Chapter Five.

Measurement of gainful labour in the 1903 Philippines Census.

Authorities prescribed women's place in the census representation of occupations by using two organising structures, the classification scheme and gainful labour. Incomplete conceptualisation of the former led at a practical level to erratic positioning of occupations within an economic-industrial arrangement that affected men and women similarly. Some distortion of the statistics probably resulted from that bias and other deficiencies in the process of specifying, classifying and tabulating the occupations (see Chapter 4). The concept of gainful labour and its applied structure, on the other hand, enabled Census officials to identify the workers involved and to control their representation in the statistics. Here, officials treated men and women differently. Although the problems associated with the concept in Western nations are well documented, there has been little or no investigation of its use in the Philippines.

This chapter and the next examine the structure and application of gainful labour in the Philippines Censuses of 1903 and 1939 respectively. To avoid repetition, the two chapters are as consecutive parts of a whole, and central to each is the effect of the measurement on the record of women's gainful employment. First, because this chapter deals with the actual enumeration of women with paid employment in 1903, Section 1 outlines the unusual conditions then found in the Philippines, possible effects on women's reported employment and interpretation of any variation. A brief explanation of the U.S. Census Office rationalisation of gainful labour and its meaning for the U.S. domestic data forms Section 2. Section 3 examines the likely implementation of the gainful labour construct in the Philippines. Like the classification scheme, it is only possible to infer the structure of the 1903 measure from Census information and with reference to U.S. sources. I speculate on the ways officials and Filipino women might have affected the record of women's gainful employment, and concede that the Census statistics in all likelihood under-reported women's work. Despite that finding, Section 4 concludes that any distortion stemming from management of the 1903 gainful labour statistics is unverified. Chapter 6 considers regulation of the 1939 gainful employment records particularly concerning the treatment of housewives.

1. Background

Conditions in the Philippines in early 1903 were not conducive to an accurate population count, much less a reckoning of occupations. In the frontier zones, the local populations were still largely free of U.S. administration and bureaucracy. Elsewhere, sporadic outbreaks of fighting in provinces such as Pampanga, Albay, Iloilo, Negros and Samar disrupted barrio life and prolonged the Philippines-U.S. war. American authorities moved villagers in parts of Albay, for example, into *reconcentrado* settlements as a tactical measure. Roads and bridges were either non-existent or in poor condition. Transport ponies were dying from surra fever and communications to outlying areas were slow and often circuitous. Men were perhaps missing and women struggled to maintain their households under severely depressed material conditions.

Government reports (RPC3, 1, 1902; RPC4, 1, 1903) detail poverty, disease, famine and death in various provinces during 1902 and early 1903. Agricultural land, either destroyed or left untilled over the past years, was not yet in full production. Crop seed was limited, carabao numbers had not recovered since decimation by rinderpest and a lengthy drought began in January 1903 that heralded another locust plague. Food supplies were inadequate in some provinces where people relied on starch foods or forest products, although the government bought emergency rice supplies and encouraged local subsistence crops. Epidemic cholera devastated the population from March to November 1902 and was still present in 1903, along with plague, malaria, tuberculosis, smallpox, typhoid and other problems such as parasites and malnutrition. Health care outside the main cities, especially for mothers and infants, was restricted to local healers and mostly untrained midwives. Incomes had fallen while the cost of living rose and the currency was unstable. In short, conditions of life were difficult for many women and perhaps abnormal in some areas.

Mortality data in Volume 3 of the Census directly reflected some of these conditions. It is not so easy to suggest if or how the circumstances affected the occupation data. One proposition might be that more women worked to maintain or supplement family incomes, given the parlous agricultural conditions of the time. This is impossible to test. We simply do not know the proportions of adult women who

worked before 1903. A proposition that more women were working in place of missing males is likewise untestable from available data.

Census data of the economic activity rate of women (the proportion of women gainfully employed) showed variation across provinces, as seen in Table 5A. The proportion of adult women working was highest in the Cagayan valley where women worked the tobacco fields and lowest on average in Bicol, even though the region still suffered military activity in 1903. These variations perhaps reflected the different agricultural practices (including seasonality) and social customs of regions and provinces instead of any spike in female activity. A discrete set of census data cannot reveal abnormality or difference over time.

TABLE 5A
PROPORTION OF WOMEN AGED 10 YEARS AND OVER WHO WERE GAINFULLY EMPLOYED, SELECTED PROVINCES, PHILIPPINES, 1903 (%).

Philippines	**41.0**				
Abra	41.6	Manila	40.6	Antique	49.3
Ilocos N.	54.0			Capiz	57.1
Ilocos S.	38.1	Batangas	51.5	Iloilo	45.6
La Union	50.9	Cavite	40.0	Negros Occ.	35.5
		Laguna	35.0	Romblon	52.1
Cagayan	62.9	Marinduque	32.8		
Isabela	61.8	Mindoro	51.4	Bohol	8.3
		Rizal	41.4	Cebu	43.8
Bataan	31.3	Tayabas	48.2	Leyte	39.5
Bulacan	42.2	Palawan	35.2	Negros Oriental	46.8
Nueva Ecija	32.4			Samar	48.5
Pampanga	46.1	Albay	34.2		
Pangasinan	38.1	Ambos Camarines	34.6	Misamis	29.5
Tarlac	33.1	Masbate	34.5	Surigao	31.8
Zambales	35.4	Sorsogon	31.8	Davao	23.0

Source: 1903 Census, Volume 2, Table 53.

