.
Read, M. (1966). *Culture, health and disease: social and cultural influences on health programmes in developing countries*. London: Tavistock.

Reeves, M. [Pember Reeves] (1912). *Family life on a pound a week*, Fabian Tract No. 162, London: Fabian Society.
Reeves, M. [Pember Reeves] (1913). *Round about a pound a week*. London: G. Bell & Sons.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1897). 'Review: Rich and poor by Bernard Bosanquet', *Economic Journal*, 7(25), pp.83-85.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1898). 'On the will in Buddhism', *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp.47-59.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1901). 'Notes on early economic conditions in northern India', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp.859-888.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1901). 'Economic conditions in ancient India', *Economic Journal*, 11(43), pp.305-320.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1909). 'Buddhism and ethics.', *The Buddhist Review*, 1(1), pp.13-23.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1914). *Buddhist psychology: an inquiry into the analysis and theory of mind in Pāli literature*. London: Bell & Sons Ltd.
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1936). *The birth of Indian psychology and its development in Buddhism*. London, Luzac & Co.

Rice, M. [Spring Rice] (1939). *Working-class wives: their health and conditions*. London: Penguin.
Rice, M. [Spring Rice] (1940). 'The health of working women', *Eugenics Review*, 32(2), pp.50-54.

Royden, A.M. (1912). *Votes and wages: how women's suffrage will improve the economic position of women.* London: National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies.
Royden, A.M. (1916). *Downward paths: an inquiry into the causes which contribute to the making of the prostitute*. London: Bell.
Royden, A.M. (1917). *Women and the sovereign state*. London: Headley Bros.
Royden, A.M. (1919). *National endowment of motherhood*. London: Women's International League.
Royden, A.M. (1921). *Sex and common sense*. London: Hurst & Blackett.

Royden, A.M., Webb, S., Conan Doyle, A., Stopes, M., Haggard, R., Reeves, M.P. and Bramwell-Booth, C. (1920). *Problems of population and parenthood: being the second report of and the chief evidence taken [at The National Birth-rate Commission inquiry], 1918-1920*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Reinherz, H. (1910). 'Review: *women and the trades. Pittsburgh, 1907-1908* by Elizabeth Beardsley Butler', *Economic Journal*, 20(77), pp.77-80.

Reynard, H. (1919). 'The industrial situation', *Economic Journal*, 29, pp.290-301.
Reynard, H. (1920). 'Review: *Working life of women in the seventeenth century* by Alice Clark', *Economic Journal*, 30(118), pp.242-244.
Reynard, H. (1920). 'The guild socialists', *Economic Journal*, 30(119), pp.321-330.
Reynard, H. (1924). 'Review: Economics for Helen by H. Belloc', *Economic Journal*, 34, pp.620-.
Reynard, H. (1924). 'Review: The standard of living by N.H. Comish', *Economic Journal*, 34, pp.452-.
Reynard, H. (1928). 'Review: Co-operation, its problems and possibilities by A.H. Enfield', *Economic Journal*, 38(151), pp.445-7.
Reynard, H. (1929). 'Review: Women and the labor movement', *Economic Journal*, 39(155), pp.435-7.

Reynard, H. (1947). *Domestic science as a career*. London & New York: Southern Editorial Syndicate.

Routledge, K. [Mrs. Scoresby Routledge] (1919). *The mystery of Easter Island: the story of an expedition*. London: Printed for the author by Hazell, Watson and Viney.

Sharp, E. (1908). Working wives in council (communications). *Nation*, 3(13), pp.453-.
Sharp, E. (1921). A child's guide to unemployment. *Living Age*, 8(308), pp.398-.
Sharp, E. (1921). Labor and foreign affairs in England. *World Tomorrow*, 4(7) (July): pp.208-.
Sharp, E. (1922). 'British labour's recent work for peace', *World Tomorrow*, 5(1), p.402.
Sharp, E. (1928). *Daily bread*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd.
Sharp, E. (1931). *The problem that is Germany*. London: Friends Service Council.
Sharp, E. (1933). *Buyers and builders: a jubilee sketch of the Women's Co-operative Guild, 1883-1933.* London: The Guild.

Sharpe, M. (1889). 'Henrik Ibsen: his men and women', *Westminster Review*, 131, pp.626-49.

Shaw, C. [Mrs. Bernard Shaw] (1909). *Rent and Value*. Fabian Tract 142. Adapted from Fabian Essays, The Economic Basis.

Sheavyn, P. (1911). *The position of women: actual and ideal*. London: James Nisbet.
Sheavyn, P. (1921). *Higher education for women in Great Britain*. London: International Federation of University Women.

Simon, S. (1910). 'The movement for international labour legislation', *Economic Journal*, 20, pp.347-57.
Simon, S. (1932). 'Municipal finance: should the Manchester City Council spend or save?', *Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies*, 3(1), pp.15-20.
Simon, S. (1938). *A century of city government*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Simon, S. (1947). *Three schools or one? Secondary education in England, Scotland and the USA*. London: Frederick Muller.

Skeel, C.A.J. (1901). *Travel in the first century after Christ: with special reference to Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Skeel, C.A.J. (1904). *The council in the marches of Wales: a study in local government during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. London: H. Rees.
Skeel, C.A.J. (1926). 'The cattle trade between Wales and England from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9, pp.135-158.

Smith, C. (1905). 'Dangerous trades', *Economic Review*, 15(4), pp.434-450.
Smith, C. (1908). *The case for wages boards*. London: National Anti-Sweating League.

Smith, C. (1908). *Child labour*. London: A.R. Mowbray.
Smith, C. (1908). *Report on the employment of children in the United Kingdom*. London: International Association for Labor Legislation, British Section.
Smith, C. (1908). The minimum wage. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry, from seven points of view*. London: Duckworth & Co, pp.25-60.
Smith, C. (1912). *The working of the Trade Board Act*. Report of the 7th general meeting of the International Association of for Industrial Legislation.
Smith, C. (1914). 'The workings of the Trade Boards Act in Great Britain and Ireland', *Journal of Political Economy*, 22(7), pp.605-29.
Smith, C. (1919). 'The Washington labour conference', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 86, pp.772-.
Smith, C. (1921). *Ten hours*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
Smith, C. (1922/3). 'Constructive welfare work in modern industry', *Journal of the Royal Sanitary Institute*, 43, pp.188-.
Smith, C. (1925). 'The Stockholm conference on life and work', *Contemporary Review*, 128, pp.636-.
Smith, C. (1927). *Factory conditions in China*. London: League of Nations.

Smith, E.M. (1915). *The investigation of mind in animals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, E.M. and Bartlett, F.C. (1920). 'On listening to sounds of weak intensity, Part I', *British Journal of Psychology*, 10, pp.101-129.

Smith, M. (1916). 'A contribution to the study of fatigue', *British Journal of Psychology*, 8(3), pp.327-350.
Smith, M. (1943). *An Introduction to industrial psychology*. London: Cassell and Co. Ltd.

Steel-Maitland, A.D. and Squire, R. (1909). *Report on the relation of industrial and sanitary conditions to pauperism, together with an additional memorandum on certain other points connected with the poor law system and its administration*. London: Wyman and Sons.

Stocks, M. (1915). 'The attempt to fix maximum corn prices in Germany', *Economic Journal*, 25, pp.274-80.
Stocks, M. (1916). 'German potato policy', *Economic Journal*, 26, pp.57-61.
Stocks, M. (1916). 'The meat problem in Germany', *Economic Journal*, 26, pp.168-73.
Stocks, M. (1918). 'The future of the woman war worker', *Athenaeum*, 4625, pp.21-.
Stocks, M. (1920). *The industrial state*. *A social and economic history of England*. London: Collins.
Stocks, M. (1921). *The meaning of family endowment*. London: Labour Publishing Co./G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
Stocks, M. (1927). *The case for family endowment*. London: Labour Publishing Company.
Stocks, M. (1932/3). 'Eight years' industrial conscription: a suggestion from America', *Hibbert Journal*, 31, pp.252-.
Stocks, M. (1937). 'London government', *Political Quarterly*, 10, pp.365-.

Stocks, M. (1937). 'Gambling: what do we pay and what do we get?', *Listener*, 17(419), p.102.
Stocks, M. (1945). *Fifty years in every street. The story of the Manchester University Settlement.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stopes, M. (1916). *Married love or love in marriage*. New York: The Critic and Guide Company.
Stopes, M. (1918). *Wise parenthood. The treatise on birth control for married people*. London: G.P. Putnam & Sons.
Stopes, M. (1920). *Radiant motherhood. A book for those who are creating the future*. London: G.P. Putnam & Sons.
Stopes, M. (1923). *Contraception: its theory, history and practice*. London: J. Bale, Sons & Danielsson.
Stopes, M. (1929). *Mother England: a contemporary history*. London: J. Bale, Sons & Danielsson.

Strachey, R. (1935). *Careers and openings for women: a survey of women's employment and a guide for those seeking work*. London: Faber and Faber.
Strachey, R. (1936). *Our freedom and its results*. London: Hogarth Press.

Streeter, B.H. and Picton-Turbervill, E.P. (1917). *Women and the church*. London: Fisher Unwin Ltd.

Swanwick, H.M. (1907). *The small town garden*. London: Sherratt and Hughes.
Swanwick, H.M. (1913). *The future of the women's movement*. London: G. Bell.
Swanwick, H.M. (1914). *Some points of English law affecting working women as wives and mothers: being notes of two lectures of a guides' course given to members of the Women's Cooperative Guild*. Women's Co-operative Guild.
Swanwick, H.M. (1915). *Women and war*. Union of Democratic Control Pamphlet, no. 11. London: Union of Democratic Control.
Swanwick, H.M. (1916). *The war in its effect upon women*. London: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Swanwick, H.M. (1921). *Women in the socialist state*. Social studies series, Vol. 5. Manchester: National Labour Press.
Swanwick, H.M. (1929). *Labour's foreign policy: what has been and what might be*. Fabian Tract, no. 227. London: The Fabian Society.

Tennant, D. [Mrs H. M. Stanley] (1890). *London street Arabs*. London: Cassell.

Tennant, M.E. (1898). 'The women's factory department', *Fortnightly Review*, n.s. 64, pp.148-56.
Tennant, M.E. (1908). 'Infant Mortality'. In G. Tuckwell, C. Smith, M. MacArthur, M. Tennant, N. Adler, A. Anderson and C. Black (Eds.), *Woman in industry, from seven points of view*. London. Duckworth, pp.85-120.

The Fabian Women's Group and E.J. Morley (1914). 'The economic position of women', *Economic Review*, 24(4), pp.389-397.

Thurtle, D. (1939). 'Minority report', in *Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Abortion*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, pp.139-151.

Tuckwell, G. (1894). *The state and its children*. London: Methuen.
Tuckwell, G. (1904). 'The industrial position of women', *Independent Review*, 3(11), pp.365-376.
Tuckwell, G. (1906). 'A minimum wage', *Independent Review*, 11(39), pp.297-304.
Tuckwell, G. (1906). 'Women's opportunity', *Fortnightly Review*, 79(471), pp.546-556.
Tuckwell, G. (1921). 'The story of the Trade Boards Act', *Contemporary Review*, CXX, p.601.

Tuckwell, G., Phillips, M. and Lawrence, S. (1919). *Labour women on international legislation.* London: Labour Party.
Tuckwell, G., Smith, C., Macarthur, M., Tennant, M., Adler, N., Anderson, A. and Black, C. (Eds.) (1908). *Woman in industry, from seven points of view*. London. Duckworth.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1895). 'Petticoat-Lane', *The Queen, The Lady's Newspaper and Court Chronicle*, 97, April 20, 1895, p.674.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1898). *Through Finland in carts*. London: Macmillan.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1912). 'Eugenics', *Fortnightly Review*, 97, pp.854-65.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1913). *America as I saw it, or America revisited*. London: Hutchinson.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1916). 'Women and war economy', *The English Review*, 22(4), pp.353-359.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1919). *A woman on four battle-fronts*. Leeds: Beck & Inchbold.
Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1932). *Cremation the world around*. London: F.J. Parsons.

Van der Veen, M. (1898). 'Home work in Berlin', *Economic Journal*, 8(29), pp.143-146.
Van der Veen, M. (1898). 'The conference on women's work at The Hague', *Economic Journal*, 8(31), pp.404-407.
Van der Veen, M. (1898). 'Review: The standard of life and other studies by Mrs. Bernard Bosanquet', *Economic Journal*, 8(32), pp.517-20.

Walker, M. (1910). 'Women and children in Dundee', *Charity Organisation Review,* 27(157), pp.31-42.

Webb, B. (1896). *Women and the Factory Acts*, Fabian Tract No. 67. London: Fabian Society.
Webb, B. (1898). 'How to do away with the sweating system'. In S. Webb and B. Webb. *Problems of modern industry*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., pp.139-155.
Webb, B. (Ed.) (1902). *The case for the Factory Acts*. London: Grant Richards.
Webb, B. (1907). Methods of investigation', *Sociological Papers*, 3, pp.345-356.
Webb, B. (1915). Teachers and their professional organisation. Parts I and II, *New Statesman*, Special Supplement, 5(129/130).

Webb, B. (1917). *Health of working girls: a handbook for welfare supervisors and others*. London: Blackie.
Webb, B., Hutchins, B.L. and the Fabian Society (1909). *Socialism and national minimum*. London: A.C. Fifield.

Webb, C. (1891). *Can women raise their husbands' wages?* Trade Unionist (October 3, October 10). Reprinted Manchester: Co-operative Printing Society.
Webb, C. (1892). *The women's guild and store life*. London: Women's Co-operative Guild.
Webb, C. (1894). *Should co-operative employees understand the principles of the movement, and if so, how are they to be taught?* Manchester: Women's Co-operative Guild.
Webb, C. (1896). *The machinery of the cooperative movement*. Manchester: Cooperative Union.
Webb, C. (1897). *High dividends and what they mean*. Women's Co-operative Guild. Manchester: Co-operative Printing Society.
Webb, C. (1903). 'An unpopular industry', *Nineteenth Century*, 53, pp.989-1001.
Webb, C. (1904). 'The committee on wage-earning children', *Economic Review*, 14(2), pp.208-211.
Webb, C. (Ed.) (1904). *Industrial co-operation: the story of a peaceful revolution. Being an account of the history, theory, and practice of the co-operative movement in Great Britain and Ireland*. Manchester: Co-operative Union Ltd.
Webb, C. (1927). *The woman with the basket. A history of the Women's Co-op Guild 1883-1927.* Manchester: Co-operative Wholesale Society's Printing Works.

Webb, M.B. (1917). *Health of working girls: a handbook for welfare supervisors and others*. London: Blackie and Son.

Webb, S., Poyntz, J.S., Drake, B., Carter, G.R., Popplewell, F., Saunders, C.K., Bourat, M., Calver, C., Webb, A.D. and Freeman, A. (1912). *Seasonal trades*. London School of Economics and Political Science. Studies in economics and political science (23). London: Constable.

Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1894). *The history of trade unionism*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1896). 'The method of collective bargaining', *Economic Journal*, 6, 1-29.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1896). 'The standard rate', *Economic Journal*, 6, pp.356-88.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1897). *Industrial democracy*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1898). *Problems of modern industry.* London: Longmans, Green and Co.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1903). *History of liquor licencing in England, 1700-1830*. London: Longmans.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1903[1930]). *History of English local government, 1688-1835*, 11 volumes. London: Longmans and Co.

Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1909). *The break-up of the Poor Law: being Part One of the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission.* London and New York: Longmans.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1909). *The public organisation of the labour market: being Part Two of the Minority report of the Poor Law Commission.* London and New York: Longmans.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1913). *English Poor Law policy*. London: Longmans.
Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1932). *Methods of social study*. London: Longmans.

White, A. [Blanco White] (1934). *The nationalisation of banking*. London: Allen & Unwin and the Fabian Society.
White, A. [Blanco White] (1939). *The new propaganda*. London: V. Gollancz Ltd.
White, A. [Blanco White] (1941). *Worry in women*. London: V. Gollancz Ltd.
White, A. [Blanco White] (1948). *Ethics for unbelievers.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wilkinson, E. (1930). 'Towards utopia – IV. Can men and women be really equal?', *Listener*, 3(64), pp.587-.
Wilkinson, E. (1939). *The town that was murdered – the life-story of Jarrow*. London: Gollancz.
Wilkinson, E. (1945). *Plan for peace: how the people can win the peace*. London: Labour Party.

Wilkinson, E., Mabon Evans, W.J., Thomas, W.M. and Jones, G.H. (1936). 'Marriage on the dole', *Listener*, 15(366), pp.102-.

Wilson, C. (1886). 'Social democracy and anarchism', *Practical Socialist*, 1/1886/1/8.
Wilson, C. (1893). 'Anarchism and outrage', *Freedom: A Journal of Anarchist Socialism*, December.

Wilson, C. and others (1886). *What socialism is.* Fabian Tract no. 4. London: Fabian Society.

Wilson, M. (1897). 'Parliamentary papers', *Economic Journal*, 7(28), pp.638-9.
Wilson, M. (1898). 'The conference of women workers', *Economic Journal*, 8(29), pp.133-5.
Wilson, M. (1898). 'Employers' liability and workmen's compensation', *Westminster Review*, 149, pp.194-203.
Wilson, M. (1899). *Our industrial laws; working women in factories, workshops, shops and laundries, and how to help them*. London: Duckworth.
Wilson, M. (1901). 'Contracting out from the Workmen's Compensation Act', *Economic Journal*, 11, pp.23-30.
Wilson, M. (1901). 'Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for the year 1900. [Notes and Memoranda]', *Economic Journal*, 11, pp.451-.
Wilson, M. (1901). 'Contracting-out from the Workmen's Compensation Act', *Economic Journal*, 11, pp.23-30.
Wilson, M. (1901). 'The Factory and the Workshops Acts Amendment Bill', *Economic Journal*, 11, pp.268-71.

Wilson, M. (1901). 'Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on early closing of shops [Notes and Memoranda]', *Economic Journal,* 11, pp.449-.
Wilson, M. (1901/2). 'Review: The case for the Factory Acts by Mrs. Sidney Webb', *International Journal of Ethics*, 12, pp.522-.
Wilson, M. (1902). 'Review: Dangerous trades by Thomas Oliver', *Economic Journal*, 12, pp.398-.
Wilson, M. (1902). 'Review: Labour legislation, labour movements, labour leaders by George Howell', *Economic Journal*, 12, pp.393-.
Wilson, M. (1938/9). 'Review: Women servants of the state by Hilda Martindale C.B.E', *English*, 2, pp.391-.

Wilson, M. and Abraham, M.E. (1899). *Our industrial laws: working women in factories, workshops, shops and laundries, and how to help them*. London: Duckworth and Co.

Wodehouse, H. (1909). 'Review: Social psychology: an outline and source book by E.A. Ross', *International Journal of Ethics*, 19(3), pp.378-379.
Wodehouse, H. (1912). 'The value of social psychology', *International Journal of Ethics*, 23(1), pp.50-59.

Women's Industrial Council, Hutchins, E.L. and MacDonald, M. (1908). *Home industries of women in London: report of an inquiry by the investigation committee of the council with an account of the development and present condition of home work in relation to the legal protection of the workers and some account of foreign experiments in legislation*. London: Women's Industrial Council.

Wood, F. (1913a). 'The course of real wages in London, 1900-12', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 77(1), pp.1-68.
Wood, F. (1913b). 'The construction of index numbers to show changes in the price of the principal articles of food for the working classes', *Economic Journal*, 23(92), pp.619-626.
Wood, F. (1916). 'The increase in the cost of food for different classes of society since the outbreak of war', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 79(4), pp.501-508.

Woods, W.W. and Picton-Turbervill, E. (1937). *Mui Tsai in Hong Kong and Malaya*. *Report of the Commission*. London: H.M. Stationery Office.

Wright, H. (1930). *The sex factor in marriage*. London: Williams & Norgate.
Wright, H. (1935). *Birth control. Advice on family spacing and healthy sex life*. London: Cassell and Co.
Wright, H. (1947). *Sex fulfilment in married women.* London: Williams & Norgate.
Wright, H. (1968). *Sex and society: new code for social behaviour*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Zimmern, A. (1894). *Methods of education in the United States*. London: Swan Sonnenschein.
Zimmern, A. (1895). 'Women in European universities', *Forum*, 19, pp.187-99.

Zimmern, A. (1898). *The renaissance of girls' education in England: a record of fifty years' progress.* London: A.D. Innes.
Zimmern, A. (1899). 'The servant question in America', *Leisure Hour*, XLVII, p.460.
Zimmern, A. (1909). *Women's suffrage in many lands*. London: Francis & Co. & Athenaeum Press.
Zimmern, A. (1912). *Demand and achievement. The international women's suffrage movement.* London: National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies.

Zimmern, D. (1912). 'Women wages', *Women's Industrial News*, 16(58), pp.49-68.
Zimmern, D. (1916). 'The civil service and women', *Political Quarterly*, 8, pp.79-103.
Zimmern, D. (1918). 'The wool trade in war time', *Economic Journal*, 28, pp.7-29.

APPENDIX A.7: KEY BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON EACH INDIVIDUAL

Entries provide a short biographical sketch. A selected bibliography detailing their published work can be found in Appendix A.6.

