

**Historical Censuses and Social Surveys Research Group  
Occasional Paper No. 1**

**THE CLASSIFICATION  
OF OCCUPATIONS IN THE  
1881 CENSUS OF ENGLAND  
AND WALES**

**Matthew Woollard**

**Department of History  
University of Essex  
Colchester, 1999**

Published by  
Historical Censuses and Social Surveys Research Group  
Department of History  
University of Essex  
Colchester  
CO4 3SQ

Copyright © Matthew Woollard, 1999

## **Acknowledgements**

This working paper is partially based on work performed on the machine-readable version of the 1881 Census Enumerators' Books. Genealogical Society of Utah, Federation of Family Historians, *1881 Census for Great Britain* [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: The Data Archive [distributor], 29 July 1997. SN 3643. The research is based on Leverhulme Trust grant number F/213/R. Data preparation was also aided by grant number 96/2/HR/03 from the Research Promotions Fund of the University of Essex. I am grateful to Professor Geoffrey Crossick, Dr Lisa Y Dillon, Professor Tim Hatton, Dr Kevin Schürer and Professor Minoru Yasumoto for their critical comments on various drafts of this paper, to Mark Allen for his assistance and Penny Rolfe for her patience.

**Figure 1. 'Paterfamilias filling up the census return'**

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Record types in the Isle of Man database.
Table 2	Comparison of database and published report for Isle of Man, 1881.
Table 3	Comparison of database and published report for those in indoor service, Isle of Man, 1881.
Table 4	Comparison of database and published report for those in agriculture, Isle of Man, 1881.
Table 5	Comparison of database and published report for those working with animals, Isle of Man, 1881.
Table 6	Comparison of database and published report for those working in food and drink, Isle of Man, 1881.
Table 7	Comparison of database and published report for those working in general and unspecified occupations, Isle of Man, 1881.

## LIST OF FIGURES

Cover	George Cruickshank, <i>The British Bee Hive</i> (publ. 1867)
Figure 1	Paterfamilias filling up the census return.
Figure 2	The census enumerator in a Gray's Inn Lane Tenement.
Figure 3	Taking the census in the dark arches of the Adelphi
Figure 4	Clerks in the indexing department of the census

Figures 1 to 4 are reproduced from the *Illustrated Times*, xii (1861).

# THE CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS IN THE 1881 CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES

The most laborious, the most costly, and, after all, perhaps the least satisfactory part of the Census, is that which is concerned with the occupations of the people...<sup>1</sup>

## Summary

This paper discusses the importance of classifying occupations both to the original collectors of the occupational data contained within the late-nineteenth century censuses and to present-day historians with particular reference to the 1881 censuses of England and Wales. It describes the method by which occupational data was collected and prepared for classification in 1881. The remainder of the paper reports on a Leverhulme Trust funded project, demonstrating that the classifications of occupations in the 1881 were remarkably similar to a present-day recoding exercise. We conclude that the rules laid down by the Census Office in 1881 for the tabulation of occupations were acted on as well as possible by the contemporary clerks, notwithstanding the remarks quoted at the head of this paper. The final section demonstrates these results and explains why differences might have occurred.

## The importance of classification

The population of the England and Wales in 1881 was just under 26 million. The number of unique entries in the occupation column given in a machine-readable version of the census enumerators' books (CEB) for this year is estimated at around 1.5 million, though many represent slight variations.<sup>2</sup> In any discussion on the use of occupations in historical research there are two problems concerning the grouping of those occupations into meaningful categories—standardisation of occupational titles and the classification of occupations. The standardisation of occupations given in the CEBs fall into two main categories, those that lose information and those that retain the full information found in the original. The standardisation of the frequently occurring terms 'Ag. Lab.' and 'Agr. Lab.' to 'Agricultural Labourer' falls under the second head, whereas the standardisation of 'Baker', 'Master Baker' and 'Master Baker employing 3 men' fall into the former category. It can be argued that standardisation which loses information is a form of classification.

The classification of occupational titles is the grouping of discrete occupational titles under a single heading. For example, those giving the occupations 'Farm Servant' and 'Agricultural Labourer'—obviously different occupational titles—might be classified together under the heading of agricultural workers. In this case, in the late-nineteenth century at least, people giving themselves either of these two occupations would be performing a similar economic function, the main difference being that the former would generally be employed under a formal contractual arrangement which included living on a farm in which they worked whereas the latter would have been living in a distinct property.<sup>3</sup> Similarly the group defined here as agricultural workers might be classified along with farmers to form an agricultural class. Given that there are an estimated 1.5 million unique occupational titles given in the CEBs in 1881, it is clear that these titles might be standardised to 'standard occupations' before they can be put to any meaningful

use. Given also that a dictionary of occupations produced for the 1921 census contains some 25,000 distinct occupational titles, it follows that classifying occupational titles into groups of similar occupational titles further increases their usability without losing too much of their original meaning. It should be kept in mind that occupational titles, like other nouns, are ultimately only linguistic codes representing our collective understanding of a concept. By extension, occupational titles are in themselves classificatory.

A number of different schemes for the classification of historical occupations have been produced in recent decades. These schemes are to some extent mirrored by the different schemes produced as part of the production of the census in the late-nineteenth century. The following section will describe the value and rationale behind the occupational classification schemes which inform the late-nineteenth-century English and Welsh censuses and their value to the present-day historian will be explained.

### **Contemporary importance**

The contemporary importance of the occupational data is not altogether clear. Detailed occupational data was not collected until the census of 1841 by which time it was under the administration of the General Register Office (GRO). This census saw the introduction of a classificatory scheme – grouping all people (excluding the unoccupied, wives and children) into twelve classes. This scheme was crude, including a labouring class which lumped together miners, charwomen, coachmen and fisherwomen, and while crude, these classifications were not used generally throughout the reports for that year. The more usual form of reporting the data from the 1841 census was in tables of 877 occupations (for England and Wales), listed alphabetically. In 1851, a new scheme was devised, in which occupations were grouped into 17 classes (and one additional for those with no stated occupation). These classes were broken down into 90 sub-classes (including those classes not sub-divided).

This classification scheme and its modifications used in 1861 and 1871 was devised by William Farr, Compiler of Abstracts for the GRO and occasional Assistant Commissioner for the Census.<sup>4</sup> The 1851 classification was described by Farr in the 1851 census report.<sup>5</sup> Here he suggested that the classification was based around five main differences in people's work: skill, talent or intelligence; tools, instruments, machinery or structures; materials; processes and products. The greatest emphasis was given to the materials in which people worked as he felt that the other criteria would follow. This emphasis on the materials in which people worked along with Farr's comments on the value of tabulating classified occupations in the 1851, 1861 and 1871 census reports clearly indicate that the primary use of the occupational data in this period was to calculate occupation-specific mortality rates.<sup>6</sup> The 1851 report stated that:

It was held to be desirable, not only to take out the numbers of persons of each sex in each occupation, but the number at each quinquennial period of age; for without this information the relative salubrity of the professions, and a great variety of important questions, cannot be determined.<sup>7</sup>

without suggesting what the "variety of important questions" were. The classifications used in 1851 were modified for the 1861 census, and in a long appendix to the 1861 report Farr attempted to explain the reasoning behind this altered classification.<sup>8</sup> However, Farr writing in the 1871 general report made his most telling statement as to the purpose of

classifying occupations. He implied that on their own these tabulations, in his opinion, were almost worthless; with the addition of age, calculations could be made of specific mortality, the age structure of different trades, professions of manufacture and age-entry levels for the same.<sup>9</sup> The primary aim, therefore for classifying the occupational data collected in the 1881 census under 414 headings and 24 orders was for actuarial purposes. Medical considerations were almost certainly of secondary importance and it was not until later in the 1880s, in England and Wales, that a particular interest in the economic structure was taken, moved forward with the work of Professor Alfred Marshall and Charles Booth.<sup>10</sup> It is perhaps interesting to note that the Scottish Registrar-General took a much more open view to the potential uses of the occupational data found in the census enumerators books. In 1861, the opening paragraph of the report on occupations, clearly considers that the main use for these data was to throw “light on an important branch of Political Economy”, i.e. what proportion of people are *dependent* on various occupations.<sup>11</sup> The other potential use, according to the Scottish Registrar-General was for the “purposes of Vital Statistics” but as he considered that the classification of occupations in the census was near to useless, as it did not separate out the same ‘trade’ within different occupational classes, and because it did not give the numbers of those dependent on those people, the occupational statistics were not of great value.<sup>12</sup>

The classification for the 1881 census was markedly different from its predecessor. Higgs argues that this was because Farr’s theories on the spread of disease were becoming acceptable.<sup>13</sup> However, the classification in use in 1881 certainly did not satisfy all those who attempted to use it for these purposes.<sup>14</sup> This is not the place to describe the problems inherent within the occupational classifications used within the English and Welsh censuses, but the comments of the Irish Registrar-General in 1871 (which also apply to 1881) make it clear that there were detractors for the British classification scheme. The main qualm given was about the professional class which included private soldiers, postmen and pew openers—“This classification is plainly repugnant to the common meaning of words and the common intelligence of the country.”<sup>15</sup> If a classification is flawed then it should be possible to disaggregate occupations within it. In the case of the English and Welsh classification scheme this is usually (but, unfortunately, not always) possible.

The purpose for the classification of occupations in the census was thus not merely a technique for making indigestible data more digestible but a means to a further end. Apart from publishing the numbers of people in each county under each occupational heading (or order), little use was made of the occupational data collected in the census. The occupational data was, however, used to more effect in the *Supplements to the annual reports of the Registrar-General*. However, it was not until after the 1881 census that any comprehensive effort was made to produce statistics of the occupational mortality using anything approaching the classifications put in place at the 1851 census. The *Supplement to the twenty-fifth annual report of the Registrar-General* published raw data for the numbers of male deaths in each occupational class, order, sub-order, and occupational heading for 1860–1 by age, in England and Wales and the respective sub-divisions, but rates of mortality were only calculated for occupations where there was little uncertainty in the occupational nomenclature as recorded with the registered cause of death. For example, no attempt was made to separate ‘Agricultural Labourers’ from ‘General Labourers’.<sup>16</sup> The following supplement, also authored by Farr, followed the same pattern, but for a selected 62 occupational classes some further detail was given.<sup>17</sup> It was not until the following *Supplement* that a more detailed examination of occupational mortality was undertaken. Deaths over a three year period (1880–2) were abstracted, “by the same clerks, on the

occupation sheets of the same form, as had served for the abstraction of the living in the census of 1881, and the same rules as to the details of the process were observed in each case.”<sup>18</sup> However, as with the earlier investigations, owing to a lack of uniformity in the occupational titles recorded in the death registers, some of the occupational groups used in the census were not replicated in this report. From this it can be seen that the initial purpose of the classification of occupations in the nineteenth-century censuses was a device to make each occupation more manageable, within an understandable but potentially arbitrary intellectual context.

It was not until occupational titles were used to categorise the population by social and industrial class that the census reports used the occupational data for any other purpose. This innovation is generally seen solely in terms of intellectual progression, however the introduction of more sophisticated mechanical devices for the tabulation of statistical data may have had some part in this development as might the external pressures on the GRO from the Local Government Board.<sup>19</sup>

### **Historical importance**

To the economic historian the census is of immense value, especially for the period after 1851. Almost all local and national studies of the economy have used the occupational data provided in the census reports to assist in the description of the economy (and society). This is because the census is the only comprehensive source for data on employment by industrial sector. In fact, because there are no single continuous sources for the other usual economic indicators—income and production, it means, according to Clive Lee, that the occupational data provided in the census, provides “the best single indicator of structural change in the British economy and its component regions”.<sup>20</sup> The value of these data to economic historians can not be underestimated, and the efforts that have been made by Charles Booth and Clive Lee (amongst others) to produce time-series data from the original shifting occupational classifications of the census reports are indirect testimony to their value (and indeed, lack of alternatives). There are two problems however, with the aggregations of Booth and Lee (and others). First, it is impossible to fully disaggregate all the published classified totals into totals for unique occupational groups. In 1861, for example, those following the occupation of ‘Carter’ would have been classified along with others to the heading of road carrier. In 1881 those occupied as carters would have been classified either to the heading of road carrier or that of agricultural labourer; the class would have been allocated depending on whether the individual in question lived in a town or in an agricultural district. This is one example of many hundred slight alterations in the classification schemes between 1861 and 1881; many others can be clearly seen in the Census Office’s own attempt to provide a series of figures for the period 1871–91.<sup>21</sup> The second problem is the reliability of the classification of the occupations by the census clerks. Though there is no evidence to suggest that the occupational data in Britain were ‘edited’, as has recently been suggested for the 1880 U.S. Census of Occupations, there is the potential that the abstraction of occupational data for classification as carried out in Britain in the late-nineteenth century was faulty.<sup>22</sup>

Students of the census will know the value of the published census reports, however, the lack of comparability between the differing occupational classifications makes it difficult to produce accurate comparable occupational totals. At a national level it is unlikely that the margin of error is particularly large and on a smaller geographical scale this margin should not be much greater. But, it must always be remembered that the smallest geographical

unit (in size) for which occupational class totals were published, in the nineteenth-century, was the urban sanitary district, and even then only when the population of that district was over 50,000. The CEBs provide our only opportunity to accurately disaggregate the national totals given in the published reports to an individual occupational level and they provide the only opportunity to calculate occupational class totals, or individual occupational totals for smaller geographic units.

The occupational data in the CEBs therefore allow us the possibility of grouping either by industry or occupation, respectively giving us the potential to view the economic or social landscape of Britain. The problem of devising a meaningful classification scheme will not be discussed here, as this is a subject which has been well covered by others.<sup>23</sup> Similarly other problems which face users of manuscript census returns like under- and over-enumeration will not be covered in this paper as they too have been tackled elsewhere, though almost exclusively for the United States.<sup>24</sup> Misreporting of data is also problematic. Some discussion of this problem will be found below but further analysis within this area is needed.

### **Occupational titles and their use**

Before discussing the collection of census data, it is necessary to discuss a number of the problems inherent in the collection of occupational titles, be it for the census or for any other census-type listing. The first, and most important point to make is that, in the case of the census, the occupation given, should only be considered as that in which the individual was principally engaged on the day on which the census was taken, rather than that generally carried out throughout the year, though it is by no means clear that this was fully understood by those who completed the household schedules; it was understood by the census takers, but is not always considered by more recent users of the census.<sup>25</sup> Also, as with much statistical material, users are often unwilling to examine and understand the provenance and potential imperfections of the raw data provided and take account of these problems in analysis.

The second issue that must be considered revolves around this problem of imperfection within the raw data. The actual meaning of occupational titles, as given in the CEBs should be considered. Both the descriptions of the occupations and their classification are value-laden. And it is as well to be aware of some of the problems that are inherent within occupational titles themselves. The problems inherent in the allocation of occupational title to a class will be discussed below.

First, we should discuss the term occupation as it applies to the census of 1881. The person completing the schedule was asked to give their "rank, profession or occupation". For of those completing the schedule this the last of these three definitions would probably have been the most important. It could, however, mean one of two things. First, what occupation do you follow and second, what engages you during the day. It is likely that most readers of the schedule would understand it to be the former. They would consider that they were being asked to write down the term which was usually used to generically describe what they did for a living. However, there are numerous examples of occupations recorded within the CEBs which refer more to the type of work done than to the simple generic name by which a member of the labour force went under. This is particularly the case for women. The term 'Housewife' is not, strictly speaking an occupation. It is of course a description (albeit highly abbreviated) for what tasks that woman might have

carried out during the working day; ('Help at Home', 'Home Work' and 'Household Duties' are other common examples found in CEBs, though any of these might also be euphemisms for 'Domestic Servant'.)<sup>26</sup> It is also the case for men (predominantly) with the term 'Labourer'. In certain instances this may be an occupation, but it is often an occupational term with no precision unless qualified by an adjective. Those of 'Independent Means' and suchlike can also be described as having given 'their occupation' rather than 'an occupation'. The numerous people who describe themselves in such terms are not describing their "rank, profession or occupation", but their means of livelihood. However, the majority of information found in this column in the CEBs can be said to be accepted occupational descriptions, many of which had been current for centuries.

Simple occupational titles are often confusing. They are generic names for a variety of different tasks oriented, usually, but not always, around the same materials. For example, 'Tailor', an occupation usually taken to mean one who makes clothes; however, within the trade the term specifically means one who makes up or sews together the pieces of cloth that a 'Cutter' has shaped.<sup>27</sup>

It is also important to recognize that the CEBs do not always reflect the schedule completer's own words. The enumerator, as we shall see later, had ample opportunity to standardise the terms given by individuals into terms which the tabulators would understand.<sup>28</sup> It is highly unlikely that many of those people enumerated in the census as agricultural labourers would have defined themselves simply as such—had not the instructions on the reverse of the schedule compelled them—preferring to use a more detailed description of the way in which they were employed around that time of the year. For someone to complete their schedule correctly he or she must have understood the concept of occupational terminology, and it is clear that many did not. The occupational description 'Feeding the Hungry Clothing the Naked' may be classifiable but is not a recognisable occupational term.