The possibility that more women than expected participated in paid work in 1903 might be important in any short-term comparison with 1939 data. Increased participation might have modified the type and range of women's occupations and the reported rate of economic activity in 1903, and therefore, any change over time. Again, we cannot quantify any possible variations from the 1903 data alone, or by comparison with the 1939 data, and there was no previous occupation census. On the other hand, the possible effect was perhaps less significant in a long-term perspective. Filipino women in 1903 were not isolated in time or space from the historical processes of change affecting their employment in different occupations. Any temporary increase in women's paid employment, whatever the occupations, perhaps would not have significantly altered historical trends already under way.

With awareness of the unsettled conditions in 1903, however, it is legitimate to ask how did the Census Office compile these data and were the standards of assessment appropriate for the circumstances?

2. The gainful labour concept.

The 1903 Philippines Census document contained neither explanation nor expression (as instructions to enumerators) of gainful labour. Given the U.S. origin of the Census, it might be presumed that the same notion of counting employment was upheld in the Philippines as in U.S. accounts. Gainful labour was the construct by which U.S. statisticians identified and counted the workforce. The occupation question in the 1900 U.S. Census applied to every person 10 years of age or over who was at work, that is, occupied in gainful labour, during any part of the census year. It also applied to any person who was usually occupied in gainful employment but during the year was unable to secure work of any kind. Enumerators were to record the profession, trade or branch of work on which the respondent depended chiefly for support, or in which that person was ordinarily engaged for the larger part of the time (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979, p. 35, Paragraph 154). Thus, statisticians categorised the population as being with or without gainful employment, and the gainful labour record provided a count of occupations in pre-1940 Censuses (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1961). But the construct had serious limitations for the recording of women's work and employment.

Feminist scholars have uncovered its structural male bias in U.S. practice (Bose 1987; Folbre 1991; Folbre and Abel 1989; Fraundorf 1979), but Margo Anderson (1992) concludes that the concept relied upon assumptions that depreciated women's work. Statisticians, she argues, assumed a separation of the market and home economies. They held that the workforce was an aggregate of independent individuals working for gain, and that the record of their labour would provide an accurate account of market labour. Anderson describes the difficulty Census officials had at the end of the nineteenth century when they supposed that women, as daughters, wives and widows, were dependants of households and not part of the productive economy. U.S. gainful labour records therefore excluded housewives. American women, Anderson reasons, were overlooked in surveys and censuses because the notion of gainful labour

did not cope with the relationship between market and non-market work, while distinguishing between independent and dependent workers. Officials then gave substance to the concept in the instructions to enumerators, which became open to different interpretations.

Accordingly, gainful labour statistics have a restricted meaning. Researchers and officials have long disparaged the concept because of its imprecision, typified by the lack of a specific, short-term time frame, and its failure to define the labour supply, including the employment status of workers at enumeration (Durand 1968; Hauser 1949; Smuts 1960; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1961). In response to the need during the Great Depression for a more exact delineation of the labour supply, the *labour **force*** concept emerged. The Census Bureau considered the labour force to be the sum of the employed and the unemployed.

During the 1930s, Bureau surveys at first counted the unemployed as those willing and able to work, that is, by attitude. The questions were found to be subjective and the results unsuitable for comparative purposes. The Bureau therefore introduced a revised construct, based not on occupational status or on attitude to work but on activity (working or seeking work) in a specified week, to the decennial 1940 U.S. Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1975). Statisticians consider workers as active or inactive. Distinctions between the employed and the unemployed make it possible to monitor change in the characteristics of workers as well as in participation and distribution of the labour supply. Gainful labour statistics do not enable us to make that level of comparison for women over time, nor are they a reliable, accurate source of information on women's labour activity and labour market status. Numbers of gainful workers from pre-1940 Censuses therefore are not properly equivalent to post-1940 measures of the labour force.

Despite the 1903 Philippines Census being a count of households[1], it is not a given fact that the Philippines officials assumed the same condition of dependency implicit in the gainful labour notion. It is also not definite that the practical bias apparent in the U.S. equally applied in the Philippines. The next section therefore attempts to establish the context of gainful labour for the 1903 Census. How did officials and enumerators identify and count gainfully employed Filipino women? Because the Census document lacks copy of the enumerators' instructions, it is necessary to work from the Philippines data and from instructions for the U.S. Twelfth

Census of 1900 (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979, pp. 35-37). All quotations or numbered Paragraphs in the following section refer to the U.S. directions. Although we should not assume that the Philippines instructions replicated U.S. directions, the evidence suggests that they were alike in most respects. It is possible to surmise about bias, but without further evidence, that does not necessarily indicate an unqualified assumption of dependency by Census officials in the Philippines. Only tentative suggestions are possible, therefore, about the context of gainful labour in 1903.

3. Philippines Census identification of the gainfully employed.

Paid employment.

