

## **Occupational classification in the nineteenth-century census of Scotland**

Matthew Woollard

This paper is based to a large extent on my thesis in progress. In that work, my main argument is that statistics, like all other historical evidence must be placed in its context before confirming its evidential status. The occupational classification used in the census is part of the framework in which we understand the social, economic and demographic conditions of a country, and without an understanding of the creation of those classifications we can not fully interpret these statistics. I also argue that the classifications themselves offer us a way of gaining insight into the agenda of the statisticians or agencies creating them. This is particularly important in the nineteenth century as we usually have no other evidence.

Thus, Scotland is treated in my work in progress as a case-study, along with Ireland, as examples of where the English influence on census taking predominated, and despite attempts from the separate administrations of Ireland and Scotland to reform the methodology surrounding the classification of occupations they were generally over-ridden by the 'central' bureaucracy in London. This paper concentrates on the censuses of 1861 and 1871 which were the years in which the GRO(S) attempted to swim against the English tide.

A brief history of the census in Scotland: Between 1801 and 1831 the census was taken simultaneously with that in England and Wales, under the auspices of John Rickman and the Home Office. In 1841 and 1851, the Scottish census was also supervised from London and carried out by the General Register Office.<sup>1</sup> Following the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland) Act in 1854,<sup>2</sup> a General Register Office was set up, which subsequently took control of the Scottish census. The first Registrar-General, William Pitt Dundas, was appointed in September 1854 and the first Scottish census run from Scotland was carried out in 1861.<sup>3</sup>

The precise administrative arrangements between the GRO(S) and the GRO are not clear, but I believe from a close reading of the 1861 census report suggests that the administrative machinery for the census of that year was to be taken over lock, stock and barrel from England despite a separate Act of Parliament for the Scottish census which differed in a number of details from that for England and Wales.<sup>4</sup> This uniformity of collection of the material, and the uniformity of the processing of the material, led to a uniformity in the publication of the abstracts, fulfilling to a certain extent the strictures laid down

by Prince Albert in his opening speech to the International Statistical Congress in London in 1860.<sup>5</sup>

Despite accepting this uniformity in its tabulations, part of the Scottish census report for 1861 contained a scathing attack on the English occupational classification scheme along with some suggestions about how to remedy this situation. In the intervening decade before the next census, a satisfactory conclusion was not reached, and the changes suggested were implemented in the 1871 census for Scotland. However useful these innovations were, or seen to be they were not utilised in the 1881 census, where the GRO enforced uniformity based on their system.

### *Classifications*

One of the purposes of classifications within statistics is to cause comparability, both over time and space. However, classifications also provide a theoretical basis upon which theories can be tested. These two functions of a classification often conflict, however, because if the theoretical underpinning of a classification alters, then comparability may be sacrificed. In order to answer the question why the Scots considered the classification used by the English impractical one needs to understand what the reason for that classification was to begin with, and whether it applied to the Scots equally as to England. If it did, why was it altered, if it didn't what were the reasons behind it?

Higgs has argued elsewhere that the mid-century English census can be seen as a medical report;<sup>6</sup> the main aim to understand mortality, and especially by geography. I would also argue that the actuarial science, which is also related to mortality (and especially that by occupation) was one of the main reasons for collecting occupational information and grouping occupations together in a particular way, especially in the period after 1850 and before the turn of the century when more focussed economic reasons become the over-riding function of the classification.

### *1861 census*

First, we need to briefly describe the classification proposed by Farr for the 1861 census. This was, in essence, a socio-economic classification, rather than an industrial one, though there were industrial elements. There were 18 orders divided into 106 sub-orders which in turn were broken down into at least 1061 headings.<sup>7</sup> Broadly speaking, the professions (and army), service and commerce covered the first six orders. Three further covered agriculture and fishing. Seven orders were for manufacturing and dealing – generally broken

down by the types of product worked on or being sold. Two final orders covered the residue.

The main difference to its predecessors was that wives “assisting generally in their husband’s occupations” were classified in the same sub-order as others carrying out those occupations. Thus, for example, there was a heading for “Wife of Innkeeper” alongside Innkeeper. Whether Farr was influenced in this matter by occupations recorded on death certificates is unknown, but we have no idea since female occupational mortality wasn’t reported on in England and Wales until the 1870s and then only for women reporting an occupation, rather than those reporting themselves as wives of people in particular occupations.<sup>8</sup> Thus the medical or actuarial basis for this particular element of the classification doesn’t hold fully, though most classification systems are predicated on multiple elements.

In the following census, these headings were kept, but all removed from the various occupational classes and moved into a separate sub-order within the domestic class. This change explicitly kept these women within the labour market, but by placing them together with non-working women (i.e., “Women and others engaged in domestic duties”), suggests that labour-market status was no longer the highest priority.

Whatever the initial reasoning for placing these particular wives alongside their husbands, apart from the fact that they were considered to “take part immediately in their husband’s business”<sup>9</sup>, it is clear that the English classification did not satisfy the GRO(S). The text of the Scottish report, signed by Dundas and Dr James Stark (the “Assistant in the RG in the matter of the census”) produced a concerted argument against the validity of the English classification scheme which had been, as far as they were concerned, foisted unwillingly upon them.

The main point of contention was that the classification used was a hybrid one which neither satisfied the economic or demographic bases of classification. (They used the terms Political Economy and Vital Statistics.) They were right to point out the value of occupational classifications to vital statistics, but their argument that by placing wives of occupied men in ‘occupied’ categories would devalue statistics of mortality was erroneous. In terms of ‘political economy’ they not only attacked including women at these points in the classification but questioned the positioning of certain occupations. However, their main argument was reserved to the question of dependency.

It is worth pointing out that Dundas and Stark were well aware of the medical value of the census. In the introduction to the second volume of the 1861

census, they suggested that it was more important than its predecessor as it included the tabulations of ages, civil condition and occupations which provided the denominators for life table calculations, which in turn are the basis of insurance and annuities: "These tables, also, taken in connection with those just noticed, form the basis whereby are ascertained the localities, the professions, the trades, etc., which shorten life, or favour its prolongation."<sup>10</sup> Later in the volume they report that one of the reasons for publishing occupational tables was to "estimate the comparative mortality prevailing among the different classes or ranks of society, as well as the comparative healthiness of each occupation or trade."<sup>11</sup> (It is worth mentioning that this comment is published in advance of the first of the decennial reports of the RG for England where occupational mortality is discussed for the first time.)

Having said this, Stark and Dundas believed that the primary purpose of the occupational tables, and thus the classification, was to measure both the numbers of people employed in, and the numbers dependent on a particular manufacture or trade. If, for whatever reason, they argued, foreign trade was damaged with another state, it would be possible to assess the likely numbers of those who would potentially be a burden on the country. Furthermore, the numbers dependent, they suggested, without pointing out how, would enable government to estimate the state of development of different trades and industries. However, they continued by suggesting that the achievement of both of these aims were being thwarted by the very system that had been put into place to accomplish them.

Their initial argument was that the numbers of dependents for occupational groups were not given and thus dependency-rates could not be calculated. This was followed up by a discussion on mortality rates. The argument given, and perhaps for the first time, was that a different form of classification should be used for mortality, and that this classification should be based on "class of society or rank in life", as opposed to occupation. This, they suggested, would allow all members of a co-resident family to be grouped together, because in an occupationally based classification where "...[T]he father is in one class, the elder sons, if above 15, in another, the wife and younger children are in a third, while the widows, if left with some little provision, are in a fourth.")<sup>12</sup>

In rhetorical fashion, they then argued that if proper (social) class-based mortality was impossible to calculate, then, of course it should be possible to calculate occupation-specific mortality rates. But, no, because the scheme is not truly an occupational classification it wouldn't allow for this — engine drivers, for example, they pointed out could be classified within almost any of the classes, and because of this both the final numbers of engine drivers and those of any other affected group would be incorrectly stated.

The English system failed then for three main reasons, first, it ignored dependency, which in itself had a potential value for economic (and poor law) policy; second because any mortality statistics based on it were likely to give an incorrect picture; and third, the scheme was inherently faulty because people carrying out the same jobs in different industries were classified in different places.

The authors were also concerned about the “domestic class”. They argued that one of the fundamental rules of classification is that each group must be exclusive. The domestic class as (shown in Figure 1) designed by Farr for the 1861 census, was comprised of two orders, first, “persons engaged in the domestic offices or duties of wives, mothers, mistresses of families, children and relations not otherwise described” and second “persons engaged in entertaining and performing personal offices for man.” The second of these orders need not detain us here, but the four unit groups used for the first were: 1) Wives, not otherwise described; 2) Widows, not otherwise described; 3) Children and relatives at home, not otherwise described and 4) Scholars, so described.

None of these groups, the authors proposed were of the slightest value, as they did not give the *total* number of any of these groups. In each case, the words ‘not otherwise described’ lent a spurious precision to these figures. The authors made a suggestion which today smacks of sexism, but at the time might not have been wholly out of place: “As the home duties of a wife are by far the most important to the community in which a woman can be engaged, every wife ought to have been tabulated under that head, no matter what trade or occupation she might occasionally follow.” The distinction here, however much the sentiment might offend, was that wives should either be classed as dependents (which was their preferred solution) or (implicitly) that wives should not be a separate category if some were being classified elsewhere. Clearly the importance of women within the labour market was not of great consequence to the Scottish census takers.

(It should be noted that the classification used in 1861 included the wives of a number of tradesmen within the group that those trades were classified: the wives of shopkeepers, farmers, graziers, butchers, shoemakers, lodging and boarding house keepers, beer sellers, publicans, innkeepers and hotel-keepers were all classified to their husband’s trade.<sup>13</sup>)

The report also noted that widows were treated differently to wives. A butcher’s widow would be tabulated to widow and not to butcher, and she might also have been tabulated to annuitant, if she “through the providence of

her late husband [had been] left with some small annuity".<sup>14</sup> After commenting on similar rules which make the groups less than exclusive, they restrict their final displeasure to the fact that criminals and those living in poorhouses were, if they reported an occupation, classified to that occupation. The census if tabulated according to the rules would make the number of paupers in Scotland 12,723 whereas the actual number of paupers was 117,587. The provenance of this figure is not known, and may include out-paupers as well as in-paupers, but the suggestion is again clear, that the figures are not exclusive.<sup>15</sup>

All of these problems, the commissioners suggested could be resolved by a conference between all those who were responsible for census taking in the British Isles. This was not to happen. However, to impress their point on the readers they presented within the report a table, showing for one (uncharacteristic) county — Linlithgow — what would happen if the principles which they held were put into practice. In this table (Figure 2) wives and children were redistributed according to their husbands' or fathers' trade and paupers were removed from the 'labour force' and moved to the eighteenth order. For the historian this table has one principal drawback, which is that we can not calculate the size of the labour market.

[Figure 2.]

This was the only practical implementation of their proposal, and to all intents and purposes the Scotland, and England and Wales censuses followed the same scheme.<sup>16</sup> In the words of the Scottish commissioners: "we followed as closely as we could the classification of occupations which was adopted for England, merely making such alterations upon it as were necessary for the peculiarities of the Scottish nation."<sup>17</sup> These alterations were minor and mainly concerned religious, legal professions and agricultural workers.

The 1871 report was, if anything, even more contemptuous of the English scheme. Like its predecessor it was signed by Dundas and Stark. Not only did it point out that the recommendation from 1861 for a conference of the British census-takers not acted upon by the Register Office in London, but, much more importantly, it acted on its own initiative in carrying out as many of their proposals and suggestions as they could manage without producing a wholly different classification scheme. There is possibly some subterfuge here – they explained that one of the reasons for doing this was caused by the delivery of an incomplete classification to Ireland. This gave the Scots the opportunity not to follow the English classification; indeed that they "suppressed or consolidated orders and sub-orders as appeared good to them".<sup>18</sup> (The Irish report noted that Scots believed that this would not be problematic to make generalisations, but they believed that "to generalise upon the occupations of

the Three Kingdoms as tabulated in the occupation statistics of each would be a work of very considerable nicety indeed."<sup>19</sup>) The main alteration of the Scots classification was to remove the fourth order of wives and children and to distribute them where to where they would be seen to be dependent. The Irish census commissioners believed that the broad principles of this were worth examination, and the Scots obviously thought it worked well.<sup>20</sup> However comparisons of the published tables of occupations in 1871 (see Table 1) show only local variations, and not a different scheme.

[Table 1]

Furthermore Charles Booth, when attempting to provide comparable statistics for the United Kingdom, found that there were little problems with these data. "I may mention that the results obtained in the census of Scotland for 1871 by actual enumeration do not differ very materially, allowing for differences of classification, from those given for the same period in the present tables."<sup>21</sup>

[Figure 3]

The 1871 report made much of the value of the statistics on dependents, explaining the reasons for the differences between the proportions of dependents in different occupational orders.<sup>22</sup> Figure 3 shows the basic dependency rates for Scotland, but a brief examination of the more detailed figures presented later in the report show that there is considerable variation in these rates at a county level. These could usefully be analysed to give us a better idea about the family economy in 1870s Scotland.

[Figure 4]

The most compelling (and curious) result of aggregating dependents by age related to a discussion (and single table (Figure 4)) on the ratio of male to female children under the age of five to different occupational groups. Dundas and Stark intimated that occupational conditions have a relationship to the number of male children born. Thus 'unhealthy' occupations such as chemical workers recorded the lowest ratio of male aged under 5 to female dependents (85) while outdoor 'healthy' road labourers recorded ratios of over 117.

These experiments were not repeated in 1881, where the English took tighter control of the administration and reporting of the census. I believe that this was more a symptom of a change of personnel than one of methodology. The period 1879-1881, during the preparations of the census was one of major personnel change in both Register Offices. In England George Graham retired in late 1879, being replaced by Bridges Hennicker in the following year; and

William Ogle replaced William Farr as Superintendent of Statistics in 1880. In Scotland Dundas retired in April 1880, being succeeded briefly by Roger Montgomerie who died within six months of taking office allowing Dundas to return temporarily for three months in late 1880 and Stair Agnew was appointed RG in January 1881.<sup>23</sup> Even James Stark was replaced during this period, so the management and technical staff experienced complete change.<sup>24</sup>

Personality and staff changes may have caused the dominance of England over Scotland in this minor issue. Stair Agnew had little to do with the early administration of the 1881 census in Scotland, though by the time occupational classification was taking place in 1882/3 he was in firm control, but following instructions from London. Agnew, a soldier and civil servant, was probably never going to be as inventive as his medical predecessors in the GRO(S) and it was perhaps inevitable that uniformity was achieved more through inertia than statistical relevance.

The subject of this paper is clearly little more than a footnote in the history of the GRO(S); however, it demonstrates the outside influences on what was, to a certain extent an independent enterprise. It shows that the Scots, unlike the English, were more transparent in their description of the purpose of collecting and classifying occupational information, and that their 'protest' in 1871 while unsuccessful in the long term provides the historian with a greater understanding of economy, society and demography.

Further archival research is necessary to consider the precise nature of the relationships, and the causes of the tensions.

Figure 1. Order 4: Sub-orders and occupational headings, England and Wales, 1861

IV.—Persons engaged in the Domestic Offices or Duties of WIVES, MOTHERS, MISTRESSES of FAMILIES, CHILDREN, RELATIVES (not otherwise returned).			
1. Wives (not otherwise described).			
WIVES . . . . .	2350096	20287	2329309
2. Widows (not otherwise described).			
WIDOWS . . . . .	269142	69	269073
3. Children and Relatives at Home (not otherwise described).			
DAUGHTER, GRAND-DAUGHTER, SISTER, NICE* . . . . .	2279277	2932383	246374
4. Scholars (so described).			
SCHOLARS . . . . .	1597310	1595637	1673
V.—Persons engaged in entertaining and performing PERSONAL OFFICES for Man.			
1. In Board and Lodging.			
INNKEEPER, HOTELKEEPER . . . . .	6981	249	6732
INNKEEPER'S, HOTELKEEPER'S, WIFE . . . . .	16127	22	16105
PUBLICAN . . . . .	6544	261	6280
BEERSELLER . . . . .	4016	113	3903
PUBLICAN'S, BEERSELLER'S, WIFE . . . . .	29743	53	29690
LODGING, BOARDING,—HOUSE KEEPER . . . . .	17257	92	17165
LODGING, BOARDING,—HOUSE KEEPER'S WIFE . . . . .	2036	3	2027
COFFEE, EATING,—HOUSE KEEPER . . . . .	1410	94	1316
Keeper of Assembly and other Public Rooms . . . . .	20	2	18
Order V.—Sub-order 1.—cont.			
Cook (not Domestic Servant) . . . . .	76	.	76
Bath Keeper, Attendant . . . . .	250	15	235
Servants' Registry Office Keeper . . . . .	205	4	201
OFFICER OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTION . . . . .	985	31	954
Proprietor, Officer, of Lunatic Asylum . . . . .	84	.	84
Others engaged in Boarding and Lodging (a) . . . . .	70	7	63
2. Attendance (Domestic Servants, &c.)			
DOMESTIC SERVANT, GENERAL . . . . .	644271	208935	345336
HOUSEKEEPER . . . . .	66106	1466	64940
COOK . . . . .	77822	4468	73354
HOUSEMAID . . . . .	102462	35837	66625
NURSE . . . . .	67785	35511	32274
LAUNDRY-MAID . . . . .	4040	650	3390
HOTEL, CLUB-HOUSE, DINING-ROOMS,—SERVANT . . . . .	14115	4547	9598
HOSPITAL, LUNATIC ASYLUM,—ATTENDANT, NURSE . . . . .	2797	99	2698
NURSE (not Domestic Servant) . . . . .	24821	106	24715
CHARWOMAN . . . . .	65273	1373	63900
College Servants . . . . .	310	10	300
Office Keeper, Cleaner . . . . .	283	7	276
Park, Gate, Lodge,—Keeper . . . . .	722	7	715
Others engaged in Attendance . . . . .	64	6	58

Source: 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Population Tables. Ages...*, Table XX, pp. lvii-lviii.

Figure 2: Demonstration of including dependents within occupational orders, Scotland, 1861.

TABLE XXXI.—OCCUPATIONS of the INHABITANTS of the COUNTY of LINLITHGOW in the two systems of Arrangement. 1. As published. 2. As suggested, with the Wives and Children tabulated along with the Head of the Family, so as to show the number of Persons dependent for their support on each Branch of Industry, while all Criminals and Paupers are tabulated as such, and not referred to Trades they may once have followed.

EIGHTEEN ORDERS OF OCCUPATIONS.	1.—AS PUBLISHED.					2.—AS SUGGESTED.				
	Males.	Females.	Both Sexes.	Number in each Class.	Proportion in every 100 Persons.	Males.	Females.	Both Sexes.	Number in each Class.	Proportion in every 100 Persons.
1. In General and Local Government, . . .	90	11	101	Professional.	1.5	169	169	338	Professional.	3.2
2. Army and Navy, . . .	218	0	218			591	261	103		
3. Engaged in the Learned Professions, . . .	210	62	272	Domestic.	59.6	304	255	559	Domestic.	4.2
4. Wives, Widows, and Children, . . .	7376	14591	21967			23271	0	0		
5. Domestic Servants, etc., . . .	186	1118	1304	Commercial.	1.8	303	1318	1620	Commercial.	4.5
6. Engaged in Mercantile Pursuits, . . .	139	50	189			700	231	164		
7. Engaged in Conveyance of Goods, etc., . . .	498	13	511	Agricultural.	9.5	758	610	1368	Agricultural.	20.9
8. Engaged in Agricultural Pursuits, . . .	2567	1056	3623			3730	4053	3796		
9. In Fisheries and about Animals, . . .	104	3	107	Industrial.	24.0	163	136	299	Industrial.	59.5
10. Engaged in Art and Mechanic Productions, . . .	997	48	1045			9342	1790	1367		
11. Engaged in Textile Fabrics and in Dress, . . .	1076	1365	2441	Indefinite.	3.6	1611	2436	4047	Indefinite.	7.7
12. Dealing in Foods and Drinks, . . .	565	158	723			1411	910	939		
13. In Animal Substances, . . .	115	1	116	Indefinite.	3.6	163	129	292	Indefinite.	7.7
14. In Vegetable Substances, . . .	107	60	167			1149	900	181		
15. Working and Dealing in Mineral Substances, . . .	4735	115	4850	Indefinite.	3.6	7066	5754	12820	Indefinite.	7.7
16. General Labourers, etc., . . .	974	31	1005			22	116	138		
17. Persons of Rank and Property, . . .	17	80	97	Indefinite.	3.6	217	666	883	Indefinite.	7.7
18. Supported by Community, and of no Specific Occupation, . . .	95	214	309			217	666	883		
Total in Linlithgow, . . .	20,069	18,976	39,045	39,045	100.0	20,069	18,976	39,045	39,045	100.0

g

Source: 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Vol. II. Abstract of ages, occupations and birthplaces of people in Scotland*, xlix.

Figure 3: Proportion of dependents to bread-winners, Scotland, 1871

OCCUPATIONS.	Number of DEPENDENTS to every Hundred Bread-winners.	OCCUPATIONS.	Number of DEPENDENTS to every Hundred Bread-winners.
TOTAL IN OCCUPATIONS . . .	126	5. Personal offices for man . . .	33
CLASSES.		6. Merchants, bankers, etc. . .	108
I. Professional . . . . .	136	7. In conveyance of persons, goods . . . . .	171
II. Domestic . . . . .	33	8. Agriculturists, etc. . . . .	172
III. Commercial . . . . .	147	9. Fisheries and about animals	211
IV. Agricultural . . . . .	177	10. In art and mechanical production . . . . .	152
V. Manufacturing . . . . .	122	11. Workers in textile fabrics . .	75
VI. Indefinite . . . . .	128	12. In food and drinks . . . . .	156
ORDERS.		13. In animal substances . . . .	150
1. In general and local government . . . . .	197	14. In vegetable substances . . .	134
2. Defence of country . . . . .	124	15. Miners and workers in minerals . . . . .	174
3. Learned professions . . . . .	120	16. Labourers, etc. . . . .	151
		17. Persons of independent means	69
		18. No specific occupation . . . .	162

Source: 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II, xlii.*

Figure 4: Ratio of male to female children in selected occupational groups, Scotland, 1871.

OCCUPATIONS.	Number of DEPENDENTS under 5 years of Age.		Proportion of MALES to every Hundred Females.	OCCUPATIONS.	Number of DEPENDENTS under 5 years of Age.		Proportion of MALES to every Hundred Females.
	Males.	Females.			Males.	Females.	
Workers in Chemicals . . . . .	1,321	1,551	85.2	Weavers, workers in mixed Fabrics . . . . .	4,081	4,008	101.8
Carriers on Canals, Rivers, and Seas . . . . .	5,409	5,787	93.5	Dealers in Coal . . . . .	1,437	1,400	102.6
Workers in Silk . . . . .	264	281	93.9	Engaged in Houses and Buildings . . . . .	20,359	19,679	103.4
Carriers on Railways . . . . .	3,318	3,516	94.4	In Shipbuilding . . . . .	3,798	3,654	103.8
Workers in Cotton . . . . .	4,618	4,845	95.3	In Mining (not Coal) . . . . .	4,312	4,147	103.9
Independent Persons . . . . .	1,170	1,222	95.8	Coal Miners . . . . .	13,875	13,340	104.0
Workers in Animal Substances . . . . .	1,161	1,204	96.4	Merchants, etc. . . . .	5,431	5,201	104.4
Cutlery, Carriages, Watches, Harness . . . . .	2,056	2,111	97.4	Storage Porters, Messengers	1,678	1,608	104.4
Workers in Wool . . . . .	4,494	4,594	97.8	Carriers on Roads . . . . .	5,899	5,644	104.5
Brewers and Dealers in Drinks . . . . .	11,589	11,818	98.1	In Vegetable Substances, Wood, etc. . . . .	3,899	3,709	105.1
General and Local Government . . . . .	2,779	2,812	98.8	Agriculturists . . . . .	40,412	38,397	105.2
Gardeners, Foresters . . . . .	2,173	2,185	99.5	Workers in Paper . . . . .	1,155	1,097	105.3
Workers in Flax and Linen . . . . .	3,510	3,511	100.0	In Machines and Tools . . . . .	4,059	3,849	105.5
Professional Class . . . . .	4,304	4,303	100.0	General Labourers . . . . .	12,023	11,278	106.6
Tailors, Clothiers, Dressmakers	12,272	12,255	100.1	In Books, Pictures, Musical Instruments . . . . .	1,929	1,799	107.2
Engaged about Animals . . . . .	1,976	1,963	100.7	In Fisheries . . . . .	7,165	6,663	107.5
Workers in Hemp, Jute . . . . .	1,160	1,151	100.7	Stone Quarriers, Brickmakers	3,744	3,473	107.8
Navy . . . . .	245	242	101.2	In Copper, Lead, Zinc, Brass	2,143	1,973	108.6
Domestic Service . . . . .	6,041	5,979	101.0	Army . . . . .	1,044	951	109.8
Workers in Iron and Steel . . . . .	13,609	13,338	102.0	In Earthenware, Glass, etc. . .	1,412	1,241	113.8
				Road Labourer, Navy, etc. . .	2,677	2,286	117.1

Source: 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II, xlv.*

**Table 1. Sub-order headings, England and Wales and Scotland, 1871.**

	England and Wales	Scotland (where different)
1.1.1	Officers of National Government	
1.1.2	Officers of Local Government	
1.1.3	Officers of East India and Colonial Government	
1.2.1	Army	
1.2.2	Navy	
1.3.1	Clergymen, Ministers, and Others connected with Religion	Clergymen, Ministers, and Church Officers
1.3.2	Lawyers and Law Stationers	Lawyers
1.3.3	Physicians, Surgeons, and Druggists	
1.3.4	Authors, Literary Persons, and Students	Authors, Editors, Reporters
1.3.5	Artists	Artists, Painters, Sculptors
1.3.6	Musicians	Musicians, Teachers of Music
1.3.7	Actors	Actors, Actresses
1.3.8	Teachers	Teachers, Professors
1.3.9	Scientific Persons	Civil Engineers and Scientific Persons
2.4.1	Wives and others mainly engaged in Household	[NOT PRESENT]
2.4.2	Wives assisting generally in their Husbands' Business	[NOT PRESENT]
2.5.1	Engaged in Board and Lodging	In Board and Lodging
2.5.2	Attendants (Domestic Servants, &c.)	
3.6.1	Mercantile Persons	Mercantile Pursuits
3.6.2	Other General Dealers	General Dealers, Hawkers
3.7.1	Carriers on Railways	
3.7.2	Carriers on Roads	
3.7.3	Carriers on Canals and Rivers	
3.7.4	Carriers on Seas and Rivers	
3.7.5	Engaged in Storage	<i>Sub-orders generally combined:</i> Engaged in Storage, Porters, Messengers
3.7.6	Messengers and Porters	
4.8.1	Agriculturalists	In Fields and Pasture (Agriculturalists)
4.8.2	Arboriculturists	In Woods (Arboriculturists)
4.8.3	Horticulturists	In Gardens (Horticulturists)
4.9.1	Persons engaged about Animals	Engaged about Animals
5.10.1	Workers and Dealers in Books	
5.10.2	Workers and Dealers in Musical Instruments	Makers of Musical Instruments
5.10.3	Workers and Dealers in Prints and Pictures	
5.10.4	Workers and Dealers in Carving and Figures	
5.10.5	Workers and Dealers in Tackle for Sports and Games	
5.10.6	Workers and Dealers in Designs, Medals, and Dies	
5.10.7	Workers and Dealers in Watches and Philosophical Instruments	
5.10.8	Workers and Dealers in Surgical Instruments	In Cutlery and Surgical Instruments
5.10.9	Workers and Dealers in Arms	In Arms, Powder, Shot
5.10.10	Workers and Dealers in Machines and Tools	
5.10.11	Workers and Dealers in Carriages	
5.10.12	Workers and Dealers in Harness	
5.10.13	Workers and Dealers in Ships	
5.10.14	Workers and Dealers in Houses and Buildings	
5.10.15	Workers and Dealers in Furniture	

5.10.16	Workers and Dealers in Chemicals	
5.11.1	Workers and Dealers in Wool and Worsted	
5.11.2	Workers and Dealers in Silk	
5.11.3	Workers and Dealers in Cotton and Flax	<i>Subdivided into 5.11.3a: cotton and 5.11.3b: flax</i>
5.11.4	Workers and Dealers in Mixed Materials	
5.11.5	Workers and Dealers in Dress	
5.11.6	Workers and Dealers in Hemp and other Fibrous Materials	<i>Subdivided into 5.11.6a: hemp and 5.11.6b: jute</i>
5.12.1	Workers and Dealers in Animal Food	
5.12.2	Workers and Dealers in Vegetable Food	
5.12.3	Workers and Dealers in Drinks and Stimulants	
5.13.1	Workers and Dealers in Grease, Gut, Bones, Horn, Ivory, and Whalebone	Workers in Grease, Bones, Ivory, Gut
5.13.2	Workers and Dealers in Skins, Feathers, and Quills	Workers in Skins, Feathers
5.13.3	Workers and Dealers in Hair	
5.14.1	Workers and Dealers in Gums and Resins	
5.14.2	Workers and Dealers in Wood	
5.14.3	Workers and Dealers in Bark	
5.14.4	Workers and Dealers in Cane, Rush, and Straw	
5.14.5	Workers and Dealers in Paper	
5.15.1	Miners	<i>Subdivided into 5.15.1a: coal miners and 5.15.1b: other miners</i>
5.15.2	Workers and Dealers in Coal	
5.15.3	Workers and Dealers in Stone, Clay	<i>Subdivided into 5.15.3a: stone workers and 5.15.3b: road and railway construction workers</i>
5.15.4	Workers and Dealers in Earthenware	
5.15.5	Workers and Dealers in Glass	
5.15.6	Workers and Dealers in Salt	
5.15.7	Workers and Dealers in Water	
5.15.8	Workers and Dealers in Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones	
5.15.9	Workers and Dealers in Copper	
5.15.10	Workers and Dealers in Tin and Quicksilver	
5.15.11	Workers and Dealers in Zinc	
5.15.12	Workers and Dealers in Lead and Antimony	
5.15.13	Workers and Dealers in Brass and other Mixed Metals	
5.15.14	Workers and Dealers in Iron and Steel	
6.16.1	General Labourers	
6.16.2	Other Persons of indefinite Occupations	Workers of indefinite occupations
6.17.1	Persons of RANK or PROPERTY not returned under any Office or Occupation	Persons of independent means
6.18.1	Scholars and Children not engaged in any directly Productive Occupation	6.18.1 and 6.18.2: Alms Person, Pauper, Prisoner 6.18.3 Persons of no stated occupation

Source: England and Wales. 1861 Census of England and Wales, *General Report*, pp.90-91;  
Scotland: 1861 Census of Scotland, *Eighth Decennial Census of the Population of Scotland. Vol. II*, pp.196-197

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> B. Collins and M. Anderson, 'The administration of the 1851 census in the county of East Lothian', *Local Population Studies*, 20 (1978), 32-7. Some little information is given in: Gordon Johnson, *Census records for Scottish families at home and abroad* (Aberdeen, 1997). See also: C. Sinclair, *Jock Tamson's Bairns: A history of the records of the General Register Office for Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> 19 & 20 Vict. c.96.

<sup>3</sup> Under the 1854 Act the Deputy of the Lord Clerk Registrar was to be appointed Registrar General. The Lord Clerk Registrar was a highly paid sinecure, which became an unpaid honorary post in 1879. In that year statutory provision was made to annexe the post of Registrar General to Deputy Clerk Register. This remained operative until 1919. (Source, untitled document on the history of General Register Office (Scotland): [http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/grosweb/grosweb.nsf/pages/files/\\$file/history.pdf](http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/grosweb/grosweb.nsf/pages/files/$file/history.pdf) [25 August 2004].)

<sup>4</sup> Act for taking the Census of the Population of Scotland. 23 & 24 Vic. c. 80.

<sup>5</sup> Both Dundas and Stark were present according to the list of participants.

<sup>6</sup> E. Higgs, 'Diseases, febrile poisons, and statistics: the census as a medical survey', *Social History of Medicine*, 4 (1991), 465-478.

<sup>7</sup> The number of sub-headings is based solely on male headings in 1861 Census of England and Wales, *Population Tables. Vol. II. Ages, civil condition, occupations and birth-places of people, Division I to Division III*, BPP 1863 LIII. Pt. I.265-, xl-lvi.

<sup>8</sup> *Supplement to the 25th AARG* (1864) covering the period 1851-60 includes a list of women who died in childbirth – almost all of them give the occupation of their husbands (those who were domestic servants excluded only).

<sup>9</sup> PRO RG 27/4 *Instructions for the use of the clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people, with alphabetical and classified lists* (1862).

<sup>10</sup> 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Vol. II. Abstract of ages, occupations and birthplaces of people in Scotland*, BPP 1864 LI.49-, ix.

<sup>11</sup> 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report*, xli.

<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, the authors of the report, note that social class is a better determinant of age-specific mortality, than simple occupation. "...the mortality at all ages is affected to a greater extent by the class of society which individuals occupy than by the mere occupation in which they engage...": 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report*, xliii.

<sup>13</sup> It is a moot point whether, if these wives reported occupations which would have placed them in a different group they would have been classified as such.

<sup>14</sup> 1861 Census of Scotland, *Population tables and report. Vol. II*, xlvi.

<sup>15</sup> The reason for including paupers within the general occupational framework is probably a conscious decision by Farr to ensure that when calculating occupational mortality those people who were no longer working but had been in contact with different materials in the past were included within the occupational statistics.

<sup>16</sup> The orders and classes were pretty much the same. Some sub-orders contained different headings which were particular to Scotland, especially in local government, the clergy and the legal professions. Some headings only occurred in Scotland, most notably in agriculture: drover, cottar, feuar and portioner, and animal workers: proprietor of salmon fisheries.

<sup>17</sup> 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II*, BPP 1874 LXXIII, xxxvi.

<sup>18</sup> 1871 Census of Ireland, *Part III General report, maps and diagrams, summary tables, appendices*, BPP 1876 LXXXI, 67.

<sup>19</sup> 1871 Census of Ireland, *Part III General report*, 66.

<sup>20</sup> In the Scottish census every class order and sub-order was divided into earners ("bread-winners") and dependants. There follows a paragraph about how the Scots dealt with wives,

---

which is difficult to follow without knowing exactly how the English dealt with wives in that year. In part it reads: "As regards the wives in Order IV of the Domestic Class, whom the English tables assume to be help-mates, not merely in the husband's household but in the husband's business, the Scotch tables admit no such presumption of the sort, but relegate these wives equally with the wives of no specified occupations to the dependent section of each order and sub-order, while the wives of specified occupations are tabulated in the bread-winning division of each order, sub-order or specific calling." Similarly, children and scholars are tabulated as dependants of a particular bread-winning division in Scotland and not in the indefinite class as in England.

<sup>21</sup> C. Booth, 'Occupations of the people of the United Kingdom, 1801-81', *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, 49 (1886), 314-444. Here at 318.

<sup>22</sup> 1871 Census of Scotland, *Eighth decennial census of the population of Scotland taken 3d April 1871, with report. Vol. II*, xlii-xliii.

<sup>23</sup> Sir Stair Agnew (1831-1916) graduated from Cambridge University in 1858 M.A. He initially served in the army (becoming a Lieutenant), but by 1861 held the office of Legal Secretary to the Lord Advocate, a post he held through till 1870 with a gap around 1867. From 1870 to 1881 he held the office of Lord Remembrancer. He took over as Registrar-General of Scotland in 1881 and remained in post until 1909. Details from:

[<http://www.thepeerage.com/p12209.htm#i122085>] [25 August 2004].

<sup>24</sup> Dundas and James Stark, M.D, signed the reports to the 1861, 1871 censuses. Agnew and R. J. Blair Cunningham, M. D., signed that of the 1881 census. Both Stark and Cunningham were described as 'Assistant to the Registrar General in the matter of the census'.