Table A.7.1: Demographic information for 188 included women

Name (life dates) / awards	**Place of birth / adult residence**	**Social origins (father's occupation)**	**Political origins (family background)**	**Religious affiliation (childhood)**	**Education**	**Marriage and children**
Abbott, Wilhelmina Hay (known as Elizabeth) [née Lamond] (1884-1957)	- Dundee - Edinburgh; London	- Business *Jute manufacturer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *City of London School for Girls; school in Brussels* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – UCL (one term)*	- Married with children (one)
Abram, Annie (1869-1930)	- London - Cambridge; London	- Business *Law stationer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Private school* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Adler, Henrietta (Nettie) (1868-1950) CBE (1934)	- London - London	- Professional *Rabbi*	- Mainstream politics	- Jewish (Orthodox)	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Unmarried
Ainslie, Charlotte Edith (1863-1960) OBE (1933)	- Edinburgh - Edinburgh	- Professional *Pharmaceutical chemist*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *George Watson's Ladies' College, Edinburgh* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of St Andrews; Bedford College, London*	- Unmarried
Anderson, Adelaide Mary (1863-1936) CBE (1918) DBE (1921)	- Melbourne, Australia - London	- Business *Shipbroker*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Queen's College, London; schools in France & Germany* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Anstey, Vera [née Powell] (1889-1976)	- Reigate, Surrey - London; Bombay, India	- Business *Leather merchant*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Cheltenham Ladies' College; Hoch Conservatorium, Germany* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; LSE* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (two) *Widowed early*
Atkinson, Mabel [married name Palmer] (1876-1958)	- Broomley, Northumberland - Durham; London; Australia; South Africa	- Professional *Inspector of mines*	- Radical politics - Women's rights	- Not known	- *Schooling* *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Glasgow University* *Postgraduate – LSE; Bryn Mawr College*	- Married
Barnett, Henrietta Octavia Weston [née Rowland] (1851-1936) CBE (1917) DBE (1924)	- London - London; Oxford	- Business *Merchant*	- Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Private boarding school, Devon* - No further/ higher education	- Married
Barrett, Florence Elizabeth [née Perry; other married name Willey] (Lady Barrett) (1867-1945) CBE (1917) CH (1929)	- Henbury, Gloucestershire - London	- Business *Merchant*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Yes, no further details* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College, Bristol; University of London School of Medicine for Women* *Postgraduate – London School of Medicine for Women*	- Married *Married twice*
Bathurst, Katherine (1862-1933)	- Diddington, Huntingdonshire - London; Cardiff; Manchester; Oxfordshire	- Professional *Vicar and later Archdeacon of Bedford*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Private school, Brighton* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Bell, Florence Eveleen Eleanore	- Paris - Yorkshire; London	- Professional *Physician*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (three,

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
[née Olliffe] (Lady Bell) (1851-1930) DBE (1918)						plus two stepchildren)
Bennett, Victoria Evelyn May (1864-1956)	- Waterford, Ireland - London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- *Schooling* *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London; UCL; Cambridge; Canterbury; Cardiff*	- Unmarried
Bentham, Ethel (1861-1931)	- London - Newcastle upon Tyne; London	- Professional *Insurance company inspector*	- Radical politics - Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Alexandra School and College, Dublin* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London School of Medicine for Women* *Postgraduate – Paris; Brussels*	- Unmarried
Billington-Greig, Teresa Mary [née Greig] (1876-1964)	- Preston, Lancashire - Manchester; Scotland; London	- Business *Shopkeeper (also engineer; shipping clerk)*	- Not known	- Roman Catholic - Agnostic (later)	- Formal schooling *Convent of Notre Dame, Blackburn* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Manchester University*	- Married with children (one)
Black, Clementina Maria (1853-1922)	- Brighton - London	- Professional *Solicitor; town clerk; coroner*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Black, Ellinor Isabella (1891-1956)	- Edinburgh - Glasgow; London; Liverpool; Sheffield	- Professional *Writer to the Signet (senior solicitor in Scotland)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Private schools, Edinburgh; Lausanne, Switzerland* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of Edinburgh; LSE*	- Unmarried
Blackman, Winifred Susan (1872-1950)	- Norwich - Oxford; Egypt	- Professional *Clergyman; scholar; tutor*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford* *Postgraduate – Oxford*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Blackwood, Beatrice Mary (1889-1975)	- London - Oxford	- Professional *Publisher*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Wycombe House School, London: Paddington and Maida Vale High School, London; finishing school, Germany* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford* *Postgraduate – Oxford*	- Unmarried
Bondfield, Margaret Grace (1873-1953) CH (1948)	- Chard, Somerset - Brighton; London	- Working class *Foreman lace-worker*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Chard elementary school* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Bosanquet, Helen [née Dendy] (1860-1926)	- Barton-upon-Irwell - London; Surrey	- Business *Silk fabric maker; previously a nonconformist minister*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married
Bottomley, Alice Thistle [née Robinson] (Lady Bottomley) (1884-1961)	- London - London; Cambridgeshire	- Business *Retail chemist and pharmacist, later became local politician* *Knighted (1916)*	- Mainstream politics *Father local politician. Municipal Reform Party (allied to the parliamentary Conservatives)*	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Kensington High School, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (two?)
Brereton, Maud Adeline Cloudesley [née Ford; other married name Horobin] (1871-1946) French government honour (1907)	- London - London	- Professional *Land steward (involved in estate management, status on par with the family solicitor)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Hockerill College, Bishop's Stortford* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married with children (five?) *Married twice*
Browne, Frances Worsley (Stella) (1880-1955)	- Halifax, Canada - London; Liverpool	- Professional *Canadian marine (Royal Navy)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *St Felix School, Southwold* - Further/ higher education	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford	
Bryant, Sophie [née Willock] (1850-1922)	- Dublin - London	- Professional *Fellow of Trinity College Dublin; Chair of Geometry, London University; clergyman*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; UCL* *Postgraduate – UCL*	- Married *Widowed early*
Buer, Mabel Craven (1881-1942)	- London - Bedford; London; Reading	- Business *Butcher (proprietor?)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Streatham Hill High School, London; Jersey Ladies' College* - Higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Bulkley, Mildred Emily (1880-1958) *Recorded as spinster in 1930 census* MBE (1918)	- Kingsclere, Hampshire - London	- Professional *Country doctor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Bulley, Agnes (Amy) [married name Brooke] (1852-1939)	- New Brighton, Cheshire - Manchester	- Business *Cotton broker*	- Women's rights	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Laleham School, Clapham* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge; Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married *Later in life*
Butler, Christina (Violet) (1884-1982)	- Oxford - Oxford	- Professional *Public school headmaster; fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; ordained priest*	- Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Wycombe Abbey School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – St Anne's College, Oxford; LSE* *Postgraduate – Oxford*	- Unmarried
Campbell, Janet Mary [married name Heseltine] (1877-1954)	- Brighton - London	- Professional *Bank manager*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Brighton High School* - Further/ higher education	- Married *Later in life*

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
DBE (1924)					≤*Undergraduate – University of London School of Medicine for Women* *Postgraduate – University of London School of Medicine for Women*	
Chesterton, Ada Elizabeth [née Jones] (1869-1962) OBE (1938)	- London - London	- Business *Manufacturer of braces*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married
Chodak-Gregory, Hazel Haward [née Cuthbert] (1886-1952)	- London - Birmingham; London	- Professional *Architect*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Private school, Eastbourne* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women* *Postgraduate – London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women*	- Married with children (one)
Clark, Alice (1874-1934)	- Street, Somerset - London; Somerset	- Business *Shoe manufacturer*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Brighthelmston, Southport* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – none* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Collet, Clara Elizabeth (1860-1948)	- London - Leicester; London	- Business *Ran laundry business*	- Radical politics	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *North London Collegiate School for Girls* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Leicester College (University of London extension college)* *Postgraduate – UCL*	- Unmarried
Collingwood, Ethel Winifred [née Graham] (1885-1973)	- Argyllshire, Scotland - Oxfordshire; London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *St Leonards School, St Andrews* - Further/ Higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford; LSE*	- Married with children (two)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Colville, Helen (Cynthia) [née Milnes] (Lady Crewe-Milnes; later Lady Colville) (1884-1968) DCVO (1937) DBE (1953)	- London - London	- Aristocracy *Father succeeded as second Baron Houghton, then Marquess of Crewe*	- Radical politics - Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father, Member of the House of Lords.* *Liberal politician, various offices (1892-1916).* *Whig family with strong interest in politics*	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Royal College of Music, London*	- Married with children (three)
Cour, Ethel Maud De la (1869-1957) MBE (1920) OBE (1929)	- Edinburgh - Edinburgh	- Business *Foreign merchant*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Madame Froebel's school, Edinburgh* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Courtney, Janet Elizabeth [née Hogarth] (1865-1954) OBE (1917)	- Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire - London	- Professional *Rector of Barton*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Grantham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford*	- Married
Cowan, Minna Galbraith (1878-1951) OBE (1928)	- Paisley, Scotland - Edinburgh	- Professional *Legal profession*	- Not known	- Presbyterian	- Formal schooling *Highfield School, Hendon* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – University of Glasgow; Girton College, Cambridge; University of Edinburgh*	- Unmarried
Creighton, Louise Hume [née von Glehn] (1850-1936)	- Sydenham, Kent - Oxford; London; Cambridge	- Business *Merchant*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – University of London*	- Married with children (seven)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Crosthwaite, Agnes Alice [née Aitken] (1876-1965)	- Falkirk, Scotland - London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *St Leonards School, St Andrews* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge; LSE*	- Married with children (four)
Crowdy, Rachel Eleanor [married name Thornhill] (1884-1964) DBE (1919)	- London - London; Surrey	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Hyde Park New College, London; Guy's Hospital, London*	- Married *Later in life*
Cullis, Winifred Clara (1875-1956) OBE (1919) CBE (1929)	- Gloucester - London	- Professional *Surveyor; civil engineer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *King Edward VI High School for Girls, Birmingham; Mason College, Birmingham (extra tuition)* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – University of London School of Medicine for Women*	- Unmarried
Cummins, Anne Emily (1869-1936)	- Reigate, Surrey - London	- Professional *Church of England clergyman*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Kensington High School, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – London School of Sociology and Economics*	- Unmarried
Curtis, Myra (1886-1971) DBE (1949)	- Sunderland - London; Cambridge	- Professional *Telegraphist*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Dame Allan School, Newcastle upon Tyne; Winchester School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Czaplicka, Marya (Maria) Antonina (1884-1921)	- Warsaw, Poland - Warsaw; London; Oxford; Bristol	- Professional *Railway official* *Polish noble ancestry*	- Not known	- Roman Catholic	- Formal schooling *Anna Jasieńska Girls' School, Warsaw* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Flying University (Polish underground institution)* *Postgraduate – LSE; University of Oxford*	- Unmarried
Davies, Margaret Caroline Llewelyn (1861-1944)	- London - Kirkby Lonsdale; London	- Professional *Trinity College, Fellow; clergyman*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Queen's College, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Davies, Maud Frances (1876-1913)	- Wiltshire - London	- Professional *Barrister*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Dawson, Lilian Augusta [married name Boyd Dawson] (1874-?)	- London - London?	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – not known* *Postgraduate – published as Dr Dawson, no further details*	- Married *Children?*
De Vesselitsky, Varvara (1872/3-1927)	- Not known - USA; London	- Professional *Diplomat; journalist* *Russian noble ancestry*	- Humanitarian causes	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Deverell, Edith Mary [married name Marvin] (1872-1958)	- Attington, Oxfordshire - London; Leeds; Liverpool	- Business *Coal merchant; farmer*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Private school, Weston-super-Mare* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford* *Postgraduate – LSE; University of Oxford*	- Married with children (three)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Drake, Barbara [née Meinertzhagen] (1876-1963)	- London - London	- Business *Merchant banker*	- Radical politics	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married
Dunlop, Olive Jocelyn [married name Kenward] (1883-1970)	- Colchester - Not known	- Professional *Army officer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (one)
Durham, Frances (Hermia) (1873-1948) CBE (1918)	- Pagham, Sussex - London	- Professional *Surgeon*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Notting Hill High School for Girls, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Edgell, Beatrice (1871-1948)	- Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire - London	- Professional *Bank manager*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Tewkesbury High School for Girls; Notting Hill High School for Girls, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College Wales; University College of Wales Aberystwyth* *Postgraduate – University College of Wales Aberystwyth; University of Würzburg*	- Unmarried
Eckhard, Edith Verena (1885-1952)	- Manchester - London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling St Leonards school, St Andrews - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Evans, Dorothy Elizabeth (1889-1944)	- Cheshire - London?	- Professional *Commercial clerk*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *North London Collegiate School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Dartford College of Physical Education,*	- Unmarried with children (one) *Common-law union*

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					Kent; Chelsea Training College, London	
Fildes, Lucy Gratia (1884-1968)	- Worcester - London; Scotland; Kent	- Working class? *Cabinet maker*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Private study; Bedford College, London* *Postgraduate – University of London*	- Unmarried
Fisher, Lettice [née Ilbert] (1875-1956)	- London - Oxford; Sheffield; Surrey	- Professional *Lawyer; civil servant*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Francis Holland School, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (one)
Florence, Emma (Mary) [née Sargant] (1857-1954)	- London - Marlow, Buckinghamshire	- Professional *Barrister*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Slade School of Fine Art, London*	- Married with children (two) *Widowed early*
Foley, Caroline Augusta [married name Rhys Davids] (1857-1942)	- Wadhurst, East Sussex - Manchester; London; Surrey	- Professional *Vicar*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – UCL* *Postgraduate – UCL*	- Married with children (three)
Ford, Isabella Ormston (1855-1924)	- Leeds - Leeds	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Fox, Evelyn Emily Marian (1874-1955) CBE (1937) DBE (1947)	- Morges, Switzerland - Aldbourne, Wiltshire; Sussex	- Landed gentry *Fox Hall, County Longford, Ireland* *Justice of the Peace; High Sheriff*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *High school, Morges* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried
Foxwell, Agnes Kate (1871-1957)	- London - London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					≤*Undergraduate – Bedford College, London* *Postgraduate – Bedford College, London; UCL*	
Freire-Marreco, Barbara Whitchurch [married name Aitken] (1879-1967)	- Surrey - London; Hampshire	- Professional *Accountant*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Guildford High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford* *Postgraduate – University of Oxford; LSE (scholarship from Somerville College, Oxford)*	- Married *Later in life*
George, Mary (Dorothy) [née Gordon] (1878-1971) OBE (1954)	- London - London	- Professional *Barrister*	- Women's rights	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *St Leonards School, St Andrews* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married
Gordon, Alice Mary [née Brandreth; other married name Butcher] (Lady Butcher; Baroness Danesfort) (1854-1929)	- East Bengal, India - London	- Professional *Scholar?* *Justice of the Peace; Member of the Council of India*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married with children (one) *Married twice*
Gray, Sarah (Eleanor) Kirkman [née Stone] (1864-?)	- London - London; Letchworth, Hertfordshire	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married *Children?*
Grier, Mary (Lynda) Dorothea (1880-1967) CBE (1950)	- Rugeley, Staffordshire - Cambridge; Leeds; Oxford	- Professional *Dean of Rugeley, later Prebendary of Lichfield*	- Radical politics - Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Gurney, Sybella Catherine Nino [married name	- Paris - London; Oxford; Hastings	- Professional	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education	- Married with children (two; adopted)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Branford] (1870-1926)		*Chaplain to the British Embassy; hymn writer*			*≤Undergraduate – Royal Holloway College, London; Oxford University*	
Hadow, Grace Eleanor (1875-1940) OBE?	- Cirencester - Oxford; London	- Professional *Vicar*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Brownshill Court School, near Stroud; Truro High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried
Hamilton, Mary (Cicely) [née Hammill] (1872-1952)	- London - London	- Professional *Lieutenant-Colonel*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *St Leonard's boarding-school, Malvern; school in Germany* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Hamilton-Gordon, Isabel (Ishbel) Maria [née Marjoribanks] (Lady Aberdeen) (1857-1939) GBE (1931)	- London - London; Aberdeenshire; Canada	- Business *Banking and other activities* *Father, Baron Tweedmouth (1880)*	- Mainstream politics *Father elected MP. Liberal politician (1853-1880)*	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (five, four surviving)
Hammond, Lucy (Barbara) [née Bradby] (1873-1961)	- Hertfordshire - Hertfordshire	- Professional *Headmaster; clergyman*	- Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *St Leonards School, St Andrews* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford*	- Married
Harkness, Margaret Elise (1854-1923)	- Great Malvern, Worcestershire - London	- Professional *Church of England clergyman*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately *Aged 21 sent to a finishing school, Bournemouth* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Harrison, Agatha Mary (1885-1954)	- Sandhurst, Berkshire - Nottingham; Hull; London; USA	- Professional *Methodist minister*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Jersey Ladies' College; Redland High School, Bristol* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Harrison, Amy [married name	- Edensor, Derbyshire - London	- Business *Hotel proprietor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Boarding school, Bedfordshire* - Further/ higher education	- Married with children (three)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Spencer] (1874-1970)					*≤Undergraduate – University College of Wales Aberystwyth* *Postgraduate – LSE*	
Hartley, Catherine Gasquoine [married names Gallichan; Lewis] (1866/7-1928)	- Antananarivo, Madagascar - Southport; Derbyshire; London	- Professional *Missionary*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (one; adopted) *Married twice*
Haskins, Minnie Louise (1975-1957)	- Gloucestershire - Madras, India; London	- Business *Grocer*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College, Bristol; LSE*	- Unmarried
Hazlitt, Victoria (1887-1932)	- London - London	- Business *Dealer in fancy goods*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London* *Postgraduate – Colorado State University*	- Unmarried
Heather-Bigg, Ada M. (1855-1944)	- London - London	- Professional *Orthopaedic appliances designer/author*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – UCL; St Andrews (distance-learning student)* *Postgraduate – UCL*	- Unmarried
Hicks, Frances Amelia [married name James] (1861-c.1909)	- London - London	- Working class *Pianoforte maker*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - No further/ higher education	- Married *Children?*
Higgs, Mary Ann [née Kingsland] (1854-1937) OBE (1937)	- Devizes, Wiltshire - Staffordshire; Withington; Oldham	- Professional *Congregational minister*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Local private school* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Hitchin College for Women, which later became Girton College, Cambridge*	- Married with children (four)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Hogg, Edith Frances [née Pittis] (1856-1900)	- Streatham, Surrey - London	- Business *East India merchant*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Pupil in London (no further details)* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married
Hubback, Eva Marian [née Spielman] (1886-1949)	- London - London	- Business *Stockbroker; schools' inspector*	- Radical politics - Humanitarian causes	- Jewish	- Formal schooling *St Felix school, Southwold* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married with children (three) *Widowed early*
Hutchins, Elizabeth (Bessie) Leigh (1858-1935)	- London - London	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – King's College for Women, London* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Irwin, Margaret Hardinge (1858-1940) CBE (1927)	- At sea *(registered at Broughty Ferry, Scotland)* - Glasgow	- Professional *Master mariner*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *High School of Dundee* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of St Andrews; Queen Margaret College, Glasgow; Glasgow School of Art*	- Unmarried
James, Clara Grace (1866-1954)	- Deptford, Kent - London	- Working class *Journeyman tailor* *Orphaned as a child and raised by an employee of her father's; Amie Hicks later legally adopted her*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Jebb, Eglantyne (1876-1928)	- Ellesmere, Shropshire - Marlborough; London; Cambridge	- Professional *Barrister* - Landed gentry *Landowner, Ellesmere*	- Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford; Stockwell Training College for Elementary Teachers*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Jenkins, Alice Brook [née Glyde] (1886-1967)	- Ilkley, Yorkshire - London	- Working class *Servant (mother)*	- Radical politics - Women's rights	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Grammar school, Yorkshire* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried with children (three) *Common-law union*
Jewson, Dorothea (Dorothy) [married names Tanner Smith; Stephen] (1884-1964)	- Norwich - London	- Business *Coal and timber merchant*	- Mainstream politics *Father, local politician*	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Norwich High School; Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge; Cambridge Teaching College*	- Married *Later in life; married twice*
Jowitt, Lettice (1878-1962) MBE?	- Stevenage, Hertfordshire - Gateshead; Beirut; Africa; Ipswich	- Professional *Rector*	- Humanitarian causes *Implicit as (descended from) a prominent Quaker family*	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried
Keeling, Dorothy Clarissa (1881-1968) OBE (1946)	- Bradford - Bradford; Liverpool; London; Sheffield	- Professional *Headmaster; clergyman*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Girls' grammar school* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Keith, Theodora [later Pagan] (1882-1930)	- Ashbourne, Derbyshire - Glasgow; Cambridge; London; South Africa	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Married *Children?*
Keynes, Florence Ada [née Brown] (1861-1958)	- Cheetham, Manchester - Cambridge	- Professional *Congregationalist minister*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married with children (three)
Knowles, Lillian Charlotte Anne [née Tomn] (1870-1926)	- St Clement, Cornwall - London	- Professional *Barrister*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Truro High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (one)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Lane-Claypon, Janet Elizabeth [married name Forber] (Lady Forber) (1877-1967)	- Boston, Lincolnshire - London	- Professional *Banker*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London College of Medicine for Women* *Postgraduate – UCL; Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine, London*	- Married *Later in life*
Lawrence, Arabella (Susan) (1871-1947)	- London - London	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Mainstream politics	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Francis Holland School, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – UCL; Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Lee, Alice Elizabeth (1858-1939)	- Dedham, Essex - London	- Business? *Master coach builder (building premises in Dedham High Street)*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *School in Dedham* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London* *Postgraduate – University of London*	- Unmarried
Leonards, Ellen Marianne (1866-1953)	- Bristol - London	- Business *Partner (chemical works)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College, Bristol; Bedford College, London; Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Levett, Ada (Elizabeth) (1881-1932)	- Bodiam, Sussex - Oxford	- Business? *Farmer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of Oxford*	- Unmarried
Levetus, Amelia Sarah (1853-1938)	- Birmingham - Birmingham; St Andrews;	- Business *Jeweller and silversmith*	- Not known	- Jewish	- Formal schooling *King Edward's School, Birmingham* - Further/ higher education	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
	Cambridge; Aberdeen; Vienna				*≤Undergraduate – Midland Institute and Mason College, Birmingham*	
Loane, Martha Jane (1852-1933)	- Plymouth - Derbyshire; Portsmouth; Plymouth; London	- Professional *Navy staff commander*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Royal Naval School for Females, Middlesex* - Further/ higher education *Unclear – nursing and midwifery training, London (no further details)*	- Unmarried
Macadam, Elizabeth (1871-1948)	- Chryston, near Glasgow - Liverpool; London	- Professional *Presbyterian minister; professor of political philosophy*	- Not known	- Presbyterian	- Formal schooling *Strathroy High School, Canada* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Morrin College, Quebec City*	- Unmarried
Macarthur, Mary Reid [married name Anderson] (1880-1921)	- Glasgow - London	- Business *Drapery business proprietor*	- Mainstream politics	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Glasgow Girls' High School; school in Germany* - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two, one surviving)
MacDonald, Margaret Ethel [née Gladstone] (1870-1911)	- London - London	- Professional *Professor of chemistry, Royal Institution*	- Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Doreck College, London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – King's College, London*	- Married with children (six)
Malvery, Olive Christian [married name Mackirdy] (1871-1914)	- India - London	- Professional *Civil engineer*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Royal College of Music, London*	- Married with children (three)
Mann, Julia de Lacy (1891-1985)	- London - Oxford	- Professional *Classical scholar*	- Humanitarian causes	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Bromley High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford; LSE Postgraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Markham, Violet Rosa [married name Carruthers] (1872-1959) CH (1917)	- Derbyshire - Chesterfield; London	- Business *Managing director/ engineer (steelworks and collieries)*	- Mainstream politics *Strong family involvement in politics; liberals*	- Not known	- Formal schooling *West Heath School, Surrey* - No further/ higher education	- Married *Later in life*
Marshall, Mary [née Paley] (1850-1944)	- Ufford, near Stamford - Bristol; Oxford; Cambridge	- Professional *Evangelical clergyman*	- Women's rights	- Nonconformist	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married
Martin, Anna (1858-1937)	- Ireland - London	- Professional	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Unclear – Milton Mount?* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London*	- Unmarried
Martindale, Hilda (1875-52) OBE (1918) CBE (1935)	- London - London	- Business *City merchant (father died before she was born)*	- Radical politics - Women's rights	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Brighton High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Royal Holloway College, London; Bedford College, London*	- Unmarried
Marx, Jenny Julia (Eleanor) [also known as Marx Aveling] (1855-1898)	- London - London	- Professional *Socialist philosopher*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Atheist	- Formal schooling *South Hampstead College for Ladies* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Matheson, Marie (Cécile) (1874-1950)	- London - Birmingham; London	- Professional *Marine insurance broker; underwriter*	- Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London*	- Unmarried
McArthur, Ellen Annette (1862-1927)	- Duffield, Derbyshire - Cambridge; London	- Professional *Missionary; rector*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *St Leonard's School, St Andrews; Germany* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					Postgraduate – Cambridge University	
McKillop, Margaret [née Seward] (1864-1929) MBE (1919)	- Wigan, Lancashire - London	- Professional *Schoolmaster*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Blackburne House Girls' School, Liverpool* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Married with children (one)
McMillan, Margaret (1860-1931) CH (1930)	- New York, USA - London; Bradford	- Business *Landscape gardener; estate manager*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Inverness High School; Inverness Academy* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Mercier, Winifred Louise (1878-1934) OBE (1933)	- Ilford, Essex - Leeds; Manchester; London	- Business *Stockbroker*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Private school* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Maria Grey Training College, London; Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried
Meyer, Adele [née Levis] (Lady Meyer) (1862-1930)	- Havre, Germany - London	- Business *Merchant*	- Not known	- Jewish	- Schooling *Not known* - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two)
Milnes, Nora Jessie (1882-1972)	- London - London; Edinburgh	- Professional *Professor of political economy*	- Mainstream politics *Father a liberal, and a member of the Cobden Club*	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London (external student)*	- Unmarried
Montagu, Lilian (Lily) Helen (1873-1963)	- London - London	- Business *Banker* *Father, Baron Swaythling (1907)*	- Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father elected MP. Liberal politician (1885-1900)*	- Jewish (orthodox)	- Formal schooling *Doreck College, London* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Morley, Edith Julia (1875-1964)	- London - Oxford; London; Reading	- Professional *Surgeon-dentist*	- Not known	- Jewish	- Formal schooling *Doreck College, London; finishing school, Hanover*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
MBE (1950)					- Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – King's College, London; UCL; Somerville College, Oxford*	
Murray, Alice Effie [married name Radice] (1877-1951)	- Shillong, India - Not known	- Professional *Civil servant (India)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Ladies' College, Guernsey; Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married *Children?*
Naden, Constance Caroline Woodhill (1858-1889)	- Birmingham - London	- Professional *Architect*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Private school, Edgbaston* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Midland Institute and Mason College, Birmingham*	- Unmarried
Neville-Rolfe, Sybil Katherine [née Burney; other married name Gotto] (1885-1955) OBE?	- London - London	- Professional *Admiral* *Father created baronet for war services (1921)*	- Not known	- Christian (no further details)	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two) *Married twice*
Nevinson, Margaret Wynne [née Jones] (1858-1932)	- Leicester - London	- Professional *Vicar*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Oxford Anglican school* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – University of St Andrews (distance-learning qualification); UCL*	- Married with children (two)
Noble, Margaret Elizabeth [known as Sister Nivedita] (1867-1911)	- Dungannon, County Tyrone, Ireland - Keswick; Rugby; Wrexham; Chester; London; India	- Professional *Wesleyan minister*	- Humanitarian causes	- Roman Catholic (at birth)	- Formal schooling *Congregationalist college, Halifax* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Oakeley, Hilda Diana (1867-1950)	- Durham - Manchester; London; Montreal, Canada	- Professional *Government schools' inspector* *Father, the younger son w/out private means (Shropshire gentry family)*	- Not known *Liberal family*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Ellerslie Ladies' College, Manchester* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford* *Postgraduate – University of London*	- Unmarried
Oakeshott, Grace Marion [née Cash; other married name Joan Reeve] (1872-1929)	- London - London; New Zealand (after faking her death)	- Professional *Clerk*	- Radical politics *Fellowship of the New Life (an early socialist movement)* - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Croydon High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married with children (two) *Married twice*
Ormsby, Hilda [née Rodwell Jones] (1877-1973)	- Hanley, Staffordshire - London	- Professional *Wesleyan Methodist minister*	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE; École Normale de Melun, France* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married
Papworth, Lucy Julia Wyatt (1874-1921)	- Middlesex - Not known	- Professional *Architect & surveyor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Unmarried
Paterson, Mary Muirhead (1864-1941) CBE (1920)	- Glasgow - Glasgow; Edinburgh	- Business	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Glasgow Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Queen Margaret College, Glasgow*	- Unmarried
Peel, Constance (Dorothy) Evelyn [née Bayliff] (1868-1934) OBE (1918)	- Ganarew, Herefordshire - Dewsbury; London	- Professional *Military captain*	- Humanitarian causes	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Petty, Florence (1870-1948)	- Montrose, Scotland - London	- Professional *Timber merchant's clerk*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Unclear – qualified sanitary inspector (no further details)*	- Unmarried
Phillips, Marion (1881-1932)	- Melbourne, Australia - London	- Professional *Lawyer*	- Not known	- Jewish	- Formal schooling *Presbyterian Ladies' College, Melbourne, Australia* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Melbourne University* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Picton-Turbervill, Edith (1872-1960) OBE (1918)	- Fownhope, Herefordshire - India; London	- Professional *Officer, Indian army* *Father later inherited Ewenny, formerly a Norman Priory in South Wales (land and coal mines)*	- Mainstream politics *Father was a member of the district council (conservative) and Justice of the Peace (lay magistrate)*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Royal School, Bath* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Power, Beryl Millicent Le Poer (1891-1974)	- Altrincham, Cheshire - London	- Business *Stockbroker*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Bournemouth Church High School; Oxford High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Power, Eileen Edna Le Poer [married name Postan] (1889-1940)	- Altrincham, Cheshire - London; Cambridge	- Business *Stockbroker*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Bournemouth Church High School; Oxford High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married
Proud, Emily Dorothea [married	- Adelaide, Australia - London; Adelaide	- Professional *Shorthand writer; sharebroker*	- Women's rights	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Advanced School for Girls, Adelaide, Australia*	- Married with children (two)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
name Pavy] (1885-1967) CBE (1917)					- Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of Adelaide* *Postgraduate – LSE*	
Pycroft, Ella (1854-1943)	- Devonshire - London; Cambridge; Paris; Gloucestershire	- Professional *Country doctor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Cambridge Teacher Training College*	- Unmarried
Rackham, Clara Dorothea [née Tabor] (1875-1966)	- London - Cambridge	- Business *Farming*	- Humanitarian causes *Family were strong liberals*	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Notting Hill High School, London; St Leonards School, St Andrews* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Married
Rathbone, Eleanor Florence (1872-1946)	- London - London; Liverpool	- Business *Merchant; businessman*	- Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father elected MP. Liberal politician (1868-1880; 1881-1895)*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Kensington High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Unmarried
Ravenhill, Alice (1859-1954)	- Snaresbrook, Essex - London; Canada	- Professional *Naval architect; marine engineer*	- Not known	- Christian (no further details)	- Formal schooling *Residential schools, London (mainly home educated)* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – National Health Society, London*	- Unmarried
Read, Margaret Helen (1889-1991) CBE (1949)	- London - London	- Professional *Doctor; Medical Officer of Health*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Roedean school* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Unmarried
Reckitt, Eva Collet (1890-1976)	- Beverley, Yorkshire	- Professional *Secretary to*	- Radical politics	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
	- London	*Reckitt and Sons, manufacturers*			- Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – UCL*	
Reeves, Magdalen (Maud) Stuart Pember [née Robison] (1865-1953)	- New South Wales, Australia - New Zealand; London; Cambridge	- Professional *Bank manager*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Christchurch High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Canterbury College, New Zealand*	- Married with children (three)
Reynard, Helene [formerly Reinherz] (1875-1947)	- Vienna, Austria - London; Cambridge; Bradford; Oxford	- Business *Mill owner*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Bradford Girls' Grammar School* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Rice, Margaret (Margery) Lois Spring [née Garrett; other married name Jones] (1887-1970)	- London - London	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; Girton College, Cambridge*	- Married with children (four) *Married twice*
Routledge, Katherine Maria [née Pease] (1866-1935)	- Darlington - London	- Business?	- Humanitarian causes *Implicit as prominent Quaker family*	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Sevenoaks School, Kent* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Somerville College, Oxford*	- Married
Royden, Agnes (Maude) [married name Hudson Shaw] (1876-1956) CH (1930)	- Mossley Hill, near Liverpool - Liverpool; London; Oxford	- Business *Shipowner* *Father created first baronet (1905)*	- Mainstream politics *Father elected MP. Conservative politician (1885-1892)*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford*	- Married with children (one; adopted) *Later in life*
Rucker, Thereza Charlotte [née Story Maskelyne] (Lady Rucker) (1863-1941)	- London - London; Berkshire	- Professional *Professor of mineralogy, Oxford* - Landed gentry *Country estate, Wiltshire*	- Mainstream politics *Father elected MP.* *Liberal (1880-1886); Liberal Unionist (1886-1892)*	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; (plus correspondence courses, Edinburgh and Oxford)*	- Married with children (one)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Sharp, Evelyn Jane [married name Nevinson] (1869-1955)	- London - London	- Business *Slate merchant*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *School in London* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Collège de France, Paris*	- Married *Later in life*
Sharpe, Maria [married name Pearson] (1853-1928)	- London - London	- Professional *Architect?*	- Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Married with children (three)
Shaw, Charlotte Frances [née Payne-Townshend] (1857-1943)	- County Cork, Ireland - London; Hertfordshire	- Business *Stockbroker* - Landed gentry *Derry estate, County Cork*	- Not known	- Protestant (no further details)	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education *She considered attending the London School of Medicine for Women*	- Married
Sheavyn, Phoebe Ann Beale (1865-1968)	- Atherstone, Warwickshire - London; Oxford; Manchester	- Business *Shop owner (drapery)*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College of Wales Aberystwyth* *Postgraduate – University College of Wales Aberystwyth; University of London*	- Unmarried
Sheepshanks, Mary Ryott (1872-1958)	- Harrogate, Yorkshire - London	- Professional *Later bishop of Norwich*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Liverpool High School for Girls* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Simon, Shena Dorothy [née Potter] (Lady Simon of Wythenshawe) (1883-1972)	- Croydon, Surrey - Manchester	- Business *Shipowner*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (three)
Skeel, Caroline Anne James (1872-1951)	- London - London	- Business *Export merchant*	- Not known	- Christian *Probably Anglican*	- Formal schooling *South Hampstead High School, London; Notting Hill High School, London*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					- Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	
Smith, Constance Isabella Stuart (1859-1930) OBE?	- London - London	- Professional *Curate*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Unclear – educated in Belgium and Germany (no further details)* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – King's College, London*	- Unmarried
Smith, Emily (Mary) (1886-1974)	- Lancashire - Cambridge	- Business *Wool manufacturer*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – Newnham College*	- Married with children (two)
Smith, May (1879-1968) OBE (1945)	- Hulme, Manchester - Oxford; London	- Professional? *Engineer (iron turner?)*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Manchester Science School* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – Owens College, Manchester* *Postgraduate – University of Manchester; University of London*	- Unmarried
Squire, Rose Elizabeth (1861-1938) OBE (1918)	- London - Manchester; London	- Professional *Surgeon*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – National Health Society, London*	- Unmarried
Stocks, Mary Danvers [née Brinton] (1891-1975) Life Peer (1966)	- London - Manchester; Liverpool; London	- Professional *General practitioner*	- Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Christian (no further details)	- Formal schooling *St Paul's Girls' School, London* - Further/ higher education ≤*Undergraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (three)
Stopes, Marie Charlotte Carmichael [married	- Edinburgh - London	- Professional *Brewer; engineer; palaeontologist*	- Women's rights	- Not known	- Formal schooling	- Married with children (one) *Married twice*