Instructions to U.S. enumerators in 1900 show the difficulty Census officials had in conceptualising gainful labour and in all likelihood instructions used in the Philippines were similarly ambiguous. To be gainfully employed in the United States generally meant earning a money income[2]. As well, it was likely that gainful labour included wages paid in kind. The first instruction for agricultural occupations, for example, directed enumerators to note as farm labourers persons who worked on a farm "for a stated wage (in money or its equivalent)" (Paragraph 166). Did this include women, paid in kind for seasonal work on the family farm? Was the principle restricted to agricultural occupations? The U.S. instructions were noncommittal. Furthermore, it can be argued that the chief means of support for women maintaining households was a form of payment in kind (Folbre and Abel 1989), but to U.S. Census officials, that construction was unacceptable[3]. For the gainful criterion, the U.S. instructions can give little guide as to how the Office might have worded the Philippines instructions, but they do alert readers to likely complexities.

A Census Office decision in the Philippines on where to discriminate between money wages and payment in kind was fundamental to the application and measurement of gainful labour. Without the Census instructions, it is impossible to know with certainty if there were the same emphasis on market work, on a stated wage or pay implying a money income. As well, any assumption of the separation of market work from non-market work was hazardous in the 1903 economy. Coin was not the universal means of exchange (Clark 1905) and production was home-based rather than

in centralised workplaces that operated throughout the year (1903 Census, Volume 4; Ofi-eneo 1982)[4]. Furthermore, even if we assume the same stated measure of gainful labour in the instructions, it does not necessarily mean that officials and enumerators in the Philippines applied the criteria similarly. Did Census staff in the Philippines decide to exclude women who were paid in kind for non-household work, an assumption Eviota (1992) accepts, only because of the perceived lack of a stated wage? The UN (1960) argued that as a consequence of the presumed distinction, women who divided their time between household duties and agriculture were not counted on the same scale as women who engaged in household duties and manufacturing.

By using the constraint, gainful labour, the Census Office effectively excluded non-waged occupations from the occupation account (M. Anderson 1992). It was that restriction which feminist researchers particularly find disturbing. They argue that the restriction consigned women enumerated as being without gainful occupations[5] to a classification as housewives (or daughters), out of the labour market (see Note 3). It denied the significance of the women's gainful work in supplementing the family income, and it downgraded women's household maintenance and family care to being non-work, not an occupation. The gainful labour concept, it is implied, therefore failed to acknowledge a distinction between women's public and private work. As well, writers have assumed that either male enumerators or husbands were responsible for the enumeration, an expression of gender domination that reinforced the male bias of the concept and its use in a census (Higgs 1987; B. Hill 1993).

Married women.

Mindful of previous inexactness over women's occupations, the Census Office had included a new paragraph specifically on married women's gainful employment in the 1900 U.S. enumerators' instructions. Enumerators were directed that if "a married woman has a gainful occupation, return the occupation accordingly, whether she does the work at home or goes regularly to a place of employment, and whether she is regularly or only occasionally so employed" (Paragraph 160)[6]. The 1903 Philippines Census did not cross-tabulate occupations by marital status, but it is possible to infer the insertion of the same or similar paragraph in the Philippines instructions from indirect evidence. Of the 2,136,948 women aged 15 years and over, 25.2 per cent

(538,221) were single, and 45.6 per cent (974,345) were categorised as being gainfully employed. If we assume that all single women of that age engaged in paid work and that the measurement of gainful employment was correct, a minimum of 436,124 (44 per cent) of those gainfully employed must have been ever married. It was therefore likely that at least 27 per cent of ever married women 15 years of age or over had gainful employment, which suggests that the Philippines instructions included the same or similar paragraph. These proportions exceeded those in the U.S.[7] and they raise a number of issues that the Census document cannot help clarify.

First, the relatively high proportion of gainfully employed women who were married suggests that we might query if Census officials did assume Filipino women's dependency. Margo Anderson contends that the assumption of women's household dependency was a necessary condition for the rationalisation of gainful labour in the U.S. Census. Given the high Philippines figures, perhaps the record reflected Census Office acceptance of Filipino women's gainful employment, which therefore demonstrated an abandonment of the dependency notion. This suggests that authorities in the Philippines conceptualised gainful labour differently from their core U.S. thinking. There is no direct evidence in the Census text to test this interpretation. It is, however, inconsistent with the general argument that the officials relied upon American assumptions and knowledge when conducting the Philippines exercise. It appears unlikely that they separately rationalised gainful labour, whereas for other issues (the classification scheme, for example) in all likelihood they carried American assumptions into the Philippines context (see Chapter 4). Nevertheless, the likely proportion of gainfully employed Filipino women who were married does suggest that, although Census officials probably assumed women's dependency, there was discordance between official thinking about gainful labour and the reality of enumeration in the Philippines. As in the case of their acceptance of Filipino definitions of occupations (see Chapter 4), this possibly indicated a degree of pragmatism perhaps not so evident in the U.S. Census.