Occupational titles, as recorded in the census, also have geographical or spatial peculiarities. Different terms have different meanings in different places. The usual occupation to fall foul of this problem is 'Clothier'. The instructions to the clerks tabulating the occupations state that:

'Clothiers' in Yorkshire and other cloth manufacturing districts are frequently Cloth Makers; elsewhere they will generally be understood to mean Clothes Dealer.<sup>29</sup>

This begs the question—how would someone who sold clothes in London, but who had previously worked in Yorkshire describe themselves? The occupation 'Wherryman' is similarly problematic. Generally such an occupation is synonymous with 'Drayman', someone who drives a dray—a low flat vehicle for carrying bulky or heavy loads, but when used in areas with considerable expanses of inland waterway it is synonymous with 'Bargeman', either the master or a member of a crew of a sailing barge. A further example is 'Hind' which is best explained by a dictionary definition:

Hind; a farm servant, often living in his employer's house; (i) North of England, takes charge of a pair of horses, which he works, feeds and looks after; (ii) (some parts of the North) assists the ploughman, steward or headman; (iii) East Riding of Yorkshire, man in charge of farm where the employer is not resident; (iv) a general utility man.<sup>30</sup>

This form of ambiguity is almost always resolvable with recourse to the original source. However, the dynamic nature of occupational terminology will always impinge on any late-twentieth-century interpretation of a particular occupational title.<sup>31</sup>

Similar to this geographic problem is a temporal problem. Examples of this sort are difficult to find for the nineteenth-century, neologisms being preferred to the creation of homonyms. The meaning of the occupational title 'Pilot' would have been clear in the late-nineteenth century, but since the invention of the aeroplane has become ambiguous. Psychological or perceptual differences in occupational titles are also commonly found. These are generally most hazardous when using a number of historical sources to trace the economic function of an individual. Perhaps we underestimate the ability of the nineteenth-century tradesman to understand the function of the document which he is completing. A census, he might think is a government form, thus he will put down the most generic name for his trade, say – 'Brewer'; whereas in a commercial directory his occupation is recorded as 'Brickmaker and Porter Merchant'.<sup>32</sup> Other sources, may record further variants.<sup>33</sup> Thus the perception or understanding of the eventual use of the information may have tempered the term the informant used in recording his or her occupation. This can also be the case within the CEBs. Prostitutes, when incarcerated in prison will often be described as such, however, when on the streets or in brothels they will be hidden under such terms as 'Milliner' or 'Seamstress' or even 'Unfortunate'.<sup>34</sup> Similarly it would be unusual to encounter anyone describing themselves as engaged in other criminal activities, but at least two occupational titles deserve mention in this context – 'Retired Poacher' and 'Retired Opium Smuggler'. (The only exception to this is those that were in prison whose crime is sometimes recorded along with their occupation.) There are also ambiguities which are not specifically geographic, as they are occupationally ambiguous, but the meaning can usually be resolved with recourse to geographic information. An example is 'Drummer' – either someone who plays a drum or a blacksmith's hammerman. Indeed, 'Hammerman' is another ambiguous occupational title. It can refer to someone who worked a hammer for a blacksmith, but it could also refer to a person in a coal mine who hammered out coal once the seam had been exposed.<sup>35</sup>

There are also a number of miscellaneous problems relating to occupations. The most important of these surrounds the practice of giving multiple occupations. For the 1881 census, as in earlier censuses, householders were instructed on their schedules to list their occupations in order of importance. Consider the occupations 'Magistrate and Farmer of 1000 acres' and 'Farmer of 12 acres and Baker employing 30 men', assuming that in each case the individual has specified the occupation they consider to be most important first. In the former case the latter occupation is probably the one which best describes the economic function of the individual, whereas both could be used to distinguish the social status. The second example is more ambiguous. Given that it is unlikely that a farmer with 12 acres would employ 30 men, we assume that it is the baking function which demands classification. Instructions to abstractors for 1881 ruled that the most important occupation should be taken when classifying, with the exception of farmers and auctioneers. Harvey *et al* followed the rule that "the occupational description which conveyed more information took precedence".<sup>36</sup> The order in which people listed their 'occupations' on their schedules and thus within the CEBs can almost certainly tell us something about the way in which they perceived their role in society.<sup>37</sup> This area deserves further attention.

However, amongst those more humbly occupied there is often an element of prestige rather than economic value involved in their multiple occupations which pose difficulties

in untangling, for example, 'Baptist Minister Quainton Master Coach Builder Emp 1 Man 2 Boys'. Most multiple occupations, however, cause no real problem as the occupations are similar or would be classified in the same general order. (The exceptions seem usually to concern publicans of any description, shoemakers, grocers and drapers.) As a rule of thumb, for census material at least, it would seem wise to consider the first occupation as the one to classify. Examples of stranger pairs of occupations are 'Publican & Pheasant Breeder', 'Shoe Maker & Coal Merchant', 'Grocer & Chairmaker' and 'Butcher and Rat Catcher'.

The general problem with multiple occupations is in the distinction (or lack of it) between the main source of income of an individual as against the social status of that individual. Little work has been carried out on the incidence of multiple occupations, though the 1851 report considered those farmers who also gave an additional occupation.<sup>38</sup> A more detailed study of multiple occupations would increase our understanding of the perceptions of work and occupations in the nineteenth century.

Two further areas can be identified which cause problems in the identification of economic or occupational status of individuals. The first, are those that are unemployed. Respondents, in the 1881 census, were asked to state their occupation and if unemployed they should have noted that fact. The other is for part-time workers, which particularly affects the work of women and children. In the latter case, there are numerous examples of children described as a scholar along with a recognised occupational term. Which of the two mutually exclusive classes should these people be classified to?

Ambiguity in occupational terms is not always location-specific. The term gardener, is taken to mean someone who tends a garden. When dealing with an economic classification we should be able to distinguish between those gardeners who were domestic servants and those who worked in so-called market gardens, even though they perform similar functions and work with similar materials. A dairymaid in a farm performed a different task to a dairymaid in a dairy in a town. The terms sailor and mariner were often used interchangeably whereas the two words are not strictly synonymous. It is obviously not always possible to discern the exact meaning of an occupational title, but one should always be aware of the potential for ambiguity, even when the occupational titles seem straightforward.

The discussion above suggests that we must be wary when using occupational terms given in whatever source we find them. Occupational terms are subject to individual interpretation, and in the census, not only by the occupied person themselves, but by the enumerator too. Occupational terms are temporally, spatially and inherently confusing. We must remember that the occupational terms given in the CEBs are at best only a good approximation of the occupations carried out by individuals, and when classified they can be the cause of a number of errors. Drake gives the example of the 233 reported civil engineers in Somerset in 1841, compared with a total of 854 nationally, suggesting that either enumeration or, more likely, tabulation of different areas was not standard over the whole country.<sup>39</sup>

## Collection of the Census

The method of collecting information from the general public in the form of a decennial census is well-known, but for the purposes of this paper it is necessary to recapitulate the process in some detail. However, this section will only describe the procedure concerning the usual householders' schedules, taking 1881 as an example. A slightly different procedure was carried out for vessels at sea, larger institutions and members of the Royal Navy. Details of these miscellaneous enumerations can be found elsewhere.<sup>40</sup> An "Act of Parliament for taking the Census of England" received Royal Assent on 7 September 1880.<sup>41</sup> The census itself was taken on Monday 4 April in the following year. 34,711 enumerators were recruited in the period between those dates to distribute schedules (during the week of 28 March 1881) to each household or tenement and to collect those completed schedules on either 4 or 5 April. Enumerators then had six days (i.e. until 11 April) to enter the details recorded on the schedules into their enumeration books, "in strict conformity with the rules given therein".<sup>42</sup>

The instructions given to the householders who had been given the schedules were laboriously printed on the reverse of that form.<sup>43</sup> Half of these instructions referred solely to the column on the form relating to the "rank, profession or occupation" of the householder and their family. Despite the exhortation to the public to read these instructions before filling in these forms, it will be clear to all users of the enumerators' books that these rules were not carried out to the full. Details of these instructions are given in Appendix 1.

Once the householders had completed these schedules, or had required assistance in completing them from the enumerator (or indeed their neighbours), the enumerator collected up all the schedules he had delivered and proceeded to copy them out into his enumeration book.<sup>44</sup>

Thus, even at this stage in the census collection process the CEBs are a recension of the original householders' schedules. It is clear that enumerators made five types of alterations in their 'copying' process. First, minor errors, such as spelling mistakes, were corrected (though they were probably introduced as well). Second, given that enumerators were responsible for the completion of a substantial proportion of schedules, information was certainly altered reflecting their own local knowledge. Third, information which would not have occurred on the householders' schedule, was added by the enumerator. For example at Ayott St. Lawrence in Hertfordshire a comment was added in the occupation column that 'A Tramp slept in Mr Pavitts Barn But Left Before the Enumerator Called'.<sup>45</sup> Fourth, it was not beyond the enumerator to falsify information, though this is hardly likely to be significant.<sup>46</sup> The fifth alteration made by the enumerators was a form of standardisation. In the instructions in each enumeration book enumerators were told that "such contractions may be used as 'Ag. Lab.' for agricultural labourer, but care must be taken that the contractions used are such as will be readily understood". An example of an ambiguous abbreviation commonly used is 'C.M.' which can refer to people in Cotton Manufacturing (or Carpet Manufacturing) or to a Coal Miner. There is little information on the editing process undertaken by the enumerators in the process of transcribing information from the schedules to the CEBs as almost no schedules remain. We are able to gain some light from a series that exist for some areas of the sub-district of Llandyrnog in Denbighshire for 1851. Comparison of the schedules completed by the enumerator and those completed by the householders suggest that comprehensive standardisation took

place in the occupational column in the CEBs, especially for those employed as agricultural labourers or domestic servants. In these cases the occupational detail seems to have been too great, even for those whose schedules were completed by others on the behalf of the householder. On the other hand those schedules completed by the enumerators were said to conform “quite closely with the instructions on the back.”<sup>47</sup> These alterations were not likely to critically affect the final census reports, though it would not be extravagant to suggest that in many cases they enhance rather than degrade the quality of information in the CEBs.<sup>48</sup>

Once the enumerator had copied out the schedules and filled in the opening pages of his enumeration book, both were dispatched to the one of the 2,175 local registrars (the officer in charge of the Registrar-General’s operations in each registration sub-district) along with his memorandum book.<sup>49</sup> After “examination and *revision* by the registrar [they] were submitted to the superintendent”.<sup>50</sup> The registrar was specifically instructed to ensure that the occupation column was filled in correctly.<sup>51</sup> The superintendent registrar approved and countersigned the enumeration books and then forwarded them to the Census Office, a temporary office in Craig’s Court, Charing Cross, London, where the next checking procedure was carried out.<sup>52</sup> The completed schedules followed a similar route, but bypassed the superintendent. Thus, both the registrars and the superintendents had the opportunity to revise and correct the enumeration books though there is little evidence to suggest that they did in any wholesale fashion.<sup>53</sup> Tillott has inferred that one Sheffield registrar carefully corrected the enumeration books from the schedules. He cites the entry for a Matthew Parker which gives his occupation as ‘Humbug’. This was altered to give what was presumably on the original schedule—‘Angel or Bishop of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, Victoria Street, Sheffield’.<sup>54</sup> However, we should note that it is by no means clear, in this case who altered the enumeration book. Again, we presume that these alterations enhance rather than corrupt the original data. One registrar gave evidence to a Treasury Committee saying that registrars were unable to completely check the CEBs against the schedules.<sup>55</sup>

The enumeration books were subject to further scrutiny at the Census Office—a process which took some 60 clerks around three months.<sup>56</sup> The instructions “respecting the revision of the enumeration books” are emphatic in the purpose for which this was carried out:

The Registrar-General expects that the revision of the enumeration books will be conducted in so careful a manner as to render the discovery of errors in the future stages of the work of exceedingly rare occurrence.<sup>57</sup>

During this process a number of annotations and alterations were made in the enumeration books, especially under the column containing information pertaining to occupation. These alterations are summarised in Appendix 2. Though we cannot be certain that some further amendments and alterations were made later, it was probably at this time that information relating directly to the classification of occupations were made. These annotations may have been added during the process of abstraction either as a reminder to the abstractor or as a means for checking decisions, but it seems more probable that they were added at this stage. The problem of identifying the authors of these corrections was as hard at the event as at present. On being presented with an enumeration book with the word ‘indoor’ added to the occupation ‘Farm Servant’, William Ogle, the Superintendent of Statistics in 1881, was unsure whether it would have been made by a

registrar or an abstractor. On balance he thought the former, but it seems much more likely to have been made at this checking stage (or by an abstractor), as the classificatory importance of the addition would have been lost on the registrar.<sup>58</sup> However, though, as has been noted above, the enumerators may have standardised occupations, these annotations often resolve ambiguity.<sup>59</sup>

In 1881, in the county of Warwickshire, the occupation 'Fender Fitter', when given in the CEBs, was almost always followed by its classificatory code. This alteration could not have been done by the enumerator, the registrar or the superintendent as they did not have copies of the occupational dictionary—it must have been made at the Census Office by either the abstractor or one of their supervisors. Another example of an alteration that probably occurred at this stage can be found in Warwickshire where the original enumeration book gave the occupation of one George Saville of Aston as 'Proffs of Art Naturalist'. Another hand has added 'Bird Stuffer'.<sup>60</sup> (Note that 'Bird Stuffer' is a heading.) The effect of these alterations is not clear, for though the schedules were available at the Census Office it is not known whether they were referred to at this stage in the process, thus any 'revisions' were not likely to have been tempered by local knowledge and inaccuracies may have been introduced. In the machine-readable version of the CEBs for Leicestershire the following four occupational titles occur:

Range Fitter (Others 21/8)  
 Range Fitter (House Fitter)  
 Range Fitter (21/8 Others)  
 Range Fitter (21/8 O)

It should be explained that order 21, sub-order 8, heading 'others', refers to 'Others in Iron and Steel Manufacture'. Whereas 'House Fitter', is found in order 11, sub-order 2 (furniture and fittings) under the heading 'House and Shop Fittings'. The dictionary of occupations does not contain this occupation under 'Furniture and Fittings' but under 'Iron and Steel Manufacture', but it seems clear that a decision was made, at some stage, to classify at least one individual described as a 'Range Fitter' to a different heading and indeed class. In attempting to resolve ambiguity, these annotations may sometimes cause ambiguity.

Once these revisions had been made the enumerators' books were passed to a variety of clerks for the production of various tables. During this process clerks tabulated the men and women of the country into 414 occupational classifications by quinquennial age groups. To perform this task the abstracting clerks were given abstracting sheets along with printed instructions as to how they should classify the occupations given in the enumeration books.<sup>61</sup> This included a classified list of occupations as well as an alphabetical list. The alphabetical list contains some 8,000 occupational descriptions. Thus, with the aid of this and the classified list of occupations the abstracting clerk should have been able to complete the abstracting sheets. The instructions given to the abstracting clerks are summarised in Appendix 3.

**Figure 2**      **The census enumerator in a Gray's Inn Lane tenement**

**Figure 3**      **Taking the census in the dark arches of the Adelphi**

## Occupational dictionaries

The occupational census is a series of conundrums, the key of which may be, to a certain extent, in that dictionary which the department is said to have...<sup>62</sup>

Alphabetical lists were first provided by the Registrar-General for the abstraction of occupations in 1861.<sup>63</sup> Though a similar classification was drawn up for 1851, no list was created for that year. This strongly suggests that the classifications for this census are highly suspect if the classification was left to the (almost) indiscriminate selection of the abstractors.

The dictionary of occupations was, in the first instance, not created for the specific purposes of the Census Office, but for the GRO as a whole. Viscount Palmerston, then Home Secretary wrote to the Registrar-General, George Graham in August 1854 instructing him to prepare returns giving the chief causes of and average age at death for a variety of different professions. Shortly after, Graham wrote to the Treasury asking for money to produce a "sort of dictionary classifying alphabetically the exact terms by which each of the numerous workers in trades should be designated". He stated that "without this assistance I cannot make as good use as I could wish of the facts which are in my possession as to the varying mortality in different professions; information which is desired by the public now that attention is much called to the benefits to be derived by the working classes from life insurance and which should be given on the same principle as the numbers living in each profession are recorded in the census."<sup>64</sup>

The 1861 dictionary is a highly incomplete document. It was supposedly compiled predominantly from trade directories from London and other large towns.<sup>65</sup> Many obscure agricultural and industrial occupations did not find their way into this dictionary. A revision was made for the 1871 census but has not been examined by this author.<sup>66</sup> For the 1881 census, a completely new dictionary was compiled, with around twice the number of occupations as in the 1861 version. This was compiled using the earlier versions, along with information compiled from leading employers. A pro-forma letter was sent out in January 1881 asking employers for as "complete a list as you can of the sub-divisions of labour in ... .., and of the titles or designations by which the craftsmen in each several sub-division are distinguished".<sup>67</sup>

The dictionary for 1881 was an improvement on its successors but it had two important failings. First, it was not completed in time for it to be used to classify the occupations in the 1881 census of Ireland, having the effect that some headings were different. This also delayed the tabulation of occupations in Scotland.<sup>68</sup> Second, and more importantly, a number of alterations were made during the census abstracting and tabulating process, led to differences in the Scottish and the English and Welsh occupational tables. Between the printing of the dictionary and the publication of the census reports a number of headings, including 'Student' and 'Farm Servant (Indoor)' were excised. (See Appendix 5.) An edited version of the dictionary was sent from the Census Office in London in September 1882 to the Scottish Registrar-General in Edinburgh, but this document only represents a half-way house.<sup>69</sup> It represented neither the original dictionary nor the finished classification. Supplemental guidelines were despatched along with the dictionary which are also of interest as they often augment, but sometimes contradict earlier abstracting rules. The annotated volume is also useful as it provides a demonstration of some of the alterations in classification from the beginning of the abstraction to the end. (However, the final

classification as published in the occupational tables in the census reports also differs slightly from the altered instructions.) The additional rules given in the letter are abstracted in Appendix 4. Together these two facts demonstrate that the occupational classification, for the 1881 census of England and Wales at least, was under a process of constant evolution. One further item of interest may be the occupational title found in the machine-readable version—'Spoon Cutter (Wh Metal) (Dr Ogles Instinctive 3/+1/82)'. Given that some of the transcription in this county is not at its best, one should consider reading instructive or instruction for instinctive. This addition suggests that during the abstraction process, Ogle made a decision that the occupational description 'Spoon Cutter' was to be allocated to order 21, sub-order 12, heading, 'White Metal, Plated Ware, Manufacturer, Pewterer', rather than order 10, sub-order 3, heading 'Domestic Implement Maker' where it can be found in the occupational dictionary. This alteration is not found in the annotated version of the dictionary.

The dating of the letter attached to the revised classifications addressed to the Scottish Registrar-General is also significant, as along with these instructions an annotated copy of the list of occupations and their classifications was enclosed. This suggests that while the abstraction of the English and Welsh enumeration books was well under way, progress in Scotland had been limited. A possible reason for this may have been the fact that in 1871 Scotland had for the first time used a different classification scheme to England and Wales.<sup>70</sup> (It should also be noted that it was not until 1911 that it was seen to be important to use the occupational titles as given in the enumeration books to help compile the dictionary though this probably happened between 1881 and 1891.)

Returning to the abstracting process, armed with the index of occupations, the abstractors ticked each person to their correct category on the abstracting sheet, produced totals for sub-districts, which were ultimately aggregated to produce the totals for each registration county and published in the census reports.<sup>71</sup> A further problem occurs at this stage, and at all subsequent stages. However detailed the instructions laid down to enumerators, registrars and clerks were, it is always possible that they were interpreted differently by different people performing the same task. This is especially pertinent in the process of abstraction where it seems most likely that the abstracting clerks were responsible for one (or part of a) county. Their inconsistency in interpreting individual occupations could have seriously affected the final published totals for counties. The example above concerning range fitters would be appropriate here.

Before ending this discussion of the processes affecting the data within the enumeration books, it is well worth examining the role of the clerks in the process. First, the office in which they worked was described by Ogle as:

very low, fearfully unventilated; they were foetid by the time day was over, quite horrible to go into ... we had perpetual complaints of illness ... two of our staff at the present time [1890] declare that their health was permanently ruined by the foul air ....<sup>72</sup>

A further practicality must be dealt with here. The abstracting clerks were not paid a salary, but by the number of ticks they made on the abstracting sheets. The instructions recommended that the abstractor learn the classification as:

the more completely he fixes them in his memory, the more rapidly will he be able to do the work of abstraction; and as the remuneration will be in proportion to the amount and accuracy of the work done, larger will be his earnings.<sup>73</sup>

How it was possible to check their accuracy is unknown, though the process may not have changed from 1861, when William Farr wrote that the extraction of data from the enumeration books and their classification was not checked. This can be illustrated by the following passage from the 1861 census report written by William Farr:

To have ensured perfect accuracy in all the details, the whole of the abstracts of occupations should have been repeated in duplicate and compared; but with the force at our disposal, this could not have been achieved in the prescribed time. Considerable pains were taken to correct evident errors of nomenclature; to instruct, assist and check the abstractors in their work; so that, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, we look with confidence on all the general results of their labours.<sup>74</sup>

And in the same vein, in 1889 William Ogle wrote the following about the 1881 Census:

... I think it desirable that I should make some remarks upon the institution of comparisons between the occupational figures of successive censuses, because I cannot but feel that persons who have no intimate knowledge of the conditions under which the occupational tables are framed are not unnaturally inclined to ascribe to them very much greater accuracy than in my judgment they deserve. I am not here alluding to the differences in the headings introduced at various times, for such changes are so palpable that no one who is justified in using the tables at all is likely to overlook them; but I mean that, even when a heading has remained throughout unaltered, and has always been intended to denote precisely the same group of occupations, a very considerable amount of difference may nevertheless underlie this apparent identity. For inasmuch as the householders' schedules are filled up by the householders themselves, a preponderating proportion of whom are extremely ignorant men and utterly incapable of accuracy, there are always, even in the case of the most simple industries, a large number of returns so carelessly worded that it is very doubtful under what heading they should be placed; and it is very probable that the views taken as to the tabulation of these doubtful cases may have differed at different censuses, taken as these have been at long intervals, and therefore necessarily to a great extent by fresh hands. Again, irrespective of this cause of possible difference, there is another and more important one. Though precise rules for the tabulation are of course laid down by those in charge of the census, the carrying out of these rules, which cannot but be minute and intricate, has in the main to be left to clerks actually employed in the process of abstraction, and requires on their part great care, considerable intelligence, and scrupulous honesty; and it must be confessed that the mode in which the numerous temporary clerks are gathered together and supplied to the census authorities is scarcely such as to ensure these necessary qualifications. Every effort is made to check the abstractors' work, and in the simpler processes of the census such checks can readily be devised and are sufficiently detective, but in the more complicated processes, such as the abstraction of occupations, no sufficient check other than working the whole occupational abstraction in duplicate can be devised, and such a duplicate abstraction is impracticable on the grounds of time and expense. There is always therefore a considerable risk that in the unchecked portion of the abstraction some unscrupulous clerks may have scamped their work, or some careless

dullards have made unintentional but serious blunders. When the entire country is taken into consideration, or the occupational heading is one under which a very large number of workers is included, the mistakes and misplacements, which may be made equally well on one side as on the other, may be assumed to right themselves sufficiently; but in small areas, or in occupations with comparatively few persons engaged in them, such counterbalancing cannot be relied upon; and consequently much caution is necessary in the use of the figures.<sup>75</sup>

The checking which Ogle alludes to above is possibly more a check on the abstractor. Abstractors were paid a piece-rate for their work. At the end of a month's grind, a sample of their work was reworked by other clerks. If a fixed error rate per thousand was exceeded the abstracting clerk had his salary docked.<sup>76</sup> It is not clear, however, that if the work had more than a certain rate of errors, that that clerks' work was wholly reworked.

So, from the householders' schedules to the census report, the information on occupation was susceptible to alteration and correction from a number of people. These alterations, were in the main beneficial, but they also damaged the integrity of the data. No one, as far as is known, has suggested that the published returns are infallible, but to recognise their imperfections, it is necessary to understand the process by which they were created.

### **Project description**

This introduction brings us to the secondary purpose of this paper, to report on a project to compare the published occupational totals with newly-classified occupations for a single British registration county. In late 1996, a project was established within the History Department at the University of Essex to work on the Genealogical Society of Utah's (GSU) machine-readable version of the CEBs for England, Wales and Scotland for 1881.<sup>77</sup> The project has a number of aims, one of which is to produce an occupational codebook for all the occupations recorded in the database. The total number of occupations for England and Wales is estimated at around 1.5 million. The completed codebook will provide a list of all these occupations with an occupational classification code allocated to each occupation. The classification chosen was the so-called Cambridge code which provides the user with further ability to convert to any of the pre-1921 Registrar-General's classifications, along with the more frequently used Booth-Armstrong classification.<sup>78</sup>

Initial work suggested, however, that the Cambridge code was not stable enough, at the outset of the project, to use with complete confidence for occupational titles in 1881. As such it was decided to code all occupational titles, in the first instance, to the classification scheme used for the 1881 census. The benefits of this method were obvious—first a rough check could be made by comparing the published returns with those from the machine-readable version, i.e., to see whether occupations were being correctly coded and second, because the Cambridge code allows one to compare data from different census classifications, it was considered to be comparatively simple to add this further level of classification at a later stage, rather than to reclassify many titles.

Classifying occupations to the 1881 Registrar-General's classification is a relatively simple but tremendously time-consuming task. The method followed to classify the occupations was simple in practice and fell into two stages. A slight complication followed the information that counties would be passed to the project one by one, so it was decided that counties would be classified as they were received, which led to the possibility that the same occupation might be coded twice if it occurred in more than one county. This

problem was alleviated by merging each completed county occupational classification table into a master table of classified occupational titles. This master table was then used to initiate the coding for the next county. However, there are still some problems of interpretation of particular occupational titles which meant that many occupations were coded twice and careful revision was necessary at the end of the process. At the end of the project all 1,333,792 occupations received have been classified, but because of problems in reading some of the magnetic tapes received from the GSU, we have still not received all the data for England and Wales.

The first stage in classifying the occupations was to create a database of all the unique occupations in a county. Then a series of around 450 database queries, which had been designed to extract from this database as many of those occupations which should fall into a particular classification as possible, was run. Ideally, all those occupations should have been automatically classified to that particular class. However, simple string queries (i.e., all those occupations which include the word 'Baker') are not wholly reliable when classifying many occupations; for example, the occupation 'Bricklayer and Baker' should be classified to the first of these occupations. While many thousand occupational strings were able to be automatically coded, the majority had to be coded by hand. This obviously prolonged the agony, but it was considered necessary, to some extent, to trade efficiency for accuracy. Even in this process there will be errors, but most of these should be corrected when the revised Cambridge codes are added. Some of these errors have been corrected when all the occupations for a county were merged with the 'master table' of occupations when each county has been fully coded.

A consequence of only using the occupational title for classification, i.e., without any other information provided in the machine-readable version of the CEBs, is that a number of occupations will not have been classified in exactly the same way as the 1881 census tabulators. There are five significant areas in which these classification 'errors' might have occurred and these will be discussed below. The other important outcome of this practice is that the number of pieces of information needing to be coded is much lower than it would have been if these qualifying items had been included.

This method of classification is both advantageous and disadvantageous. Clearly, less classification will need to be carried out and accuracy, for the purposes of the exercise reported on below, is likely suffer as a result. However, given that it is difficult to repress imposing one's own assumptions on the occupational terms in isolation, it would be much more difficult doing this with the occupational term *and* additional information. All problems, should be of the variety of adding a parameter to the query, rather than altering the actual occupational classification itself. With or without this problem there will always the problems surrounding the classification of multiple occupations and unverifiable occupations. This process described by some as 'isolationist', is also the preferred technique carried out on the Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples (IPUMS) for the USA and Canada. Matt Sobek, writes in their documentation: "Our classification method leaves the occupational variable independent. It does not superimpose our own notions of social reality, but treats such issues as open questions subject to empirical investigation".<sup>79</sup>

Three further problems have been encountered while classifying the occupational titles. These all concern the manner in which the machine-readable version of the CEBs was created. First, information that had been added in the CEBs in 'another hand' (i.e. not that of the enumerator), was added to the machine-readable transcription in brackets. Information already in brackets was also transcribed in the same way. In some cases this

may be helpful but in others it may be a hindrance to a clearer understanding of the occupation carried out by an individual. An example is 'Nurse (Domestic Servant) (SMS)', where SMS is an abbreviation for subsidiary medical service. For the 1881 classification the sub-orders 'Domestic Servant' and 'Subsidiary Medical Service' were mutually exclusive. Second, the lack of punctuation in the machine-readable version may sometimes pose problems. One case which highlights this type of problem, but in which there is no ambiguity is the title, 'Gardener Cooks Husband (Dom)'. Third, in the case of multiple occupations, Higgs suggests that abstractors may have underlined that component which was to be classified. This underlining is not replicated in the machine-readable version.<sup>80</sup>

The five areas where additional information from the CEBs could have been used by the tabulators to inform their choice in classifying occupations are discussed below. Examples have been taken from the machine-readable version of the Isle of Man, which is discussed more fully below, but there is no reason to believe that these problematic areas are not representative of the country as a whole.

## Gender

In agricultural areas female farm servants seem generally to have been classified by the 1881 tabulators to domestic servants. Without information on gender, these will be allocated in the present classification to agricultural labourers. ('Indoor Farm Servants', when male were first classified as 'Farm Servants Indoor' and latterly aggregated under the 'Agricultural Labourer' heading in the published report.)

## Relationship to head of household

On the basis that those described as 'Gardener', 'Coachman', 'Waitress' or 'Nurse' etc., without any 'domestic' or 'servant' qualifier are always allocated to the commercial variety, problems may occur.

For the Isle of Man, only two people (out of 183) described as 'Gardener' also have the relationship to head of household as 'servant', suggesting that these individuals are more likely to be accurately classified to 'Market Gardeners' rather than 'Gardeners (Domestic)'. No coachmen seem to have been erroneously coded on these grounds, but the following 23 (of only 63) people have been classified as '031' (i.e., Subsidiary Medical Service) are also described as 'servant' in their relationship to the head of household.

1	Monthly Nurse (Sub Med)
17	Nurse
1	Nurse (S Med)
1	Nurse (SMS)
1	Nurse Tender
2	Sick Nurse (S Med)

It is not really possible to consider the problems surrounding 'Inn Servants' and 'Domestic Servants' and their relationship to heads of households, as, technically, both can be described as servants, even if they have a kin relationship to the head of household. There will always be some discrepancy in both the classification of certain occupations within these classes, as of course there would be in the actual job itself.

### Occupation of head of household

Shop assistants, without explicit information as to what kind of shop they worked in were classified to 'General Shopkeepers'. However, if these people were described as servants to their head of household, the classifying clerks in 1881 would have allocated them to the profession of their master. Similarly, children of dealers, such as those given occupations as 'Shop Assistant' would almost certainly have been classified to the occupational sub-order of their parent or head of household. As in the following examples, again from the Isle of Man:

#### Assistant In Shop

Daughter aged 29. Father is 'Baker'  
 Daughter aged 16. Father is 'Plumber'  
 Niece aged 18. Uncle is a 'Master Baker One Man'  
 Sister aged 42. Sister is a 'Fancy Wool Dealer'

#### Assistant Shop Keeper

Daughter aged 34. Father's occupation is given as '---' but brother's is 'Grocer'

#### Assistant Shopkeeper

Sister aged 32. Sister is 'Grocer and Draper'

#### Assistent (sic) In Shop

Daughter aged 17. Father is a 'Merchant'

#### Shop Assistant

Daughter aged 17. Father is a 'Provision Dealer'  
 Daughter aged 16. Mother is a 'Shopkeeper' (Father is a 'Blacksmith' and both sons follow same trade).  
 Daughter aged 18. Father is 'Master Tailor 4 Men 2 Boys'  
 Daughter aged 15. Father 'Railway Carrier'  
 Servant aged 20. Master is an 'Auctioneer'  
 Servant aged 17. Master is an 'Auctioneer'

#### Shop Girl

Daughter aged 24. Father is a 'Master Baker (Employing 3 Men)'  
 Daughter aged 15. Father is a 'Butcher'  
 Daughter aged 20. Father is a 'Grocer'  
 Daughter aged 27. Father is a 'Grocer'  
 Daughter aged 20. Father is a 'Millar'

#### Assistant at Above Business

Daughter aged 23. Father is a 'Hat Manufacturer'  
 Daughter aged 20. Father is a 'Hat Manufacturer'

#### Apprentice to Above

Orphan aged 14. Head is a 'Boot and Shoe Maker'

In the Isle of Man there is also one 'Dealer with Father', who has been allocated to the sub-order 'General Dealers', which is fortunate as the father of this fourteen year-old boy is described as being a 'General Dealer', and thus correctly classified, but there are other examples, in the Isle of Man, of similar problems. A 'Manageress' (classified to 'Managers undefined'), who is the head of household, and has a 20-year old son with the occupation 'Proprietor (Publican)', which, if known at classification, would have resulted in her being classified as a 'Publican'. Similarly, a 29 year old female head of household has the same occupation, but with the information in the address column, it becomes clear that she runs a coffee house. (The address is given as '52 North Quay (Coffee Palace)').