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
names Gates; Roe] (1880-1958)					*St George's High School, Edinburgh; North London Collegiate School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – UCL* *Postgraduate – UCL; Botanical Institute, Munich*	
Strachey, Rachel (Ray) Pearsall Conn [née Costelloe] (1887-1940)	- London - London	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Women's rights	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Kensington High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge; Bryn Mawr College, Philadelphia; Oxford University*	- Married with children (two)
Streatfeild, Lucy Anne Evelyn [née Deane] (1865-1950) CBE (1918)	- Madras, India - London; Kent	- Professional *British army*	- Not known	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – National Health Society, London; Parker Institute, London*	- Married *Later in life*
Swanwick, Helena Maria Lucy [née Sickert] (1864-1939) CH (1931)	- Munich, Germany - Manchester	- Professional *Commercial artist (painter)*	- Radical politics	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Boarding-school, France; Notting Hill High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Married
Tennant, Dorothy [married names Stanley; Curtis] (Lady Stanley) (1855-1926)	- London - London	- Professional *Attorney* - Landed gentry *Welsh estates*	- Mainstream politics *Father elected MP.* *Whig politician (1830-1831)*	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Slade School of Fine Art, London*	- Married with children (one; adopted) *Married twice*
Tennant, Margery (May) Mary Edith Josephine Pia [née Abraham] (1869-1946) CH (1917)	- Dublin - London	- Professional *Lawyer*	- Not known	- Roman Catholic	- Educated at home / privately - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (five)

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
Thurtle, Dorothy [née Lansbury] (1890-1973)	- London - London	- Working class *Various, including journeyman; later politician*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father elected MP.* *Labour politician (1910-1912, 1922-1940)*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *East London elementary school* - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two)
Tuckwell, Gertrude Mary (1861-1951) CH (1930)	- Oxford - London	- Professional *Master, New College, Oxford; Chaplain, New College*	- Radical politics - Women's rights - Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Liverpool Teacher Training College; Bishop Otter College, Chichester*	- Unmarried
Tweedie, Ethel Brilliana [née Harley] (1862-1949) [Also wrote as Mrs Alec Tweedie]	- London - London	- Professional *Physician*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Queen's College, London; school in Germany* - No further/ higher education	- Married with children (two) *Widowed early*
Unwin, Emma (Jane) Catherine [née Cobden] (1851-1947)	- London - London	- Business *Manufacturer*	- Radical politics *Father elected MP:* *Independent Radical (1841-1857* - Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father elected MP:* *Liberal (1859-1865)*	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Warrington Lodge School, Maida Vale* - No further/ higher education	- Married
Van der Veen, Margrieta Johanna	- Manchester - Kent; London	- Business	- Not known	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Local private school; boarding school, Holland*	- Married *Children?*

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
[married name Beer] (1871-1951) MBE?					- Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of Manchester* *Postgraduate – University of Manchester*	
Varley, Julia (1871-1952) OBE (1931)	- Horton, Bradford - Bournville; Bradford	- Working class *Engine tenter (mill worker)*	- Radical politics	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *St Andrew's School, Listerhills, Bradford; Quaker Sunday school* - No further/ higher education	- Unmarried
Walker, Mary Lily (1863-1913)	- Dundee - Dundee	- Professional *Solicitor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Tayside House, private school for girls, Dundee; High School of Dundee* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University College, Dundee*	- Unmarried
Webb, Catherine (1859-1947)	- London - London?	- Professional *Manager of local Cooperative Society*	- Radical politics *Father was a journeyman coppersmith who worked his way out of poverty through the cooperative movement*	- Not known	- Schooling *Not known* - Further/ higher education *Not known*	- Unmarried
Webb, Martha (Beatrice) [née Potter] (1858-1943)	- Stonehouse, Gloucestershire - London	- Business *Financier; railway director* *Family established in the gentry of the Cotswold region*	- Mainstream politics - Radical politics - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Private school, Bournemouth; mainly self-educated* - No further/ higher education	- Married
Webb, Martha Beatrice (1863-1951)	- Disley, Cheshire - Edgbaston; Birmingham	- Business *Cotton yarn manufacturer; quarry proprietor*	- Not known	- Not known	- Educated at home / privately - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – Birmingham Medical School*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
White, Amber Blanco [née Reeves] (1887-1981)	- Christchurch, New Zealand - London	- Professional *Various, including New Zealand's agent-general; LSE Director (1908-19)*	- Women's rights - Humanitarian causes - Mainstream politics *Father elected MP. Liberal politician (New Zealand, 1887-1996)*	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Kensington High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge* *Postgraduate – LSE*	- Married with children (three)
Whitmore, Dorothy (1881-1955?)	- Chelmsworth, Essex - London	- Not known	- Not known	- Not known	- Formal schooling *Worcester Park School, Surrey* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – LSE*	- Not known
Wilkinson, Ellen Cicely (1891-1947)	- Chorlton upon Medlock, Manchester - London	- Working class *Cotton worker; insurance agent*	- Radical politics - Humanitarian causes	- Nonconformist	- Formal schooling *Stretford Road school, Manchester* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of Manchester*	- Unmarried
Wilson, Charlotte Mary [née Martin] (1854-1944) OBE?	- Kemerton, Worcestershire - London	- Professional *Physician*	- Not known	- Christianity (no further details)	- Formal schooling *Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Merton Hall (Newnham College), Cambridge*	- Married
Wilson, Mona (1872-1954)	- Rugby - London	- Professional *Headmaster; clergyman*	- Humanitarian causes	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Clifton High School, Bristol; St Leonard's School, St Andrews* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Newnham College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Wodehouse, Helen Marion (1880-1964)	- North Devon - Birmingham; Yorkshire; Bristol; Cambridge	- Professional *Rector; mathematician*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Notting Hill High School* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge; University of Birmingham*	- Unmarried

Name (life dates) / awards	Place of birth / adult residence	Social origins (father's occupation)	Political origins (family background)	Religious affiliation (childhood)	Education	Marriage and children
					Postgraduate – University of Birmingham	
Wood, Frances [née Chick] (1883-1919) MBE (1917) OBE (1918)	- London - London	- Business *Lace dealer; property developer*	- Not known	- Christian *Probably Anglican*	- Formal schooling *Notting Hill High School* *≤Undergraduate – UCL* *Postgraduate – UCL*	- Married with children (one) *- She died two weeks after the birth*
Wright, Helena Rosa [née Lowenfeld] (1887-1982)	- London - China, London	- Business *Various, including Brewery owner and theatre manager* - Landed gentry *Lowenfeld family estate, Chrzanow, Polish Austria*	- Not known	- Anglican	- Formal schooling *Froebel Educational Institute, London; Princess Helena College and High School for Girls, London; Cheltenham Ladies' College* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – University of London School of Medicine for Women*	- Married with children (four)
Zimmern, Alice Louisa Theodora (1855-1939)	- Nottingham - Tunbridge Wells; London; USA	- Business *Lace merchant*	- Not known	- Jewish	- Formal schooling *Private school* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Bedford College, London; Girton College, Cambridge*	- Unmarried
Zimmern, Dorothea Margaret [married name Barton] (1883-1982)	- Surrey - London; Surrey	- Business	- Not known	- Christian *Father's family were German Jews*	*- Schooling* *Not known* - Further/ higher education *≤Undergraduate – Girton College, Cambridge*	- Married *Children?*

Notes: ≤Undergraduate refers to post-secondary education up to and including the level of a bachelor's degree (courses leading to professional certifications, e.g., teaching, sanitation, and social work, are included in this definition). Postgraduate relates to a course of study for an advanced degree (usually undertaken after completing a first degree). Women may have attended classes and lectures though never undertaken a formal course of study leading to a qualification. Some may have left university without completing their studies or been denied the honour of graduating with a full academic degree. Non-conformist denotes the non-Anglican Protestant denominations (e.g., Baptists, Methodists, and Quakers). CH (Order of the Companions of Honour); CBE (Commander of the Order of the British Empire); DBE (Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire); DCVO (Dame Commander of the Royal Victorian Order); GBE (Dame Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire); KBE (Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire); MBE (Member of the Order of the British Empire); OBE (Officer of the Order of the British Empire).

APPENDIX A.8: MATERIAL MARKED FOR FOLLOW-ON RESEARCH

Additional data sources

Bain, G.S. and Woolven, G.B. (1979). *A bibliography of British industrial relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, E. (1999). *The women's suffrage movement: a reference guide 1866-1928*. London: UCL Press.

Dawson, W.H. (Ed.) (1914, and annually) Yearbook of the Universities of the Empire (of the Commonwealth).

Harrison, E. (1998). *Women members and witnesses on British Government ad hoc Committees of Inquiry 1850-1930, with special reference to Royal Commissions of Inquiry*. Commonwealth Universities Yearbook 1914.

Madden, K., Seiz, J.A. and Pujol, M. (2004). *A bibliography of female economic thought to 1940*. London and New York: Routledge.

Martin, K.C. (2008). *Hard and unreal advice: mothers, social science and the Victorian poverty experts*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Murray, J.H. and Stark, M. (Eds.). *The Englishwoman's Review of Social and Industrial Questions*. 25 Volumes.

Oldfield, S. (2001). *Woman humanitarians: biographical dictionary of British women active between 1900 and 1950*. London: Continuum.

Rappaport, H. (2001). *Encyclopedia of women social reformers*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Royal Economic Society: information on past members available from the archive of membership records of the Society. Available at: https://www.res.org.uk/about/about-us.html.

Uglow, J. and Hendry, M. (Eds.) (2005). *The Palgrave Macmillan dictionary of women's biography*. 4th Edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Valentine, E. (2014). *Philosophy and history of psychology: selected works of Elizabeth Valentine*. London: Psychology Press.

William Beveridge's price and wages material collected for a proposed four volume history. Available at: https://archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk/search/archives/0c1ad237-949e-344a-9df7-9b3afe56add4.

Potentially relevant research subjects

The names on this list could not be processed in time. These individuals were either identified during the writing up stage or additional information about the woman surfaced after she had been excluded from the analysis.

Daisy Lucie Adler (1891-1961); Olive Aldridge; Ada Sarah Ballin (1862-1906); Mabel Barker (1885-1961); Mary Beeton; Gertrude Bell; Anne Black; Helen Blagg;

Katherine Bompas; Rosalie Bosanquet (c.1877-1957); Laura Brackenbury (1868-1937); Constance Braithwaite; Jane M.E. Brownlow; Alice Mary Buckton (1867-1944); H.C. Burdett; Nellie Carey (1886–1960); Anne Cobden; Edith Collet; Helen Coleridge Davis (1880-?); Beatrice De Normann (1885-1974); Marion Wallace Dunlop (1864-1942); Edith Durham; Mary Durham; Ethel Elderton (1878-1954); Leonora Eyles (1889-1960); Dorothea Thimbleby Farquharson (1882-1976); Flora Lucy Freeman; Madeline Grace Glasier; Maria Ogilvie Gordon (1864-1939); Caroline Graveson (1874-1958); Charlotte Haldane; Elizabeth Haldane (1862-1937); Lavinia Mary Hardy (1868-1950); Lilian Harris; Hazel Hunkins Hallinan (1890-1982); Edith Harvey; A. Beatrice Hewart; Eileen Isabel Hobson; Susan Isaacs (1885-1948); Constance Jones; Dorothy H. Jones; Jessie Jones (1882-1945); Ruth Kenyon; Alice Brown Lennie; Mary Longman; Margaret Lowenfeld; Eva Lückes (1854-1919); Edith How Martyn; Helen Masters; Edith L, Maynard; Elsie Colsell McDougall (1883-1961); Terese Merz (1879-1958); Jessie Murray (1867-1920); Rosalind Nash (1862-1952); Nellie Nelson; Marion Isabel Newbigin (1869-1934); Christabel Osborn (1868-1933); Edith Pearson; Maria Penrose; Bertha Putnam; Doris B. Read; Jane Reaney (1874-1936); Dorothy Mary Revel (1890-1981); Ida Saxby (1883-1949); Nelly M. Scott; Dorothy Sells; Susan Stebbing; Mary C. Tabor (c.1858-1912); Nina Taylor (1876-1951); Margaret A. Tillard; Catherine Towers; Margaret Tuke (1862-1947); Julia Turner (1863-1946); Helen Verrall (1883-1959); Nora Vynne (1864-1914); Margaret Whiteley; Constance Williams; Ethel Williams (1863-1948).

APPENDIX A.9: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN THE TEXT

Abbott, J.M. (2009). *The angel in the office: the life and work of the office secretary in Victorian and Edwardian times*. London: British Sociological Association Auto/Biography Study Group.

Abir-Am, P.G. and Outram, D. (Eds.) (1987). *Uneasy careers and intimate lives: women in science, 1789-1979*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Abramovitz, M. and Eliasberg, V.F. (1957). *The growth of public employment in Great Britain.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Abrams, P. (1963). 'The failure of social reform: 1918-1920', *Past and Present*, 24(1), pp.43-64.

Abrams, P. (1968). *The origins of British sociology, 1834-1914.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ackerly, B. and True, J. (2010). *Doing feminist research in political and social science.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Adams, P. (1996). *Somerville for women: An Oxford college 1879-1993*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alberti, S.J. (2005). 'Civic cultures and civic colleges in Victorian England'. In M. Daunton (Ed.), *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.337-356.

Aldrich, R. (2002). *The Institute of Education, 1902-2002: a centenary history*. London: Institute of Education.

Aldrich, R. and Gordon, P. (1989). *Dictionary of British educationalists*. London: Woburn Press.

Alexander, S. (2004, September 23). Reeves [née Robison], Magdalen Stuart [known as Maud Pember Reeves] (1865–1953), suffragist and socialist. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Alexander, S. (Ed.) (1988). *Women's Fabian tracts*. London: Routledge.

Alfonso, R. and Trigilio, J. (1997). Surfing the third wave: a dialogue between two third wave feminists. *Hypatia*, 12(3), pp.7-16.

Allan, L. (2008). 'Why have economists done so well in the British civil service?', *Oxonomics*, 3, pp.26-29.

Anderson, A.M. (1922). *Women in the factory: an administrative adventure, 1893 to 1921*. London: John Murray.

Anderson, C. (2012). *Subaltern lives. Biographies of colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, P. (1968). 'Components of the national culture', *New Left Review*, 50, pp.1-57.

Anderson, R.D. (1992). *Universities and elites in Britain since 1800*. London: Macmillan.

Andrews, M. (2007). *Shaping history: narratives of political change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anon. (1972). ‘Obituary’, *University of Edinburgh Journal*, p.75.

Ardis, A.L. (1990). ‘Beatrice Webb’s romance with ethnography’, *Women’s Studies*, 18(2-3), pp.233-248.

Auchmuty, R. (2008). ‘Early women law students at Cambridge and Oxford’, *The Journal of Legal History*, 29(1), pp.63-97.

Avery, G. (1991). *The best type of girl: a history of girls’ independent schools*. London: Andre Deutsch.

Ayrton, R. (2017). *Time for a revival? A historical review of the social survey in Great Britain and the United States. National Centre for Research Methods Methodological Review paper.* University of Southampton, Southampton.

Baigent, E., Brewer, C., Larminie, V. (2005). ‘Women and the archive: the representation of gender in the Dictionary of National Biography and the Oxford English Dictionary’, *Archives: Journal of the British Records Association*, 30, pp.13-35.

Baillie, M. (1996). *Mary Lily Walker: social worker and reformer*. Unpublished master’s thesis, McMaster University.