On the other hand, the high Philippines proportion probably reflected an acceptance by Philippine society that many married women engaged in paid work (Eviota 1992). In this view, perhaps we might assume that the Census data represented a reasonable cross-section of Filipino women. But if, as American researchers argue, the U.S. Census underestimated the extent of married women's paid work, did the

higher Philippines proportion imply greater accuracy and less bias against married women in the Philippines Census? Was there, for example, a greater leniency by Filipino enumerators in applying criteria of gainful labour (such as payment in kind) than U.S. enumerators allowed? Conversely, if one argues as do Owen (1984) and Eviota (1992), that the 1903 Census underestimated the paid work of married Filipino women, to what extent did undercounting occur?

We simply cannot test this from the data. First, of the 1,474,462 women aged 10 years or over categorised as non-gainfully employed in 1903, we do not know what proportion was ever married. More than half (822,992) of these women were aged 25 years or over, of whom a majority were married in all likelihood. The implication is that married women needed the extra income from gainful employment for household maintenance. Indeed, Owen and Eviota declare that it is ludicrous to suggest otherwise. But we do not know how many of the women engaged in paid work, in which occupations, whether it was part-time, full-time, regular or seasonal work, or any details about the method or amount of payment. For wealthy women, marriage did not necessitate earning supplementary income to maintain a household. Conversely, some women might have worked for reasons other than household maintenance. Furthermore, there were 163,637 single women aged 25 years or older. Their employment status is also unknown. It is therefore difficult to estimate a proportion of women who engaged in paid work but who were categorised as being without gainful occupations.

Another construction is also possible. Filipino women themselves might have described their occupations as housewives, in spite of the gender subjugation and cultural conditioning it implied. Perhaps women considered the home-based work they did to earn extra family income as allied or even complementary to, but not separate from their primary role, that of wife or mother[8]. It might have been that women made little distinction between household work and non-household work. Illo (1995) for example, finds that married women in a Quezon province fishing village consider themselves first as *maybahay* (housewife), for social status[9], and that outside, paid work is thought of as being part of, not separable from that status. In the women's view, they consider being a housewife means providing goods *and* labour[10]. Did early twentieth-century Filipino women think similarly, so that home-based or outside work was a condition of identity[11], as distinct from a separate, economic occupation?[12]

Aggregated census statistics can provide only limited, general clues to questions of perspective, but the interpretation remains a possibility.

Alternatively, some may consider the women's classification as housewives a form of feminine resistance to the colonial Census process. In his report, Joseph Sanger acknowledged resistance to earlier Spanish censuses by obstruction and misinformation, because of the imposition of taxes and corvée labour (1903 Census Vol. 1, Prologue). There is no evidence available that might test the proposition about women in 1903. We do not know if women had the authority or opportunity to oppose categorisation in this way. Resistance by women against their categorisation remains a tentative suggestion only. Married women with gainful employment therefore might have chosen to be counted as housewives for a positive reason (social identity) or perhaps as a negative reaction to the event. Either way, it was a statistical matter of chance. Yet, if women participated in their own history by complying with the housewife classification, did they not help to shape the records?

Chappell (1995) discusses the problem this question raises of passive victim versus active agency. If women were to claim agency through co-operation or resistance, then that might remove their victimisation by the imposed census categorisation and measurement. On the other hand, it can be argued that the count, knowingly carried out by U.S. Census authorities, was of greater import (see also Borofsky 2000). It is implied that the U.S. Census authorities consciously subjugated Filipino women, knowing the consequences (including the factor of chance) of identifying and measuring the workforce by the gainful labour construct. This, however, assumes intent for the occupation account that we cannot prove and tends to confuse it with the purpose of the census. We cannot answer the sensitive question of women's agency and their possible gainful labour categorisation from the Census document alone.

Time at work and multiple occupations.

Gainful labour also carried a time dimension[13], which had two facets. First, time referred to the census year (for the Philippines, 3 March 1902 to 2 March 1903), and presumably enumerators were to record the occupation a respondent would ordinarily follow during that year. It bears repeating that unemployment for any period

of the year did not exclude a person from being counted in gainful employment. Persons recorded as being without gainful employment did not mean that they were unemployed, only that they did not report a gainful occupation. There is no evidence that enumerators in the 1903 Philippines Census asked about time unemployed. Census officials allocated neither a column on the population Schedule nor space on the punch cards for the question or response, and the report made little mention of persons with gainful occupations being unemployed for any number of months. We simply cannot tell any details about the employment status of women from the 1903 account, unlike the U.S. Census. From 1890 on, the U.S. Census Office had added a question about unemployment during the U.S. census year (see, for example, Paragraph 221 in 1900's instructions). It was a logical extension of the questions based on that notion of time.

A second aspect of time, newly added to the 1900 U.S. Census, covered persons who did more than one type of paid work in the census year (such as teachers who were farmers, or farmers who fished) (Paragraph 158). Enumerators had to enter a single occupation for each person on the Schedule, but when respective amounts in money income were hard to establish, time spent in the occupation became the criterion of measurement. It applied also to the classification of students who supported themselves with part-time paid work (Paragraph 162). Supposedly, income earned had precedence over time, which perhaps reflected the Census Office assumption of market based labour. As evidence that the Philippines instructions included the same paragraphs, the 1903 Census Report indicated that persons with more than one occupation did not necessarily choose their nominated occupation in accordance with the criteria[14]. The author suggested it was chance that respondents told enumerators whether they were farmers or fishermen. His comment perhaps connoted that Census officials had compiled loosely worded instructions to enumerators. Furthermore, the Report stated that for this reason of chance, many of the statistics, with the exception of professional occupations, decreased in significance relative to the lower number in the occupation.