The converse may also be true of the occupations, 'Domestic Helper', 'Help At Home', 'Helps In Lodging Ho', 'Home Helper', 'Domestic Helper', etc., have all been classified to 'Domestic Service', however, in the Isle of Man, seven of the eight people who follow these occupations are all daughters of the head of household (the last is a sister).

### **Disability**

The CEBs for the Isle of Man enumerate 128 lunatics, all but two of these have the relationship to head of household as 'inmate', but almost all have occupations ascribed to them which are classified. Many of those described as blind have given occupational titles, however, it is not always clear whether they were engaged in that occupation on census day or was their previous employment. A small few have occupations like 'Lead Miner' which we can assume are unlikely to be carried out by blind men. However, the descriptions given in this column of the CEB give no indication as to the severity of the disability. All in all 45% of those with 'disabilities' have been classified as 'occupied'. (N=323). If one considers only those who are not inmates only 30% are considered occupied.

### **Geography**

The rules for classifying 'undefined' manufacturing occupations, especially those in the textile industries, were, to some extent influenced by geography. For example, those described as a 'Weaver' in an area with a large proportion of the occupied population involved in cotton manufacture would be classified to cotton manufacturing; working with a single code for each occupational title over the country meant that for this exercise this, and similar, rules have had to be ignored. The effects of this particular rule are hard to quantify, though it is unlikely that any serious error will occur at the economic sector level.

The database for the Isle of Man contains 286 occupational titles containing the word 'Labourer' without the qualifier 'general', leaving them to be classified either to 'General Labourer', 'Farm Labourer' or to any other form of labouring. The first two are the most convincing possibilities, but unless one considers both the occupation of the head of household and the location of the individuals in question a fair judgement cannot be made on which of these two categories the individual should be classified to. (It should be noted that even if an individual lives at a farm, and is described as a 'Labourer', it is not certain that this person is an agricultural or farm labourer.)

The effects of these problems can be seen in the tables that follow. They are generally slight, but care must be taken when interpreting database figures particularly in the areas of domestic servants, agriculturalists and general shopkeepers. The other side to this

argument is that if information from these five areas had been incorporated into the coding frame, to assist in the interpretation, there is every reason to believe that the number of codes to be allocated would have increased by at least 50% if not doubled. For example, as we have seen above, the occupation 'Gardener' could be classified under either the 'Domestic Gardener' or the 'Market Gardener'. However, with the distinguishing variable 'relationship to head of household', this matter can be resolved, but only by doubling the amount of coding. With a few thousand occupational titles this may not be problematic, but with around 1.5 million to begin with it was just not a workable proposition at the initial stages.

It is admitted that the practice of isolationist coding is not completely satisfactory, but with the time available it was deemed better to attempt to code all occupational titles, and warn users of the machine-readable dictionary of the problems inherent within it. All problems, should be of the variety of adding a parameter to the query, rather than altering the actual occupation itself. (Some of the problems about double occupations and unverifiable occupations will remain though.)

**Figure 4**            **Clerks in the indexing department of the census**

## Isle of Man

The aim of this section is to investigate the reliability of the published reports in the classification of occupations. This preliminary study is based on the Isle of Man rather than a mainland county because of the difficulties in mapping the published occupational tables geographically to the data as provided by the Genealogical Society of Utah. The data provided by the GSU have been (approximately) accumulated by ancient county whereas the published reports are given by registration county.<sup>81</sup> This difference will not be a problem in the future, but at the time this paper was written, the data from all the counties had not been received or read from the tapes supplied by the GSU, which meant that a county with no border problems should be relatively straightforward to investigate. In this sense, it is hoped that this Isle of Man provides a useful illustrative example, similar work will be carried out on other counties when all the data is verified and made analysable in terms of the published census reports.

The published population of the Isle of Man was 53,558 (including those accidentally enumerated twice—54,089), however the data as received from GSU contained 56,115 records. (See Table 1.) By removing all records which related to uninhabited houses or houses being built and all records referring to the names of vessels or institutions this figure was reduced to a total of 54,134 records relating to individuals. The census office noted in an addenda that some 540 fishermen had been enumerated twice.<sup>82</sup> Checking the database version found only 511 'double-entries' – those which referred to the men while on board ship were excluded. A further 38 records which referred to people who were absent or entered twice (i.e. crossed out in the CEBs) were also excluded from analysis (though it seems possible that these people were tabulated at the census office). Finally a further 95 records were excluded from the database representing intentional duplicates introduced by the GSU for indexing purposes. At the end of this process the database contained 68 less people than the published reports. It is not clear whether this is a cause of faulty tabulation by the census office, or an inability to remove unnecessary records from the database. However, 68 records out of 53,558 is a small enough number not to significantly affect the results of this exercise.

Table 2 shows the occupational classification for the Isle of Man as given in the 1881 census report along with the count for Isle of Man based on the machine-readable version. There are some differences between the newly-classified occupational titles in the CEBs and the published reports, but none is particularly striking. And taking into account the problems mentioned above, it indicates that the strategy adopted is broadly comparable with the census enumerating clerks. It would be well to discuss some of the problems which have arisen, within the orders. The differences along with the percentage difference, which minimises the effect of the people missing from the database are shown in Table 2. The most striking discrepancies are in the Agricultural and Unoccupied orders, which respectively have 405 people more and 367 less in the database than in the published report., though there are also rather large differences in the domestic service, food and lodgings and general/unspecified orders. The implication of these results will be discussed below.

**Table 1 Record types in the Isle of Man database.**

GSU raw data	56,115
Header records	1,981
Sub-total	54,134
Enumerated twice	511
Excluded for other reasons	38
Intentional duplicates	95
Remainder	53,490

**Table 2 Comparison of database and published report for Isle of Man, 1881.**

Order	Number			Percentage		
	Report	Database	Difference	Report	Database	Difference
1 Government	144	153	-9	0.27	0.29	-0.02
2 Army/Navy	99	106	-7	0.18	0.20	-0.01
3 Professional	668	664	4	1.25	1.24	0.01
4 Domestic Service	4,331	4,198	133	8.09	7.85	0.24
5 Commercial	272	254	18	0.51	0.47	0.03
6 Transport	1,351	1,369	-18	2.52	2.56	-0.04
7 Agriculture	3,747	4,152	-405	7.00	7.76	-0.77
8 Animals	2,139	2,209	-70	3.99	4.13	-0.14
9 Books etc.	95	103	-8	0.18	0.19	-0.02
10 Machines etc.	116	111	5	0.22	0.21	0.01
11 Houses, furniture etc.	1,760	1,733	27	3.29	3.24	0.05
12 Carriages etc.	100	102	-2	0.19	0.19	0.00
13 Ships and Boats	164	155	9	0.31	0.29	0.02
14 Chemicals	58	57	1	0.11	0.11	0.00
15 Tobacco	47	50	-3	0.09	0.09	-0.01
16 Food and Lodging	1,617	1,549	68	3.02	2.90	0.12
17 Textiles	559	561	-2	1.04	1.05	-0.01
18 Dress	2,316	2,281	35	4.32	4.26	0.06
19 Animal Substances	38	37	1	0.07	0.07	0.00
20 Vegetable Substances	88	89	-1	0.16	0.17	0.00
21 Mineral Substances	1,681	1,676	5	3.14	3.13	0.01
22 General/Unspecified	1,052	1,131	-79	1.96	2.11	-0.15
23 Refuse	10	11	-1	0.02	0.02	0.00
24 Unoccupied	31,106	30,739	367	58.08	57.47	0.61
Total	53,558	53,490	68			

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

**Table 3 Comparison of database and published report for those in Indoor Service, Isle of Man, 1881.**

Sub-order	Published Report			Database			Difference
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
054 Domestic coachman,	0	83	83	0	31	31	52
055 Domestic gardener	0	208	208	0	32	32	176
056 Domestic indoor servant	3,487	47	3,534	3,523	89	3,612	-78
057 Lodge, etc. keeper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
058 Inn, hotel servant	57	42	99	64	41	105	-6
059 College, club service	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
060 Office keeper	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
061 Cook (not domestic)	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
062 Charwoman	211	0	211	216	1	217	-6
063 Washing/bathing	173	3	176	171	4	175	1
064 Hospital/institution	7	8	15	17	7	24	-9
065 Others	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,937</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>4,331</b>	<b>3,991</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>4,198</b>	<b>133</b>

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

Table 3 shows the numbers of males and females classed into each occupational heading within the Indoor Service order. There are three significant differences between the database and the published returns: the database contains 52 less domestic coachmen than the report, 176 less domestic gardeners and it contains 78 more domestic servants than the report. The missing coachmen have probably been allocated to the coachman (non domestic) heading (which has 101 more people in the database than in the report). (The remainder of much of the further discrepancy is probably found in the 'Carter' sub-order which has 68 more individuals in the published figures.)

The discrepancy in domestic gardeners is also almost wholly balanced by the excess of non-domestic gardeners (see Table 4). The classification process has automatically coded all those described as gardeners to the non-domestic sector where there is no alternative description. The additional 78 domestic servants (42 men and 36 women) is harder to explain, though it is likely that the women are caused by the erroneous classification of farm servants (note in Table 4 that there are 50 more female agricultural labourers and farm servants in the database than in the published report). For example, occupations like 'Farm Servant Dom' have been classified to farm servants, whereas the abstractors may have classified them to domestic servants.

The database has 405 additional people in agriculture (see Table 4). For the first of these groups, farmers, the main reason for 67 more farmers being found in the database is probably the inclusion of occupational titles under this heading, like 'Local Prim Methodist Preacher Farmer (of 115 Ac.)'. The rule followed in this exercise was that all multiple occupations which included the term farmer *first* are classified to that category. Those occupations where farmer is the second term, as above, are only classified to farmer if the title has some indication of the size of the farm (or a number of agricultural employees). (This is a wide interpretation of two rules in the *Instructions to the clerks employed in classifying the occupations* which state that all those farming land should be classified as farmers and all those cottagers where the occupational titles includes enough

**Table 4 Comparison of database and published report for in agriculture, Isle of Man, 1881.**

	Published Report			Database			Difference
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
100 Farmer	172	1,222	1,394	176	1,285	1,461	-67
101 Farmer's son, etc.†	0	557	557	6	653	659	-102
102 Farm bailiff	0	22	22	6	24	30	-8
103 Agricultural labourer*	153	1,586	1,739	141	929	1,070	-46
104 Shepherd	0	15	15	0	15	15	0
105 Farm servants*	-	-	-	62	653	715	
106 Land drainage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107 Agricultural machine	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1
108 Agricultural student	0	1	1	0	2	2	-1
109 Others	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1
110 Woodman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
111 Nurseryman	1	11	12	1	8	9	3
112 Gardener (Not domestic)	0	7	7	3	186	189	-182
<b>Total</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>3,421</b>	<b>3,747</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>3,757</b>	<b>4,152</b>	<b>-405</b>

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

**Note:** \* Farm servants and agricultural labourers are not disaggregated in the published reports. The difference column for agricultural labourers is calculated by summing the total number of agricultural labourers and farm servants.

† This heading includes all male relatives of farmers.

detail to allow one to imply that the cottager is a farmer rather than a farm labourer (e.g. the inclusion of a number of acres) should also be classified to farmer.) The slightly larger discrepancy in Farmer's Sons and other male relatives is almost certainly caused by the inclusion in the database of very young sons of farmers. These would be able to be ignored when the CEBs were examined, but in the list of occupational strings it is impossible to separate these. There is clearly another error in this table—there are six 'Farmer's Son's etc.' who are female. This highlights a problem in coding occupations in isolation of the other material. However, whilst it is clear that there is an error it is not possible to resolve the error, in this case, with the gender information alone, as it conflicts with the occupational information. There are 46 more agricultural labourers in the database than in the published report. However, the gender difference (4 less men and 50 more women) suggests that the ambiguity in the occupational titles for farm servants has spread both ways. The missing men may have been allocated to the 'general labourer' occupational heading; while the additional women should perhaps have been allocated to Domestic Indoor Servants. The problem associated with gardeners has been described above.

Table 5 shows the differences in those in the order containing those involved in working with animals. The only significant difference between the published report and the database for those working with animals is within the heading fisherman. It is not apparent why there is this difference, but it is possible it is associated with the 'doubly-enumerated' fishermen.

**Table 5 Comparison of database and published report for animal workers, Isle of Man, 1881.**

	Published Report			Database			Difference
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
113 Horse proprietor	0	2	2	0	2	2	0
114 Huntsman, etc.	0	15	15	1	21	22	-7
115 Veterinary, etc.	0	14	14	0	12	12	2
116 Cattle, etc. salesman	1	2	3	0	2	2	1
117 Drover	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118 Game keeper	0	2	2	0	2	2	0
119 Dog, bird, etc. keeper	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
120 Vermin destroyer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
121 Fisherman	0	2,102	2,102	4	2,164	2,168	-66
122 Knacker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2,138	2,139	5	2,204	2,209	-70

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

**Table 6 Comparison of database and published report for those in food and drink, Isle of Man, 1881.**

	Published Report			Database			Difference
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
214 Innkeeper, etc.	52	119	171	47	114	161	10
215 Lodging, boarding house	280	44	324	280	45	325	-1
216 Coffee, eating house	4	4	8	4	4	8	0
217 Hop merchant, dealer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
218 Maltster	0	7	7	0	7	7	0
219 Brewer	0	23	23	0	26	26	-3
220 Beerseller, etc.	0	0	0	1	0	1	-1
221 Cellarman	0	3	3	0	3	3	0
222 Wine, spirit merchant	0	16	16	0	15	15	1
223 Milkseller	46	13	59	4	5	9	50
224 Cheesemonger, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225 Butcher	5	141	146	6	135	141	5
226 Provision curer, dealer	30	15	45	28	14	42	3
227 Poulterer	4	7	11	4	6	10	1
228 Fishmonger	7	37	44	9	37	46	-2
229 Corn, flour, seed	6	26	32	5	21	26	6
230 Corn miller	0	82	82	3	83	86	-4
231 Baker	15	237	252	14	237	251	1
232 Confectioner	49	8	57	48	6	54	3
233 Greengrocer	24	14	38	16	12	28	10
234 Mustard, vinegar, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
235 Sugar refiner	2	4	6	2	5	7	-1
236 Grocer, etc.	64	224	288	60	225	285	3
237 Ginger beer, etc.	0	5	5	0	6	6	-1
238 Others	0	0	0	9	3	12	-12
Total	588	1,029	1617	540	1,009	1,549	68

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

Table 6 shows the differences in numbers in the database and the printed report for those working in food and drink. The main discrepancy here is in those working as milksellers. This is a further problem caused by not using any other information than that in the occupational title. The rules laid down for milk sellers (and associated occupational titles) make this clear:<sup>83</sup>

- 056 DOMESTIC INDOOR SERVANT. Include Dairymaid but only if not a Farmer's Dairymaid.
- 100 FARMER, GRAZIER. Includes Dairymen if listed with agricultural servants.
- 105 FARM SERVANT, INDOOR. Includes "Dairymaids, &c". if living in a Farmer's House. Note, however that this occupational group was not listed in the report. It seems likely that those listed here would have been allocated to Agricultural Labourers (if male) and Domestic Servants (if female)
- 223 MILKSELLER, DAIRYMAN. Includes "Cowkeeper (in towns), Purveyor of Asses' and Goats Milk. Milk Hawker, Carrier, Contractor."

These rules are not as clear as they might be, and have the added complication that one of the groups (105) was not used in the published report, though it seems certain that these were completely aggregated with those classified as 'Agricultural Labourer'. At present the solution has been to classify all people to do with the production, distribution and sale of milk to milkseller unless they were specifically designated to an agricultural category, i.e. the words 'farmer' or 'ag. lab' was also within the occupational title.

Table 7 showing the frequency of general and unspecified workers also suffers from slight differences between the published reports and the database. The only easily explicable discrepancy concerns the 10 female machinists, who no doubt are sewing machinists. With information on gender these would probably have been allocated to seamstresses.

The final area in which there are discrepancies between the published tables and the database are in the unoccupied and general category, there being 367 less people allocated to this order in the database than in the published report (see Table 2). There are three possible reasons for this discrepancy. First, the method used by the abstracting clerks would have been to tick each person off that they considered to belong under a particular heading, once whole registration districts had been completed, the sum of those occupied was calculated and the difference between the total population and this became the total for Order 24. For the database each and every occupational title has been classified, including those in this order, which will confer greater accuracy on this figure.

Second, it seems clear that the tabulating clerks were not always clear about the procedure for those people who were, at the time of the census, not occupied. Legal men, who noted that they were not practising, should have been allocated to the Legal sub-order. However, in some cases it is clear that the tabulators put these people into the unoccupied category. Given that the main reason for producing these occupational tables was to calculate occupational mortality, it would seem foolish not to include those who were temporarily out of work. However, it is also clear that those people who were 'retired' or 'superannuated' were classed into this section. For the purposes of this exercise, those people who were described as retired were classified with their working counterparts and latterly tagged to denote that they were retired.

**Table 7 Comparison of those working in general and unspecified occupations, Isle of Man, 1881.**

	Published Report			Database			Difference
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
399 General shopkeeper	95	39	134	95	43	138	-4
400 Pawnbroker	1	1	2	0	1	1	1
401 Costermongers, etc.	21	21	42	27	23	50	-8
402 Manufacturers	3	1	4	4	3	7	-3
403 Contractors (undefined)	0	2	2	0	2	2	0
404 General labourers	54	719	773	65	720	785	-12
405 Engine drivers, etc.	0	60	60	1	69	70	-10
406 Artizans (undefined)	0	22	22	2	32	34	-12
407 Apprentices (undefined)	1	3	4	20	5	25	-21
408 Factory labourers	2	3	5	2	4	6	-1
409 Machinists (undef.)	0	4	4	10	3	13	-9
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>1,052</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>1,131</b>	<b>-79</b>

**Source:** 1881 Census England and Wales, *Islands in the British seas*, BPP 1883, LXXX.707; database.

Third, it is conceivable that some occupations which could not be coded by the tabulating clerks have been allocated elsewhere in the table. There is also the possibility that other people in this sub-order will also be removed, once further information can be found about their occupational title. There are very few unclassified occupational titles. For the Isle of Man, only three of importance remain: 'Aeide Woman', 'Badge Porter', 'Harrier'. The first is probably a typographical error, the second is probably a dock porter or labourer, whilst the last is probably either someone involved in hare hunting or possibly previously involved in coal mining. Presently these have not been classified, but as they each only refer to a single person they do not detract from the arguments presented above.

The preceding section has shown that there is a high degree of correspondence between the newly classified CEBs and the published reports. The main differences are due to a small number of occupational titles where disambiguation is impossible. It has also demonstrated that the coverage of classification is greater in the database than in the reports giving it a slightly greater level of accuracy. However, for the Isle of Man, at least, it is clear that the classification of the occupations was completed successfully both by the abstractors in the 1880s and in the current project.

## Conclusion

This paper has re-emphasised the necessity for historians and social scientists to classify occupations in order to undertake analysis on those titles, but concedes the fact that occupational titles in themselves are classificatory and should not be judged solely on the words used in the title but on all manner of contextual material. However, this paper reports on a project where this contextual material has not been able to be fully considered because of the sheer volume of data available; however it demonstrates that the careful re-classification of all the occupational titles in a machine-readable version of the census enumerators' books for the 1881 English and Welsh census has produced occupational tabulations remarkably similar to those published in the census reports. The main

suggestion here is that, with some errors and omissions, the original process of classification was remarkably accurate in light of the rules applied. The isolationist approach carried out in this exercise has produced similar tabulations to the original census clerks; the inference is that the re-classification of these occupational titles, when examined in conjunction with other information within the CEBs, will provide more accurate occupational statistics than hitherto available; and when used in conjunction with other data within the CEBs will allow a much more detailed analysis of the economic and social structure of the country than before.

This paper while re-investigating the processes involved in the creation of the nineteenth-century occupational statistics, has clearly shown where there were problems in interpretation within the CEBs, and thus potentially reflected within the published reports. It is suggested that the rules for classification followed by the clerks in the Census Office, for 1881, at least, altered from the beginning of the data tabulation procedure to the end making the published reports potentially unreliable. This paper has also shown how the occupational classification schemes for the English and Welsh censuses came into being and how they were implemented, noting that the 1851 census seems not to have had an occupational dictionary for the Census Office clerks to follow.

The further classification of the occupations given in the 1881 CEBs to the Cambridge codes will allow comparative work to be carried out using a variety of other classification schemes. What else of the future? There are plans to extend the current project in a number of different directions. The most obvious of these is to reclassify the 1881 returns to provide comparative employment statistics for each census year post-1881 on at least a county level. Given the problems found in the classification of individual level data this will obviously contain a margin of error. A variety of other summary statistics could also be created. Most notably, regarding multiple occupations and non-employment. The latter is perhaps more interesting given that the census reports are usually quiet about this subject. Further possibilities include a national examination of family structure by occupational groups and occupational succession will be able to be analysed.<sup>84</sup>

A number of miscellaneous studies, at a county level at least, could include an examination of the occupations of those with disabilities and the levels of migration within certain occupational categories and a comparison, on an individual level with court reports to see how criminals before conviction described themselves on their schedules. A further area of research which has not been carried out to any great detail concerns those individuals who were classified as 'unoccupied' in the published reports. Given that these individuals in 1881 generally represent over 50% of the population their neglect is perhaps unusual.

A further area of research, which will be facilitated by the classification of the occupations in the 1881 census will be comparative studies with the machine-readable 2% sample for 1851.<sup>85</sup> The final aim of the Leverhulme-funded project was to harmonise the classifications between the 1851 sample and the 1881 database. All 36,434 unique occupational descriptions from the sample have been classified to the 1881 scheme.

## NOTES

- 1 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. IV, General report and tables*, BPP 1883 LXXX, 25.
- 2 This number is an estimate because, at the time of writing some of the data had not been received by the project. Regarding slight variations, in the county of Warwickshire, for example, there are some 2,000 different occupational titles based on the formula "Farmer of x acres, employing y labourers" (out of almost 70,000 unique occupations).
- 3 For a discussion of some of the problems surrounding agricultural occupations see D. Mills and J. Mills, 'Farms, farmers and farm workers in the nineteenth-century census enumerators' books: a Lincolnshire case study', *The Local Historian*, 27 (1997), 137–40.
- 4 For biographical details see N. A. Humphreys, ed., *Vital statistics. A memorial volume of selections from the reports and writings of William Farr* (London, 1855), vii–xxiv. It has been suggested that Farr was assisted in the design of the 1851 classification by Horace Mann and George Graham; see S. Szreter, *Fertility, class and gender in Britain, 1860–1940* (Cambridge, 1996), 77.
- 5 1851 Census of Great Britain, *Population tables II. Ages, civil condition, occupations, and birth-places of the people. Vol. 1*, BPP 1852–3 LXXXVIII pt. 1, lxxxi–c.
- 6 This has been described in E. Higgs, 'The struggle for the occupational census, 1841–1911', in *Government and expertise: specialists, administrators and professionals, 1860–1914*, ed., R. M. McLeod (Cambridge, 1988), 73–86. See also M. McDowell, 'William Farr and the study of occupational mortality', *Population Trends*, 31 (1983), 12–14.
- 7 1851 Census of Great Britain, *Population tables II. Ages, civil condition, occupations, and birth-places of the people. Vol. 1*, BPP 1852–3 LXXXVIII pt. 1, lxxv.
- 8 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, General report*, BPP 1863 LIII, pt. I, Appendix, 225–32.
- 9 1871 Census of England and Wales, *General report (Vol. IV)*, BPP 1873 LXXI, pt. II, xxxviii–xxxix.
- 10 See E. Higgs, *A clearer sense of the census. The Victorian censuses and historical research* (London, 1996), 158–9; K. Schürer, 'The 1891 census and local population studies', *Local Population Studies*, 47 (1991), 16–29.
- 11 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Ages, civil or conjugal condition, occupations and birth places of the people in Scotland, Vol. II*, BPP 1864 LI, xl–xli.
- 12 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Ages, civil or conjugal condition, occupations and birth places of the people in Scotland, Vol. II*, BPP 1864 LI, xliii–xlvi.
- 13 E. Higgs, 'Structuring the past. The occupational and household classification of the nineteenth-century census data', in *History and computing III*, eds, E. Mawdsley *et al* (Manchester, 1990), 70.
- 14 For example, G. B. Longstaff, 'Suggestions for the census of 1891', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52 (1889), 455–6.
- 15 1871 Census of Ireland, *Part III, General Report, Maps and Diagrams, Summary Tables, Appendices*, BPP 1876 LXXXI.1, 71. (The 1871 Census of Scotland report was equally scathing about the classification scheme but for different reasons. See 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the Population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II*, BPP 1874 LXXIII, xxxvi–xxxvii.)
- 16 *Supplement to the twenty-fifth annual report of the Registrar-General* (London, 1864), xxv.

- <sup>17</sup> *Supplement to the thirty-fifth annual report of the Registrar-General* (London, 1875), 448–56 and for mortality rates, clxxii–clxxiv.
- <sup>18</sup> *Supplement to the forty-fifth annual report of the registrar-general* (London, 1885), xxi–xxii.
- <sup>19</sup> M. Campbell-Kelly, ‘Information technology and organizational change in the British census, 1801–1911’, *Information Systems Research*, 17 (1996).
- <sup>20</sup> C. Lee, *British regional employment statistics, 1841–1971* (Cambridge, 1979), 3. For an earlier study see C. Day, ‘The distribution of industrial occupations in England, 1841–1861’, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 28 (1927), 79–235.
- <sup>21</sup> *Occupations of the people (England and Wales) enumerated in 1871, 1881 and 1891*, BPP 1895 LXXX [468], 245–73.
- <sup>22</sup> S. B. Carter and R. Sutch, ‘Fixing the facts: editing of the 1880 U.S. census of occupations with implications for long-term labor-force trends and the sociology of official statistics’, *Historical Methods*, 29 (1996), 5–24. See also M. A. Conk, ‘Accuracy, efficiency and bias: the interpretation of women’s work in the U.S. census of occupations, 1890–1940’, *Historical Methods*, 14 (1981), 65–72.
- <sup>23</sup> Amongst others, W. A. Armstrong, ‘The use of information about occupations’, in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972), 191–310; G. Routh, *Occupations of the people of Great Britain, 1801–1981: with a compendium of a paper by Charles Booth* (Basingstoke, 1987); K. Schürer, ‘Understanding and coding the occupations of the past’, in *The use of occupations in historical analysis*, eds, K. Schürer and H. Diederiks (St. Katharinen, 1993), 101–62.
- <sup>24</sup> R. H. Steckel, ‘The quality of census data for historical inquiry: a research agenda’, *Social Science History*, 15 (1990), 579–99.
- <sup>25</sup> 1871 Census of England and Wales, *General report (Vol. IV)*, BPP 1873 LXXI, pt. II, xxxix. (“Our classification is in principle a *classification of each individual under his principal occupation on Census day*” (italics in original)).
- <sup>26</sup> See E. Higgs, ‘The tabulation of occupations in the nineteenth-century census, with special reference to domestic servants’, in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators’ books*, eds, D. R. Mills & K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 27–35 and a response from M. Anderson, ‘Mis-specification of servant occupations in the 1851 census: a problem revisited’, *Local Population Studies*, 60 (1998), 58–64.
- <sup>27</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, sub Tailor.
- <sup>28</sup> D. R. Mills and K. Schürer, ‘The enumeration process’, in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators’ books*, eds, D. R. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996) remark in note 6, that for the 1911 census this standardisation did not damage the context of the information given.
- <sup>29</sup> Public Record Office (hereafter PRO) RG 27/5, Item 27, Instructions to the various officers as to their duties in taking the census, 57.
- <sup>30</sup> Ministry of Labour, *A dictionary of occupational terms based on the classification of occupations used in the census of population, 1921* (London, 1927), sub. Hind.
- <sup>31</sup> P. Glennie, ‘Distinguishing Men’s trades’. *Occupational sources and debates for pre-census England* (1990) (Historical Geography Research Series, 25).
- <sup>32</sup> This is a ‘real’ example, see D. J. Butler, *Durham city. The 1851 census* (Durham, 1992), 165, 172.

- <sup>33</sup> R. J. Morris, 'Occupational coding: principles and examples', *Historical Social Research*, 15 (1991), 3–29. See also C. A. Crompton, 'Changes in rural service occupations during the nineteenth century. An evaluation of two sources for Hertfordshire, England', *Rural History*, 6 (1995), 193–203.
- <sup>34</sup> *Report of the committee appointed by the treasury in inquire into certain questions connected with the taking of the census*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q1850. (Evidence of Charles White, an enumerator in London's east end.) He testified that a number of prostitutes were enumerated as 'unfortunates', rather than servants or needlewomen.
- <sup>35</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, sub. Hammerman.
- <sup>36</sup> C. Harvey, E. M. Green and P. J. Corfield, *The Westminster historical database. Voters, social structure and electoral behaviour* (Bristol, 1998), 99.
- <sup>37</sup> See G. Crossick, 'From the gentleman to the residuum: languages of social description in Victorian Britain', in *Language, history and class*, ed., P. J. Corfield (Oxford, 1991), 166–7.
- <sup>38</sup> 1851 Census of Great Britain, *Population tables II. Ages, civil condition, occupations, and birth-places of the people. Vol. 1*, BPP 1852–3 LXXXVIII, cclxxxv–vi. Table XXXVII. Occupiers of land engaged in other pursuits besides farming.
- <sup>39</sup> M. Drake, 'The census, 1801–1891', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972), 29.
- <sup>40</sup> Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 35–47. One point to note is that in 1881 the tabulations for fishermen included all those on shore on census night and all those who came into port in the following two weeks, unlike in the preceding and the successive censuses.
- <sup>41</sup> 43 & 44 Vict. c.37. (Census Act, 1880). A similar Act was passed authorising the Census for Scotland on the same day: 43 & 44 Vict. c.38.
- <sup>42</sup> PRO RG 27/5, Item 27, Instructions to the Various Officers, 27. On Registration Districts see D. R. Mills and K. Schürer, 'The enumeration process', in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books*, eds, D. R. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 16–26.
- <sup>43</sup> 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. IV, General report and tables*, BPP 1883 LXXX gives a re-set version of the schedule at 116–7. A copy of the original schedule can be found in PRO RG 27/5, Item 5.
- <sup>44</sup> The numbers of schedules completed by enumerators ranged from 18 to 55 per cent in four Somerset parishes in 1871. Letter from D. McCallum in *Local Population Studies*, 26 (1981), 63.
- <sup>45</sup> PRO RG 11/1428 f.62, 5. Another hand has added the age of this tramp as 60.
- <sup>46</sup> *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q1850. (Evidence of Charles White.) His diligence in getting a shoeblack (one who polishes shoes, generally working at an inn or a hotel) to describe himself thus rather than falsify his schedule testifies to the single-mindedness of some enumerators.
- <sup>47</sup> See the articles on the schedules for the sub-district of Llandyrnog in Denbighshire, R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'The 1851 Census in the Llandyrnog sub-district', *Denbighshire Historical Transactions*, 27 (1978), 199–201; R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'Interpreting the census returns for rural Anglesey and Llyn', *Anglesey Antiquarian Society Transactions* (1973), 111–36; R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'The Llandyrnog householder's schedules for the 1851 Census', *Local Population Studies*, 28 (1982), 89–90. I am grateful to Mr and Mrs Benwell for allowing me to see a revised version of the second of these papers.
- <sup>48</sup> See Mills and Schürer, 'The enumeration process', 18, n.6.

- 49 On memorandum books, see Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 14.
- 50 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. IV, General report and tables*, BPP 1883 LXXX, 3.
- 51 PRO RG 27/5, Item 27, Instructions to the various officers, 20.
- 52 Scottish schedules and CEBs were not sent to London but to the General Register Office in Edinburgh. The only published description of the administration of a census in Scotland is for 1851, before the establishment of the Scottish Register Officer in 1854. See B. Collins and M. Anderson, 'The administration of the 1851 census in the county of East Lothian', *Local Population Studies*, 20 (1978), 32–7.
- 53 William Ogle in his evidence in the *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q84, suggested that only a few registrars made corrections and that most were made by the abstractors.
- 54 P. M. Tillott, 'Sources of inaccuracy in the 1851 and 1861 Censuses', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972), 84 and 87.
- 55 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q1021. (Evidence of Mr Tupper).
- 56 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q76. (Evidence of Dr Ogle).
- 57 PRO RG 27/5, Item 52, Instructions Respecting the Revision of the Enumeration Books, 1.
- 58 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q87. (Evidence of Dr Ogle).
- 59 This occurred in the 1921 Census where schedules were classified as a precursor to punching.
- 60 PRO, RG 11/3044, f.106, 6.
- 61 The sheets for this process in 1861 (where there were 431 occupational classes were 26 inches by 51 inches), see 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, General Report*, BPP LIII Pt. 1., 27.
- 62 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q1462. (Evidence of Professor Alfred Marshall).
- 63 A photocopy of this document, supplied by Dr Edward Higgs, is in the possession of the author.
- 64 PRO RG 29/1, 448–9. Letter dated 7 September 1854. I am grateful to Dr Edward Higgs for this reference.
- 65 1911 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. X, Appendix. Classified and alphabetical list of occupations*, BPP 1915 7660, ii.
- 66 Reference to it is made in 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the Population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II*, BPP 1874 LXXIII, xxxvi. A copy is at PRO RG 25/4, Item 85.
- 67 PRO RG 27/5, Item 12.
- 68 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q426. (Evidence of Dr Thomas Grimshaw, Registrar General for Ireland.)
- 69 Letter from W. B. Hancock to Stair Agnew, 8 September 1882 and annotated Instructions to the Clerks Employed in Classifying the Occupations and Ages of the People. The location of the original of this document is unknown to me. A photocopy is available at the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. (It is perhaps interesting to note that the

reference number printed in the end-papers for this document is 21806-250-3/82 suggesting that 250 copies of the volume were printed in March 1882.) An unannotated copy of the 'Instructions' can be found at PRO RG 27/5.

- 70 See the comments of C. Booth, 'Occupations of the people of the United Kingdom, 1801-1881', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 49 (1886), 317n. It should also be noted that the occupational classifications (as published in the Census Reports) for England and Wales and Scotland differed in minor respects. Many of these differences are local, for example the Scottish scheme classifies all 'national' clergymen separately. Some differences are simple re-groupings, for example, Plumber and Gas Fitter. Some are more significant, e.g. Iron and Steel Manufacturer.
- 71 The occupational tables for 1881 can be found in 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, Ages, Conditions as to marriage; occupations and birthplaces of people*, BPP 1883 LXXX, Table 10. For Scotland they can be found in 1881 Census of Scotland, *Ninth Decennial Census Vol. II, Ages, Education, Civil Condition, Birthplaces, General Index*, BPP 1883 LXXXI, Table 15.
- 72 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q282. (Evidence of Dr Ogle.)
- 73 *Instructions to the clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people*, 1.
- 74 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, General Report*, BPP LIII pt. I, 27-8.
- 75 W. Ogle, 'The alleged depopulation of the rural districts of England', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52 (1889), 216-7.
- 76 *Report of the Committee appointed by the Treasury*, BPP 1890 LVIII, Q238. (Evidence of Dr Ogle.)
- 77 For details of the GSU database see M. Woollard, 'Creating a machine-readable version of the 1881 census of England and Wales', in C. Harvey and J. Press, *Databases in historical research* (London, 1996), 98-101. A preliminary version of the documentation for the machine-readable version is M. Woollard with M. Allen, *1881 census enumerators' books database: description of the fields, v.0.2* (Colchester, 1998).
- 78 The Cambridge code is described in Schürer, 'Understanding and coding the occupations of the past', 101-62 and more pertinently in 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), 149-50.
- 79 Steven Ruggles and Matthew Sobek (with Catherine A. Fitch, Patricia Kelly Hall and Chad Ronnander), *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0* (Minneapolis, 1997). (See <http://www.ipums.umn.edu/~ipums/volii/88occtc.htm>).
- 80 Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 97.
- 81 See the Appendix in M. Drake, 'The census, 1801-1891', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972) for a description of the differences between ancient and registration counties. See also Interdepartmental Committee on Social and Economic Research, *Guides to the official sources. No. 2. Census reports of Great Britain, 1801-1931* (London, 1951), 95-101.
- 82 This is dealt with in M. Woollard, "'Shooting the nets": A note on the reliability of the 1881 census enumerators' books', *Local Population Studies*, 59 (1997), 54-7.
- 83 *Instructions to Clerks*, 29 etc.
- 84 For example, following the work carried out by B. Preston, *Occupations of father and son in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Reading Geographical Papers No. 56, Department of Geography, University of Reading, 1977).

- <sup>85</sup> The sample and documentation are held at the ESRC Data Archive. See M. Anderson, 'Households, families and individuals: some preliminary results from the national sample from the 1851 census of Great Britain', *Continuity and Change*, 3 (1988), 421-38.

## APPENDIX 1

Digest of instructions given on the reverse of the householders' schedules.<sup>1</sup>

- Titles of Peers and persons of rank should be inserted along with any other important office they might hold.
- MPs, Magistrates and Aldermen, along with those holding important offices should state their profession or occupation after their official rank.
- Members of the Army and Navy should state their rank and branch of service while officers should also state whether they are retired or on the active list. All pensioners should be designated as such.
- Church of England clergy should describe themselves as "Rector (or whatever) of ...". Other ministers or priests were expected to name their church or chapel. Occasional preachers were expected to give their ordinary occupation along but "may add "Local Methodist Preacher &c. &c."
- Barristers were asked to denote whether or not they were in practice. Clerks in Solicitors' Offices were expected to state what type of clerk they were (Managing, Articled or General).
- Members of the medical profession were asked to state in which branch of medicine they practised (or if they didn't) along with "the University or Society of which they are Graduates, Fellows or Licentiates".
- Professors, Teachers, Public Writers, Authors and Scientific men were asked to state which branch of Science or Art they followed, similarly artists were to "state the art which they follow" and graduates were to give details of their degree.
- Only Medical, Legal or Theology students were to be explicitly returned.
- The term Scholar should only be used to denote a child (or young person) "attending a school, or receiving regular instruction".
- Farmers were asked to state the number of acres occupied, along with the number of men, women and boys employed at the time of the Census. Farmers were also asked to return their children as farmer's sons or daughters. "Men employed on the farm and sleeping in the Farmer's house must be described in the schedule as Farm Servants."
- All others employed on farms but not living in the farmers' house should be described as "Agricultural Labourers, Shepherds &c."
- Merchants, Brokers, Traders, Commercial Clerks and Travellers and Shopmen were asked to state the particular branch of commerce in which they were engaged.<sup>2</sup>
- Master traders and manufacturers were asked to state their occupation in the following style: "Carpenter – Master, employing 6 men and 2 boys".
- Manufacturing trades considered to be "much sub-divided" should return both the branch and the trade, if they were not implied in the name.
- Miners should always describe the mine in which they work.
- Engineers: Civil and Mining Engineers should be explicitly described as such. Factory workmen should be distinctly described: "Engine Smith at Factory". Engine Drivers, Stokers and Firemen should be described in connection with the manufactory, railway &c. with which they were employed.

- Artisans and Mechanics should *invariably* state their particular branch of mechanical art or business. (original italics)
- The term weaver should not be used without qualification.
- Domestic Servants should be described according to the nature of their service.
- Messengers, porters and labourers should be described according to the nature of their service. The term labourer should never be used without qualification.
- Persons currently unemployed should be described as such, i.e. Coal Miner, unemployed.
- Those following no profession, trade or calling, and holding no public office, but deriving their incomes chiefly from land, houses, dividends, interest of money, annuities &c., may describe themselves accordingly. Those retired should state their former profession. The terms Gentleman and Esquire should not be used.
- Women and children who are employed at home should distinctly record their following.

## APPENDIX 2

Instructions given to clerks at census office before abstraction.<sup>3</sup>

- Married women returned with a domestic occupation (e.g. Housekeeper), whose husbands had a non-domestic occupation were to have their occupation struck out. (However, terms like Housewife, Cook, Charwoman and Laundress were *not* to be struck out.) (If the husband also had a domestic occupation, however, this would not have been struck out).
- Farmer's sons (and other near male relatives), aged 15 or above, who had not been enumerated with an occupation were to have the term Farmer's Son added.
- Children under the age of three enumerated as scholars should have their "occupation" struck out.
- All individuals returned without an occupation but containing a description such as "Student, Scholar, Barmaid, Waitress, Cook, Servant &c." in column 6 (i.e. relationship to the head of household) of the enumeration book would be given that occupation. <sup>4</sup>
- Men, in business houses (e.g. a Baker or Grocer) would, if they were described as a Servant or an Apprentice in column 6 have an occupation inserted in added to column 10 along the lines of Baker's Assistant or Baker's Apprentice.<sup>5</sup>
- Domestic servants living in farm houses (specifically including "Groom") must be returned as originally stated and not as a Farm Servant. However, the description "in-door" should be added to those people described explicitly as farm servants. Other so-called servants (as described in column 6 (relationship to head of household) living within a farm should have, if their occupation was blank, have their occupation recorded as 'Farm Servant, in-door'.

### APPENDIX 3

The following rules are digested from the instructions to the clerks tabulating the occupations.<sup>6</sup> All italics are as in the original.

- Multiple Occupations. “The general rule in such case (sic) is to select for ticking that occupation which would seem the main or more important one. If there be none such, *the first in the entry* is to be selected.” With the following exceptions - people described as Clergyman and Schoolmaster were to be allocated to Schoolmasters (032). MPs or Magistrates in any profession or branch of industry should have be ticked to the latter, and any combinatory occupational title containing the phrase auctioneer should have been allocated to Auctioneer (068) regardless.
- Men returned by Rank, Degree or Property only should always have been allocated to Unoccupied (414).<sup>7</sup> However, those, property owners who worked their property were to be ticked to their specific occupation, e.g. Ship Owner. The instructions state, “in this matter, common sense must be the guide”.
- People who were returned by letters, either degrees or membership of a learned society, should have been allocated to the appropriate professional category (or in the case of ‘B.A.’ or ‘M.A.’ to unoccupied (414).
- Foreign officials were returned to the Unoccupied (414) heading.
- Merchants in a specific commodity were ticked “by the nature of the article in which they deal”. Foreign merchants were ticked to Merchants (066).
- Agents and brokers by default are ticked to that category (067), with a number of exceptions.
- Farmer’s sons or other close male relatives aged over 15 were abstracted to Farmer’s sons (101), whereas women with a similar relation were not to be ticked at all
- Cottagers by default were ticked to agricultural labourers (103) though if they occupied and cultivated their land (i.e. had an occupational description such as “Cottager with five acres of land”) they should have been ticked to farmer (100).
- Town carters were to be ticked to Carman (085), but carters in rural districts or small towns were to be ticked Agricultural Labourers (103).
- All clerks were to be ticked to Commercial Clerks with a number of exceptions (Civil Service (002), Army (010), Navy (014), Law (026), Shorthand (036), Banks (075), Insurance (077), Railway (081), Bookstall (123) and Clerks of Works (167). However, Book-keepers, Cashiers and (non-private) Secretaries were to be considered clerks (072).
- Apprentices, Journeymen and Assistants were to be ticked to the occupation to which they assist or are apprenticed to. If their occupation was not clear they were ticked to “Indefinite” (406 or 407).
- Messengers, Errand Boys and Porters and Watchmen (excepting Railway and Government) were to be ticked to (098) and not to their respective trades.
- Warehousemen. First, warehousemen within an industry or manufactory were ticked to that industry. Second, warehousemen when used as a synonym for dealer or shopkeeper should be ticked to the type of goods dealt in. Third, warehousemen, *qua* store-house keepers were ticked to Warehousemen (096).
- “Workmen having any distinct trade or occupation of their own with a Heading for it on the Abstract Sheet, but carrying it on in some manufactory, institution, or house of

business, Government or other, are to be ticked to their own occupation or trade, and not to the manufacture to which they are temporarily, or even permanently, attached.

- Labourers working in a distinct industry or manufacture should have been ticked to the industry. Labourers and General Labourers were ticked to general labourers (404). Special headings were provided for Agricultural, Road and Railway labourers (103, 360 and 360 respectively).
- Tenders, Drivers, Stokers and Firemen of Engines (not agricultural, nor on railways, nor in ships) were to be ticked to the heading Engine Driver (405), independently of the place or manufactory in which they work.
- For trade designations which occur in distinct industries, e.g. Finisher, Spinner, etc. the instructions suggest that the enumeration books should give the “nature of manufacture”. Where it was not given the abstractors had three paths to follow, “supply the missing information” themselves, ask the Superintendent, “when ... there is one predominating or exclusive manufacture in the sub-district with which he [the abstractor] is dealing” and thirdly to “tick vaguely designated workmen to the Indefinite groups of workers.”<sup>8</sup>
- Retired people were to be ticked to order 24 (414) with the exception of retired Army and Navy *officers* (my italics), paupers, inmates of workhouses and prisoners – all to be ticked to their former business. Those described in the occupation column as idiots, imbeciles, lunatics or Almsmen/women and Inmates of Almshouses should be considered as retired.
- The unemployed were to be ticked to their usual profession if stated.
- Finally the abstractors were instructed to be on their guard for regional differences, especially where the same name designates different occupations. The example given is ‘Clothier’.

## APPENDIX 4

These additional rules are taken from the annotated version of the Instructions for clerks tabulating the occupations. Some reinforce the rules given in Appendix 3 others clarify the earlier rules.<sup>9</sup>

- “In abstracting occupations it is necessary to view trade as combining many divisions and it is of paramount importance to distinguish the actual work or sub-division of work in which a workman is employed or business in which a shop-keeper is engaged—without reference to—or being biased (sic) by—the place in which it is carried on, or the Master, Company or Municipality who pays”.
- Individuals should have been ticked to the “actual Manufacture as represented by the producer (including in many instances the Merchant) whether described as Mechanic, Apprentice, Improver, Assistant, Labourer, Dealer, or Maker.”
- However, when “accessories” (like clerks, etc.) did not “form the staple labour of the Business” they should have been ticked to their respective categories, rather than with the type of business.
- Similarly, “distributors of finished articles, as Carriers, Carters, Carmen, Porters, Messengers, Errand Boys” should have been ticked to those categories “when they do not form the staple labour (as Railway Porters &c.)”
- Furthermore, “substantive Trades employed in any business, or trade temporarily or permanently but having a distinct trade of their own (such as Carpenter, or Smith in a Brewery, Hotel, &c.” should have been allocated to the distinct trade (in this example, carpenter or smith).
- “Soldiers and Seamen even if described *also* as Artizans or Domestics are primarily Soldiers or Seamen, and should be so understood.” (italics original).
- “As a rule a Profession, or a Mechanical Trade should be taken in preference to a Dealing or Shopkeeping business if a person be described as both, thus:- John Jones, *Blacksmith* and Grocer.” (original italics) “When Masters or Companies are engaged in several distinct businesses or trades the Master can only be placed to the most important one, but their *trade* assistants, or *trade* servants must be placed to any of the several trades in which they may be occupied and *domestic* servants of the same master would be placed in the *domestic class*.” (original italics)
- “By Civil or Municipal Service is generally meant those persons who are engaged in the *general government* either of Towns &c. or the Imperial Civil Service; it does not include Labourers, Mechanics, or Scientists or persons of a similar character in professions or trades which may be carried on in Commercial life, as Solicitors, Surgeons, Architects, Telegraphists, Waterworks, or Gas Service, Vestry, Road or Workhouse Labourer, &c., &c., although they may be paid either by the Government or the Municipality”.

## APPENDIX 5

This appendix gives the classes, orders, sub-orders and headings for the classification used in the 1881 Census for England and Wales. Some of the headings are surrounded by square brackets indicating the existence of these headings in the occupational dictionary, but denoting that these headings were not used in the published reports. For seven of these headings this may be troublesome when working with the published dictionary: Student (037) which was presumably subsumed into Persons with no specified occupation (414); Indoor Farm Servant (105) presumably subsumed into Agricultural Labourer (103); Hauliers (343) probably integrated into Carters (085) or with Coal merchants (344); Iron Manufacture (375) and Steel Manufacture (376) were aggregated in the published report to a new heading Iron and Steel Manufacture which may also include Others in Iron and Steel Manufacturing (382), an important heading as it includes those involved in kitchen range, stove and grate making. The heading for Coppersmith (384) was removed and presumably added to Workers in Copper (383); similarly Tin Manufacture (385) was removed and added to Tin and Tin plate goods manufacturers (386).

A further eight headings were also used in the occupational dictionary but are not found in the printed reports presumably these categories were redundant: Others in maps and prints (132), Others in machinery (140); Others in tools and implements (150); Others in watches and philosophical instruments (155); Others in houses (construction) (176); Others in house decoration (191); Others in drugs (211); Others in cotton and flax (261).

It is also perhaps worth noting that the names for the headings in the report are not always exactly identical with those in the dictionary. For example, in the report the heading for 004 is 'Prison Service &c.' whereas in the dictionary this is given as 'Prison Officer'. The dictionary for group 103 just says 'Agricultural Labourer (Cottager) whereas the printed report specifies 'Agricultural Labourer, Farm Servant, Cottager' reflecting the alteration made during the process of classification.

### I. PROFESSIONAL CLASS

#### 1. General/Local Government

		<i>National Government</i>
001	010101	Peer, M.P., Privy Councillor (not otherwise described)
002	010102	Civil Service (officers and clerks)
003	010103	Civil Service (messengers, &c.)
004	010104	Prison Service, &c.
		<i>Local Government</i>
005	010201	Police
006	010202	Municipal, Parish, Union, District, Officer
007	010203	Other Local or County Official
		<i>East Indian and Colonial Service</i>
008	010301	East Indian and Colonial Service

#### 2. Defense of the country

		<i>Army (at home)</i>
009	020101	Army Officer (effective or retired)
010	020102	Soldier and Non-commissioned officer
011	020103	Militia, Yeomanry, Volunteers
012	020104	Army Pensioner

		<i>Navy (ashore or in port)</i>
013	020201	Navy Officer (effective or retired)
014	020202	Seaman, R.N.
015	020203	Royal Marines (officers and men)
016	020204	Navy Pensioner

### 3. Professionals

		<i>Clerical Profession</i>
017	030101	Clergymen (Established Church)
018	030102	Roman Catholic Priest
019	030103	Minister, Priest of other religious bodies
020	030104	Missionary, Scripture Reader, Itinerant preacher
021	030105	Nun, Sister of Charity
022	030106	Theological Student
023	030107	Church, Chapel, Cemetery – Officer, Servant
		<i>Legal Profession</i>
024	030201	Barrister, Solicitor
025	030202	Law Student
026	030203	Law Clerk, and others connected with the law
		<i>Medical Profession</i>
027	030301	Physician, Surgeon, General Practitioner
028	030302	Dentist
029	030304	Medical Student, Assistant
030	030305	Midwife
031	030306	Subordinate Medical Service
		<i>Teachers</i>
032	030401	Schoolmaster
033	030402	Teacher, Professor, Lecturer
034	030403	School Service, and others connected with teaching
		<i>Literary and Scientific Persons</i>
035	030501	Author, Editor, Journalist
036	030502	Reporter, Short-hand Writer
037	030503	[Student]
038	030504	Persons engaged in Scientific Pursuits
039	030505	Literary, Scientific, Institution, Service, &c.
		<i>Engineers and Surveyors</i>
040	030601	Civil Engineer
041	030602	Mining Engineer
042	030603	Land, House, Ship Surveyor
		<i>Artists</i>
043	030701	Painter (Artist)
044	030702	Engraver (Artist)
045	030703	Sculptor
046	030704	Architect
047	030705	Musician, Music Master
048	030706	Art Student
049	030707	Photographer
050	030708	Actor
051	030709	Art, Music, Theatre Service
		<i>Exhibitions, Shows &amp; Games, &amp;c.</i>
052	030801	Performer, Showman, Exhibition Service
053	030802	Billiard, Cricket & other Games Service

**II. DOMESTIC CLASS****4. Domestic Service or Offices**

		<i>Domestic Service</i>
054	040101	Domestic Coachman, Groom
055	040102	Domestic Gardener
056	040103	Domestic Indoor Servant
057	040104	Lodge, Gate, Park Keeper (not Government)
058	040105	Inn, Hotel Servant
059	040106	College, Club Service

		<i>Other Service</i>
060	040201	Office Keeper (not Government)
061	040202	Cook (not Domestic)
062	040203	Charwoman
063	040204	Washing and Bathing Service
064	040205	Hospital and Institution Service
065	040206	Others engaged in Service

**III. COMMERCIAL CLASS****5. Commercial Occupations**

		<i>Merchants and Agents</i>
066	050101	Merchant
067	050102	Broker, Agent, Factor
068	050103	Auctioneer, Appraiser, Valuer, House Agent
069	050104	Accountant
070	050105	Salesman, Buyer (not otherwise specified)
071	050106	Commercial Traveller
072	050107	Commercial Clerk
073	050108	Officer of Commercial Company, Guild, Society &c.
		<i>Dealers in Money</i>
074	050201	Banker
075	050202	Bank Service
076	050203	Bill Discounter, Bill Broker, Finance Agent
		<i>Insurance</i>
077	050301	Life, House, Ship &c., Insurance Service

**6. Conveyance of men, goods and messages**

		<i>Railways</i>
078	060101	Railway Engine Driver, Stoker
079	060102	Railway Guard
080	060103	Pointsman, Level Crossing Man
081	060104	Other Railway Officials and Servants
		<i>Roads</i>
082	060201	Toll Collector, Turnpike Gate Keeper
083	060202	Omnibus, Coach, Cab, Owner – Livery Stable Keeper
084	060203	Cabman, Flyman, Coachman (not Domestic)
085	060204	Carman, Carrier, Carter, Drayman
086	060205	Tramway Companies' Service
087	060206	Wheel Chair Proprietor, Attendant &c.
		<i>Canals, Rivers and Seas</i>
088	060301	Inland Navigation Service
089	060302	Bargeman, Lighterman, Waterman
090	060303	Navigation Service (on shore)
091	060304	Seaman (Merchant Service)
092	060305	Pilot

093	060306	Ship Steward, Cook
094	060307	Boatman on Seas
095	060308	Harbour, Dock, Wharf, Lighthouse Service <i>Storage</i>
096	060401	Warehouseman (not Manchester)
097	060402	Meter, Weigher <i>Messages, Portage, &amp;c.</i>
098	060501	Messenger, Porter, Watchman (not Railway or Government)
099	060502	Telegraph, Telephone Service

#### IV. AGRICULTURAL CLASS

##### 7. Agriculture

		<i>In Fields and Pastures</i>
100	070101	Farmer, Grazier
101	070102	Farmer's, Grazier's – Son, Grandson, Brother, Nephew
102	070103	Farm Bailiff
103	070104	Agricultural Labourer, Cottager
104	070105	Shepherd
105	070106	[Farm Servant Indoor]
106	070107	Land Drainage Service (not in towns)
107	070108	Agricultural Machine – Proprietor, Attendant
108	070109	Agricultural Student
109	070110	Others engaged in, or connected with agriculture <i>In Woods</i>
110	070201	Woodman <i>In Gardens</i>
111	070301	Nurseryman, Seedsman, Florist
112	070302	Gardener (not domestic)

##### 8. Animals

		<i>Animals</i>
113	080101	Horse Proprietor, Breeder, Dealer
114	080102	Groom, Horse-keeper, Horse-breaker
115	080103	Veterinary Surgeon, Farrier
116	080104	Cattle, Sheep, Pig – Dealer, Salesman
117	080105	Drover
118	080106	Gamekeeper
119	080107	Dog, Bird, Animal – Keeper, Dealer
120	080108	Vermin Destroyer
121	080109	Fisherman
122	080110	Knacker, Catsmeat Dealer &c &c.

#### V. INDUSTRIAL CLASS

##### 9. Books, Prints and Maps

		<i>Books</i>
123	090101	Publisher, Bookseller, Librarian
124	090102	Music-Publisher, Seller, Printer
125	090103	Bookbinder
126	090104	Printer
127	090105	Newspaper Agent, News Room Keeper
128	090106	Others <i>Prints and Maps</i>
129	090201	Lithographer, Lithographic Printer
130	090202	Copper Plate and Steel Plate Printer
131	090203	Map and Print – Colourer, Seller

132 090204 [Others]

#### 10. Dealers in Machines and Implements

##### *Machines*

133 100101 Engine and Machine Maker  
 134 100102 Millwright  
 135 100103 Fitter, Turner (Engine and Machine)  
 136 100104 Boiler Maker  
 137 100105 Spinning and Weaving Machine Maker  
 138 100106 Agricultural Machine and Implement Maker  
 139 100107 Domestic Machinery – Maker, Dealer  
 140 100108 [Others]

##### *Tools and Implements*

141 100201 Tool Maker, Dealer  
 142 100202 Cutler, Scissors Maker  
 143 100203 File Maker  
 144 100204 Saw Maker  
 145 100205 Pin Maker  
 146 100206 Needle Maker  
 147 100207 Steel Pen Maker  
 148 100208 Pencil Maker (Wood)  
 149 100209 Domestic Implement Maker  
 150 100210 [Others]

##### *Watches and Philosophical Instrument Makers*

151 100301 Watch Maker, Clock Maker  
 152 100302 Philosophical Instrument Maker  
 153 100303 Electrical Apparatus Maker  
 154 100304 Weighing and Measuring Apparatus Maker  
 155 100305 [Others]

##### *Surgical Instrument Maker*

156 100401 Surgical Instrument Maker

##### *Arms and Ordnance*

157 100501 Gunsmith, Gun Manufacturer  
 158 100502 Ordnance Manufacturer  
 159 100503 Sword, Bayonet – Maker, Cutler  
 160 100504 Others

##### *Musical Instrument Maker*

161 100601 Musical Instrument Maker, Dealer

##### *Type, Dies, Medals, Coins*

162 100701 Type Cutter, Founder  
 163 100702 Die, Seal, Coin, Medal Maker

##### *Tackle for Sports and Games*

164 100801 Toy Maker, Dealer  
 165 100802 Fishing Rod, Tackle, Maker, Dealer  
 166 100803 Apparatus for Other Games, Maker, Dealer

#### 11. Workers and Dealers in Houses, Furniture and Decorations

##### *Houses*

167 110101 Builder  
 168 110102 Carpenter, Joiner  
 169 110103 Bricklayer  
 170 110104 Mason  
 171 110105 Slater, Tiler  
 172 110106 Plasterer, Whitewasher  
 173 110107 Paperhanger  
 174 110108 Plumber  
 175 110109 Painter, Glazier

176	110110	[Others] <i>Furniture and Fittings</i>
177	110201	Cabinet Maker
178	110202	French Polisher
179	110203	Furniture Broker, Dealer
180	110204	Locksmith, Bellhanger
181	110205	Gas Fitter
182	110206	House and Shop Fittings – Maker, Dealer
183	110207	Funeral Furniture Maker, Undertaker
184	110208	Others <i>House Decorations</i>
185	110301	Wood Carver
186	110302	Carver, Gilder
187	110303	Dealer in Works of Art
188	110304	Figure, Image – Maker, Dealer
189	110305	Animal, Bird &c. Preserver, Naturalist
190	110306	Artificial Flower Maker
191	110307	[Others]

## 12. Workers and Dealers in Carriages and Harnesses

		<i>Carriages</i>
192	120101	Coachmaker
193	120102	Railway Carriage, Railway Wagon, Maker
194	120103	Wheelwright
195	120104	Bicycle, Tricycle – Maker, Dealer
196	120105	Others <i>Harness</i>
197	120201	Saddler, Harness, Whip Maker

## 13. Workers and Dealers in Ships and Boats

		<i>Hull</i>
198	130101	Ship, Boat, Barge Builder
199	130102	Shipwright, Ship Carpenter (ashore)
		<i>Masts, Rigging, &amp;c.</i>
200	130201	Mast, Yard, Oar, Block Maker
201	130202	Ship Rigger, Chandler, Fitter
202	130203	Sail Maker

## 14. Workers and Dealers in Chemicals and Compounds

		<i>Colouring Matter</i>
203	140101	Dye, Paint Manufacture
204	140102	Ink, Blacking, Colour Substance Manufacture
		<i>Explosives</i>
205	140201	Gunpowder, Guncotton, Explosive Substance Manufacture
206	140202	Fusee, Fireworks, Explosive Article Manufacture
		<i>Drugs and other Chemicals and Compounds</i>
207	140301	Chemist, Druggist
208	140302	Manufacturing Chemist
209	140303	Alkali Manufacture
210	140304	Drysalter
211	140305	[Others]

**15. Workers and Dealers in Tobacco and Pipes***Tobacco and Pipes*

212	150101	Tobacco Manufacture, Tobacconist
213	150102	Tobacco Pipe, Snuff Box &c. Maker

**16. Workers and Dealers in Food and Lodging***Board and Lodging*

214	160101	Innkeeper, Hotel Keeper, Publican
215	160102	Lodging, Boarding House Keeper
216	160103	Coffee, Eating House, Keeper

*Spirituuous Drinks*

217	160201	Hop – Merchant, Dealer
218	160202	Maltster
219	160203	Brewer
220	160204	Beerseller, Ale, Porter, Cider Dealer
221	160205	Cellarman
222	160206	Wine, Spirit – Merchant, Agent

*Food*

223	160301	Milkseller, Dairyman
224	160302	Cheesemonger, Butterman
225	160303	Butcher, Meat Salesman
226	160304	Provision Curer, Dealer
227	160305	Poulterer, Game Dealer
228	160306	Fishmonger
229	160307	Corn, Flour, Seed Merchant, Dealer
230	160308	Corn Miller
231	160309	Baker
232	160310	Confectioner, Pastrycook
233	160311	Greengrocer, Fruiterer
234	160312	Mustard, Vinegar, Spice, Pickle Maker, Dealer
235	160313	Sugar Refiner
236	160314	Grocer. Tea, Coffee, Chocolate Maker, Dealer
237	160315	Ginger Beer, Mineral Water Manufacturer, Dealer
238	160316	Others Dealing in Food

**17. Workers and Dealers in Textile Fabrics***Wool and Worsted*

239	170101	Woolstapler
240	170102	Woollen Cloth Manufacture
241	170103	Wool, Woollen Goods – Dyer, Printer
242	170104	Worsted, Stuff Manufacture
243	170105	Flannel Manufacture
244	170106	Blanket Manufacture
245	170107	Fuller
246	170108	Cloth, Worsted, Stuff, Flannel, Blanket Dealer
247	170109	Others

*Silk*

248	170201	Silk, Silk Goods, Manufacture
249	170202	Silk Dyer, Printer
250	170203	Ribbon Manufacture
251	170204	Crepe, Gauze Manufacture
252	170205	Silk Merchant, Dealer

*Cotton and Flax*

253	170301	Cotton, Cotton Goods Manufacture
254	170302	Cotton, Calico – Printer, Dyer, Bleacher
255	170303	Cotton, Calico – Warehouseman, Dealer
256	170304	Flax, Linen – Manufacturer, Dealer

257	170305	Lace Manufacturer, Dealer
258	170306	Fustian Manufacturer, Dealer
259	170307	Tape Manufacturer, Dealer
260	170308	Thread Manufacturer, Dealer
261	170309	[Others] <i>Hemp and other Fibrous Materials</i>
262	170401	Hemp, Jute, Cocoa Fibre Manufacture
263	170402	Rope, Twine, Cord – Maker, Dealer
264	170403	Mat Maker, Seller
265	170404	Net Maker
266	170405	Canvas, Sailcloth Manufacture
267	170406	Sacking, Sack, Bag – Maker, Dealer
268	170407	Others working and Dealing in Hemp <i>Mixed or Unspecified Materials</i>
269	170501	Weaver (undefined)
270	170502	Dyer, Printer, Scourer, Bleacher, Calenderer (undefined)
271	170503	Factory Hand (Textile) Undefined
272	170504	Felt Manufacture
273	170505	Carpet, Rug Manufacture
274	170506	Manchester Warehouseman
275	170507	Draper, Linen Draper, Mercer
276	170508	Fancy Goods (Textile) Manufacturer, Worker, Dealer
277	170509	Trimming Maker, Dealer
278	170510	Embroiderer
279	170511	Others

#### 18. Workers and Dealers in Dress

		<i>Dress</i>
280	180101	Hatter, Hat Manufacture
281	180102	Straw – Hat, Bonnet, Plait Manufacture
282	180103	Tailor
283	180104	Milliner, Dressmaker, Staymaker
284	180105	Shawl Manufacture
285	180106	Shirt Maker, Seamstress
286	180107	Hosiery Manufacture
287	180108	Hosier, Haberdasher
288	180109	Glover, Glove Maker
289	180110	Button Maker, Dealer
290	180111	Shoe, Boot – Maker, Dealer
291	180112	Patten, Clog Maker
292	180113	Wig Maker, Hair Dresser
293	180114	Umbrella, Parasol, Stick – Maker, Dealer
294	180115	Accoutrement Maker
295	180116	Old Clothes Dealer, and others

#### 19. Workers and Dealers in Various Animal Substances

		<i>Grease, Gut, Bone, Horn, Ivory and Whalebone</i>
296	190101	Tallow Chandler, Candle, Grease Manufacture
297	190102	Soap Boiler, Maker
298	190103	Glue, Size, Gelatine, Isinglass – Maker, Dealer
299	190104	Manure Manufacture
300	190105	Bone, Horn, Ivory, Tortoise-shell – Worker, Dealer
301	190106	Comb Maker
302	190107	Others <i>Skins</i>
303	190201	Furrier, Skinner
304	190202	Tanner, Fellmonger

305	190203	Currier
306	190204	Leather Goods, Portmanteau, Bag, Strap &c., Maker, Dealer
307	190205	Parchment, Vellum – Maker, Dealer <i>Hair and Feathers</i>
308	190301	Hair, Bristle – Worker, Dealer
309	190302	Brush, Broom, Maker
310	190303	Quill, Feather – Dresser, Dealer

## 20. Workers and Dealers in Various Vegetable Substances

		<i>Oils, Gums and Resins</i>
311	200101	Oil Miller, Oil Cake – Maker, Dealer
312	200102	Oil and Colourman
313	200103	Floor Cloth, Oil Cloth Manufacture
314	200104	Japanner
315	200105	India Rubber, Gutta Percha – Worker, Dealer
316	200106	Waterproof Goods – Maker, Dealer
317	200107	Others <i>Cane, Rush and Straw</i>
318	200201	Willow, Cane, Rush Worker, Dealer, Basketmaker
319	200202	Hay, Straw (not plait), Chaff, Cutter, Dealer
320	200203	Thatcher <i>Wood and Bark</i>
321	200301	Timber, Wood – Merchant, Dealer
322	200302	Sawyer
323	200303	Lath, Wooden Fence, Hurdle Maker
324	200304	Wood Turner, Box Maker
325	200305	Cooper, Hoop Maker, Bender
326	200306	Cork, Bark – Cutter, Worker, Dealer
327	200307	Others <i>Paper</i>
328	200401	Paper Manufacture
329	200402	Envelope Maker
330	200403	Stationer, Law Stationer
331	200404	Card, Pattern Card Maker
332	200405	Paper Stainer
333	200406	Paper Box, Paper Bag Maker
334	200407	Ticket, Label Writer
335	200408	Others

## 21. Workers and Dealers in Various Mineral Substances

		<i>Miners</i>
336	210101	Coal Miner
337	210102	Ironstone Miner
338	210103	Copper Miner
339	210104	Tin Miner
340	210105	Lead Miner
341	210106	Miner, in other or undefined Minerals
342	210107	Mine Service
343	210108	[Haulier] <i>Coal, Coal Gas, &amp;c.</i>
344	210201	Coal Merchant, Dealer
345	210202	Coal Heaver, Labourer
346	210203	Coke, Charcoal, Peat – Cutter, Burner, Dealer
347	210204	Gas Works Service <i>Stone, Clay and Road Making</i>
348	210301	Stone Quarrier
349	210302	Stone Cutter, Dresser, Dealer

350	210303	Slate Quarrier
351	210304	Slate Worker, Dealer
352	210305	Limeburner
353	210306	Clay, Sand, Gravel, Chalk, Labourer, Dealer
354	210307	Fossil, Coprolite Digger, Dealer
355	210308	Well Sinker, Borer
356	210309	Plaster, Cement Manufacture
357	210310	Brick, Tile – Maker, Burner, Dealer
358	210311	Paviour
359	210312	Road Contractor, Surveyor, Inspector
360	210213	Road Labourer
361	210214	Railway Contractor
362	210215	Platelayer
363	210216	Railway Labourer, Navvy
364	210217	Others
		<i>Earthenware and Glass</i>
365	210301	Earthenware, China, Porcelain, Manufacture
366	210302	Glass Manufacture
367	210303	Earthenware, China, Glass Dealer
		<i>Salt</i>
368	210401	Salt Maker, Dealer
		<i>Water</i>
369	210501	Waterworks Service
370	210502	Others
		<i>Precious Metals and Jewellery</i>
371	210601	Goldsmith, Silversmith, Jeweller
372	210602	Gold, Silver, Beater
373	210603	Lapidary
374	210604	Others
		<i>Iron and Steel</i>
375	210701	[Iron Manufacture]
376	210702	[Steel Manufacture]
377	210703	Blacksmith
378	210704	Whitesmith
379	210705	Nail Manufacture
380	210706	Anchor, Chain Manufacture
382	210707	Other Iron and Steel Manufacture
381	210708	Ironmonger, Hardware Dealer, Merchant
382	210709	[Others]
		<i>Copper</i>
383	210801	Copper, Copper Goods – Manufacturer, Worker, Dealer
384	210802	[Coppersmith]
		<i>Tin and Zinc</i>
385	210901	[Tin Manufacture]
386	210902	Tin, Tin Plate, Tin Goods – Manufacturer, Worker, Dealer
387	210903	Zinc, Zinc Goods – Manufacturer, Worker, Dealer
		<i>Lead</i>
388	211001	Lead, Leaden Goods – Manufacturer, Worker, Dealer
		<i>Other, Mixed or Unspecified Metals</i>
389	211101	Metal Refiner, Worker, Turner, Dealer
390	211102	Brass, Bronze Manufacture. Brazier
391	211103	Metal Burnisher, Lacquerer
392	211104	White Metal, Plated Ware, Manufacture, Pewterer
393	211105	Wire Maker, Worker, Weaver, Drawer
394	211106	Bolt, Nut, Rivet, Screw, Staple Maker
395	211107	Lamp, Lantern, Candlestick Maker
396	211108	Clasp, Buckle, Hinge Maker

397	211109	Fancy Chain, Gilt Toy Maker
398	211110	Others

## 22. Workers and Dealers in General or Unspecified Commodities

*Makers and Dealers (General or Undefined)*

399	220101	General Shopkeeper, Dealer
400	220102	Pawnbroker
401	220103	Costermonger, Huckster, Street Seller
402	220104	Manufacturer, Manager, Superintendant (undefined)
403	220105	Contractor (undefined)
		<i>Mechanics and Labourers (General or Undefined)</i>
404	220201	General Labourer
405	220202	Engine Driver, Stoker, Fireman (not railway, marine or agricultural)
406	220203	Artizan, Mechanic (undefined)
407	220204	Apprentice (undefined)
408	220205	Factory Labourer (undefined)
409	220206	Machinist, Machine Worker (undefined)

## 23. Workers and Dealers in Refuse Matters

*Refuse Matters*

410	230101	Town Drainage Service
411	230102	Chimney Sweep, Soot Merchant
412	230103	Scavenger, Crossing Sweeper
413	230104	Rag Gatherer, Dealer

## VI. UNOCCUPIED CLASS

### 24. Persons without Specified Occupations

414	240101	Persons returned by Property, Rank &c. and not special occupation Children under 5 years of age
-----	--------	--

## NOTES TO APPENDICES

- 1 BPP 1883 LXXX gives a re-set version of the schedule at 116-7. A copy of the original schedule can be found in PRO RG 27/5, Item 5.
- 2 It is not clear why 'Commercial Travellers' were included in this list as they were all classified together.
- 3 PRO RG 27/5, Item 27, Instructions to the various officers as to their duties in taking the census.
- 4 It should be noted that children between the ages of 3 and 15 would not have the occupational designation "scholar" added to column 10 except under this rule.
- 5 The wording of the original implies that all male servants in such situations will be allocated to an 'Assistant' or 'Apprentice' role unless specified as a 'Domestic Servant'. This poses the question how should someone described as a 'Baker's Servant' be classified; this rule suggests that we can be clear it is a servant rather than an assistant—but in the real world these distinctions may be blurred.
- 6 PRO RG 27/5, *Instructions to the clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people*, 1-4.
- 7 One assumes that this rule applies equally to women.
- 8 It is not clear on what basis the tabulators were meant to 'supply the missing information themselves'.
- 9 See reference 69 in the main body of notes.

## Bibliography

### Official publications

- 1851 Census of Great Britain, Population tables II. Ages, civil condition, occupations, and birth-places of the people. Vol. 1, BPP 1852-3 LXXXVIII.
- 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, General report*, BPP 1863 LIII.
- 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Ages, civil or conjugal condition, occupations and birth places of the people in Scotland, Vol. II*, BPP 1864 LI.
- 1871 Census of England and Wales, *General report (Vol. IV)*, BPP 1873 LXXI.
- 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the Population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II*, BPP 1874 LXXIII.
- 1871 Census of Ireland, *Part III, General Report, Maps and Diagrams, Summary Tables, Appendices*, BPP 1876 LXXXI.1
- 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. III, Ages, Conditions as to marriage; occupations and birthplaces of people*, BPP 1883 LXXX.
- 1881 Census of England and Wales, *Vol. IV, General report and tables*, BPP 1883 LXXX.
- 1881 Census of Scotland, *Ninth Decennial Census Vol. II, Ages, Education, Civil Condition, Birthplaces, General Index*, BPP 1883 LXXXI.
- 1911 Census of England and Wales, Vol. X, *Appendix. Classified and alphabetical list of occupations*, BPP 1915, 7660.
- Supplement to the twenty-fifth annual report of the registrar-general* (London, 1864).
- Supplement to the thirty-fifth annual report of the registrar-general* (London, 1875).
- Supplement to the forty-fifth annual report of the registrar-general* (London, 1885).
- Occupations of the people (England and Wales) enumerated in 1871, 1881 and 1891*, BPP 1895 LXXX [468].
- Report of the committee appointed by the treasury in inquire into certain questions connected with the taking of the census*, BPP 1890 LVIII.

### Other publications

- M. Anderson, 'Households, families and individuals: some preliminary results from the national sample from the 1851 census of Great Britain', *Continuity and Change*, 3 (1988), 421-438.
- M. Anderson, 'Mis-specification of servant occupations in the 1851 census: a problem revisited', *Local Population Studies*, 60 (1998), 58-64.
- W. A. Armstrong, 'The use of information about occupations', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972), 191-310.
- J. M. Bellamy, 'Occupational statistics in the nineteenth century census', in *The census and social structure*, ed., R. Lawton (London, 1978), 165-179.

- R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'The 1851 census in the Llandyrnog sub-district', *Denbighshire Historical Transactions*, 27 (1978), 199–201.
- R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'Interpreting the census returns for rural Anglesey and Llyn', *Anglesey Antiquarian Society Transactions* (1973), 111–36.
- R. M. and G. A. Benwell, 'The Llandyrnog householder's schedules for the 1851 census', *Local Population Studies*, 28 (1982), 89–90.
- C. Booth, 'Occupations of the people of the United Kingdom, 1801–1881', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 49 (1886), 314–444.
- D. J. Butler, *Durham city. The 1851 census* (Durham, 1992).
- M. Campbell-Kelly, 'Information technology and organizational change in the British census, 1801–1911', *Information Systems Research*, 17 (1996), 22–36.
- D. Caradog Jones, 'Some notes on the census of occupations for England and Wales', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 78 (1915), 55–81.
- S. B. Carter and R. Sutch, 'Fixing the facts: editing of the 1880 U.S. census of occupations with implications for long-term labor-force trends and the sociology of official statistics', *Historical Methods*, 29 (1996), 5–24.
- B. Collins and M. Anderson, 'The administration of the 1851 census in the county of East Lothian', *Local Population Studies*, 20 (1978), 32–7.
- M. A. Conk, 'Accuracy, efficiency and bias: the interpretation of women's work in the U.S. census of occupations, 1890–1940', *Historical Methods*, 14 (1981), 65–72.
- C. A. Crompton, 'Changes in rural service occupations during the nineteenth century. An evaluation of two sources for Hertfordshire, England', *Rural History*, 6 (1995), 193–203.
- G. Crossick, 'From the gentleman to the residuum: languages of social description in Victorian Britain', in *Language, history and class* ed., P. J. Corfield (Oxford, 1991), 150–78.
- C. Day, 'The distribution of industrial occupations in England, 1841–1861', *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 28 (1927), 79–235.
- M. Drake, 'The census, 1801–1891', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972), 7–46.
- Genealogical Society of Utah, Federation of Family Historians, *1881 Census for Great Britain* [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: The Data Archive [distributor], 29 July 1997. SN 3643.
- P. Glennie, 'Distinguishing men's trades'. *Occupational sources and debates for pre-census England* (1990) (Historical Geography Research Series, 25).
- C. Harvey, E. M. Green and P. J. Corfield, *The Westminster historical database. Voters, social structure and electoral behaviour* (Bristol, 1998).
- E. Higgs, 'The struggle for the occupational census, 1841–1911', in *Government and expertise: specialists, administrators and professionals, 1860–1914*, ed., R. M. McLeod (Cambridge, 1988), 73–86.

- E. Higgs, 'Structuring the past. The occupational and household classification of the nineteenth-century census data', in *History and computing III*, eds, E. Mawdsley *et al* (Manchester, 1990), 67–73.
- E. Higgs, 'Occupational censuses and the agricultural workforce in Victorian England and Wales', *Economic History Review*, 48 (1995), 700–16.
- E. Higgs, 'The tabulation of occupations in the nineteenth-century census, with special reference to domestic servants', in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books*, eds, D. R. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 27–35.
- E. Higgs, *A clearer sense of the census. The Victorian censuses and historical research* (London, 1996).
- Interdepartmental Committee on Social and Economic Research, *Guides to the official sources. No. 2. Census reports of Great Britain, 1801–1931* (London, 1951), 95–101.
- W. H. Hubbard and K. R. Jarausch, 'Occupation and social structure in modern central Europe. Some reflections on coding professions', *Quantum Information*, 11 (1979), 10–19.
- N. A. Humphreys, ed., *Vital statistics. A memorial volume of selections from the reports and writings of William Farr* (London, 1855).
- C. J. Koepp and S. L. Kaplan, 'Introduction', in *Work in France. Representations, meaning, organisation and practice*, eds, S. L. Kaplan and C. J. Koepp (Cornell UP, Ithica, 1986).
- C. Lee, *British regional employment statistics, 1841–1971* (Cambridge, 1979).
- G. B. Longstaff, 'Suggestions for the census of 1891', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52 (1889), 436–67.
- M. McDowell, 'William Farr and the study of occupational mortality', *Population Trends*, 31 (1983), 12–14.
- D. Mills and J. Mills, 'Farms, farmers and farm workers in the nineteenth-century census enumerators' books: a Lincolnshire case study', *The Local Historian*, 27 (1977), 130–43.
- D. R. Mills and K. Schürer, 'The enumeration process', in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books*, eds, D. R. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 16–26.
- D. R. Mills and K. Schürer, 'Employment and occupations', in *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books*, eds, D. R. Mills and K. Schürer (Oxford, 1996), 136–60.
- R. J. Morris, 'Occupational coding: principles and examples', *Historical Social Research*, 15 (1991), 3–29.
- Ministry of Labour, *A dictionary of occupational terms based in the classification of occupations used in the census of population, 1921* (London, 1927).
- W. Ogle, 'The alleged depopulation of the rural districts of England', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52 (1889), 205–40.
- B. Preston, *Occupations of father and son in mid-Victorian Britain* (Reading Geographical Papers No. 56, Department of Geography, University of Reading, 1977).

- G. Routh, *Occupations of the people of Great Britain, 1801–1981: with a compendium of a paper by Charles Booth* (Basingstoke, 1987).
- K. Schürer, 'The 1891 census and local population studies', *Local Population Studies*, 47 (1991), 16–29.
- K. Schürer, 'Understanding and coding the occupations of the past', in *The use of occupations in historical analysis*, eds, K. Schürer and H. Diederiks (St. Katharinen, 1993), 101–62.
- R. H. Steckel, 'The quality of census data for historical inquiry: a research agenda', *Social Science History*, 15 (1990), 579–99.
- S. Szreter, *Fertility, class and gender in Britain, 1860–1940* (Cambridge, 1996).
- P. M. Tillott, 'Sources of inaccuracy in the 1851 and 1861 Censuses', in *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*, ed., E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge, 1972).
- T. A. Welton, *Statistical papers based on the census of England and Wales, 1851, and relating to the occupations of the people and the increase of population, 1841–51* (London, 1860).
- E. A. Wrigley, ed., *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data* (Cambridge, 1972).
- M. Woollard, 'Creating a machine-readable version of the 1881 census of England and Wales', in C. Harvey and J. Press, *Databases in Historical Research* (London, 1996), 98–101.
- M. Woollard, "'Shooting the nets": a note on the reliability of the 1881 census enumerators' books', *Local Population Studies* 59 (1997), 54–7.
- M. Woollard with M. Allen, *1881 census enumerators' books database: description of the fields, v.0.2* (Colchester, 1998).