Baillie, M. (2000). The grey lady: Mary Lily Walker of Dundee. In L. Miskell, C. Whatley and B. Harris (Eds.), *Victorian Dundee: image and realities*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, pp.122-34.

Baker, D.B. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of the history of psychology: global perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, K.M. (1964). ‘The early history of the term “social science”’, *Annals of Science*, 20(3), pp.211-226.

Baldwin, P. (1990). *The politics of social solidarity: class bases of the European welfare state, 1875-1975*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bales, K. (1994). ‘Early innovations in social research: the Poverty Survey of Charles Booth’. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London School of Economics.

Bales, K. (1996). ‘Lives and labours in the emergence of organised social research, 1886-1907’, *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 9(2), pp.113-138.

Bales, K. (1999). ‘Popular reactions to sociological research: the case of Charles Booth’, *Sociology*, 33(1), pp.153-168.

Banks, O. (1985). *The biographical dictionary of British feminists. Volume one: 1800-1930*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Banks, O. (1986). *Becoming a feminist. The social origins of ‘first wave’ feminism*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Banks, O. (1990). *The biographical dictionary of British feminists. Volume two: a supplement, 1900-1915*. New York: New York University Press.

Bannerman, G. (2021). ‘The early years: a department in the making, 1895-1920’. In C. Schonhardt-Bailey and G. Bannerman (Eds.), *Political science at the LSE: a history of the Department of Government, from the Webbs to Covid*. London: Ubiquity Press, pp.21-48.

Baraclough, J. (2011, January 06). Cummins, Anne Emily (1869–1936), social worker. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Barclay, K., Carr, R., Elliot, R. and Hughes, A. (2011). 'Introduction: gender and generations: women and life cycles', *Women's History Review*, 20(2), pp.175-188.

Barnes, S.V. (1996). 'England's civic universities and the triumph of the Oxbridge ideal', *History of Education Quarterly*, 36(3), pp.271-305.

Barnes, T. (2013). *Higher doctorates in the UK 2013*. UK Council for Graduate Education.

Barnett, S. and Barnett, H. (1915). *Practicable socialism: essays on social reform*. 2nd Edition. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Bastow, S., Dunleavy, P. and Tinkler, J. (2014). *The impact of the social sciences: how academics and their research make a difference*. London: Sage.

Bateson, M.C. (1989). *Composing a life*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Bathurst, K. (1905). 'The need for national nurseries', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 57(339), pp.818-827.

Bean, J.S. (2015). '"Not much use in disliking it": the work and wages of female home workers in London, 1897-1908', *Research in Economic History*, 31, pp.193-239.

Beard, C. (1913). *Economic interpretation of the constitution of the United States*. New York: Dover Publications.

Beauman, K.B. (1996). *Women and the settlement movement*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Béland, D. (2009). 'Ideas, institutions, and policy change', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(5), pp.701-718.

Béland, D. and Hacker, J.S. (2004). 'Ideas, private institutions, and American welfare state 'exceptionalism': the case of health and old-age insurance, 1915-1965', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 13(1), pp.42-54.

Béland, D. and Mahon, R. (2016). *Advanced introduction to social policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Bell, M. and McEwan, C. (1996). 'The admission of women Fellows to the Royal Geographical Society, 1892-1914; the controversy and the outcome', *The Geographical Journal*, 162(3), pp.295-312.

Berg, M. (1989). *The first women economic historians: the LSE connection*. University of Warwick Working Paper No.328. Available at: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/research/workingpapers/1989-1994/twerp328.pdf. (Accessed: 2 July 2017).

Berg, M. (1992). 'The first women economic historians', *Economic History Review*, 45(2), pp.308-329.

Berg, M. (1996). *A woman in history: Eileen Power, 1889-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berghahn, V.R. and Lässig, S. (Eds.) (2008). *Biography between structure and agency: central European lives in international historiography*. New York: Berghahn.

Berman, S. (1998). *The social democratic moment: ideas and politics in the making of interwar Europe*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.

Bernard, H.R. (2012). 'The science in social science', *PNAS*, 109:20796–20799.

Bernstein, S.D. (2013). *Roomscape: women writers in the British Museum from George Eliot to Virginia Woolf*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Berridge, V. and Edwards, G. (1981). *Opium and the people: opiate use in nineteenth-century England*. New York: Martin's Press.

Berridge, V. and Thom, B. (1996). 'Research and policy: what determines the relationship?', *Policy Studies*, 17(1), pp.23-34.

Biagini, E.F. (2002). *Citizenship and community: liberals, radicals and collective identities in the British Isles, 1865-1931*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (2013). *Learn to write badly. How to succeed in the social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Binard, F. (2014). ''The injustice of the woman's vote': opposition to female suffrage after World War I', *Women's History Review*, 23(3), pp.381-400.

Black, C. (1907). *Sweated industry and the minimum wage*. London: Duckworth & Co.

Black, C. (1910). 'Review: Les Sociétés Coopératives de Consommation, by Charles Gide', *Economic Journal*, 20(77), pp.69-71.

Blackburn, H. (Ed.) (1881). *A handbook for women engaged in social and political work*. Bristol: J.W. Arrowsmith.

Blackburn, S. (1991). 'Ideology and social policy: the origins of the Trade Boards Act', *The Historical Journal*, 34(1), pp.43-64.

Blackburn, S. (1995). 'How useful are feminist theories of the welfare state?', *Women's History Review*, 4(3), pp.369-394.

Blackburn, S. (1997). ''No necessary connection with homework': gender and sweated labour, 1840-1909', *Social History*, 22(3), pp.269-285.

Blackburn, S. (2007). *A fair day's wage for a fair day's work? Sweated labour and the origins of minimum wage legislation in Britain.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Blagg, H. and Wilson, C. (1912). *Women and prisons*. Fabian Tract No 163. London: Fabian Society.

Blair, M.E. (2008). *A life well led: the biography of Barbara Freire-Marreco Aitken, British anthropologist*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press.

Blakestad, N.L. (1994). 'King's College of Household and Social Science and the household science movement in English higher education, c.1908-1939'. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.

Blandford, A. (2013). 'Semi-structured qualitative studies'. In M. Soegaard and R.F. Dam, (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of human-computer interaction*, 2nd Edition. Aarhus: Interaction Design Foundation.

Blayney, S. (2019). 'Industrial fatigue and the productive body: the science of work in Britain, c. 1900-1918', *Social History of Medicine*, 32(2), pp.310-328.

Bock, G. and Thane, P. (1991). *Maternity and gender policies: women and the rise of the European welfare states 1880s-1950s*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bode, K. (2017). 'The equivalence of 'close' and 'distant' reading; or, toward a new object for data-rich literary history', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 78(1), pp.77-106.

Boissevain, J. (1974). *Friends of friends. Networks, manipulators and coalitions*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Boissevain, J. (1979). 'Network analysis: a reappraisal', *Current Anthropology*, 20(2), pp.392-394.

Bondfield, M.G. (1948). *A life's work*. London: Hutchinson.

Booth, A. (2009). 'Recovery 2.0: beginning the Collective Biographies of Women Project', *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 28(1), pp.15-35.

Booth, C. (1902). *Life and labour of the people in London*. 17 Vols. 3rd Edition. London: Macmillan.

Borgatti, S.P., Everett, M.G. and Freeman, L.C. (2002). *Ucinet for Windows: software for social network analysis*. Harvard, M.A.: Analytic Technologies.

Bornmann, L. (2017). 'Measuring impact in research evaluations: a thorough discussion of methods for, effects of and problems with impact measurements', *Higher Education*, 73(5), pp.775-787.

Boswell, C. and Smith, K. (2017). 'Rethinking policy 'impact': four models of research-policy relations', *Palgrave Communications*, 3(44). Doi.org/10.1057/s41599-017-0042-z.

Bott, E. (1957). *Family and social network: roles, norms and external relationships in ordinary urban families*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Homo academicus*. Paris: Minuit. English translation 1988: *Homo academicus*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). 'Die biographische illusion', *BIOS*, 3(1), pp.75-81.

Bourke, B. (2014). 'Positionality: reflecting on the research process', *The Qualitative Report*, 19(33), pp.1-9.

Bousfield, W., Carpenter, W.L., Stanford, C.V., Onslow, G.M., Ricks, G., Heather-Bigg, A., and Grieve, W.H. (1890). *Elementary schools, how to increase their utility. Being six lectures delivered to the managers of the London board schools in 1889 and 1890*. London: Percival & Co.

Bowley, A.L. (1950). 'Clara E. Collet (September 10, 1860 – August 3, 1948)', *Economic Journal*, 60(238), pp.408-410.

Bradley, K. (2009). *Poverty, philanthropy and the state: charities and the working classes in London*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brannen, J. (2004). 'Working qualitatively and quantitatively'. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium and D. Silverman (Eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage, pp.312-26.

Braybon, G. (2012). *Women workers in the First World War*. London: Routledge.

Brewis, G. (2014). *A social history of student volunteering: Britain and beyond, 1880-1980. Historical Studies in Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brittain, V. (1960). *The women at Oxford: a fragment of history*. London: Harrap.

Broady, D. (2002). 'French prosopography. Definition and suggested readings', *Poetics*, 30 (5-6), pp.381-385.

Brock, M.G. and Curthoys, M.C. (Eds.) (2000). *The history of the University of Oxford.*, Vol. VII, Part 2: Nineteenth century Oxford. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bronstein, J. (2007). *Caught in the machinery: workplace accidents and injured workers in nineteenth-century Britain*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Brooke, C.N.L. (1993). *A history of the University of Cambridge*. Vol. IV. 1870-1990. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brooks, A. (1997). *Academic women*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Broschart, K.R. (1991). 'Beatrice Webb'. In M.J. Deegan (Ed.), *Woman in sociology: a bio-bibliographical sourcebook*. Westport, C.T.: Greenwood Press, pp.425-31.

Brougham, Lord (1858). 'Inaugural Address'. In *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1857*. London: John W. Parker and Son.

Brown, J. (1990). *Victims or villains? Social security benefits in unemployment.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Brown, M.K. (2011). "*A college for women, or something like it": Bedford College and the women's higher education movement, 1849-1900*. Unpublished master's thesis, Portland State University.

Brown, S. (2014). 'The professionalization of British philosophy'. In W.J. Mander (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of British philosophy in the nineteenth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.619-640.

Bruce, L. (2012). *Scottish settlement houses from 1886-1934*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Glasgow.

Brückweh, K., Ziemann, B., Wetzell, R.F. and Schumann, D. (Eds.) (2012). *Engineering society: the role of the human and social sciences in modern societies, 1880-1980*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Bryman, A. (2015). *Social research methods*. 5th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Budd, S. (1977). *Varieties of unbelief: atheists and agnostics in English society, 1850-1960*. London: Heinemann.

Bulmer, M. (1980). *Social research in Royal Commissions*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Bulmer, M. (1981). 'The British tradition of social administration: moral concerns at the expense of scientific rigor', *The Hastings Center Report*, 11(2), pp.35-42.

Bulmer, M. (1982). *The uses of social research: social investigation in public policy-making*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Bulst, N. and Genet, J.P. (Eds.) (1986). *Medieval lives and the historian, studies in medieval prosopography*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University.

Burnett, J. (1989). *Plenty and want: a social history of food in England from 1815 to the present day*. 3rd Edition. London: Routledge.

Burnette, J. (2008). *Gender, work and wages in Industrial Revolution Britain*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Burnham, D. (2016). *The social worker speaks: a history of social workers through the twentieth century*. London: Routledge.

Burns, E.M. (1925). 'The economics of family endowment', *Economica*, 14, pp.155-164.

Burstyn, J.N. (1972). 'Religious arguments against higher education for women in England, 1840-1890', *Women's Studies: An interdisciplinary Journal*, 1(1), pp.111-131.

Burstyn, J.N. (1980). *Victorian education and the ideal of womanhood*. London: Croom Helm.

Butler, R.F. and Prichard, M.H. (1930). *The Society of Oxford Home-Students: retrospects and recollections (1879-1921)*. Oxford: Oxonian Press.

Byrne. D. (2011). *Applying social science: the role of social research in politics, policy and practice.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Cain, M.T. (1994). The maps of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge: a publishing history', *Imago Mundi*, 46, pp.151-167.

Caine, B. (1986). *Destined to be wives: the sisters of Beatrice Webb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caine, B. (1994). 'Feminist biography and feminist history', *Women's History Review*, 3(2), pp.247-261.

Caine, B. (2007). 'Stefan Collini, Virginia Woolf, and the question of intellectuals in Britain', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68(3), pp.369-373.

Caine, B. (2010). *Biography and history*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Caird, M. (1888). 'Marriage', *Westminster Review*, 130, pp.186-201.

Cairney, P. (2007). 'A 'multiple lenses' approach to policy change: the case of tobacco policy in the UK', *British Politics*, 2, pp.45-68.

Campbell, J. (2002). 'Ideas, politics, and public policy', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28(1), pp.21-38.

Campbell, J.M. and Wilson, L.E. (1917). *Inquiry into the health of women engaged in munition factories*. Interim Report of the Health of Munition Workers Committee. Cd. 8511, pp.110-119.

Campbell, R. (2018). *Codename intelligentsia: the life and times of the honourable Ivor Montagu, filmmaker, communist, spy*. Stroud: History Press.

Canning, K. (2006). *Gender history in practice: historical perspectives on bodies, class, and citizenship.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cantor, G., Dawson, G., Gooday, G., Noakes, R., Shuttleworth, S., and Topham, J. (2004). *Science in the nineteenth-century periodical: reading the magazine of nature*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carney, T.F. (1973). 'Prosopography: payoffs and pitfalls', *Phoenix*, 27(2), pp.156-179.

Carr, E.H. (1964). *What is history?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Carrier, J. and Kendall, I. (1973). 'Social policy and social change', *Journal of Social Policy*, 2(3), pp.209-24.

Carter, J.J., and Withrington, D.J. (Eds.) (1992). *Scottish universities: distinctiveness and diversity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Carter, P. (2013). 'Opportunities for national biography online: the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2005-2012'. In M. Nolan and C. Fernon (Eds.), *The ADB's Story*. ANU Press, pp.345-372.

Chamberlain, G. (2006). 'British maternal mortality in the 19th and early 20th centuries', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99(11), pp.559-563.

Chamberlayne, P., Bornat, J. and Wengraf, T. (Eds.) (2000). *The turn to biographical methods in social science: comparative issues and examples*. London: Routledge.

Chapman, R.A. (2004). *The Civil Service Commission 1855-1991: a bureau biography*. London: Routledge.

Chapman, R.A. (2007). 'The origins of the Joint University Council and the background to public policy and administration', *Public Policy and Administration*, 22(1), pp.7-26.

Charle, C. (1994). *La Republique des universitaires, 1870-1940*. Paris: Seuil.

Charteris, J., Gannon, S., Mayes, E., Nye, A. and Stephenson, L. (2016). 'The emotional knots of academicity: a collective biography of academic subjectivities and spaces', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 35(1), pp.31-44.

Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, C. (2018). 'Is equal pay worth it?: Beatrice Potter Webb's, Millicent Garrett Fawcett's and Eleanor Rathbone's changing argument'. *The Routledge Handbook of the History of Women's Economic Thought*. London: Routledge, pp.129-149.

Clark, W. (2006). *Academic charisma and the origin of the research university*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Clarke, N. (1990). *Ambitious heights*: *writing, friendship, love: the Jewsbury sisters, Felicia Hemans, and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. London: Routledge.

Clokie, H.M. and Robinson, J.W. (1937). *Royal commissions of inquiry; the significance of investigations in British politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Clough, B.A. (1897). *A memoir of Anne Jemima Clough*. London: Edward Arnold.

Coats, A.W. (1968). 'The origins and early development of the Royal Economic Society', *Economic Journal*, 78(310), pp.349-371.

Coats, A.W. (1993). *The sociology and professionalization of economics: British and American economics essays*. London: Routledge.

Cobbe, F. (1904). *Life of Frances Power Cobbe as told by herself*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Cohen, E.W. (1941). *The growth of the British civil service, 1870-1939.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Cohen, G. (2002). 'Missing, biased and unrepresentative: the quantitative analysis of multi-source biographical data', *Historical Methods*, 35(4), pp.166-176.

Cohen, G. (2005). 'Propensity-score methods and the Lenin School', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 36(2), pp.209-232.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education*. 4th Edition. London: Routledge.

Cohen, S. and Fleay, C. (2000). 'Fighters for the poor', *History Today,* 50(1), pp.36-37.

Cole, M. (1946). *Beatrice Webb*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Cole, M. (1949). *Growing up into revolution*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Cole, T. (2018, July 12). Wood [née Chick], Frances (1883–1919), medical statistician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Coleman, W., Cornish, S. and Hagger, A. (2006). *Giblin's platoon: the trials and triumph of the economist in Australian public life*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Collet, C. (1899). *Report by Miss Collet on the money wages of indoor domestic servants*. Presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. Printed for H.M. Stationery Office by Darling & Son.

Collet, C. and Webster, C. (1940). Obituary. *The Economic Journal*, 50(200), pp.546-572.

Collini, S. (1991). *Public moralists: political thought and intellectual life in Britain. 1850-1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Collini, S. (2006). *Absent minds: intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Collyer, F. (2010). 'Origins and canons: medicine and the history of sociology', *History of the Human Sciences*, 23(2), pp.86-108.

Colpus, E. (2018). 'Women, service and self-actualization in inter-war Britain', *Past and Present*, 238(1), pp.197-232.

Cook, S.J. (2009). *Economics when it was a moral science: the intellectual foundations of Alfred Marshall's economic science. A rounded globe of knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Costin, L.B. (2003). *Two sisters for social justice: a biography of Grace and Edith Abbott*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Cott, N. (1987). *The grounding of modern feminism*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Cott, N. (1989). 'What's in a name? The limits of "social feminism"; or, expanding the vocabulary of women's history', *Journal of American History*, 76(23), pp.809-829.

Courtney, J.E. (1920). *Freethinkers of the nineteenth century*. New York: Dutton & Company.

Cousins, M. (2005). *European welfare states: comparative perspectives*. London: Sage.

Cowan, M. (1912). *The education of the women of India*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrie.

Cowman, K. (2007). *Women of the right spirit. Paid organizers in the Women's Social and Political Union, 1904-18*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Cowman, K. (2014). 'Women, locality and politics in nineteenth century Britain'. In K. Cowman, N.J. Koefoed and Å.K. Sjögren (Eds.), *Gender in urban Europe: sites of political activity and citizenship, 1750-1900*. New York/London: Routledge, pp.210-226.

Cowman, K. (2015). ''From the housewife's point of view': female citizenship and the gendered domestic interior in post-First World War Britain, 1918-1928', *The English Historical Review*, 130(543), pp.352-383.

Cowman, K. (2016). 'Collective biography'. In S. Gunn and L. Faire (Eds.), *Research methods in history*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.85-103.

Cox, P. and Hobley, A. (2014). *Shopgirls: the true story of life behind the counter*. London: Arrow Books.

Cree, V.E. (2019). ''States of change'? One hundred years of the JUC', *Social Work Education*, 38(8), pp.1054-1068.

Creese, M.R.S. (2000). *Ladies in the laboratory? American and British women in science, 1800-1900: a survey of their contributions to research*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches.* 3rd Edition. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Crossen-White, H.L. (2015). 'Using digital archives in historical research', *Research Ethics*, 11(2), pp.108-119.

Crossick, G. (Ed.) (1977). *The lower middle class in Britain 1870-1914*. London: Croom Helm.

Crossley, N., Edwards, G., Harries, E. and Stevenson, R. (2012). 'Covert social movement networks and the secrecy-efficiency trade off: the case of the UK suffragettes (1906-1914)', *Social Networks*, 34(4), pp.634-644.

Crowther, M.A. (1989). *Social policy in Britain, 1914-39*. London. Macmillan.

Crowther, M.A. (1990). ‘Poverty, health and welfare’. In W.H. Fraser and R.J. Morris (Eds.), *People and society in Scotland*. Vol.2. Edinburgh: John Donald, pp.265-289.

Csiszar, A. (2018). *The scientific journal. Authorship and the politics of knowledge in the nineteenth century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cullen, M. (1975). *The statistical movement in early Victorian Britain: the foundations of empirical social research*. Hassocks: Harvester.

Culpin, M. and Smith, M. (1930). *The nervous temperament* (Industrial Health Research Board Report no. 61). London: HMSO.

Current Topics. (1892). *The Economic Journal*, 2(7), pp.575-581.

D’Agostino, R.B. and Rubin, D.B. (2000). ‘Estimating and using propensity scores with partially missing data’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(451), pp.749-759.

Dahrendorf, R. (1995). *LSE: a history of the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1895-1995*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dale, J. and Foster, P. (1986). *Feminists and state welfare*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Danaher, T. and Briod, M. (2005). ‘Phenomenological approaches to research with children’. In S. Greene and D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children’s experience: approaches and methods*. London: Sage, pp.217-235.

Daniels, C.E.J. and Bayliss, R.A. (1985). ‘Alice Ravenhill, home economist, 1859-1954’, *Westminster Studies in Education*, 8(1), pp.21-36.

Daunton, M. (Ed.) (2005). *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

David, M.E. (1980). *The state, the family and education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

David, M.E. (2003). *Personal and political: feminisms, sociology and family lives*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

David, M.E. (2014). *Feminism, gender and universities: politics, passion and pedagogies*. London: Ashgate.

Davidoff, L. and Hall, C. (1987). *Family fortunes: men and women of the English middle class, 1780-1850*. London: Hutchinson.

Davidson, R. (2016). ‘Working-class women activists: citizenship at the local level’. In P. Ackers and A.J. Reid (Eds.), *Alternatives to state-socialism in Britain: other worlds of labour in the twentieth century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Davidson, R. and Lowe, R. (1981). ‘Bureaucracy and innovation in British welfare policy, 1870-1945’. In W. J. Mommsen (Ed.), *The emergence of the welfare state in Britain and Germany.* London: Croom Helm, pp.263-295.

Davies, B. and Gannon, S. (2006). *Doing collective biography: investigating the production of subjectivity*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Davies, J. (1993). *A history of Wales*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Davies, P. (2012). ‘‘Me’, ‘me’, ‘me’: the use of the first person in academic writing and some reflections on subjective analyses of personal experiences’, *Sociology*, 46(4), pp.744-752.

Davis, N.Z. (1976). ‘Women’s history in transition: the European case’, *Feminist Studies,* 3(3-4), pp.83-103.

De Zwart, M.L. (2016). *Alice Ravenhill: never say die*. Vancouver, B.C.: Ormsby Review Press.

Deakin, S. and Green, F. (2009). ‘One hundred years of British minimum wage legislation’, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(2), pp.205-213.

Deegan, M.J. (1988). *Jane Addams and the men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918*. New York: Routledge.

Deegan, M.J. (2014). *Annie Marion MacLean and the Chicago School of Sociology, 1894-1934*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Deegan, M.J. (2003). ‘Textbooks, the history of sociology, and the sociological stock of knowledge’, *Sociological Theory*, 21(3), pp.298-305.

Deegan, M.J. (Ed.) (1991). *Women in sociology: a bio-bibliographical sourcebook*. Westport, C.T.: Greenwood.

Delamont, S. (1978). ‘The domestic ideology and women’s education’. In S. Delamont and L. Duffin (Eds.), *The nineteenth-century woman: her cultural and physical world*. London: Croom Helm, pp.164-187.

Delaney, T. (2013). *Classical and contemporary social theory: investigation and application*. London: Routledge.

Delap, L. (2011). ‘The “woman question” and the origins of feminism’. In G. Stedman Jones and G. Claeys (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of nineteenth century political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57(4), pp.693-695.

Delmar, R. (1986). ‘What is feminism?’. In J. Mitchell and A. Oakley (Eds.), *What is feminism?* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp.9-14.

Deloitte (2016). Women in STEM: technology, career pathways and the gender pay gap. Available at: https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/Growth/deloitte-uk-women-in-stem-pay-gap-2016.pdf. (Accessed: 16 February 2018).

Den Otter, S. (2004, September 23). *Naden, Constance Caroline Woodhill (1858–1889), poet and philosopher*. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Deneke, H.C. (1946). *Grace Hadow*. London: Oxford University Press.

Desch, M.C. (2019). *Cult of the irrelevant: the waning influence of social science on national security*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

DeVault, M.L. (1996). ‘Talking back to sociology: distinctive contributions of feminist methodology’, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, pp.29-50.

DiCenzo. M. and Motuz, A. (2016). ‘Politicizing the home: welfare feminism and the feminist press in interwar Britain’, *Women: A Cultural Review*, 27(4), pp.378-396.

Dicey, A.V. (1905). *Lectures on the relation between law and public opinion in England during the nineteenth century*. London: Macmillan, pp.176-183.

Digby, A. (1989). *British welfare policy: workhouse to workfare*. London: Faber and Faber.

Dimand, R.W. (1999). 'Women economists in the 1890s: journals, books and the Old Palgrave', *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 21(3), pp.269-288.

Dimand, R.W., Dimand, M.A. and Forget, E.L. (2000). *A biographical dictionary of women economists*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Dingsdale, A. (1995). *''Generous and lofty sympathies': the Kensington Society, the 1866 women's suffrage petition and the development of mid-Victorian feminism'*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Greenwich.

Donnelly, S. (2015, March 18). Women at the front – pioneering LSE teachers. LSE History blog. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/equityDiversityInclusion/2015/03/women-at-the-front-pioneering-lse-teachers/ (Accessed: 10 May 2017).

Drezner, D. (2010). 'Is historical institutionalism bunk?', *Review of International Political Economy*, 17(4), pp.791-804.

Dumbill, E. (2021). *Factory Acts*. In: The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Victorian Women's Writing. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02721-6_314-1.

DSU [Dundee Social Union] (1905). *Report on housing and industrial conditions and medical inspection of school children*. Dundee: John Leng & Co.

Dwor, R. (2018). 'Lily Montagu and Liberal Judaism'. In J.M. Guy (Ed.), Edinburgh companion to fin de siècle literature, culture and the arts. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.345-360.

Dwork, D. (1987). *War is good for babies and other young children. A history of the infant and child welfare movement in England 1898-1918.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Dyhouse, C. (1977). 'Good wives and little mothers: social anxieties and the schoolgirl's curriculum, 1890-1920', *Oxford Review of Education*, 3(1), pp.21-35.

Dyhouse, C. (1995). *No distinction of sex? Women in British universities 1870-1939*. London: UCL Press.

Dyhouse, C. (2001). 'Family patterns of social mobility through higher education in England in the 1930s', *Journal of Social History*, 34(4), pp.817-842.

Dyhouse, C. (2006). *Students: a gendered history*. London and New York: Routledge.

Edgell, B. (1916). 'The government as advertiser', *Sociological Review*, a9(1), pp.45-48.

Edwards, G. (2010). *Mixed-method approaches to social network analysis*. Southampton: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.

Edwards, G. (2014). 'Infectious innovations? The diffusion of tactical innovation in social movement networks, the case of suffragette militancy', *Social Movement Studies*, 13(1), pp.48-69.

Edwards, G. and Crossley, N. (2009). 'Measures and meanings: exploring the ego-net of Helen Kirkpatrick Watts, militant suffragette', *Methodological Innovations Online*, 4(1), pp.37-61.

Edwards, R. (1993). *Mature women students: separating of connecting family and education: separating or connecting family and education*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Eisenmann, L. (2001). 'Creating a framework for interpreting U.S. women's educational history: lessons from historical lexicography', *History of Education*, 30(5), pp.453-470.

Ellis, D. (2000). *Literary lives: biography and the search for understanding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Engel, A.J. (1983). *From clergyman to don: the rise of the academic profession in nineteenth century Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Englander, D. and O'Day, R. (Eds.) (1995). *Retrieved riches: social investigation in Britain 1840-1914*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.

Erben, M. (1996). 'A preliminary prosopography of the Victorian street', *Auto/biography*, 4 (2-3), pp.53-68.

Erickson, A. (2006, May 25). *McArthur, Ellen Annette (1862–1927), historian*. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Erickson, A.L. (2018). 'Ellen Annette McArthur: establishing a presence in the academy'. In H.L. Smith and M. Zook (Eds.), *Generations of women historians: within and beyond the academy*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.25-48.

Eriguchi, T. (2009). 'The Webbs, public administration and the LSE: the origin of public governance and institutional economics in Britain', *History of Economics Review*, 50(1), pp.17-30.

Evans, D. (1934). *Women and the civil service*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.

Evans, E.J. (2000) *Parliamentary reform, 1770-1918*. Harlow: Longman.

Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (Eds.) (1995). *Bringing the state back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fara, P. (2018). *A lab of one's own. Science and suffrage in the First World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farewell, V. and Johnson, T. (2016). 'Major Greenwood (1880-1949): a biographical and bibliographical study', *Statistics in Medicine*, 35(5), pp.645-670.

Farmer, A. (2008). *By their fruits: eugenics, population control, and the abortion campaign*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (1993). 'The five sexes: why male and female are not enough*', The Sciences,* March/April, pp.20-24.

Fearon, P. (2015). 'A 'social evil': Liverpool moneylenders 1920s-1940s', *Urban History*, 42(3), pp.440-462.

Feinstein, C. (1998). 'Pessimism perpetuated: real wages and the standard of living in Britain during and after the Industrial Revolution', *Journal of Economic History*, 58(3), pp.625-58.

Fincham, J. (1975). '*The development of sociology first degree courses at English universities, 1907-1972*'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, City University London.

Finkelstein, B. (1998). 'Revealing human agency: the uses of biography in the study of educational history'. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Writing educational biography: explorations in qualitative research*. New York: Garland, pp.45-49.

Fitzgerald, T. (2007). 'An absent presence: women professors at the University of New Zealand 1911-1961', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 39(3), pp.239-253.

Fitzgerald, T. and Collins, J. (2011). *Historical portraits of women home scientists: the University of New Zealand 1911-1947*. Amherst: Cambria Press.

Fitzgerald, T. and Smyth, E.M. (Eds.) (2014). *Women educators, leaders and activists: educational lives and networks, 1900-1960*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fitzpatrick, E. (1990). *Endless crusade: women social scientists and progressive reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Flanders, J. (2012). *The Victorian city: everyday life in Dickens' London*. London: Atlantic.

Fleck, C. (2011). *A transatlantic history of the social sciences: Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the invention of empirical social research*. London: Bloomsbury.

Fokkens, A., Braake, S., Ockeloen, N., Vossen, P., Legêne, S., Schreiber, G., and Boer, V. (2017). 'BiographyNet: extracting relations between people and events'. In Á. Bernád, C. Gruber, and M. Kaiser (Eds.), *Europa baut auf Biographien*. Wien: New Academic Press, pp.193-227.

Foley, C.A. (1893). 'Notes: George Croom Robertson as a teacher', *Mind*, 2(6), pp.275-280.

Fontaine, P. and Backhouse, R. (Eds.) (2014). *A historiography of the modern social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forrester, J. and Cameron, L. (2017). *Freud in Cambrid*ge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frank, K. (1997). 'Auto/biography: writing the lives of women', *Auto/biography*, 1(2-3), pp.87-93.

Fraser, D. (2003). *The evolution of the British welfare state: a history of social policy since the industrial revolution*. 3rd Edition. London: Macmillan.

Fraser, N. and Gordon, L. (1992). 'Contract versus charity: why is there no social citizenship in the United States?', *Socialist Review*, 22, pp.45-65.

Freeden, M. (1978). *The New Liberalism: an ideology of social reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Freeman, M. (2001). 'Journeys into poverty kingdom: complete participation and the British vagrant, 1866-1914', *History Workshop Journal*, 52, pp.99-121.

Freeman, M. and Nelson, G. (2008). *Vicarious vagrants: incognito social explorers and the homeless in England, 1860-1910*. Lambertville, N.J.: The True Bill Press.

Frost, G. (2008). *Living in sin: cohabiting as husband and wife in nineteenth-century England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Fuller, S. (2009). *The sociology of intellectual life: the career of the mind in and around the academy*. London: Sage.

Furner, M.O. and Supple, B. (Eds.) (1990). *The state and economic knowledge: the American and British experiences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FWG [Fabian Women's Group] (1911). *Fabian Women's Group: three years' work, 1908-1911*. London: Fabian Women's Group.

Galton, F. (1865). 'Hereditary character and talent. Part 1', Macmillan's Magazine, 12, pp.157-166.

Garrard, J. (2002). *Democratisation in Britain: elites, civil society and reform since 1800*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Garside, W.R. (2002). *British unemployment 1919-1939: a study in public policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gazeley, I. and Newell, A. (2015). 'Urban working-class food consumption and nutrition in Britain in 1904', *The Economic History Review*, 68(1), pp.101-122.

Gender Institute (2016). *Confronting gender inequality: findings from the LSE commission on gender, inequality and power.* London: London School of Economics and Political Science, Gender Institute.

George, V. and Wilding, P. (1994). *Welfare and ideology:* Hemel Hempstead. Harvest wheatsheaf.

Gibbins, J.R. (2005). ''Old studies and new': the organisation of knowledge in university curriculum'. In M. Daunton (Ed.), *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.235-261.

Gibbins, J.R. (2011). Designing knowledge: the moral sciences in Cambridge, Dublin, Edinburgh, London and Oxford, 1830-1880, History of Universities.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilbert, J.S. (1988). '*Women at the English civic universities 1880-1920*'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Gill, J., Matthews, J.M., Zannettino, L. and Carroll, T. (2008). 'Thesis writing as a feminist project: negotiating space for women's embodies selves in new scholarship', *Australian Feminist Studies*, 23(56), pp.249-261.

Gillie, A. (2008). 'Identifying the poor in the 1870s and 1880s', *Economic History Review,* 61(2), pp.302-325.

Glage, L. (1981). *Clementina Black, a study in social history and literature*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Gleadle, K. (2001). *British women in the nineteenth century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Glendenning, V. (1988). 'Lies and silences'. In E. Homberger and J. Charmley (Eds.), *Troubled face of biography*. London: Macmillan, pp.49-62.

Glennerster, H., Hills, J., Piachaud, D. and Webb, J. (2004). *One hundred years of poverty and policy*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Glew, H. (2016). *Gender, rhetoric and regulation: women's work in the civil service and the London County Council, 1900-55*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Goldman, L. (1983). 'The origins of British 'social science': political economy, natural science and statistics, 1830-1835', *The Historical Journal*, 26(3), pp. 587-616.

Goldman, L. (1987). 'A peculiarity of the English? The Social Science Association and absence of sociology in nineteenth-century Britain', *Past & Present*, 114(1), pp.133-171.

Goldman, L. (1995). *Dons and workers: Oxford and adult education since 1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goldman, L. (2005). 'Victorian social science: from singular to plural'. In M. Daunton (Ed.), *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.87-114.

Goldman, L. (2007a). 'Foundations of British sociology 1880-1930: contexts and biographies', *The Sociological Review*, 55(3), pp.431-440.

Goldman, L. (2007b). *Science, reform, and politics in Victorian Britain: the Social Science Association 1857-1886*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldman, L. (2013). *The life of R.H. Tawney*. London, Bloomsbury Academic.

Goldthorpe, J.H. (1964). 'The development of social policy in England, 1800-1914'. In *Transactions of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology*. International Sociological Association, Louvain.

Gonick, M. and Gannon, S. (2014). *Becoming girl: collective biography and the production of girlhood*. Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Gonner, E.C.K. (1894*). Methods of economic training adopted in this and other countries. Report of the sixty-fourth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*. London: John Murray.

Goodman, J. (1998). 'Social investigation and economic empowerment: the Women's Industrial Council and the LCC Trade Schools for Girls, 1892-1914', *History of Education*, 27(3), pp.297-314.

Goodman, J., Jacobs, A., Kisby, F., and Loader, H. (2011). 'Travelling careers: overseas migration patterns in the professional lives of women attending Girton and Newnham before 1939', *History of Education*, 40(2), pp.179-196.

Goodwin, J. (2012). *SAGE biographical research*. London: Sage.

Gorard, S. (2004). *Combining methods in educational and social research*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Gordon, A. (1895). 'The after-careers of university-educated women in the nineteenth century', *The Nineteenth Century*, 37(220), pp.955-960.

Gordon, A., Buhle, M., and Dye, N. (1976). The problem of women's history. In B.A. Carroll (Ed.), *Liberating women's history: theoretical and critical essays*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp.75-92.

Gordon, E. and Nair, G. (2006) 'Domestic fathers and the Victorian parental role', *Women's History Review*, 15(4), pp.551-559.

Gordon, P. (1978). 'Edith Mary Deverell: an early woman inspector', *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 22, pp.6-12.

Gordon, P. (1988). 'Katherine Bathurst: a controversial woman inspector', *History of Education*, 17, pp.193-207.

Gordon. E. and Nair, G. (2000). 'The economic role of middle-class women in Victorian Glasgow', *Women's History Review*, 9(4), pp.791-814.

Gorham, D. (2012). *The Victorian girl and the feminine ideal*. London; Routledge.

Goronwy-Roberts, M. (2000). *A woman of vision: a life of Marion Phillips, MP.* Wrexham: Bridge Books.

Gorsky, M. (1999). *Patterns of philanthropy, charity and society in nineteenth-century Bristol*. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Gosden, C, Larson, F. and Petch, A. (2007). 'Origins and survivals: Tyler, Balfour and the Pitt Rivers Museum and their role within anthropology in Oxford 1883-1905'. In P. Riviére (Ed.), *A history of Oxford anthropology*. Oxford: Berghahn, pp.21-42.

Gough, D. and Boaz, A. (2017). 'Politics and practices of knowledge production and use', *Evidence and Policy*, 13(3), pp.397-400.

Gough, I. (1978). 'Theories of the welfare state: a critique', *International Journal of Health Services*, 8(1), pp.27-40.

Grant, L., Stalp, M.C. and Ward K.B. (2002). 'Women's sociological research and writing in the AJS in the pre-World War II era', *American Journal of Sociology*, 33, pp.69-91.

Grant, J.M., McCutcheon, J.H. and Sanders, E.F. (1927). *St Leonard's School, 1877-1927*. London.

Green, B. (2017). *Feminist periodicals and daily life: women and modernity in British culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Green, E. (2011). *The arrival of research degrees at Cambridge*. Darwin Research Report. Cambridge.

Green, J. and LaDuke, J. (2009). *Pioneering women in American mathematics: the pre-1940 PhDs*. Providence, R.I.: American Mathematical Society.

Green, S. (2017). 'Inclusions and exclusions: considerations for a Stopes digital collection', *Women's History Review*, 26(5), pp.721-737.

Greenhalgh, T. (2018). 'What have the social sciences ever done for equity in health policy and health systems?', *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 17(124). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-018-0842-9.

Greer, S.L., Stewart, E., Ercia, A., Donnelly, P. (2021). 'Changing health care with, for, or against the public: an empirical investigation into the place of the public

in health service reconfiguration', *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 26(1), pp.12-19.

Grey, M.G. and Shirreff, E. (1850). *Thoughts on self-culture, addressed to women*. London: Moxon.

Grey-Wilson, W. (1918). *Gabriel de Wesselitsky: a sketch*. London: Central Committee for National Patriotic Organizations.

Griffin, B. (2003). 'Class, gender, and liberalism in Parliament, 1868-1882: the case of the Married Women's Property Acts', *The Historical Journal*, 46(1), pp.59-68.

Griffin, E. (2010). *Short history of the British industrial revolution*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Groenewegen, P.D. (1988). 'Alfred Marshall and the establishment of the Cambridge Economic Tripos', *History of Political Economy*, 20(4), pp.627-667.

Groenewegen, P.D. (1994). 'A neglected daughter of Adam Smith: Clara Elizabeth Collet (1860–1948)'. In P.D. Groenewegen (Ed.), *Feminism and political economy in Victorian England.* Aldershot: Elgar, pp.147-73.

Groenewegen, P.D. (1995). *A soaring eagle: Alfred Marshall 1842-1924*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Groenewegen, P.D. (2003). *Classics and Moderns in Economics: essays on nineteenth and twentieth century economic thought*, 2 Vols. London: Routledge.

Guba, E.G. (1981). 'Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries', *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29(2), pp.75-91.

Gunn, S. (2004). 'Class, identity and the urban: the middle class in England, c.1790-1950', *Urban History,* 31(1), pp.29-47.

Gunn, S. and Bell, R. (2003). *Middle classes: their rise and sprawl*. London: Phoenix.

Gunn, S. and Faire, L. (Eds.) (2016). *Research methods for history*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Guttsman, W.L. (1965). *The British political elite*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Haas, P.M. (1992). 'Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination', *International Organization*, 46(1), pp.1-35.

Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st century: preference theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, C. (1979). 'The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology'. In S. Burman (Ed.), *Fit work for women*. London: Croom Helm, pp.15-32.

Hall, L. (2006, September 28). Wright [née Lowenfeld], Helena Rosa (1887–1982), family planning practitioner and sex therapist. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Hamilton, P. and Spongberg, M. (Eds.) (2017). 'Twenty years on: feminist histories and digital media', *Women's History Review*, 26(5), pp.671-677.

Hamilton, R.F. (2003). 'American sociology rewrites its history', *Sociological Theory*, 21(3), pp.281-297.

Hamilton, S. (1987). *'Women and the Scottish universities c.1869-1939: a social history'*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Hammersley, M. (1987). 'Some notes on the terms 'validity' and 'reliability'', *British Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), pp.73-81.

Hannam, J. (1984) 'The employment of working class women in Leeds, 1880-1914'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sheffield.

Hannam, J. (1996). 'An enlarged sphere of usefulness: the Bristol women's movement, c 1860–1914'. In M. Dresser and P. Ollerenshaw (Eds.), *The Making of Modern Bristol*. Tiverton: Redcliffe Press, pp. 184–209.

Hannam, J. (2007). Women's Industrial Council (act. 1894–c. 1917). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/96080 (Accessed: 10 June 2020).

Hannam, J. (2010). 'Women as paid organizers and propagandists for the British Labour Party between the wars', *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 77, pp.69-88.

Hannam, J. and Hunt, K. (2002). *Socialist women: Britain 1880s to 1920s*. London: Routledge.

Hans, N.A. (1951). *New trends in education in the eighteenth century*. London: Routledge.

Harders, L. (2014). 'Legitimizing biography: critical approaches to biographical research', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 55, pp.49-56.

Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hardy, G. (1981). *William Rathbone and the early history of district nursing: a welfare service, 1859-1908*. Northbridge, C.A.: Hesketh.

Harris, B. (2004). *The origins of the British welfare state: society, state and social welfare in England and Wales, 1800-1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harris, J. (1972). *Unemployment and politics: a study in English social policy 1886-1914*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harris, J. (1983). 'The transition to high politics in English social policy'. In M. Bentley and J. Stevenson (Eds.), *High and low politics in modern Britain.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.58-79.

Harris, J. (1989). 'The Webbs, the Charity Organisation Society and the Ratan Tata Foundation: social policy from the perspective of 1912'. In M. Bulmer, J. Lewis and D. Piachaud (Eds.), *The goals of social policy*. London: Unwin Hyman, pp.27-63.

Harris, J. (1992). 'Victorian values and the founders of the welfare state', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 78, pp.165-182.

Harris, J. (2004, September 23). Bosanquet [née Dendy], Helen (1860–1925), social theorist and social reformer. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

Harrison, A. (1904). *Women's industries in Liverpool: an enquiry into the economic effects of legislation regulating the labour of women*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Harrison, B. (1966). 'Philanthropy and the Victorians', *Victorian Studies*, 9(4), pp.353-374.

Harrison, B. (1976). Miss Butler's social survey. In A.H. Halsey (Ed.), *Traditions of social policy: essays in honour of Violet Butler*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.27-72.

Harrison, B. (1987). *Prudent revolutionaries: portraits of British feminists between the wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, E. (1998). *Women members and witnesses on British Government ad hoc Committees of Inquiry 1850-1930, with special reference to Royal Commissions of Inquiry*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Harrison, R. (2000). *The life and times of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, 1858-1905: the formative years*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hart, E. (1893). 'Objects of the National Health Society of London', *Public Health Papers and Reports*, 19, pp.71-73.

Hart, V. (1994). *Bound by our constitution: women, workers, and the minimum wage*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Harte, N. (1979). *The admission of women to University College, London: a centenary lecture*. London: UCL.

Harte, N. (1986). *The University of London, 1836-1986*. London: Athlone Press.

Harte, N., North, J. and Brewis, G. (2018). *The world of UCL*. 4th Edition. London: UCL Press.

Hartesveldt, F.R. (2001). 'Caring for workers: the health and welfare programs of the British Ministry of Munitions, 1916-1918', *Maryland historian*, 1(1), pp.26-43.

Harvey, C. and Press, J. (1996). *Databases in historical research: theory, methods and applications.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haug, F. (1987). *Female sexualisation: a collective work of memory*. London: Verso.

Hay, J. (1983). *The origins of the Liberal welfare reforms, 1906-14*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hayek, F.A. (1946). 'The London School of Economics 1895-1945', *Economica*, 13(49), pp.1-31.

Haynes, J. (2006). 'Sanitary ladies and friendly visitors: women public health officers in London, 1890-1930', Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.

Heath, H.F. and Heatherington, A.L. (1946). 'Industrial research and development in the United Kingdom', *Nature*, 158(4010), pp.250-251.

Heather-Bigg, A. (1886). 'Female labour in the nail trade', *Fortnightly Review*, 39(234), pp.829-838.

Heather-Bigg, A. (1894). ‘The wife’s contribution to family income’, Economic Journal, 4(13), pp.51-58.

Heffernan, R. (2002). ‘The possible as the art of politics: understanding consensus politics’, *Political Studies*, 50(4), pp.742-760.

Hesse-Biber, S.N. (2014). *Feminist research practice: a primer*. Los Angeles and London: Sage.

Hetherington, D. (2014). ‘Sociology of small things: Olive Schreiner, Eleanor Marx, Amy Levy and the intertextualities of feminist cultural politics in 1880s London’. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Hicks, F.A. (1896). ‘Dressmakers and tailoresses’. In F.W. Galton (Ed.), *Workers on their industries*. London: Sonnenschein, pp.13-31.

Higgs, E. (2000). ‘Medical statistics, patronage and the state: the development of the MRC Statistical Unit, 1911-1948’, *Medical History*, 44, pp.323-340.

Higgs, E. (2004). *The information state in England: the central collection of information on citizens since 1500*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill, D. and Lean T. (1995). ‘Gendering welfare state theory: a cross-national analysis of women’s public pension quality’, *Gender and Society*, 9(1), pp.99-111.

Hill, E.J.R. and James A.G. (2014). ‘Career decisions and gender: the illusion of choice?’, *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 3(3), pp.151-154.

Hill, P. (1995). *The early Cambridge women students: the sociological, demographic and sexual contexts and the women’s subsequent careers*. Cambridge: Privately printed.

Hilliard, C. (2014). ‘Popular reading and social investigation in Britain, 1850s-1940’, *The Historical Journal*, 57(1), pp.247-271.

Hillyar, A. and McDermid, J. (2000). *Revolutionary women in Russia 1870-1917: a study in collective biography*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hinely, S. (2012). ‘Charlotte Wilson, the “woman question”, and the meanings of anarchist socialism in late Victorian radicalism’, *International Review of Social History*, 57(1), pp.3-36.

Hobson, B. (1993). ‘Feminist strategies and gendered discourses in welfare states: married women’s right to work in the United States and Sweden’. In S. Koven and S. Michel (Eds.), *Mothers of a new world*. New York: Routledge, pp.396-429.

Hoff, J. (1994). ‘Gender as a postmodern category of paralysis’, *Women’s History Review*, 3(2), pp.149-168.

Hollis, P. (1987). *Ladies elect: women in English local government, 1865-19I4*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Holloway, G. (1995). ‘A common cause? Class dynamics in the industrial women’s movement, 1888-1918’. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sussex.

Holloway, G. (2005). *Women and work in Britain since 1840*. London: Routledge.

Holmes, C. (1976). 'Laissez-faire in theory and practice: Britain, 1800-1875', *Journal of European Economic History*, 5(3), pp.671-688.

Holmes, R. (2014). *Eleanor Marx: a life*. London: Bloomsbury.

Holmwood, J. and Scott, J. (Eds.) (2014). *The Palgrave handbook of sociology in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holroyd, M. (2002). *Works on paper: the craft of biography and autobiography*. London: Little, Brown and Company.

Holton, S. (1995). 'Women and the vote'. In J. Purvis (Ed.), *Women's history: Britain, 1850-1945. An introduction*. London: Routledge, pp.277-305.

Holton, S. (1996). *Suffrage days: stories from the women's suffrage movement*. London: Routledge.

Holton, S. (2007). *Quaker women: personal life, memory and radicalism in the lives of women friends, 1780-1930*. New York: Routledge.

Home Office (1921). HO 334/92/8081 Naturalisation Certificate: Marie Anteinette Christine Elizabeth Lubicz de Czaplicka. From Poland. Resident in Bristol. Certificate A8081 issued 24 May 1921. Available at: http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C11938471. (Accessed: 10 January 2021).

Home Office (1923a). HO 144/2231 Nationality and Naturalisation: de Vesselitsky, Varvara, from Russia. Resident in London. Certificate 9,896 issued 17 March 1923. Available at: https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4175897. (Accessed: 10 January 2021).

Home Office (1923b). HO 144/2151 Nationality and Naturalisation: de Vesselitsky, Sergei, from Russia. Resident in Surbiton. Certificate 10,528 issued 8 October 1923. Available at: https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4175823. (Accessed: 10 January 2021).

Honeyman, K. (2000). *Women, gender and industrialisation in England, 1700-1870*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Horowitz, H.L. (1993). *Alma mater: design and experience in the women's colleges from their nineteenth-century beginnings to the 1930s*. 2nd Edition. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Horrell, S. and Humphries, J. (1995). 'Women's labour force participation and the transition to the male-breadwinner family, 1790-1865', *Economic History Review*, 48(1), pp.89-117.

Horrell, S. and Oxley, D. (2012). 'Bringing home the bacon? Regional nutrition, stature, and gender in the industrial revolution', *The Economic History Review*, 65(4), pp.1354-1379.

Horton, S. (2006). 'The public service ethos in the British civil service: an historical institutional analysis', *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(1), pp.32-48.

Howard, J. (1982). *Darwin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howarth, J. (1984). ‘‘In Oxford but ... not of Oxford’: The women’s colleges’. In M.G. Brock and M.C. Curthoys (Eds.), *The history of the University of Oxford*, Vol. VII, Nineteenth-Century Oxford, Part 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.237-311.

Howarth, J. and Curthoys, M. (1987). ‘The political economy of women’s higher education in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain’, *Historical Research*, 60(142), pp.208-31.

Howe, A. (2006). Unwin, (Emma) Jane Catherine Cobden (1851-1947), suffragist and radical. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/38683. (Accessed: 25 July 2019).

Howe, A. and Morgan, S. (Eds.) (2006). *Rethinking nineteenth-century liberalism: Richard Cobden Bicentenary Essays*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hsiao-Yuh, K. (2018). ‘In pursuit of social democracy: Shena Simon and the reform of secondary education in England, 1938-1948’, *History of Education*, 47(1), pp.54-72.

Hubbard, L. (1893). ‘Statistics of women’s work’. In A. Burdett-Coutts (Ed.), *Women’s mission*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, pp.361-366.

Huber, E. and Stephens, J.D. (2001). *Development and crisis of the welfare state: parties and politics in global markets.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Hudson, J. and Lowe, S. (2009). *Understanding the policy process: analysing welfare policy and practice*. 2nd Edition. Bristol: Policy Press.

Humphreys, R. (1992). *Much ado about nothing. The aims and achievements of Charity Organisation Societies in provincial England – 1870-1890* (LSE working paper 10/92). London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Hunt, C. (2013). ‘Gertrude Tuckwell and the British Labour Movement, 1891-1921: a study in motives and influences’, *Women’s History Review*, 22(3), pp.478-496.

Husbands, C.T. (2014). ‘The first sociology ‘departments’’. In J. Holmwood and J. Scott (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of sociology in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.155-188.

Husbands, C.T. (2015). ‘Rescuing from oblivion: social characteristics and career destinations of early British ‘sociology’ graduates, 1907-1939’, *British Journal of Sociology*, 66(4), pp.645-672.

Husbands, C.T. (2019). *Sociology and the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1904-2015*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hutchins, B.L. (1907). *Home work and sweating: The causes and the remedies*. London: Fabian Society.

Hutchins, B.L. and Harrison, A. (1966 [1903]). *A history of factory legislation*. 3rd Edition. London: Routledge.

Innes, J. (2009). *Inferior politics: social problems and social policies in eighteenth-century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford. University Press.

ICPD [Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration] (1904). *Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*. London: Wyman & Sons.

Israel, M. and Hay, I. (2006). *Research ethics for social scientists*. London: Sage.

Iversen, T. (2001). 'The dynamics of welfare state expansion: trade openness, deindustrialization and partisan politics'. In P. Pierson (Ed.), *The new politics of the welfare state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.45-79.

Ives, E., Drummond, D. and Schwarz, L.D. (2000). *The first civic university: Birmingham 1880-1980*. Birmingham: Birmingham University Press.

Jackson, C. (2019). 'A history of psychology in the United Kingdom. Meeting of minds – the road to professional practice', *British Journal of Psychology*.

Jacob, H. (1988). *Silent revolution: the transformation of divorce law in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jansen, H. (2010). 'The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods', *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 11(2), Art.11. Available at: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1002110. (Accessed: 6 May 2018).

Janssen, F. (2018). *Women writers, world problems, and the working poor, c.1880-1920: ''blackleg' work in literature'*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Birkbeck, University of London.

Janssen, F. (2020). 'Paying for principles: women and the politics of translation work, 1880-1900', *Women's Writing*, 27(4), pp.524-536.

Jarausch, K.H. (Ed.) (1983). *The transformation of higher learning, 1860-1930: expansion, diversification, social opening, and professionalization in England, Germany, Russia, and the United States*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Jenson, J. (1989). 'Paradigms and political discourse: protective legislation in France and the United States before 1914', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 22(2), pp.235-58.

Jevons, W.S. (1970 [1871]). *Theory of political economy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Johnson, D.A. (1999). *The changing shape of English nonconformity, 1825-1925*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, A. (2016). 'Lessons from the Niagara movement: prosopography and discursive protest', *Sociologist Focus*, 49(1), pp.63-83.

Jones, C. (1976). *The foundations of social work education*. Working Papers in Sociology, No. 11. Durham: University of Durham.

Jones, C. (1979). 'Social work education, 1900-1977'. In N. Parry, M. Rustin and C. Satyamurti (Eds.), *Social work, welfare and the state*. London: Edward Arnold, pp. 72-88.

Jones, C. (2009). *Femininity, mathematics and science, 1880-1914*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, C. (2017). ''All your dreadful scientific things': women, science and education in the years around 1900', *History of Education*, 46(2), pp.162-175.

Jones, C. (2019). ‘Careers and controversy before the First World War’, *Nature*, 575(7781), pp.239-242.

Jones, D.K. (2001). ‘Researching groups of lives: a collective biographical perspective on the Protestant ethic debate’, *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), pp.325-346.

Jones, G. (1986). *Social hygiene in twentieth century Britain*. London: Croom Helm.

Jordan, E. (1988). ‘Female unemployment in England and Wales 1851-1911: an examination of the census figures for 15-19 year olds’, *Social History*, 13(2), pp.175-190.

Kabeer, N. (2002). *Citizenship and the boundaries of the acknowledged community: identity, affiliation and exclusion*. Working Paper 171. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Kadish, A. (1982). *The Oxford economists in the late nineteenth century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kadish, A. (1989). *Historians, economics, and economic history*. London: Routledge.

Kadish, A. (1993). ‘Oxford economics in the later nineteenth century’. In A. Kadish and K. Tribe (Eds.), *The market for political economy: the advent of economics in British university culture, 1850-1905*. London: Routledge, pp.42-77.

Kadish, A. and Tribe, K. (1993). *The market for political economy: the advent of economics in British university culture, 1850-1905*. London: Routledge.

Kasper, S. (2012). ‘Eveline Mabel Burns: the neglected contributions of a social security pioneer’, *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 34(3), pp.321-337.

Kassam, A. (2014). ‘Spain’s everyday internet warrior who cut free from Google’s tentacles’, *The Guardian*, 13 May, Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/may/13/spain-everyman-google-mario-costeja-gonzalez. (Accessed: 20 November 2017).

Katznelson, I. (1996). ‘Knowledge about what? Policy intellectuals and the New Liberalism’. In D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (Eds.), *States, social knowledge and the origins of modern social policies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp.17-47.

Katznelson, I. (2004). *Desolation and enlightenment: political knowledge after total war, totalitarianism, and the holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. (Ed.) (2002). *Resourcing sources: the use of computers in developing prosopographical methodology*. Oxford: Unit for Prosopographical Research, Linacre College.

Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. (Ed.) (2007). *Prosopography approaches and applications: a handbook.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelleher, M. (1997). ‘‘Philosophick views?’: Maria Edgeworth and the Great Famine’, *Eire-Ireland*, 32, pp.41-62.

Kelly, J. (1984). *Women, history and theory the essays of Joan Kelly*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kelly, L., Regan, L. and Burton, S. (1992). 'Defending the indefensible? Quantitative methods and feminist research'. In H. Hinds, A. Phoenix and J. Stacey (Eds.), *Working out: new directions in women's studies*. Lewes: Falmer Press, pp.149-161.

Kenney, S. (2003). 'Where is gender in agenda setting?', *Women and Politics*, 25(1-2), pp.179-207.

Kent, S.K. (1988). 'The politics of sexual difference: World War I and the demise of British feminism', *Journal of British Studies*, 27(3), pp.232-253.

Kershaw, I. (2008). 'Biography and the historian: opportunities and constraints'. In V.R. Berghahn and S. Lässig (Eds.), *Biography between structure and agency: central European lives in international historiography*. New York: Berghahn, pp.27-39.

Keynes, J.M. (1924). 'Alfred Marshall, 1842-1924', *Economic Journal*, 34(135), pp.311-372.

Kha, H. and Swain, W. (2016). 'The enactment of the Matrimonial Causes Act 1857: the Campbell Commission and the Parliamentary Debates', *The Journal of Legal History*, 37(3), pp.303-330.

King, S. (2004). ''We might be trusted': female poor law guardians and the development of the New Poor Law: the case of Bolton, England, 1880-1906', *International Review of Social History*, 49(1), pp.27-46.

Kingdon, J.W. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Kirk, E. (2003). 'Women academics at Royal Holloway and Bedford Colleges, 1939-69', *Historical Research*, 76(191), pp.128-50.

Kirsch, G. (1994). 'The politics of I-dropping', *College Composition and Communication*, 45(3), pp.381-383.

Klein, V. (1946). *The feminine character: history of an ideology*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

Knight, B. (Ed.) (2011). *A minority view: what Beatrice Webb would say now*. London: Alliance Publishing Trust and the Webb Memorial Trust.

Knight, K.L. (2018). *A.C. Pigou and the 'Marshallian' thought style: a study in the philosophy and mathematics underlying Cambridge economics*. London: Macmillan.

Knights, B. (2010). *The idea of the clerisy in the nineteenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knüsel, A. (2012). *Framing China: media images and political debates in Britain, the USA and Switzerland, 1900-1950*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Komine, A. (2014). *Keynes and his contemporaries: tradition and enterprise in the Cambridge School of Economics*. London: Routledge.

Korpi, W. (1983). *The democratic class struggle*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Koven, S. (1993). 'Borderlands: women, voluntary action, and child welfare in Britain, 1840-1914'. In S. Koven and S. Michel (Eds.), *Mothers of a new world:*

maternalist politics and the origins of welfare states. New York: Routledge, pp.94-135.

Koven, S. and Michel, S. (1990). 'Womanly duties: maternalist politics and the origins of welfare states in France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States, 1880-1920', *American Historical Review*, 95(4), pp.1076-1108.

Koven, S. and Michel, S. (Eds.) (1993). *Mothers of a new world: maternalist politics and the origins of welfare states.* New York: Routledge.

Krishnamurthy, A. (Ed.) (2009). *The working-class intellectual in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Britain*. London: Routledge.

Kubica, G. (2015). 'Maria Czaplicka and her Siberian expedition, 1914-1915: a centenary tribute', *Arctic Anthropology*, 52, pp.1-22.

Kubica, G. (2020). *Maria Czaplicka: gender, shamanism, race*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kuper, A., Lingard, L. and Levinson, W. (2008). 'Critically appraising qualitative research', *British Medical Journal*, 337: a1035. Doi:10.1136/bmj.a1035.

Lacey, M.J and Furner, M.O. (Eds.) (1993). *The state and social investigation in Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamphere, L. (2018). 'The transformation of ethnography: from Malinowski's tent to the practice of collaborative/activist anthropology', *Human Organization*, 77, pp.64-76.

Large, J. (2003). *The studio and the workshops: Amelia Levetus and the British influence on the applied arts in Vienna*. Unpublished MA thesis, Central European University, Budapest.

Larsen, K. (2017). *The women who popularized geology in the 19th century*. Cham: Springer.

Larsen, T. (2009). *Crisis of doubt: honest faith in nineteenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larson, F. (2021). *Undreamed shores: the hidden heroines of British anthropology*. London: Granta.

Laslett, B. (1991). 'Biography as historical sociology', *Theory and Society*, 20(4), pp.511-538.

Lässig, S. (2004). 'Toward a biographical turn? Biography in modern historiography – modern historiography in biography', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 35, pp.147-155.

Lässig, S. (2008). 'Introduction. Biography in modern history – modern historiography in biography'. In V.R. Berghahn and S. Lässig (Eds.), *Biography between structure and agency: central European lives in international historiography*. New York: Berghahn, pp.1-26.

Lauer, H. and Anyidoho, K. (Eds.) (2012). *Reclaiming the human sciences and humanities through African perspectives*. Sub-Saharan Publishers.

Lawson, J. and Silver, H. (1973). *A social history of education in England*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Lawton, R. (1955). ‘The population of Liverpool in the mid-nineteenth century’, *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 107, pp.89-120.

Leavy, P. and Harris, A. (2019). *Contemporary feminist research from theory to practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lee, H. (2009). *Biography: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leibfried, S. and Mau, S. (Eds.) (2008). *Welfare states: construction, deconstruction, reconstruction*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Lengermann, P. and Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1998). *The women founders: sociology and social theory 1830-1930*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Lengermann, P. and Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (2002). ‘Back to the future: settlement sociology’, 1885-1930’, *The American Sociologist*, 33(3), pp.5-20.

Letherby, G. (2003). *Feminist research in theory and practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Levetus, A.S. (1897). ‘Working women in Vienna’*, Economic Journal*, 7(25), pp.101-109.

Levine, P. (1989). ‘“So few prizes and so many blanks”: marriage and feminism in later nineteenth-century England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 28(2), pp.150-174.

Levine, P. (1990). *Feminist lives in Victorian England*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Levitt, I (1988). *Poverty and welfare in Scotland, 1890-1948.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lewenhak, S. (1977). *Women and trade unions: an outline history of women in the British trade union movement*. London: St. Martin’s Press.

Lewis, H. (2020). *Difficult women: a history of feminism in 11 fights*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Lewis, J. (1980). *The politics of motherhood: child and maternal welfare in England, 1900-39*. London: Croom Helm.

Lewis, J. (1991). ‘Models of equality for women: the case for state support for children in twentieth century Britain’. In G. Bock and P. Thane (Eds.), *Maternity and gender policies*. London: Routledge, pp.73-92.

Lewis, J. (1992). ‘Gender and the development of welfare regimes’, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2(3), pp.159-73.

Lewis, J. (1995). *The voluntary sector, the state and social work in Britain: the Charity Organisation Society/Family Welfare Association since 1869*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Lewis, J. (2001). ‘The decline of the male breadwinner model: the implications for work and care’, *Social Politics*, 8(2), pp.152-170.

Liddington, J. and Norris, J. (1978). *One hand tied behind us: the rise of the women’s suffrage movement*. London: Virago.

Liebovich, B. (2019). ‘Margaret McMillan’s contributions to cultures of childhood’, *Genealogy*, 3(3), 43. Doi.org/10.3390/genealogy3030043.

Lipman, V.D. (1990). *A history of the Jews in Britain since 1858*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: feminist perspectives*. 2nd Edition. New York: New York Press.

Livesey, R. (2004). 'The politics of work: feminism, professionalisation and women inspectors of factories and workshops', *Women's History Review*, 13(2), pp. 233-255.

Lockard, C.A. (2015). *Societies, networks, and transitions: a global history*. 3rd Edition. Stamford: Cengage.

Love, R. (1979). ''Alice in eugenics-land': feminism and eugenics in the scientific careers of Alice Lee and Ethel Elderton', *Annals of Science*, 36(2), pp.145-158.

Lowe, R. (2004). *Welfare state in Britain since 1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

LSE (1934). *LSE Register 1895-1932* (Introduction by W.H. Beveridge). London: LSE.

Luo, W., Adams, J. and Brueckner, H. (2018). 'The ladies vanish? American sociology and the genealogy of its missing women on Wikipedia', *Comparative Sociology*, 17(5), pp.519-556.

Lynch, J. and Rhodes, M. (Eds.) (2016). 'Historical institutionalism and the welfare state'. In O. Fioretos, T.G. Falleti and A. Sheingate (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of historical institutionalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.417-437.

Lyon, E.S. (2007). 'Viola Klein: forgotten émigré intellectual, public sociologist and advocate of women', *Sociology*, 41(5), pp.829-842.

Macadam, E. (1925). *The equipment of the social worker*. London: G. Allen and Unwin.

MacKenzie, D. (1981). *Statistics in Britain, 1865-1930: the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

MacKenzie, N. and MacKenzie, J. (1977). *The first Fabians*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

MacKenzie, N. and MacKenzie, J. (Eds.) (1982). *The diary of Beatrice Webb, Volume One, 1873-1892: Glitter around and darkness within*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mackinnon, A. (1986). *The new women: Adelaide's early women graduates*. Netley: Wakefield Press.

MacLeod, C. and Nuvolari, A. (2006). 'The pitfalls of prosopography: inventors in the "Dictionary of National Biography"', *Technology and Culture*, 47(4), pp.757-776.

Maclure, M. (1993). 'Arguing for yourself: identity as an organising principle in teachers' jobs and lives', *British Educational Research Journal*, 19, pp.311-322.

Kirsten, K. (2002). ‘Female contributions to economic thought, 1900-1940,’ *History of Political Economy*, 34(1), pp.1-30.

Madden, K, Seiz, J.A. and Pujol, M. (2004). *A bibliography of female economic thought to 1940*. London and New York: Routledge.

Madden, K, and Persky, J. (2018). ‘The economic thought of the Women’s Co-operative Guild’. In K. Madden and R. Dimand (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of the History of Women’s Economic Thought*. London: Routledge, p.150-168.

Maddrell, A. (2006). ‘Revisiting the region: ordinary and exceptional regions in the work of Hilda Ormsby, 1917-1940’, *Environment and Planning A*, 38, pp.1739-52.

Maddrell, A. (2008). ‘The ‘map girls’ British women geographers’ war work, shifting gender boundaries and reflections on the history of geography’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33(1), pp.127-148.

Maddrell, A. (2009). *Complex locations: women’s geographical work in the UK, 1850-1970*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Magdalino, P. (2003). ‘Prosopography and Byzantine identity’. In A. Cameron (Ed.), *Fifty years of prosopography: the later Roman Empire, Byzantium and beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.41-56.

Magnello, M. (2009). ‘Karl Pearson and the establishment of mathematical statistics’, *International Statistical Review*, 77, pp.3-29.

Mahood, L. (2009). *Feminism and voluntary action: Eglantyne Jebb and Save the Children, 1876-1928*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mak, B. (2014). ‘Archaeology of a digitization’, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(8), pp.1515-26.

Maloney, J. (1985). *Marshall, orthodoxy and the professionalisation of economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maloney, J. (1993). ‘The teaching of political economy in the University of London’. In A. Kadish and K. Tribe (Eds.), *The market for political economy: the advent of economics in British university culture, 1850-1905*. London: Routledge, pp.20-41.

Malpas, P. (2005). *Housing and the welfare state: the development of housing policy in Britain.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malvery. O. (1907). *The soul market, with which is included ‘The heart of things’.* London: Hutchinson & Co.

Mappen, E. (1985). *Helping women at work: the Women’s Industrial Council, 1889-1914*. Dover: Hutchinson.

Marriner, S. (1956). *Rathbones' trading activities in the middle of the nineteenth century*. Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire.

Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1902). ‘Review: Educated working women by Clara E. Collet’, *Economic Journal*, 12(46), pp.252-257.

Marshall, M. [Paley Marshall]. (1947). *What I remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class: and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martel, C. (1986). *British women in the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1857-1886*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Arizona.

Martin, J. (2002). 'Interpreting biography in the *History of Education*: past and present', *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 14(1), pp.87-102.

Martin, J. (2003). 'Shena D. Simon and English education policy: inside/out?', *History of Education*, 32(5), pp.477-494.

Martin, J. (2005). 'Gender, the city and the politics of schooling: towards a collective biography of women 'doing good' as public moralists in Victorian London', *Gender and Education,* 17(2), pp.143-163.

Martin, J. (2014). 'Intellectual portraits: politics, professions and identity in twentieth-century England', *History of Education*, 43(6), pp.740-767.

Martin, J. (2017). 'Intellectual women, social science, and political power: municipal feminism and reform at the London School of Economics, 1895 to 1960'. In E.L. Panayotidis, Paul Stortz (Eds), *Women in higher education, 1850-1970: international perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp.119-144.

Martin, J. and Goodman, J. (2003). *Women and education, 1800-1980*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, K.C. (2008). *Hard and unreal advice: mothers, social science and the Victorian poverty experts*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Martindale, H. (1938). *Women servants of the state, 1870-1938: a history of women in the civil service*. London, Allen and Unwin.

Martindale, J. (2001). *Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire I, 641-867*. Aldershot: Ashgate. *PBE I Online* edition available at http://www.pbe.kcl.ac.uk/.

Mason, D. (2017). 'Margery Spring Rice: throwing light on hidden misery'. In J. Stewart (Ed.), *Pioneers in public health: lessons from history*. London: Routledge, pp.106-113.

Maton, K. (2003). 'Reflexivity, relationism and research: Pierre Bourdieu and the epistemic conditions of social scientific knowledge', *Space and Culture*, 6(1), pp.52-65.

Mayhew, H. (1852). 'Home is home, be it never so homely'. In Viscount Ingestre (Ed.), *Meliora: or, better times to come*. London: John W. Parker and Son, pp.258-280.

Mazower, M. (2012). *Governing the world: the history of an idea, 1815 to the present*. New York: Penguin.

McBriar, A.M. (1987). *An Edwardian mixed doubles: the Bosanquets versus the Webbs. A study of British social policy 1890-1929*. Oxford: Clarendon.

McCarthy, H. (2016). 'Social science and married women's employment in post-war Britain', *Past and Present*, 233(1), pp. 269-305.

McCrone, K. (1982). 'The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science and the advancement of Victorian women', *Atlantis*, 8(1), pp.44-66.

McDonald, D. (2004). *Clara Collet 1860-1948: an educated working woman*. London: Woburn Press.

McDonald, L. (1993). *The early origins of the social sciences*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McDonald, L. (1994). *Women founders of the social sciences*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McGregor, O.R. (1957). 'Social research and social policy in the nineteenth century', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 8(2), pp.146-157.

McIntosh, M. (1981). 'Feminism and social policy', *Critical Social Policy*, 1, pp.32-42.

McKibbin, R. (1990). 'Class and poverty in Edwardian England', in *The ideologies of* class*: social relations in Britain*, 1880-1950. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McPhee, C. and Fitzgerald, A. (Eds.) (2001). *The non-violent militant: selected writings of Teresa Billington-Greig*. London: Routledge.

McWilliams-Tullberg, R. (1975). *Women at Cambridge. A men's university – though of a mixed type*. London: Gollancz.

McWilliams-Tullberg, R. (1990). 'Alfred Marshall and the "woman question" at Cambridge', *Economie Appliquée*, 43(1), pp.209-230.

Mearns, G. (2011). ''Long trudges through Whitechapel': the East End of Beatrice Webb's and Clara Collet's social investigations', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 13. Doi: https://doi.org/10.16995/ntn.634.

Menand, L. (2002). *The Metaphysical Club: a story of ideas in America*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Menger, K. (1892). 'On the origin of money', *Economic Journal*, 2(6), pp.239-255. Translated by Caroline A. Foley.

Merrill, B. and West, L. (2009). *Using biographical methods in social research*. London: Sage.

Midgley, C. (2010). 'Women, religion and reform'. In S. Morgan and J. De Vries (Eds.), *Women, gender and religious cultures in Britain 1800-1940*. London: Routledge, pp.138-158.

Miller, R.L. (2005). *Biographical research methods* (4 vol.). London: Sage.

Mills, C. [Wright] (1959). *Sociological imagination*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Mills, D. and James, D. (2020). 'Reconceptualising organisational collaborations in social science doctoral education', *Higher Education*, 79, pp.791-809.

Milnes, N. (1955) 'James Seth and the Department of Social Study', *University of Edinburgh Journal*, Autumn, pp.43-53.

Misra, J. (1998). 'Mothers or workers? The value of women's labor: women and the emergence of family allowance policy', *Gender & Society*, 12(4), pp.376-99.

Misra, J. and Akins, F. (1998). 'The welfare state and women: structure, agency and diversity', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 5(3), pp.259-285.

Mitchell, D. (2018). *Against all odds: the life and work of Helena Swanwick*. Bristol: Silverwood Books.

Mitchell, R. (2018). 'Women in the English Historical Review', *English Historical Review*, 2-3. Doi:10.1093/her/cey395.

Montagu, L.H. (1913). *Samuel Montagu: First Baron Swaythling, born December 21st 1832, died January 12th 1911: a character sketch*. London: Truslove and Hanson Limited.

Montagu, L.H. (1941). *My club and I: the story of the West Central Jewish Club*. London: Herbert Joseph.

Montagu, L.H. (1943). *The faith of a Jewish woman*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Moore, L. (2003). 'Young ladies' institutions: the development of secondary schools for girls in Scotland, 1833-c.1870', *History of Education*, 32(3), pp.249-272.

Moore, M.J. (1977). 'Social work and social welfare: the organization of philanthropic resources in Britain, 1900-1914', *Journal of British Studies*, 16(2), pp.85-104.

Morgan, L.A. and Kunkel, S.R. (2006). *Aging, society, and the life course*. 3rd Edition. Berlin: Springer.

Morgan, M.S. (1993). 'Economics'. In T.M. Porter and D. Ross (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of science Volume 7: the modern social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.275-305.

Morgan, S. (2009). 'Theorising feminist history: a thirty-year retrospective', *Women's History Review*, 18(3), pp.381-407.

Moriarty, P. (2011). 'Science as a public good'. In J. Holmwood (Ed.), *A manifesto for the public university*. London: Bloomsbury, pp.56-73.

Morley, E. (2016 [1944]). *Before and after: reminiscences of a working life*. Edited by B. Morris. Reading: Two Rivers Press.

Morley, E.J. (1914a). *Women at the universities and university teaching as a profession. In Women workers in seven professions: a survey of their economic conditions and prospects*. London: Routledge, pp.11-23.

Morley, E.J. (Ed.) (1914b). *Women workers in seven professions: a survey of their economic conditions and prospects*. London: Routledge.

Morse, J.M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K. and Spiers, J. (2002). 'Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research', *International Journal for Quality Research*, 1(2), pp.13-22.

Muggeridge, A. (2018). 'The missing two million: the exclusion of working-class women from the 1918 Representation of the People Act', *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique*, XXIII-1. Doi.org/10.4000/rfcb.1824.

Muggeridge, K. and Adam, R. (1967). *Beatrice Webb: a life, 1858-1943*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Munro Kerr, J.M. (1954). 'The maternity services'. In J.M. Munro Kerr, R.W. Johnstone and M.R. Phillips. *Historical Review of British Obstetrics and Gynaecology 1800-1950*. Edinburgh and London: Livingstone Ltd.

Murray, C. with comments by P. Alcock, M. David, M. Philips and S. Slipman (1996). *Charles Murray and the underclass: the developing debate. Choice in Welfare No. 33.* London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

Musgrove, F. (1959). 'Middle-class education and employment in the nineteenth century', *Economic History Review*, 12(1), pp.99-111.

Myles, J. (1984). *Old age in the welfare state: the political economy of public pensions*. Boston: Little Brown.

Myles, J. and Quadagno, J. (2002). 'Political theories of the welfare state', *Social Service Review*, 76(1), pp.34-57.

Nakagomi, S. (2016). *English middle-class girls' high schools and 'domestic subjects' 1871-1914*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University College London.

Nelson, G. (2010). *A century of covert ethnography in Britain, c.1880-c.1980*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Glasgow.

Nenadic, S. (1991). 'Businessmen, the urban middle classes, and the "dominance" of manufacturers in nineteenth-century Britain', *Economic History Review*, 44(1), pp.66-85.

Neville-Rolfe, S.K. (1949). *Social biology and welfare*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.

Nevinson, M. (1926). *Life's fitful fever: a volume of memories*. London: Black.

Newson, R., King, L., Rychetnik, L., Milat, A. and Bauman, A. (2018). 'Looking both ways: a review of methods for assessing research impacts on policy and the policy utilisation of research', *Health Research and Policy Systems*, 16, 54. Doi.org/10.1186/s12961-018-0310-4.

Nicholson, V. (2008). *Singled out: how two million British Women survived without men after the First World War*. London: Viking.

Nilsen, A. (1996). 'Stories of life – stories of living: women' narratives and feminist biography', *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 4(1), pp.16-30.

Nord, D.E. (1985). *The apprenticeship of Beatrice Webb*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Norris, N. (1997). 'Error, bias and validity in qualitative research', *Educational Action Research*, 5(1), pp.172-176.

Nutley, S., Walker, I. and Davies, H. (2007). *Using evidence: how research can inform public services*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Nyland, C. (1995). 'Beatrice Webb as feminist', *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work,* 6(2), pp.67-85.

Nyland, C. and Rix, M. (1998). 'Beatrice Webb and the Fabian Women's Group'. In P. Beilharz and C. Nyland (Ed.), *The Webbs, Fabianism and feminism: Fabianism and the political economy of everyday life*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.117-.

O'Connor, J., Orloff, A. and Shaver, S. (1999). *States, markets, and families: gender, liberalism and social policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Day, R. (1989). 'Interviews and investigations: Charles Booth and the making of the religious influences survey', *History*, 74, pp.361-376.

O'Day, R. (1993). 'Before the Webbs: Beatrice Potter's early investigations for Charles Booth's inquiry', *History*, 78(253), pp.218-42.

Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, gender and society*. London: Temple Smith. New edition 2015, Farnham: Ashgate.

Oakley, A. (1981). 'Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms'. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp.30-62.

Oakley, A. (1984). *Taking it like a woman*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Oakley, A. (1998). 'Gender, methodology and people's way of knowing: some problems with feminism and the paradigm debate in social science', *Sociology*, 32(4), pp.707-732.

Oakley, A. (2000). *Experiments in knowing: gender and method in the social sciences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Oakley, A. (2010). 'The social science of biographical life-writing: some methodological and ethical reflections', *International Journal of Social Science Methodology*, 13(5), pp.425-439.

Oakley, A. (2011). *A critical woman: Barbara Wootton, social science and public policy in the twentieth century*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Oakley, A. (2017). 'The forgotten example of 'settlement sociology': Gender, research, communities, universities and policymaking in Britain and the USA, 1880-1920', *Research for All*, 1(1), pp. 20-34.

Oakley, A. (2019). 'Fact, fiction and method in the early history of social research: Clementina Black and Margaret Harkness as case-studies', *Women's History Review*, 28(3), pp.360-379.

Oakley, A. (2020). 'Women, the early development of sociological research methods in Britain and the London School of Economics: a (partially) retrieved history', *Sociology*, 54(2), pp.292-311.

Oakley, A. (2021). *Forgotten wives: how women get written out of history*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Obinger, H. (2009). 'Religion and the consolidation of the Swiss welfare state, 1848-1945'. In K. Van Kersbergen and P. Manow (Eds.), *Religion, class coalitions, and welfare states*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.176-209.

Offen, K. (1988) 'Defining feminism: a comparative historical approach', *Signs*, 14(1), pp.119-157.

Offen, K. (1994). 'Women, citizenship, and suffrage in the French context, 1789-1993'. In M. Nolan and C. Daley (Eds.), *Suffrage and beyond: international feminist perspectives*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, pp.151-170.

Offer, J. (2009). 'The Poor Law Commission of 1905-09: a view from a century on'. In K. Rummery, I. Greener and C. Holden (Eds.), *Social Policy Review.* Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 109-129.

Okin, S.M. (1979). *Women in western political thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Oldfield, S. (2015). 'Narrative methods in sport history research: biography, collective biography and prosopography', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 32(15), pp.1855-1882.

Oliver, M.J. and Pemberton, H. (2004). 'Learning and change in twentieth-century British economic policy', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 17(3), pp.415-441.

Orloff, A.S. and Palier, B. (2009). 'The power of gender perspectives: feminist influence on policy paradigms, social science, and social politics', *Social Politics*, 16(4), pp.405-412.

Panayotova, P. (2020). *Sociology and statistics in Britain, 1833-1979*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pande, R. and Roy, H. (2021). ''If you compete with us, we shan't marry you': the (Mary Paley and) Alfred Marshall Lecture', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(6), pp.2992-3024.

Park, A., Bryson, C., Clery, E., Curtice, J. and Phillips, M. (Eds.) (2013). *British social attitudes: the 30th Report*. London: NatCen Social Research.

Parke, C.N. (1996). *Biography: writing lives*. New York, London.

Parkes, S.M. (1996). 'Trinity College, Dublin and the "Steamboat Ladies", 1904-1907'. In M.R. Masson and D. Simonton (Eds.), *Women and higher education: past, present and future.* Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen Press, pp.244-250.

Parkinson-Bailey, J. (2000). *Manchester: an architectural history*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pascall, G. (1986). *Social policy: a feminist analysis*. London: Tavistock.

Paster, T. (2013). 'Business and welfare state development: why did employers accept social reforms?', *World Politics*, 65(3), pp.416-451.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pearson, K. (1900). [Letter to Robert Harrison]. Royal Society. Catalogue Reference: MM/17/66. London.

Pedersen, J. (1975). 'Schoolmistresses and headmistresses: elites and education in nineteenth century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 15(7), pp.135-162.

Pedersen, S. (1989). 'The failure of feminism in the making of the British welfare state', *Radical History Review*, 43, pp.86-110.

Pedersen, S. (1993). *Family dependence and the origins of the welfare state: Britain and France, 1914-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedersen, S. (2000). 'The future of feminist history', *Perspectives*, 38(7). Available at: https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2000/the-future-of-feminist-history. (Accessed: 20 October 2018).

Pedersen, S. (2004). *Eleanor Rathbone and the politics of conscience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Peel, D. (Mrs C.S.) (1914). *Marriage on small means*. London: Constable.

Peel, D. (Mrs C.S.) (1917). *The labour saving house*. London: Bodley Head.

Pellew, J. (1982). *The Home Office, 1848-1914, from clerks to bureaucrats.* London: Heinemann.

Penn, A. (2016). *Women's voluntary action: social investigations into women's health and poverty 1900-1940*. Paper given to the Voluntary Action History Society, 6th International Conference, 13 July 2016.

Pereira, M. do Mar (2012). ''Feminist theory is proper knowledge, but …': The status of feminist scholarship in the academy', *Feminist Theory*, 13(3), pp.283-303.

Perkin, H.J. (1961). 'Middle-class education and employment in the nineteenth century: a critical note', *The Economic History Review*, 14(1), pp.122-130.

Perkin, J. (1993). *Victorian women*. London: John Murray.

Perkins, J. (1989). *Women and marriage in nineteenth-century England.* Chicago: Lyceum.

Perrone, F. (1993). 'Women academics in England, 1870-1930', *Histories of Universities*, XII, pp.339-67.

Peters, G.B., Pierre, J. and King, D. (2005). 'The politics of path dependency in historical institutionalism', *The Journal of Politics*, 67(4), pp.1275-1300.

Phillips, A. (1993) *Democracy and difference*. Cambridge: Polity.

Pierson, C. (2006). *Beyond the welfare state*? *The new political economy of welfare.* 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pierson, J. (2011). *Understanding social work: history and context*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Pietsch, T. (2013). *Empire of scholars: universities, networks and the British academic world, 1850-1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pilgrim, D. (2000). 'The real problem for postmodernism', *Journal of Family Therapy*, 22, pp. 6-23.

Pinzón-Fuchs, E., Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, C. and Herfeld, C. (2019). *Impact factor pressures, scientific practices, and the place of survey articles in the history of economics*. Center for the History of Political Economy at Duke University Working Paper Series No. 2019-09.

Pitt, J. (1982). 'Russell and the Cambridge Moral Sciences Club', *Russell: The Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies*, 1(2), pp.103-118.

Platt, L. (2005). *Discovering child poverty: the creation of a policy agenda from 1800 to the present*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Polkinghorn, B. and Thomson, D.L. (1998). *Adam Smith's daughters. Eight prominent women economists from the eighteenth century to the present*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Pollard, L. (2020). *Margery Spring Rice: pioneer of women's health in the early twentieth century*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

Pomata, G. (2004). 'Rejoinder to Pygmalion: the origins of women's history at the London School of Economics', *History of Historiography*, 46, pp.79-104.

Pomata, G. (2013). 'Amateurs by choice: women and the pursuit of independent scholarship in twentieth-century historical writing', *Centaurus. An International Journal of the History of Science and its Cultural Aspects*, 55(2), pp.196-219.

Pooley, S. (2013). 'Parenthood, child-rearing and fertility in England, 1850-1914', *The History of the Family*, 18(1), pp.83-106.

Porter, R. (2000). *London: a social history*. London: Penguin.

Porter, T.M. and Ross, D. (Eds.) (2003). *The Cambridge history of science Volume 7: the modern social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Potter, B. (1888). 'Pages from a work-girl's diary', *The Nineteenth Century*, XXIV, pp.301-14.

Potter, B. (1889). 'The docks'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.184-208.

Potter, B. (1889). 'The Jewish community'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.564-590.

Potter, B. (1889). 'The tailoring trade'. In C. Booth (Ed.), *Labour and life of the people*. Vol.1: East London. London: Williams and Norgate, pp.209-240.

Potter, B. (1890). 'The Lords and the sweating system', *Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, 27(160), pp.885-905.

Powell, M. (2020). 'The eureka moment? The creation of the British welfare state', *Social Work and Social Sciences Review*, 20(3), pp.12-33.

Prentice, A. (1999). 'Workers, professionals, pilgrims: tracing Canadian women teachers' histories'. In K. Weiler and S. Middleton (Eds.), *Telling women's lives: narrative inquiries in the history of women's education*. Buckingham: Open University Press, pp.25-42.

Preston, I. (2018). 'Women in the early days of the RES', *Royal Economic Society Newsletter*, 182, pp.19-21.

Prochaska, F. (1980). *Women and philanthropy in 19th Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pycior, H., Slack, N. and Abir-Am, P. (Eds.) (1996). *Creative couples in the sciences.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Pugh, M. (1982). *The making of modern British politics, 1867-1939*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Purvis, J. (1991). *A history of women's education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Purvis, J. (2018). ''A glass half full'? Women's history in the UK', *Women's History Review*, 27(1), pp.88-108.

Purvis, J. (Ed.) (1995). *Women's history in Britain, 1850-1945*. London: UCL Press.

Purvis, J. and Holton, S. (Eds.) (2000). *Votes for women*. London: Routledge.

Raemdonck, L. (2000). *Methodological reflections on the prosopographical study of academics: Bourdieu's sociological theory and its application in a historical context*. Paper presented at the International Commission for the History of Universities, Oslo 2000.

Raftery, D. (2002). ‘The opening of higher education to women in nineteenth century England: ‘unexpected revolution’ or inevitable change?’, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(4), pp.331-346.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1992). ‘On feminist methodology: male reason versus female empowerment’, *Sociology*, 26(2), pp.207-212.

Raven, J. (2007). ‘The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: dictionary or encyclopaedia’, *The Historical Journal*, 50(4), pp.991-1006.

Ravenhill, A. (1951). *Memoirs of an educational pioneer*. Toronto: Dent.

Rayner-Canham, M.F. and Rayner-Canham, G. (2008). *Chemistry was their life: pioneering British women chemists, 1880-1949*. London: Imperial College Press.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rendall, J. (1985). *The origins of modern feminism: women in Britain, France and the United States, 1780-1860*. London: Macmillan.

Rendall, J. (Ed.) (1987). *Equal but different: women’s politics 1800-1914*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rendel, M. (1980). ‘How many women academics, 1912-1976?’. In R. Deem (Ed.), *Schooling for women’s work*. London: Routledge, pp.142-161.

Renders, H. and de Haan, B. (Eds.) (2013). *Theoretical discussions of biography: approaches from history, microhistory, and life writing*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.

Renwick C. (2011). ‘From political economy to sociology: Francis Galton and the social-scientific origins of eugenics’, *British Journal of the History of Science*, 44(162, Pt 3), pp.343-69.

Renwick, C. (2012). *British sociology’s lost biological roots: a history of futures past*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (1901). ‘Economic conditions in ancient India’, *Economic Journal*, 11(43), pp.305-320.

Richardson, A. (2003). *Love and eugenics in the late nineteenth century: rational reproduction and the new woman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, A. and Willis, C. (Eds.) (2002). *The new woman in fiction and in fact: fin-de-siècle feminisms*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave.

Richardson, S. (2006). ‘*“You know your father’s heart”: the Cobden sisterhood and the legacy of Richard Cobden’.* In A. Howe and S. Morgan (Eds.), *Rethinking nineteenth-century liberalism: Richard Cobden bicentenary essays. Modern economic and social history series*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.229-246.

Richmond, M.L. (2001). ‘Women in the early history of genetics: William Bateson and the Newnham College Mendelians, 1900-1910’, *Isis*, 92(1), pp. 55-90.

Rickard, J. (1979). ‘The anti-sweating movement in Britain and Victoria: the politics of empire and social reform’, *Australian Historical Studies*, 18(73), pp.582-597.

Riley, D. (1988). *“Am I that name?” Feminism and the category ‘women’ in history*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rinaldi, J. (2013). ‘Reflexivity in disability research: disability between the lines’, *Disability Studies Quarterly*, pp.33(2).

Risman, B.J., Sprague, J. and Howard, J. (1993). ‘Comment on Francesca M. Cancian’s ‘Feminist Science’’, *Gender & Society*, 7(4), pp.608-609.

Rivière, P. (2007). (Ed.) *A history of Oxford anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, B. (2001). *Biographical research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Roberts, D. (2003). ‘Charity disestablished? The origins of the Charity Organisation Society revisited, 1868-1871’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54(1), pp.40-61.

Roberts, H. (Ed.) (1981). *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Robinson, J. (2010). *Bluestockings. The remarkable story of the first women to fight for an education*. London: Penguin.

Robinson, J. (2015). *In the family way: illegitimacy between the Great War and the swinging sixties.* London: Viking.

Robson, J. (2016). *Radical reformers and respectable rebels: how the two lives of Grace Oakeshott defined an era*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rocquin, B. (2017). ‘The British sociological tradition in the interwar years (1920-1940)’. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis. University of Oxford.

Rodler, C., Kirchler, E. and Holzl, E. (2001). ‘Gender stereotypes of leaders: an analysis of the contents of obituaries from 1974 to 1998’, *Sex Roles*, 45(11-12), pp.827-843.

Rolfe, G. (2006). ‘Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative research’, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53(3), pp.304-310.

Romanes, G.J. (1887). Mental differences of men and women’, *Popular Science Monthly*, Aug, pp.383-401.

Romano, M.A. (1998). *Beatrice Webb (1858-1943): the socialist with a sociological imagination*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.

Rosenthal, N., Fingrutd, M., Ethier, M., Karant, R. and McDonald, D. (1985). ‘Social movements and network analysis: a case study of nineteenth-century women’s reform in New York State’, *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(5), pp.1022-1054.

Ross, E. (Ed.) (2007). *Slum travelers: ladies and London poverty, 1860-1920*. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press.

Rossiter, M.W. (1982). *Women scientists in America: struggles and strategies to 1940.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Rossiter, M.W. (1993). ‘The Matthew Matilda Effect in science’, *Social Studies of Science*, 23(2), pp.325.34.

Rothblatt, S. (1983). ‘The diversification of higher education in England’. In K.H. Jarausch (Ed.), *The transformation of Higher Learning 1860-1930*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp.131-148.

Rowbotham, S. (1973). *Hidden from history: 300 years of women’s oppression and the fight against it*. London: Pluto Press.

Rowbotham, S. (2010). *Dreamers of a new day: women who invented the twentieth century*. London: Verso.

Rowe, M. and McAllister, L. (2006). ‘The role of commissions of inquiry in the policy process’, *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(4), pp.99-115.

Rowntree, B.S. (1901). *Poverty: a study of town life*. London: Macmillan.

Rowold, K. (2010). *The educated woman: minds, bodies, and women’s higher education in Britain, Germany, and Spain, 1865-1914*. London: Routledge.

Rubies, J.P. (2002). ‘Travel writing and ethnography’. In P. Hulme and T. Youngs (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to travel writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.242-260.

Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (Eds.) (1996). *States, social knowledge and the origins of modern social policies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rueschemeyer, D. and Van Rossem, R. (1996). ‘The Verein für Sozialpolitik and the British Fabian Society: a study in the sociology of policy-relevant knowledge’. In D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (Eds.), *States, social knowledge and the origins of modern social policies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp.117-162.

Ruskin, J. (1865). *Sesame and lilies*. London: George Allen.

Rusterholz, C. (2020). *Women’s medicine: sex, family planning and British female doctors in transnational perspective, 1920-1970*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ryan, D. and Bolaki, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Contradictory Woolf: selected papers from the Twenty-First Annual International Conference on Virginia Woolf*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. (Eds.). (1993). *Policy change and learning: an advocacy coalition approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sanders, V. and Weiner, G. (Eds.) (2017). *Harriet Martineau and the birth of disciplines: nineteenth-century intellectual powerhouse*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Sapiro, G. (1999). *La guerre des écrivains 1940-1953*. Paris: Fayard.

Sapiro, G. (2002). ‘The structure of the French literary field during the German Occupation (1940-1944): a multiple correspondence analysis’, *Poetics*, 30(5-6), pp.387-402.

Savage, M. (2008). ‘Elizabeth Bott and the formation of modern British sociology’, *Sociological Review,* 56(4), pp.579-605.

Sayers, J.E. (1973). *The fountain unsealed: a history of Notting Hill and Ealing High School*. Welwyn Garden City: The Broadwater Press Limited

Schaser, A. (2008). ‘Women’s biographies – men’s histories?’. In V.R. Berghahn and S. Lässig (Eds.), *Biography between structure and agency: central European lives in international historiography*. New York: Berghahn, pp.72-84.

Schmidt, B.B. (2014). ‘When the historian spies through the keyhole: biography and ethics’, *História*, 33(1), pp.124-144.

Schwartz, L. (2015). ‘A job like any other? Feminist responses and challenges to domestic worker organizing in Edwardian Britain’, *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 88, pp.30-48.

Schweber, L. (1996). ‘Progressive reformers, unemployment, and the transformation of social inquiry in Britain and the United States, 1880s-1920’. In D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (Eds.), *States, social knowledge and the origins of modern social policies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp.163-200.

Scotland, N. (2007). *Squires in the slums. Settlements and missions in late-Victorian London*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Scott, J. (2016). ‘Leonard Hobhouse as a social theorist’, *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 16(4), pp.349-36.

Scott, J. (Ed.) (2007). *Fifty key sociologists: the formative theorists*. London: Routledge.

Scott, J. and Bromley, R. (2013). *Envisioning sociology Victor Branford, Patrick Geddes, and the quest for social reconstruction*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Scott, J.W. (1986). ‘Gender: a useful category of historical analysis’, *American Historical Review*, 91, pp.1053-1075.

Scott, J.W. (1988). *Gender and the politics of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Scott, J.W. (2004). ‘Feminism’s history’, *Journal of Women’s History*, 16(2), pp.10-29.

Scriven, T. (2012). *Activism and the everyday: the practices of radical working-class politics 1830-1842.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Manchester University.

Seidel, J. and Kelle, U. (1995). ‘Different functions of coding in the analysis of textual data’. In U. Kelle (Ed.), *Computer-aided qualitative data analysis: theory, methods, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, pp.52-61.

Senn, P.R. (1958). ‘The earliest use of the term “social science”’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 19(4), pp.568-570.

Seymour-Jones, C. (1992). *Beatrice Webb: woman of conflict*. London: Allison and Busby.

Sharp, E. (2009 [1933]). *Unfinished adventure: selected reminiscences from an Englishwoman’s life.* London: Faber and Faber.

Sharpe, L.J. (1975). ‘The social scientist and policy-making’, *Policy and Politics*, 4(4), pp.3-27.

Sharpe, M. (1889). ‘Henrik Ibsen: his men and women’, *Westminster Review*, 131, pp.626-49.

Sharpe, P. (1995). ‘Continuity and change: women’s history and economic history in Britain’, *Economic History Review*, 48(2), pp.353-369.

Sheavyn, P. (1921). *Higher education for women in Great Britain*. London International Federation of University Women.

Shefter, M. (1977). ‘Party and patronage: Germany, England, and Italy’, *Politics and Society*, 7, pp.403-51.

Shepard, A. and Walker, G. (Eds.) (2009). *Gender and change: agency, chronology and periodisation*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shiman, L. (1992). *Women and leadership in nineteenth-century England*. New York: Routledge.

Shoemaker, R. (1998). *Gender in English society 1650-1850: the emergence of separate spheres?* Harlow: Longman.

Shuttleworth, S. and Charnley, B. (2016). ‘Science periodicals in the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries’, *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 70(4), 297-304.

Siim, B. (2000). *Gender and citizenship: politics and agency in France, Britain and Denmark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverberg, H. (Ed.) (1998). *Gender and American social science: the formative years*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Simey, T.S. (1961). ‘The contribution of Sidney and Beatrice Webb to sociology’, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 12(2), pp.106-123.

Simpson, R. (2009). *The development of the PhD degree in Britain, 1917-1959 and since: an evolutionary and statistical history in higher education*. Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press**.**

Singer, D.W. (1955). *Margrieta Beer 1871-1951: a memoir*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Siouti, I. (2018). ‘Research Ethics in biographical research: challenges in the field of political participation’, *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 19(3), pp.1-18.

Skidelsky, R. (2000). *John Maynard Keynes: fighting for Britain, 1937-1946*. London: Macmillan.

Skocpol, T. (1985). ‘Bringing the state back in: strategies of analysis in current research’. In P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Bringing the state back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3-37.

Skocpol, T. (1992). *Protecting soldiers and mothers: the political origins of social policy in the United States*. Cambridge, M.A.: Belknap Press.

Skocpol, T. and Amenta, E. (1986). ‘States and social policies’, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), pp.131-157.

Skocpol, T. and Orloff, A. (1986). ‘Explaining the origins of welfare states: a comparison of Britain and the United States, 1880s-1920s’. In S. Lindenberg, J.S. Coleman and S. Nowak (Eds.), *Approaches to social theory: proceedings of the WI Thomas and Florian Znaniecki Memorial Conference on Social*

Theory. Held Nov. 9-12 at the University of Chicago. Russell Sage Foundation: New York, pp.229-254.

Sloane, N. (2020). *The women in the room: labours forgotten history*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Small, E. (2013). *Mary Lily Walker: forgotten visionary of Dundee*. Dundee: Dundee University Press.

Smart, N., Clayton, J., Sherry, P. and Katz, S.T. (Eds.) (1985). *Nineteenth-century religious thought in the west*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. (1905). 'Dangerous trades', *Economic Review*, 15(4), pp.434-450.

Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, E.M. (2014). 'To walk upon the grass: the impact of the university of St Andrews' Lady Literate in Arts, 1877-1892'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of St Andrews.

Smith, G., Peretz, E. and Smith, T. (2014). *Social enquiry, social reform and social action: one hundred years of Barnett House*. Oxford: University of Oxford Department of Social Policy and Intervention.

Smith, H. (1996). 'British feminism and the equal pay issue in the 1930s', *Women's History Review*, 5(1), pp.97-110.

Smith, M. (1916). 'A contribution to the study of fatigue', *British Journal of Psychology*, 8(3), pp.327-350.

Smith, M. (1949). 'An autobiography', *Occupational Psychology*, 23, pp.74-80.

Smith, M.J. (1952). *Professional education for social work in Britain*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Smitley, M. (2009). *The feminine public sphere: middle-class women in civic life in Scotland, c.1870-1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Smythe, D. (2000). 'Putting technology to work: the CD ROM version of the Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire I (641-867)', *History and Computing*, 12(1), pp.85-98.

Soffer, R.N. (1978). *Ethics and society in England: the revolution in the social sciences, 1870-1914.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Soldon, N.C. (1978). *Women in British trade unions, 1874-1976*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Somekh, B. and Lewin, C. (2005). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: Sage.

Spence, J. (2004). 'Working for Jewish girls: Lily Montagu, girls' clubs and industrial reform 1890-1914', *Women's History Review*, 13(3), pp.491-509.

Spurgeon, A. (2012) *The contribution of the women's factory inspectorate (1893-1921) to improvements in women's occupational health and safety*. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Worcester.

Spurgeon, A. (2016). *Women and children in the factory: a life of Adelaide Anderson (1863-1936)*. Worcestershire, Aspect Design.

Squire, R. (1927). *Thirty years in public service. An industrial retrospect*. London: Nisbet & Co.

Staeheli, L., Koffman, E. and Peake, L. (2004). *Mapping women, making politics: feminist perspectives on political geography*. New York: Routledge.

Stainthorp, C. (2017). 'Constance Naden: a critical overview', *Literature Compass*, 14, e12401. Doi: 10.1111/lic3.12401.

Stanley, L. (1984). *The diaries of Hannah Cullwick: Victorian maidservant*. London: Virago Press.

Stanley, L. (1987). 'Biography as microscope or kaleidoscope?' the case of 'power' in Hannah Cullwick's relationship with Arthur Munby', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(1), pp.19-31.

Stanley, L. (1990). 'Moments of writing: is there a feminist auto/biography?', *Gender and History*, 2(1), pp.58-67.

Stanley, L. (1993). 'On auto/biography in sociology', *Sociology*, 27(1), pp.41-52.

Stanley, L. (1995). *The auto/biographical I: theory and practice of feminist auto/biography*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stanley, L. (2000). 'From 'self-made women' to 'women's made-selves'?'. In T. Cosslett, C. Lury and P. Summerfield (Eds.), *Feminism and autobiography. Text, theories, methods*. London: Routledge, pp.40-60.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1990). 'Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes'. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist praxis: research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology.* London: Routledge, pp.20-60.

Stanley. L. (Ed.) (2013). *Documents of life revisited: narrative and biographical methodology for a 21st century critical humanism*. London: Routledge.

Starkey, P. (2006). *'Kindhearted and good with people' or skilled professionals? Social work training – the evidence of student files at the University of Liverpool*. Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire.

Stedman Jones, G. (1972). 'History: the poverty of empiricism'. In R. Blackburn (Ed.), *Ideology in social science*. London: Fontana Press, pp.96-115.

Steedman, C. (1990). '"Public" and "private" in women's lives', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 3(3), pp.294-304.

Steedman, C. (1990). *Childhood, culture and class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860-1931*. London: Virago.

Steel, D. (1989). *Against Goliath: David Steel's story*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Steinmetz, G. (2014). 'British sociology in the metropole and the colonies, 1940s-60s'. In J. Holmwood and J. Scott (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of sociology in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.302-337.

Stephens, J. (1979). *The transition from capitalism to socialism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stephens, W.B. (1998). ‘Secondary and higher education from the 1860s to 1914’. In *Education in Britain, 1750-1914. Social history in perspective*. London: Palgrave, pp.98-124.

Stephens, B. and Cummings, J.N. (2021). ‘Knowledge creation through collaboration: The role of shared institutional affiliations and physical proximity’, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 72(11), pp.1337-1353.

Stevenson, J. (1995). ‘Women in higher education, with special reference to University College, London, 1873-1913’. In I. Blanchard (Ed.), *New directions in economic and social history*. Avonbridge: Newlees, pp.101-109.

Stocks, M.D. (1945). *Fifty years in every street. The story of the Manchester university settlement*. *Publications of the University of Manchester. No. 291.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stocks, M. (1970). *My commonplace book*. London: P. Davies.

Stone, D. (1996). *Capturing the political imagination*. London: Cass.

Stone, D. (1997). *Policy paradox: the arts of political decision making*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Stone, L. (1971). ‘Prosopography’, *Daedalus*, 100(1), pp.46-71.

Stone, L. (1987). *The past and the present revisited*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sullivan, A. (2020). ‘Sex and the census: why surveys should not conflate sex and gender identity’, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 23(5), pp.517-524.

Sutherland, G. (1972). *Studies in the growth of nineteenth-century government.* London: Rowan & Littlefield.

Sutherland, G. (2015). *In search of the New Woman: middle-class women and work in Britain, 1870-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sutton, D. (2013). ‘Radical liberalism, Fabianism and social history’. In R. Johnson, G. McLennan, B. Schwarz and D. Sutton (Eds.), *Making histories: studies in history-writing and politics*. London: Routledge, pp.15-43.

Swanwick, H.M. (1935). *I have been young*. London: Gollancz.

T.S.B. (1957). ‘Sergei De Vesselitsky Merriman, 1882-1957’, *Alpine Journal*, 61(357), pp.532-533.

The Editor (1891). ‘The British Economic Association’, *The Economic Journal*, 1(1), pp.1-14.

Thane, P. (1989). ‘The British welfare state: its origins and character’. In A. Digby and C. Feinstein (Eds.), *New directions in economic and social history*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.143-154.

Thane, P. (1991). ‘Visions of gender in the making of the British welfare state: the case of women in the British labour party and social policy, 1906-1945’. In G. Bock and P. Thane (Eds.), *Maternity and gender policies*. New York: Routledge, pp.93-118.

Thane, P. (1996). *Foundations of the welfare state*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman.

Thane, P. (2004). 'The careers of female graduates of Cambridge University, 1920s-1970s'. In D. Mitch, J. Brown, and M. van Leeuwen (Eds.), *Origins of the modern career*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.207-224.

Thane, P. (2020). 'Beatrice Webb (1858–1943): "A career of disinterested research"'. In U. Frevert, E. Osterkamp, and G. Stock (Eds.), *Women in European academies: from patronae scientiarum to path-breakers*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Akademie Forschung, pp.137-152.

Thom, D. (1998). *Nice girls and rude girls: women workers in World War 1*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Thomas, J. (2005). Was there ever a "London" School of Economics? Paper to be presented at the 32nd Annual HES Conference at the University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA, 26th June 2005. STICERD, LSE.

Thomas, J., Graziosi, S., Brunton, J., Ghouze, Z., O'Driscoll, P. and Bond, M. (2020). *EPPI-Reviewer: advanced software for systematic reviews, maps and evidence synthesis*. *EPPI-Centre Software*. London: UCL Social Research Institute.

Thomas, K. (2005). *Changing conceptions of national biography: the ODNB in historical perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, E.P. and Yeo, E. (1971). *The unknown Mayhew*. London: Merlin Press.

Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.) (1990). *The University of London and the world of learning, 1836-1986*. London: Hambledon Continuum.

Thomson, A. (2016). 'Life stories and historical analysis'. In S. Gunn and L. Faire (Eds.), *Research methods for history*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.104-121.

Tight, M. (2008). 'Dead academics: what can we learn about academic work and life from obituaries?', *London Review of Education*, 6(2), pp.125-135.

Tosh, J. (2000). 'Gender'. In *Historians on history*. London: Longman.

Trentmann, F. (2016). *Empire of things: how we became a world of consumers, from the fifteenth to the twenty-first*. London: Allen Lane.

Tribe, K. (1992). 'The Economic Journal and British economics, 1891-1940', *History of the Human Sciences*, 5(4), pp.33-58.

Tribe, K. (2000). 'The Cambridge Economics Tripos 1903-55 and the training of economists', *The Manchester School*, 68(2), pp.222-248.

Tribe, K. (2005). 'Political economy and the science of economics in Victorian Britain'. In M. Daunton (Ed.), *The organisation of knowledge in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.115-137.

Tribe, K. (2017). 'Henry Sidgwick, moral order, and utilitarianism', *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 24(4), pp.907-930.

Tuke, M. (1928). 'Women students in the universities', *Contemporary Review*, pp. 71-77.

Tuke, M. (1939). *A history of Bedford College for Women, 1849-1937*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1895). 'Petticoat-Lane', *The Queen, The Lady's Newspaper and Court Chronicle*, 97, April 20, 1895, p.674.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1912). *Thirteen years of a busy woman's life*. London: John Lane.

Tweedie, E. [Mrs Alec Tweedie] (1918). *Women and soldiers*. London: John Lane.

Tyler, C. and Connelly, J. (2018). 'Language, aesthetics and emotions in the work of the British idealists', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 26(4), pp.643-65.

Unwin [Cobden], J. (Ed.) (1904). *The hungry forties: life under the bread tax, descriptive letters and other testimonies from contemporary witnesses*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Valentine, E. (2006). *Beatrice Edgell: pioneer woman psychologist*. New York. Nova Science Publishers.

Valentine, E. (2010). 'Women in early 20th-century experimental psychology', *The Psychologist,* 23(12), pp.972-974.

Valentine, E. (2014). *Philosophy and history of psychology: selected works of Elizabeth Valentine*. London: Psychology Press.

Valentine, M.O. (1920). *Dundee Social Union and Grey Lodge Settlement*. Dundee.

Valenze, D. (1995). *The first industrial woman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vallance, P. (2016). 'The historical roots and development of the civic university'. In J. Goddard, E. Hazelkorn and P. Vallance (Eds.), *The civic university: the policy and leadership challenges.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.16-33.

van Lieshout, C., Smith, H., Montebruno, P. and Bennett, R.J. (2019). 'Female entrepreneurship: business, marriage and motherhood in England and Wales, 1851-1911', *Social History*, 44(4), pp.440-468.

Verboven, K., Carlier, M. and Dumolyn, J. (2007). *A short manual to the art of prosopography. Prosopography approaches and applications. A Handbook*. Oxford: Unit for Prosopographical Research, Linacre College.

Vicinus, M. (1977). *A widening sphere.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Vicinus, M. (1985). *Independent women: work and community for single women 1850-1920*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Vider, J. (2017). 'Marginal anthropology? Rethinking Maria Czaplicka and the development of British anthropology from a material history perspective'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford.

Vincent, J. (2007). 'The commerce of ideas: protectionism versus free trade in the international circulation of economic ideas in Britain and France around 1900'. In C. Charle, J. Vincent and J. Winter (Eds.), *Anglo-French attitudes: comparisons and transfers between English and French intellectuals since the 18th century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.194-213.

Wagner, P. (2007). ‘Public policy, social science, and the state: an historical perspective’. In F. Fischer, G. Miller and M. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics and methods*. New York: Taylor & Francis, pp.29-40.

Wagner, P., Weiss, C.H., Wittrock, B. and Wollmann, H. (Eds.) (1991). *Social sciences and modern states. National experiences and theoretical crossroads*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, M.L. (1899). ‘Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Dundee Social Union, December 27th, 1899’, Appendix, DSU, Annual Report.

Wall, C. (2017). ‘Sisterhood and squatting in the 1970s: feminism, housing and urban change in Hackney’, *History Workshop Journal*, 83(1), pp. 79-97.

Walsh, J.J. (2009). ‘The university movement in the north of England at the end of the nineteenth century’, *Northern History*, 46(1), pp.113-131.

Walsh, S. (1989). ‘Beatrice Webb and Bacup’, *Manchester Region History Review*, 3(2), pp.9-14.

Ward, M. (2011). *Beatrice Potter: her quest for a fairer society. A hundred years of the Minority Report*. London: The Smith Institute.

Warren, C., Shore, D., Otis, J., Wang, L., Finegold, M. and Shalizi, C. (2017). ‘Six degrees of Francis Bacon: a statistical method for reconstructing large historical social networks’, *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 10(3), pp.1-16.

Warren, C.N. (2018). ‘Historiography’s two voices: data infrastructure and history at scale in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)’, *Journal of Cultural Analytics*. doi: 10.22148/16.028.

Warwick, A. (1994). ‘The world of Cambridge physics’. In R. Staley (Ed.), *The physics of empire: public lectures*. Cambridge: Whipple Museum of the History of Science, pp.57-86.

Watson, N. (2001). *Daughters of Dundee: gender and politics in Dundee: the representation of women 1870-1997*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Open University.

Watts, R. (2007). *Women in science: a social and cultural history*. London: Routledge.

Watts, R. (2010a). Collecting women’s lives in ‘national’ history: opportunities and challenges in writing for the ODNB. *Women’s History Review*, 19(1), pp.109-124.

Watts, R. (2010b). ‘Introduction: rational dissenting women and the travel of ideas’, *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 26.

Weaver, S.A. (1997). *The Hammonds: a marriage in history*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Webb, B. (1892). *How best to do away with the sweating system*. Paper read at the twenty-fourth Annual Congress of Co-operative Societies, held at Rochdale, June 1892. Manchester: Co-operative Union.

Webb, B. (1907). ‘Methods of investigation’, *Sociological Papers*, 3, pp.345-356.

Webb, B. (1926). *My apprenticeship*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Webb, C. (1992). 'The use of the first person in academic writing: objectivity, language and gatekeeping', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17(6), pp.747-752.

Webb, G. (2005). *The history of the University of Cambridge and education in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1897). *Industrial democracy*. London, New York, Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co.

Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1932). *Methods of social study*. London: Longmans.

Weiner, G. (1998). *Feminisms in education - an introduction.* Buckingham: Oxford University Press.

Weiner, G. (2008). 'Olive Banks and the collective biography of British feminism', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(4), pp.403-410.

Weir, M. and Skocpol, T. (1985). 'State structures and the possibilities for 'Keynesian' responses to the Great Depression in Sweden, Britain, and the United States'. In P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Bringing the state back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.169-191.

Weir, M., Orloff, A.S. and Skocpol, T. (Eds.) (1988). *The politics of social policy in the United States*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Weiss, C.H. (1977). 'Research for policy's sake: the enlightenment function of social research', *Policy Analysis*, 3, pp.531-547.

Weiss, C.H. (1979). 'The many meanings of research utilization', *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), pp.426-431.

Weiss, C.H. and Bucuvalas, M.J. (1980). 'Truth tests and utility tests: decision-makers' frames of reference for social science research', *American Sociological Review*, 45(2), pp.302-313.

Welshman, J. (2013). *Underclass: a history of the excluded since 1880*. 2nd Edition. London: Bloomsbury.

Westmarland, N. (2001). 'The quantitative/qualitative debate and feminist research: a subjective view of objectivity', *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-2.1.974.

Whatley, C. (1992). *Remaking of Juteopolis: Dundee, 1891-1991*. Dundee: Abertay Historical Society.

Whatley, C.A., Harris, B., and Miskell, L. (Eds.) (2011). *Victorian Dundee: image and realities*. 2nd Edition. Dundee University Press.

Wheeldon, C.E. (2014). ''Pioneers in the corridors of power': women civil servants at the Board of Trade and the Factory Inspectorate, 1893-1919'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Goldsmiths College, University of London.

White, J. (2007). *London in the nineteenth century*. London: Vintage.

Whitehead, C. (2003). *Colonial educators: the British Indian and Colonial Education Service, 1858-1983*. London: Bloomsbury.

Whitfield, R. (2001). *The extension of the franchise, 1832-1931*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Whitley, J.H. (1931). *Royal Commission on Labour in India*. London: H.M. Stationery Office.

Whyte, W. (2005). ‘The intellectual aristocracy revisited’, *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 10(1), pp.15-45.

Whyte, W. (2015). *Redbrick: a social and architectural history of Britain’s civic universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiggins, S. (2009). ‘Gendered spaces and political identity: debating societies in English women’s colleges, 1890-1914’, *Women’s History Review*, 18(5), pp.737-752.

Wightman, C. (1999). *More than munitions: women, work and the engineering industries, 1900-1950*. London: Longman.

Wilensky, H.L. and Lebeaux, C.N. (1958). *Industrial society and social welfare*. New York: Russell Sage.

Williams, P. (1987). *Pioneer women students at Cambridge, 1869-81*. In F. Hunt (Ed.), Lessons for life: the schooling of girls and women 1850-1950. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp.171-191.

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research methods in psychology*. 2nd Edition. Maidenhead: McGare Hill/Open University Press.

Wilson, D.A.H. (2003). ‘British female academics and comparative psychology: attempts to establish a research niche in the early 20th century’, *History of Psychology,* 6(1), pp.89-109.

Wilson, E. (1977). *Women and the welfare state*. London: Tavistock/Methuen.

Wilson, M. (2018). ‘A new civic spirit for garden city-states: on the lifework of Sybella Gurney’, *Journal of Planning History*, 17(4), pp.320-344.

Winch, D. (1990). ‘A century of economics’. In J.D. Hey and D. Winch (Eds.), *A century of economics: 100 years of the Royal Economic Society*. London: Blackwell.

Winch, D. (2014). ‘Keynes and the British Academy’, *The Historical Journal*, 57(3), pp.751-771.

Winkelstein, W. (2006). ‘Janet Elizabeth Lane-Claypon: a forgotten epidemiologic pioneer’, *Epidemiology*, 17(6), p.705.

Winter, J.M. (1985). *The Great War and the British people*. Houndmills: Macmillan.

Wise, S. (2009). *The blackest streets: the life and death of a Victorian slum*. London: Vintage Books.

Wisselgren, P. (2021). ‘Women and extra-academic social research in Sweden 1900-1950: a sociology of knowledge approach’, *International Review of Sociology*, 31(1), pp.123-143.

Wohl, A.S. (2009). *The eternal slum: housing and social policy in Victorian London*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Wood, F. (1913a). ‘The course of real wages in London, 1900-12’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 77(1), pp.1-68.

Wood, F. (1913b). ‘The construction of index numbers to show changes in the price of the principal articles of food for the working classes’, *Economic Journal*, 23(92), pp.619-626.

Wood, F. (1916). ‘The increase in the cost of food for different classes of society since the outbreak of war’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 79(4), pp.501-508.

Woollacott, A. (1994). *On her their lives depend. munitions workers in the Great War*. London: University of California Press.

Woollacott, A. (1998). ‘The fragmentary subject: feminist history, official records and self-representation’, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 21, pp.229-239.

Woollacott, A. (2001). *To try her fortune in London: Australian women, colonialism, and modernity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Worsnop, J. (1990). ‘A reevaluation of “the problem of surplus women” in 19th-century England: the case of the 1851 census’, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 13(1-2), pp.21-31.

Yeo, E.J. (1996). *The contest for social science: relations and representations of gender and class*. London: Rivers Oram Press.

Yeo, E.J. (2012). ‘Social science couples in Britain at the turn of the twentieth century: gender divisions in work and marriage’. In A. Lykknes, D. Opitz and B. Van Tiggelen (Eds.), *For better or for worse? Collaborative couples in the sciences*. Basel*:* Birckhäuser, pp.221-243.

Young, A. (2019). *From spinster to career woman: middle-class women and work in Victorian England*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Young, J.K. (1991). ‘From “laissez-faire” to “homes fit for heroes”: housing in Dundee 1868-1991’. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of St Andrews.

Young, M. (2004). *Malinowski: odyssey of an anthropologist, 1884-1920*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). ‘Women, citizenship and difference’, *Feminist Review*, 57(1), pp.4-27.

Zimmeck, M. (1988). ‘‘Get out and get under’: the impact of demobilisation on the Civil Service, 1919-1932’. In G. Anderson (Ed.), *The white-blouse revolution: female office workers since 1870*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.88-120.

Zimmeck, M. (2003). ‘The ‘new woman’ in the machinery of government’. In R. MacLeod (Ed.), *Government and expertise, specialists, administrators and professionals, 1860-1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.186-202.

Zimmern, A. (1898). *The renaissance of girls’ education in England: a record of fifty years’ progress*. London: A.D. Innes.

Zimmern, A. (1911). ‘Carpenter, Mary’. In H. Chisholm (Ed.), *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. 5 (11th Ed.). Cambridge University Press, p.385.