For women, the choice was not only between occupations, but also between gainful and non-gainful employment, with the possibility of exclusion from the workforce records. Detailed examination of Census data for one occupation, teaching, illustrates the counting problem and tends to support the view that chance might have affected the enumeration. This is the only occupation for which the Census provided

two sets of relatively uniform statistics. That it was a classified professional occupation and supposedly immune to the difficulty appears to add weight to, but does not confirm the Report's assertion of an unreliable occupation count. The total number of teachers (male and female) enumerated in the 1903 population Census (Table 59, Volume 2) was less than the number recorded in the School Schedules (Volume 3): 5,362 compared with 5,925. Although the Census Report explained the difference by noting that some teachers held other jobs under which they were enumerated, there is a sense that it was referring only to males. Of the extra teachers, however, 248 were women[15].

TABLE 5B
RECORDED FEMALE TEACHERS, PHILIPPINES, 1903

	Total	Filipino	White
School Schedule, Vol. 3.	2116	1779	337
Table 59, Vol. 2.	1868	1595	273
Table 60, Vol. 2.	1733	1483	250

Table 5B shows that schools nominated another 184 Filipino and 64 white (American and Spanish) women teachers compared with the population Census (Table 59). That is, enumerators perhaps failed to count more than 1 in 9 women teachers recorded in the School Schedules. The Report, however, did not describe where else the 248 women might or might not be classified in the occupation count. A range of factors might have influenced either count and therefore contributed to the difference. School principals, for example, might have inflated staff numbers, when the reporting of them was possibly dependent on conditions such as government or administrative policy, enrolments, local conditions, the supply of teachers, or political reasons. For the moment, consideration of these likely factors is beyond this discussion. Yet, if we assume reliability in the School Schedules, why did enumerators apparently miscount women teachers? Was the population enumeration of occupations inaccurate?

Possible answers might include that the women chose to be identified as something else. That might have been a deliberate action, although Census officials viewed it as chance. Perhaps some chose enumeration as nuns, for example, where a vocation took precedence over the secondary occupation. There is no way to crosscheck this owing to the limited provincial information given in Table 60, which omitted the 81 nuns identified in Table 59. Perhaps the Census counted some women under other occupations. Alternatively, perhaps it enumerated some as housewives,

that is, without gainful employment despite income earned from and time spent in teaching. We can only surmise reasons for the possible enumeration, since published data do not tell whether a response was deliberate or incidental, or whether men or women answered the enumeration questions. If some of the difference for female teachers between the School Schedules and the population enumeration was because of choice or chance, however, then it illustrates the counting difficulty instituted by the gainful labour structural provisions. It also clouds the issue of reliability.

An examination of the provincial distribution of teachers further complicates the problem. Table 5C lists by province the numbers of female teachers recorded in Census Table 60, Volume 2 and in the School Schedules recorded in Volume 3, page 652. Numbers of white teachers in most provinces were too low for the individual provincial differences to be of significance, although the variation was 24 per cent in Manila. In contrast, the provincial data show that there appeared to be some regional inconsistency in counting Filipino women teachers. Of the extra Filipino teachers included in the School Schedules throughout the 32 provinces for which Table 60 recorded teachers, nearly four-fifths were in Bicol. In Albay and Sorsogon, their numbers doubled. Conversely, School Schedule numbers of Filipino teachers decreased by one quarter or more in Bulacan, Pampanga and Nueva Ecija, and by smaller proportions in other Central Luzon Plain provinces and the Ilocos region[16].

Some explanation of this Table is necessary. The provincial distribution of occupations in Census Table 60 from which I have partly compiled Table 5C was an incomplete record. The Census distribution in Table 60 omitted 287 women with professional occupations, including 135 teachers and the 81 nuns[17]. We can establish for each province how many of the professional sector were omitted from Table 60, but not which individual occupations were affected. In Cebu, for example, 43 professional women were unidentified (see Appendix 1 Table L), but their specific occupations are unknown. That might have explained some of the difference in Cebu's teachers shown in Table 5C. In the main Bicol provinces however, Census Table 60 left out few from the sector – Albay (3 professional women), Ambos Camarines (5), and Sorsogon (1 only). In other words, Census officials omitted from the provincial record in Table 60 very few Bicol teachers identified by enumerators in the population Census, and this possible factor does not explain the regional anomaly noted in the previous paragraph.

TABLE 5C

FEMALE TEACHERS, PROVINCIAL DISTRIBUTION, PHILIPPINES, 1903

	Population Schedule[a]			Schools Schedule		
	Total	Filipino	White	Total	Filipino	White
PHILIPPINES	1733	1483	250	2116	1779	337
Abra	16	16	. .	21	20	1
Ilocos Norte	30	26	4	28	25	3
Ilocos Sur	63	59	4	54	49	5
La Union	25	22	3	24	21	3
Cagayan	29	25	4	37	32	5
Isabela	12	12	....	17	17	....
Bataan	....	....	....	13	10	3
Bulacan	59	51	8	45	37	8
Nueva Ecija	16	11		11	6	5
Pampanga	40	32	8	33	24	9
Pangasinan	66	59	7	73	63	10
Tarlac	13	8	5	18	10	8
Zambales	15	14	1	13	11	2
Manila	336	229	107	338	205	133
Batangas	41	36	5	54	49	5
Cavite	44	32	12	43	33	10
Laguna	32	29	3	27	23	4
Marinduque	15	14	1	22	20	2
Mindoro	....	....	....	9	8	1
Rizal	34	29	5	32	22	10
Tayabas	35	33	2	39	37	2
Palawan[b]	....	....	....	7	6	1

	Population Schedule[a]			Schools Schedule		
	Total	Filipino	White	Total	Filipino	White
Albay	73	70	3	142	139	3
Amb. Camarines	84	75	9	112	96	16
Masbate	....	....	....	10	8	2
Sorsogon	31	30	1	66	65	1
Antique	51	50	1	43	42	1
Capiz	....	....	....	20	16	4
Iloilo	129	111	18	135	116	19
Negros Occ.	56	47	9	53	45	8
Romblon	....	....	....	12	10	2
Bohol	79	78	1	100	98	2
Cebu	131	120	11	143	125	18
Leyte	72	67	5	70	65	5
Negros Oriental	36	34	2	48	43	5
Samar	....	....	....	20	19	1
Misamis	33	30	3	54	47	7
Surigao	31	28	3	50	47	3
Cotabato	....	....	...	4	3	1
Davao	....	....	...	30	29	1
Sulu[b]	....	....	...		....	1
Dapitan	....	....	....	8	8	....
Basilan	....	....	....	2	1	1
Zamboanga	....	....	.....	22	18	4
Benguet	....	....	....	2	....	2
Lep.-Bontoc	....	....	...	1	1	....
N. Vizcaya	6	6	....	10	10	....

Sources: 1903 Census, Volume 2, Table 60; Volume 3, p. 652

[1]. Note that in this Schedule, the absence of teachers in some provinces means only that they were not recorded in Census Table 60.

[b] Palawan includes Paragua (where the teachers were) and Paragua Sur. Sulu includes Jolo (the one teacher), Siassi and Tawi Tawi.

Perhaps enumerators misunderstood the instructions. The result would not be visible in the population data of Census Tables 53-59, but it would mean that data for the teaching occupation were suspect – an extravagant claim. It was unlikely that enumerators misinterpreted instructions for just one occupation either nationally or by regions. Furthermore, the Census Report did note that instructions were generally misinterpreted in Bohol (see below), but it did not refer to a similar error restricted to one occupation throughout the provinces. Evidence therefore appears to suggest that there was a regional variation by Bicol teachers in particular when they nominated their occupation, which statisticians attributed to chance.

Owen (1984) notes that in Albay and Sorsogon, municipalities had difficulty in hiring teachers in 1902, because wages were much lower than the income women could earn in the hemp market. Did the women nominate trading as their occupation? Or did they perhaps consider social status of more importance than acknowledging an economic occupation? On the other hand, the School Schedules might have inflated staff numbers for the region. It is impossible to confirm or contradict such speculation from Census statistics. The conjecture, however, leaves open the notion that chance affected the enumeration and the possibility that some misrepresentation of women's occupations occurred.

By not commenting on female teachers, Census authors perhaps implicitly admitted that their assumption of a distinction between market and non-market work was unreasonable or unworkable. That would support Margo Anderson's interpretation, but it is conjecture based on effect, not proven intent. On the other hand, the counting difficulty did show that the idea of gainful labour was poorly thought out, and that probable instructions about its application were written in a vague, open-ended way. The example of the teachers also points to the specific conditions that the Census Office failed to consider when instituting gainful labour as the measurement standard of the workforce. First, the example hints at the lack of specialisation and training amongst the working population. Some of the extra women teachers, for example, were possibly teacher aides in today's terms (Camagay 1995; Worcester 1914). They might have been identified as teachers in the School Schedules while enumerated as something else in the population count. Second, the enumeration and subsequent classification depended largely on how inexperienced enumerators

understood the instructions and asked about gainful employment, as well as on the response given to the question.

While the difficulties for U.S. enumerators were ambiguity and imprecise definitions, the foreign language (English) in which instructions were designed and the language of census enumeration (Spanish) exaggerated the difficulties in the Philippines. Joseph Sanger, Director of the Philippines Census, noted in his report the potential for misinterpretation (1903 Census, Vol. 1, Prologue, p. 13). Not only did enumerators have to understand the questions, but also they had to ask the questions so that the inquiries could be understood and responses judged for their accuracy. When enumerators were inexperienced in census taking and had a minimum of training, it was inevitable that they made errors, especially when the instructions were inexact. There are no other available sources from which to check the extent of possible enumerator mistakes. Census statistics for Bohol, however, illustrated the result when enumerators misunderstood the probably ambiguous instructions.

Enumerators in Bohol recorded 8,210 women as having a gainful occupation, just 8.3 per cent of the 99,080 women aged 10 years and over in the province[18] (Table 5A). That proportion was much lower than might have been expected. In other East Visayan provinces (Negros Oriental, Cebu, Leyte and Samar), a weighted mean of 43.9 per cent of women engaged in gainful employment. If we use this mean to estimate the proportion of Bohol women gainfully employed, then enumerators possibly excluded about 35,285 women from the data. The Census Report noted that the low recorded proportion of gainfully employed women probably was "due to poor understanding of the instructions that were given to enumerators in that province" (1903 Census, Vol. 2, p. 108) [19]. The author noted that this was likely because enumerators recorded few women occupied as weavers. He therefore avoided writing that the instructions, not the enumerators, were at fault, yet it is possible to interpret his comment as connoting that instructions for women's occupations were ambiguous. Moreover, the Bohol data for teachers in Table 5C perhaps show that the enumeration error in that province probably affected women in other occupations as well as in manufacturing.

4. Summary and conclusions.

I have attempted in this chapter to establish the particular instructions given to Philippines enumerators in 1903 about who could be counted as gainfully employed. On balance, it is a fair assumption that, with the exception of months unemployed, the instructions were similar to or the same as those given to U.S. enumerators in 1900. Most likely, the emphasis was on market work. Enumerators probably recorded the occupation from which respondents earned most of their income or in which they spent most paid time, irrespective of the worker's employment status or place of work. The Census therefore tabulated the numbers of women engaged in small-scale textile and handcraft occupations, for example, regardless of the seasonal, part-time or home-based nature of the work. Those instructions, however, were probably ill-defined, which resulted in enumeration errors and variations in interpretation. It remains unclear where the instructions distinguished between money wages and payment in kind, between market and non-market work. The Census Report's author confirmed that a counting difficulty arose when respondents engaged in more than one occupation. Other comments in the Report appeared to suggest that at least the author was aware of some of the ambiguities in the instructions.

The investigation heeded M. Anderson's contention that looseness in the enumerators' instructions for women followed from an unfavourable conceptualisation of gainful labour. Despite the relatively high proportion of Filipino women enumerated with gainful employment, there was no sound evidence in the Philippines Census to show that the reasoning of gainful labour in the Philippines differed from that in the United States. American Census authorities had imagined an independent, industrialised, skilled, U.S. labour force in which women took little part. Census authorities appeared to adopt the same concept in the Philippines, yet they also appeared to accept that at least two-fifths of adult Filipino women were not solely dependent on men's income. To that extent, the actions of Census officials were incongruous with their own American thinking.

For the domestic Philippines economy still largely based on small-scale, low technology, home-based production and limited coin exchange, and in an unsettled state, the concept of gainful labour was perhaps unsuitable as a measure of the

workforce. Filipino workers lacked specialisation and regulated training, they engaged in different occupations for different times of the year or consecutively, and they were sometimes paid wages in kind. For women, distinctions between market and non-market work might not have been clear when they carried out the labour at home. This was especially so in conditions of hardship. Yet, the economic notion and structure of gainful labour confined the Census accounts to occupations paid in money or its direct equivalent. Gainful labour failed to take into account household work (including subsistence production) performed by women in particular, and it failed to consider social elements of occupational identification. These failings do not mean that we can judge the concept as being wrong, but it was perhaps inappropriate for the Philippines circumstances.

Statistical management and misrepresentation.

Given the probable unsuitability of the gainful labour measurement, the nature of the management might be considered crucial to the standing of the 1903 occupation account. If regulation of the enumeration were rigidly in accordance with the concept's assumptions, then perhaps one might dismiss the account as misrepresenting women's gainful employment. It is, however, difficult to assess from the Philippines data how strictly the officials adhered to that approach in 1903. The Filipino population (including enumerators) most likely accepted that many women worked to supplement family income. Officials might have allowed flexibility in reporting women's paid employment, so that some discontinuity appeared between the criteria and the data. The recorded proportion of women with gainful employment attests to that. Unless future evidence from enumerators' schedules reveals otherwise, there is no reason to assume that statisticians altered any reports of women's gainful employment. It appears then that the regulation was extensive and sympathetic to local responses, but sufficient to be consistent with the broad gainful labour concept.

Did the 1903 Census therefore misrepresent Filipino women's employment? That depends on one's interpretation of work, employment and occupation. It is possible to argue that statisticians seriously restricted the record of women's work by excluding housewives. Enumerators had reported slightly more than half the women over 10 years of age with no gainful occupation, a significant misrepresentation in this

view. Furthermore, one can argue that the instructions were probably expressed in such a way that encouraged enumerators to identify women as not being gainfully occupied even when the women engaged in perhaps irregular or part-time paid employment. We do not know how many of the women earned income from other occupations. The argument relies on an assumption that Census officials downgraded women's work when they rationalised gainful labour, as Margo Anderson claims for the United States Census. It also relies on the assumption that the Census category, gainful employment, was a record of work, which is perhaps an anachronistic view. If those assumptions are accepted, and if as seems likely, Census staff transferred the American concept directly into the Philippines context, then the argument of misrepresentation may be reasonable. Nevertheless, evidence other than from the 1903 Census is needed for its testing.

On the other hand, some women might have chosen their categorisation on a social basis instead of nominating an economic occupation. This possibility inhibits an allegation of deliberate statistical misrepresentation by Census officials, but allows for incidental distortion of the data. Although unverified, a regional variation in the identification of teachers suggests that the interpretation is possible. Yet, there is no direct evidence for the claims of women's social categorisation or women's agency. Moreover, we cannot tell if women made the choice, rather than men who might have responded to the enumeration on their behalf. Census officials appeared to suggest that the enumeration of some women as housewives, not gainfully employed, was chance. The weight of argument therefore appears to indicate that by using gainful labour as the organising structure, officials might have misrepresented some women's employment and therefore, their occupations in the 1903 Census.

Nevertheless, no clear evidence emerged to confirm or deny misrepresentation of women's occupations in 1903, whether by under-counting or inaccurate identification. The two were linked because women had additional status as housewives. Such inability to test or verify the proposition must leave open two possible conclusions. First, we cannot dismiss the possibility that the gainful labour data under-represented women's employment. The data therefore represented the minimum extent and range of women's occupations. Future research may better enable scholars to substantiate the notion, if not quantify the extent of distortion. Conversely, we should also accept the possibility that the data were reasonably correct and

represented a tolerable cross-section of Filipino women. In that case, they form a fair foundation for assessment of future change. Although either conclusion is possible and only indicative, together they denote that the 1903 Census statistics are useful, but that some qualification may be in order when considering the transformation of women's occupations. The next chapter continues the inquiry into gainful labour by investigating the circumstances and evidence of the 1939 account.

---

1 Philippines Census officials followed American practice. Enumerators were to obtain their information by inquiry made of the head of each family, or of the member deemed most competent and trustworthy. Men were considered the heads of families. Enumerators were to ask individual persons living out of a family the same questions (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979; 1903 Census, Volume 1, Prologue, p. 13).

2 Folbre and Abel (1989, Footnote 9, p. 549) dispute this, instead arguing that "gainfulness" was not associated explicitly with money until 1910 (see also Smuts 1960). I would argue that that was not entirely so: in the 1900 instructions, a number of clauses stated specifically the criterion, money. Paragraph 158, for example, began with "If a person has two occupations, enter the more important one, that is, the one from which he gets the more money" (see also M. Anderson 1992). This is not to say that money was the only form of support envisaged by Census officials.

3 The 1900 U.S. instructions to enumerators stated in Paragraph 185: "Return as a housekeeper a woman who receives a stated wage or salary for her services, and do not confuse her with a woman who keeps house for her own family or for herself, without any gainful occupation, or with a grown daughter who assists in the household duties without pay. A wife or daughter who simply keeps house for her own family should not be returned as a housekeeper in any case." Folbre and Abel (1989) argue that an earlier form of the paragraph implied that keeping house was a gainful occupation. In the 1900 version, that ambiguity had largely been removed. Joseph Hill (1978), author of a 1929 Census Bureau report on women's paid work, justified the exclusion of "home housekeeping" because it lay outside the field of economic competition, and did not affect or was not affected by the labour supply or market demand. Hill argued that the Bureau was cognisant of the economic and social value of the work done by women in the home. He cited a Census Bureau Supplementary Analysis, 1900, p. 439: "On the contrary, it has been explicitly recognized in the census reports that 'the wife, sister, or adult daughter who keeps house for her family, though she receives no pecuniary return for her services and does not regard herself as having a gainful occupation, is helping to sustain the productive capacity of the community quite as truly as her male relatives who are earning money wages' " (p. 2). He also suggested that work done by women in the home provided a service to society that was not "solely economic or even mainly so" (p. 3), was very elastic in quantity and could not be adequately evaluated. Hill thus repeated the bias against women's work that underpinned the gainful labour concept.

4 Sokoloff and Dollar (1997) note that American literature pertaining to nineteenth century manufacturing either highlights the exotic nature of home-based production or ignores it completely. The example of Clark's 1905 examination of the Philippines labour market and economy would support that interpretation. It might be suggested therefore that U.S. Census officials were not fully attuned to an economy such as that of the Philippines in 1903. See also Folbre and Abel (1989) on the historical Census Office interpretation of household manufacturing.

5 Folbre and Abel (1989) argue that gainful occupation, a derivative of gainful labour, was conceptually ambiguous, confusing an economic activity with a social construct. Their argument tends to ignore the economic purpose of the statistics.

6 Bose (1987) asserts this paragraph unjustly subjected the enumeration of women's gainful employment to additional criteria compared with the count for men, by asking where the work was done and how often. In doing so, I suggest she ascribes a different meaning to the conjunction, whether. Nonetheless, her assertion gives another possible interpretation of the paragraph.

7 The 1900 12th U.S. Census did not cross-tabulate occupation with marital status, but only 18.8 per cent of all females worked, compared with 41 per cent in the Philippines (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1903). The 1890 11th U.S. Census reported that about 31 per cent of the 1890 U.S. female labour force was ever married, representing just 4.6 per cent of all married women and 30 per cent of widowed and divorced women (M. