

Department of History

Research Tools

The Classification of Multiple Occupational Titles in the 1881 Census of England and Wales

Matthew Woollard



XA

Research Tools Department of History University of Essex First published 2001, re-published Dec. 2012 © Department of History, University of Essex ISBN 1-904059-99-6 ISSN 2051-9575

The Classification of Multiple Occupational Titles in the 1881 Census of England and Wales

Matthew Woollard

Research Tools

No. 1

First published in 2001 Re-published in December 2012 by Department of History, University of Essex Colchester, Essex CO4 3SQ

© Department of History, University of Essex

ISBN 1-904059-99-6 ISSN 2051-9575

The Classification of Multiple Occupational Titles in the 1881 Census of England and Wales

Introduction

The study of occupational diversity in past times has progressed slowly in the recent years, mainly because the sources available for use are neither explicit enough in their detail to allow a full understanding nor provide clear means to measure the complexity of individuals' work patterns. Recent theorists have suggested areas where historians might examine multiple occupations and the diversity of work, but very few historians have taken up the challenge because of the unreliable nature of the sources.¹ (For an innovative (and non-census based) approach see Hussey's 1997 article).² This paper does not argue that the census enumerators' books (CEB) are the best available source to measure the incidence of multiple occupations, but instead seeks to demonstrate that the occupational terminology found in the CEBs gives both the fullest picture of the types of multiple occupation carried out in the late nineteenth-century and also some representation of the scale of this phenomena. The result of this analysis of multiple occupations must be seen as a signpost towards the understanding of the plural occupations and plurality of occupational activity, rather than a map of these areas. CEBs would seem to be the only source of representative individual-level data which asked respondents explicitly to list more than one occupation if they followed more than one distinct occupation. This paper takes an abstract approach towards the classification and analysis of multiple occupational titles based on a machine-readable version of the manuscript census of England and Wales of 1881.³

There are two prevailing definitions of multiple occupations, one which includes a number of skilled tasks being carried out by an individual in the pursuit of their occupation: most notably farm labourers must be able to drive a cart, plough, reap, sow, perhaps thatch, and mend agricultural equipment. Some of these tasks may be considered specialist enough in their own right to be an occupation, for example, they could be called carters, ploughmen, reapers, sowers and thatchers but not all those who carry out these tasks would describe themselves as such. These are task-oriented skills which form part of the activities necessary to carry out an occupation, a point not strictly noted by writers on the subject.⁴ The second is less ambiguous: where multiple occupations are actually more than one (separate) occupation or trade carried out by an individual. This grouping can be decomposed into those who, perhaps like a rural 'baker and grocer' who may carry out two occupations in the same place and those who receive an income from two separate activities, e.g., 'innkeeper and farmer'. Not only is location a factor but skill, where even though the skills carried out by two occupations may to a certain extent (and for certain individuals) overlap they should perhaps be considered two separate occupations. It is the second general type that is examined here, because it is the only type that one can explicitly discern in the CEBs. It is obvious that the occupational descriptions given in the nineteenth-century CEBs will never give full and detailed information about occupational diversity but it is the only mass source which allows the examination of occupational diversity over the whole country and over time.

The procedure followed in the collection of the census data may also impinge on the manner in which these occupational titles are handed down to us. In Britain, enumerators left schedules for the householder to complete, and once complete collected them and transcribed them into the volumes we presently call census enumerators' books.⁵ So, one must also always keep in mind the fact that we do not really know how individuals thought when they came to complete their schedules - the majority of individuals would have had little influence on how they were recorded in the schedules and thus the CEBs-and even for those who did complete the forms, we have no real idea of how they interpreted the instructions for the column headed "Rank, profession or occupation". On the other hand, it might be argued that the working population were more likely to be completing the schedules themselves, as they were more likely to be the heads of household. It is also necessary to remember that the CEBs (and indeed the machine-readable version being used here) are multiple recensions of the householders' schedules and may, in many cases, not even reflect the individuals' own interpretation of importance in their occupational entry.6

Definitions

This section deals with the problems surrounding the definition of a multiple occupational title. Traditionally, a multiple occupation, is one which involves more than a single trade or occupation. For example, 'baker and draper' is understood to be someone who carries out both trades, and, if it is found in a CEB we make an assumption that either the first mentioned is more important or the two trades carried out are of equal importance to the individual concerned. The former interpretation seems more probable because of the wording of the instructions on the householder's schedule which stated (in 1881) that 'A person following more Distinct Occupations than one, should insert each of them in the order of their importance'.⁷ This instruction obviously doesn't allow for the latter interpretation to be true. And the rules for classification were

generally, as we will see below, in correspondence with this statement. However, as with all matters occupational in micro-level census studies, not all titles are quite so simple to interpret; there are other considerations in defining multiple occupational titles. Take the occupation, 'Spirit Merchant Draper & Woolen Manufacturer Mayor Of Appleby' for example.⁸ This individual, John Pearson, is involved in three trades and he also holds an elected mayoral post, which, strictly speaking one understands not as an occupation but as a status or a condition. Whichever way this particular occupation demands to be treated it is clearly a multiple. What is more difficult is to decide whether an occupational title like 'Mayor Alderman Iron Merchant' is a multiple or not.⁹ The problem arises because there is only a single *occupational title* here.¹⁰

For the purposes of analysis of the CEBs an operational definition of a multiple occupation is necessary. A multiple occupational title is just that: an occupational entry made up of more than one occupational title-but what the CEBs give us are occupational entries, and, as those entries which are not occupational titles are sometimes considered to be classifiable (e.g., naval pensioner, pauper, etc.) then those part entries which are not occupations must also be considered in the classification process. Similarly, the order of each of the entries must also be considered. The title innkeeper and farmer is clear here – taken at face value this means that the person kept an inn and farmed some land; but it should also be obvious that while someone described as a farmer and innkeeper carries out the same basic tasks, the occupational entry should not be interpreted in the same way. William Bindloss, whose occupational entry is 'Mayor Alderman Iron Merchant' almost certainly earns his income from dealing in iron and should thus be considered first and foremost an iron merchant, but there is also a matter of prestige here. Both Pearson and Bindloss (probably, being heads of household) read the instructions on the householder's schedule quoted above about the order of importance of occupational information. These two men clearly have differing opinions of the importance of their mayoral activities, compared to their more usual businesses. We can look at this in two ways, either Bindloss just considers his mayoral (and aldermanic) position(s) as more important than his iron dealing or his local governmental activities are more important than his iron dealing; in the former case he would be classified as an iron merchant, in the latter he might be classified to some local government category. Given that it is not possible to know which is 'more important', rules must be created to effectively interpret some of these multiple occupational titles and to facilitate comparative research.

Before considering the rules which may or may not assist in understanding some of these multiple occupational entries, some clarification is needed to separate those occupational entries which look like multiples but are in fact single titles. It would seem to be the case that those occupational entries which are a single occupational titles are those that don't usually have the maker, dealer, merchant part of the entry repeated, therefore wine and spirit merchant is a single occupational title. If the entry usually said 'wine dealer and spirit dealer' it might be considered two titles. While there are no occurrences of this particular phenomena it is necessary to consider the possibility. There are also occupational entries which are so similar in terms of economic function; they can be carried out in the same premises and with similar skills, that one assumes that they do not refer to separate occupations, e.g., brass and iron moulder, spade and shovel finisher, black and whitesmith, tin and copper miner, shoeing & general smith. However, each of these titles could be classified, under the 1881 classification rules, to two separate occupational groups. (Here it should be noted that the official classification scheme for the 1881 census had six major classes, which were divided into 24 orders. Sub-orders were used to decompose some of these orders. A total of 414 occupational groups were used.) There are also occupations which are so similar that they are often considered synonymous but are usually treated as one, even though they do exist separately: examples are, chemist and druggist, fitter and turner, hedger and ditcher, and carver and gilder. There are also those that profess to perform more than one process on certain similar raw materials, e.g., cotton stripper & grinder, book folder and sewer.

There would thus seem to be five types of multiple occupation:

- those that are in fact a single occupation;
- those that would be classed to the same occupational group;
- those that would be classified to the same order;
- those that are unrelated within the classification scheme;
- those that are made up of occupational entries as well as titles.

The first category is typified by occupations like boot and shoe maker/closer/clicker etc., wine and spirit dealer, watch and clock maker, carver and gilder, painter and decorator, ship and boat builder).¹¹ There are some ambiguities here which are not easily resolvable: do china and glass dealer, spade and shovel finisher, rope and twine manufacturer belong here or in the second category? The second group includes, typically, saddle and harness maker, stove and grate fitter, cart and wheelwright. Some of these can probably be considered to be the same occupation, but for this discussion, as they are classed in the same grouping in the occupational classification scheme they are considered equivalent. Obviously while these are classified to the same category in 1881 they may not have been in other census years. The third category has the same problems of temporal indecision as the second, and may be typified by

occupational entries such as baker and grocer, or draper and milliner. The fourth type includes occupations like stone mason and grocer. A particular problem surrounds this form of title; that is that we do not know whether these represent the 'life-time' occupation of an individual along with their 'current' occupation or a clear contemporary division of tasks. (It would seem unlikely that anyone would be carrying out the trades of Butcher and Rat Catcher simultaneously, but that is exactly what William Horne of Mollington in Oxfordshire was described as.)¹² The final grouping suggested here includes those occupational entries which include either 'status' or 'inactive' occupational entries, for example, grocer and retired baker. (The potential for ambiguity entries like retired grocer and baker or grocer and farmer's wife should not be neglected.) It is important to highlight the fact that the decision on which of the three true multiple categories (types 2, 3 and 4 above) is dependent on the classification scheme being used.

As part of a process of reexamining the figures published in the census reports, the third and fourth of these types are of particular interest, because the method of classifying the occupations by the census tabulators may have distorted the occupational landscape. For a more detailed examination of occupational diversity, those in the second and fifth groups are also of interest. These groups allow us a greater understanding of the diversity of working practices in the late nineteenth century. Random occupational entries show that we do know a considerable amount about the 'multi-tasking' of people in various occupational categories. For example, nineteenth-century farm labourers would have carried out a range of different tasks; many rural craftsmen would have had to have been master of a number of trades in order to survive throughout the year; the distinctions between certain retail trades were frequently blurred-there would be an overlap in the goods that grocers, provision dealers and butchers would have sold; even within the professions, dentists would (before the 1850s at least) often have had another string to their bows.¹³ The problem faced is how these occupations should be classified-and also how, once classified, they can be analysed by a useful method.

Methods of classification

Before considering the methods which might be used in analysis of historical occupational titles it is necessary to consider any contemporary classification rules which may impinge on our interpretation of these titles. The instructions to the clerks for classifying 'multiple occupational titles' in 1881 are clear, though it is worth repeating the whole rule: ¹⁴

A person is often returned as *following several Occupations*. The general rule in such case is to select for ticking that Occupation which would seem the main or most important one. If there be none such, *the first in the entry* is to be selected; but:

- (a) A *Clergyman who is also a Schoolmaster* must be ticked to Schoolmaster.
- (b) A *Member of Parliament or a Magistrate* who is *also engaged in a profession or a branch of industry,* say as a Barrister, or a Brewer, is to be ticked to the special profession or industry.
- (c) "Auctioneer and House Agent" or "Auctioneer and Surveyor," or other combinations including Auctioneer, to be ticked to Auctioneer.

It should be noted that the schedules and the tabulators' instructions potentially contradict each other, for the schedules tell the householder to put their most important occupation first, while the clerks are asked to classify the main or most important occupation regardless of position and if this isn't clear then the first given occupation. However, the 1881 *General report* gives a slightly different picture. This states that the three general rules followed were, first: "that a mechanical handicraft or constructive occupation should be preferred to a mere shop-keeping occupation"; second, that the more important should be chosen and third, "in default of such apparent difference the occupation first mentioned should be taken, on the ground that a person would be likely to mention his main business first."¹⁵

In classifying the occupations in the machine-readable version of the 1881 CEBs these rules were followed as consistently as possible-where there was conflict the rules reported in the General report were followed as they probably described the most up-to-date practice. A further rule followed in this classification, which relates to farmers, should also be highlighted here. The instructions to the *clerks* are not completely clear. They say that 'All persons returned as farming land, whether the land be their own or hired, are to be ticked to Farmer.'¹⁶ This suggests that all individuals with farmer in the title (except wives, etc.) would have been classified to this group. The rule followed in the re-classification of the 1881 occupations is that in multiple occupational entries, not just farmer has to occur but Farmer (or similar) and either the number of labourers or the number of acres. This means that huge numbers of occupational titles (probably with a national frequency of 1) are classified to this category rather than to either their first listed occupation or potentially the 'most important'. In summary farmer and grocer is classified to Farmer (100); grocer and farmer to Grocer (236) but grocer and farmer of 5 acres to Farmer (100). Some effort has been made to judge some of the titles here, but it is by no means perfect, i.e., someone described as 'Farmer and Baker employs 3 labourers 95 in biscuit works' will have been allocated to biscuit making, but given the sheer volume of entries in the occupation column it is not clear whether this has been done consistently. A further exception here concerns titles like gardener and farmer of 10 acres. All of these have allocated to the market gardener category. The rules quoted above have informed the basic classification of the 1881 occupations, though the interpretation of the phrase 'main or most important one' may not be consistent. Pearson would have been classified to [Wine and] Spirit Merchant and Bindloss to Iron Merchant.

Other commentators on the subject have tended to follow the same line. Classify the occupation that is the most important (which is a roundabout way of saying if one part of the entry is incomegenerating and the other isn't then the income-generating one is classified); if both are income-generating then the one that comes first (on the basis that the individual listed the income-generating jobs in order of importance.) Honorary, voluntary and preaching jobs are always considered 'less important' than other entries within an occupational entry. Anderson et al, in the documentation for the machine-readable 2 per cent sample of CEBs for Britain note that only the first given occupation is used for their classification and two further variables are available for the second and third listed titles.¹⁷ Harvey et al. on the other hand, working with eighteenth century poll books for Westminster, said the "general rule was followed that the occupational description which conveyed most information took precedence".18 They also ruled that dual occupations which occurred in an inverted form to one which they had already decided upon would receive the same codes. Thus they classify the occupation 'stationer and perfumer' in the same way as 'perfumer and stationer', though it is not possible to tell (without checking the dictionary) whether either is classed to an order of people who manufacture or sell perfume or one of those who manufacture or sell stationery.

The scale of the problem

What is the scale of the problem? As a data reduction problem it is quite difficult to say because to calculate it each and every recorded occupation must be inspected. This study examines three English counties from the 1881 census. The total population of this sample is 856,619. Within this sample there are no more than 800 multiple occupational titles which affect two or more people, while there are in the region of 5,000 that affect only a single person. The combination means that around 9,000 people are affected out of a combined population of 850,000. If we say that some 60 per cent are "inactive" then approximately 1 in 30 of those 'occupied' are affected by this problem. This is very much a maximum, as not all titles that only affect a single person have been checked. This is because there is a problem in extracting the multiple titles – it is not just a question of searching for those with ampersands or the word 'and' (e.g., 'Employing 2 Men & 3 Boys' or 'Employed by Jones and Co'), but there is also the problem of deciding whether there are two trades being carried out or not given that two parts of an entry may be semantically identical. The inclusion of these erroneous multiples in this calculation may be balanced by those which are not so easily identifiable, that is those titles which do not include an 'and' or an ampersand, e.g., 'Cook Wainwright'. Presently only four occupational titles have been examined in their entirety. A later article will report in greater detail at the scale of the problem, and at a greater level of accuracy. The large number of people who record multiple occupations give us some ability to look at some of the numbers that were involved in more than one trade, but also allow us to see in a more general manner some of the connections between different occupations.

Table 1 demonstrates the potential effect (in a single direction only) of taking into account multiple parts of occupations in the three county sample. This table shows the total number of people whose occupational title was not classified to the grocer grouping because another occupational title took precedence. The table can be read that there were seven individuals in Cornwall whose subsidiary occupation included a term which would have been classified to group 236, but because of the the first (or more important) title were classified in local government. For all counties the influence of the rule for classifying farmer (see above) is noticeable, but in Derbyshire it seems that grocers predominantly shared occupations with others in the food and lodgings sector, whereas in Cornwall, the textile sector provides a healthy overlap. (In essence the occupational titles baker and draper cause these two groups respectively.) It should also be noted that other occupations like cocoa manufacturer that would have been allocated to the grocery category have not been examined (as part of the multiple element) in this example, meaning that these figures are the lowest possible estimates. The total at the base of the table shows how many people are allocated to the occupational category 236 (Grocer, Tea, Coffee, Chocolate Maker, Dealer) using the classifications for the 1881 census occupations. Note that there is some double counting here: the 'total' in grocery includes those already counted in the sixteenth order in the earlier part of the table. (These need to be deducted to calculate the possible percentage change.) Thus if all those involved in grocery in Cornwall had been classified to grocery; the minimum number would be 2,558 representing an increase of around 12 percent from 2,286. Derbyshire would have seen a 10 percent increase and Westmoreland would show a 7 percent increase. The same exercise is carried out in Tables

		Cornwall	Derbyshire	Westmoreland
Order				
1	Local Government	7	6	0
3	Professionals	0	2	0
4	Domestic Service	1	3	1
5	Commercial	2	2	1
6	Transport	5	6	2
7	Agriculture	61	70	11
8	Animals	9	2	1
10	Working, Dealing in Machines	2	9	0
11	Houses, Furniture etc.	33	30	4
12	Carriages and Harnesses	2	1	1
13	Ships and Boats	2	0	0
14	Chemicals and Compounds	15	13	1
16	Food and Lodgings	32	78	5
17	Textiles	87	25	4
18	Dress	20	12	3
19	Animal Substances	2	3	1
20	Vegetable Substances	2	3	0
21	Mineral Substances	22	54	1
22	General/Unspecified	0	7	0
	Total	304	326	36
	Total in Grocery	2,286	2,499	447

Table 1. Numbers of grocers, 1881 classified elsewhere

Note: see text for explanation and source

Table 2. Numbers of dentists, 1881 classified elsewhere

		Cornwall	Derbyshire	Westmoreland
Order				
1	Local Government	0	1	0
14	Chemicals and Compounds	2	8	4
	Total	2	9	4
	Total in Dentistry	3	36	18

Table 3. Numbers of Wheelwrights, 1881 classified elsewhere

		Cornwall	Derbyshire	Westmoreland
Order				
7	Agriculture	0	28	0
11	Houses, Furniture etc.	2	83	23
12	Carriages and Harnesses	13	48	3
16	Food and Lodgings	0	2	0
21	Mineral Substances	1	2	0
	Total	16	163	26
	Total Wheelwrights	260	673	10

		Cornwall	Derbyshire	Westmoreland
Order				
1	Local Government	0	2	0
3	Professionals	1	2	0
6	Transport	3	3	0
7	Agriculture	8	5	2
10	Working, Dealing in Machines	0	1	0
11	Houses, Furniture etc.	1	2	1
16	Food and Lodgings	1	0	0
17	Textiles	1	0	0
21	Mineral Substances	2	0	0
	Total	17	15	3
	Total in Auctioneering	91	147	32

Table 4. Number of Auctioneers, 1881 classified elsewhere

2 to 4 for dentists, wheelwrights and auctioneers. The number of dentists is rather small but shows their continuing dependence on other forms of occupation in order to sustain themselves. Wheelwrights present a particularly varied picture. In Cornwall only a single additional percentage point is added, but for Westmoreland the increase would be 230 percent: more than double the number of those who used the term Wheelwright used it in a (lesser) combination with another occupation (in this case all 23 are Joiners and Wheelwrights). The spread for auctioneers is not that different ranging from 9 percent in Westmoreland to 19 percent in Cornwall with Derby in between with around 10 percent. These four tables clearly demonstrate that the method of reporting of multiple occupations can significantly affect the final tabulations. It also shows that there are regional variations for some occupations whereas for others there seem to be rough uniformity. What has not been checked in this experiment is the effect of the reverse phenomena, i.e., ignoring the first occupation. For the three counties however, there are no fewer than 209, 437 and 59 (in Cornwall, Derbyshire, and Westmoreland respectively) individuals who are classified to the grocer category who have multiple occupations where the part of the title referring to grocery is first.

The data for Tables 1 through 4 are sufficient to demonstrate the existence and the extent of the problem for 1881. It is also possible to examine the extent of this problem at an earlier date using Michael Anderson's 2 percent sample of the 1851 census.¹⁹ Here the total population under examination is only 398,401 whereas for 1881 856,619 were under observation. In 1851 0.40 percent of the total population under examination were grocers (i.e., have the word grocer in their occupational title), whereas in 1881 this figure (for our three sample counties) has increased to 0.61 percent. This may be an

Order	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	Total
Local Government	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2
Domestic Service	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Commercial	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Transport	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Agriculture	1	-	3	5	1	2	1	3	1	-	-	4	21
Animals	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Machines	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
House, Furniture	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	6
Carriages/Harness	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Chemicals etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	2	9
Food/Lodging	1	1	6	4	2	6	7	6	6	-	2	3	44
Textiles	-	-	5	2	6	2	6	1	11	2	1	1	37
Dress	1	-	4	1	-	2	-	1	3	1	1	3	17
Animal products	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
Minerals	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4
Others	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
TOTAL	6	1	21	14	14	15	15	11	28	10	4	15	154
All in Grocery	92	146	82	197	123	294	160	78	120	88	138	97	1,615

Table 5. Number of Grocers, 1851 classified elsewhere

artifact of the counties selected for 1881, but is more likely to be explained by structural changes in the economy. However, not only does the proportion of grocers in the population increase in the period, the number who are being allocated to a different class because the proportion of occupational titles which could have been allocated elsewhere rises from 9.5 percent to 12.7 percent. The figures for 1851 for grocers are large enough to demonstrate their significance. For dentists however, the figures are not so clear. There were 20 people classified as dentists in the 1851 sample. Had those whose occupations simply included the word dentist a total of 24 would have been recorded. Two were also surgeons (and not 'Surgeon Dentists') and two were also chemists. For wheelwrights the pattern is less conclusive: only 21 would be added to the total of 542 already recorded. Finally, auctioneers would have increased by around 7 percent. Table 6 shows the alterations that could be made for each of the three counties for 1881 and for the whole of the 1851 sample. It also demonstrates that the minimum percentage increase for each of the occupational groups for 1881 is always larger than that for 1851. This would tend to lead to the conclusion that multiple occupations (for these four occupational clusters) were more

Columns: (1) East Anglia; (2) London; (3) North Midlands; (4) North West; (5) North; (6) Scotland; (7) South East; (8) South Midlands; (9) South West; (10) Wales; (11) West Midlands; (12) Yorkshire.

	Total	same code	extra	percentage change
Grocers				
Cornwall	2,286	32	304	11.90
Derbyshire	2,499	78	326	9.92
Westmoreland	447	5	36	6.94
1881 total	5,232	115	666	10.53
1851 total	1,615	44	154	6.81
Dentists				
Cornwall	3	0	2	66.67
Derbyshire	36	0	9	25.00
Westmoreland	18	0	4	22.22
1881 total	57	0	15	26.32
1851	20	0	4	20.00
Wheelwrights				
Cornwall	260	13	16	1.15
Derbyshire	673	48	163	17.09
Westmoreland	10	3	26	230.00
1881 total	943	64	205	14.95
1851	542	15	36	3.87
Auctioneers				
Cornwall	91	0	17	18.68
Derbyshire	147	0	15	10.20
Westmoreland	32	0	3	9.38
1881 total	270	0	35	12.96
1851	137	6	15	6.57

Table 6. Summary of tables 1–5 with additional material for 1851

Note: This table should be read: in Cornwall, a total of 2,286 people were recorded with an occupation falling into group 236 (Grocer). There were 304 people who, if their second occupation had been classified would have been classified here; 32 of these were already classified here because their first occupation also placed them in this group. The final column is the percentage increase that would have been recorded in that particular category if the additional people were included.

prevalent in 1881 than in 1851 and also that they were of greater significance in the classification of occupations. The very slight difference in the question posed to householders in 1851 and in 1881 should be mentioned again (see note 7). Another possible reason for this finding which is counter to the intuitive view that multi-tasking became less common towards the end of the century may be that individuals were more clear in their minds about what constituted an occupation. Hallas' work on rural North Yorkshire has demonstrated that the proportions of the workforce with dual occupation almost trebled between 1851 and 1891. The largest numbers of those with multiple occupations were to be found in agriculture, but the sector with the largest proportion of multiple occupations was in crafts and services. Hallas suggests that the reason for this increase was an individual response to the declining employment opportunities in the area in this period rather than the general expansion of the economy and its increasing diversification.²⁰ A more detailed examination of patterns of the plurality of work will allow a much greater understanding of the economy and peoples' work choices in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Conclusion

The CEBs are certainly not the ideal source to help us establish the incidence of multiple employment, for they do not tell us about seasonal employment and a bland occupational title may hide a multitude of work practices which can not be uncovered. However, what the CEBs do allow us is to glimpse at those in multiple employment and to gauge the relative importance of multiple employment in different areas. The secondary occupation of a grocer in Cornwall is more likely to be a draper than in Derbyshire where grocers with other occupations are more likely also to be bakers. Wheelwrights in Derbyshire are more likely to follow secondary agricultural employment than in either Cornwall or Westmoreland. The introduction of the 1851 data also suggests that there is a temporal dimension here. The analysis of four occupational groupings in 1851 and 1881 shows that despite similar rules used in the tabulation of the information within the census that there was a consistent increase in people's propensity to record more than one occupation which is perhaps contrary to expectations. And not only can temporal change be ascertained by using a uniform classification scheme, gender divisions and the effects of location can be explored. The manner in which one interprets multiple occupational entries does encroach on their study and it is important that a clear operational definition of an multiple occupation is designed before starting out on any such project. Finally, it is the opinion of this author that all definitions of multiple occupations must be based on a single classification scheme which will determine the parameters of an inconsistency within the method of classification – for while it is interesting to know that someone defines themselves as a butcher is also a meat salesman, it does not help us probe how the classification scheme affects the creation of official statistics.

ENDNOTES

Research for this paper was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, award number L212252004: The future of work: an historical perspective. I would like to thank Professors Geoff Crossick, Tim Hatton and Kevin Schürer for their invaluable comments on this paper.

- 1. P. Joyce, 'Work', in *The Cambridge social history of Britain* 1750–1950 Volume 2, edited by F. M. L. Thompson (Cambridge, 1990), 131–194. Cited here at 143; Ray Pahl, ed., *On work. Historical and theoretical approaches* (Oxford, 1998), 48.
- 2. S. Hussey, 'Low pay, underemployment and multiple occupations: men's work in the inter-war countryside', *Rural History*, 8 (1997), 217–235.
- 3. Genealogical Society of Utah, Federation of Family Historians, *1881 Census for England and Wales, the Channel Isles and the Isle of Man* [computer file] (Colchester, Essex, The Data Archive [distributor], 1997). SN 3643.
- 4. W. A. Armstrong, 'The workforce', in *The Victorian Countryside*, ed., G. E. Mingay (London, 1981), 491–495. Cited here at 495; E. A. Wrigley, 'Men on the land in the countryside: employment in agriculture in early nineteenth-century England', in *The world we have gained*. *Histories of population and social structure*, eds, L. Bonfield, R. Smith and K. Wrightson (Oxford, 1986), 295–336. E. Higgs, 'Occupational censuses and the agricultural workforce in Victorian England and Wales', *Economic History Review*, XLVIII (1995), 700–716.
- 5. E. Higgs, A clearer sense of the census (London, 1996).
- Higgs, A clearer sense, 94–115; D. Mills and K Schürer, 'Employment and occupations', in Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books, eds, D. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 136–160; M. Woollard, The classification of occupations in the 1881 census of England and Wales (Colchester, 1999).
- 1881 Census of England and Wales, *General report*, BPP 1883 LXXX, 583-, 116. The schedule for 1851 contains the instruction: 'A person following more than one distinct trade may insert his occupations in order of their importance' (1851 Census of England, Wales and Scotland, *Forms and instructions prepared for the use of the persons employed in taking an account of the population...*, BPP 1851 XLIII, 6). The two subtle differences, relating to trade rather than occupation and gender are unlikely to have made a considerable difference in reporting though the gendered distinction in 1851 may affect the scale of female reported multiple occupation.
- 8. Public Record Office (hereafter PRO) RG 11/5198 f.65 p.40, John Pearson.
- 9. PRO RG 11/5212 f.25 p.25, William Bindloss.
- 10. This may or may not be the case but the point should be clear.
- 11. Of these titles only one, Carver and Gilder, is mentioned specifically in P. L. Simmonds, A dictionary of trade products, commercial, manufacturing and technical terms (London, 1858), 73 though he includes Watch and Clock Tool Maker. Also note Booth's comment: "We have already dealt with wood-carvers, and shall shortly deal with gilders. The combined name [carver and gilder] has a special significance as applying to picture-frame makers." (C. Booth, ed., Life and labour of the people of London, Volume V (London, 1897), 190.)
- 12. PRO RG 11/1526 f.106 p. 2, William Horne.
- 13. R. Samuel, 'Village labour', in Village life and labour, ed. R. Samuel (London, 1975), 3–26; G. Sturt, The wheelwright's shop (Cambridge, 1923); M. J. Winstanley, The Shopkeeper's world, 1830–1914 (Manchester, 1983); C. Hillam, Brass plate and brazen impudence. Dental practice in the provinces, 1755–1855 (Liverpool, 1991). In the final case, Hillam suggests that the use of the title surgeon dentist would diminish the numbers classified to dentist.
- 14. PRO RG 27/5 Instructions to clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people, 3.
- 15. 1881 Census of England and Wales, General report, BPP 1883 LXXX, 583-, 28.

- 16. PRO RG 27/5 Instructions to clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people, 3.
- 17. M. Anderson, B. Collins and J. C. Scott, *Preparation and analysis of a machine*readable national sample from the enumerators books of the 1851 census of Great Britain. SSRC End of Grant Report (HR 2066) filed at the British Library, 1980, D6.
- 18. C. E. Harvey, E. Green and P. Corfield, *The Westminster Historical Database* (Bristol, 1998), 99.
- M. Anderson, B. Collins and C. Stott, *National Sample from the 1851 Census of Great Britain* [computer file] (Colchester, Essex, The Data Archive [distributor], 1979). SN 1316.
- 20. C. Hallas, Rural responses to industrialisation. The North Yorkshire Pennines, 1790– 1914 (Bern, 1999), 42–43.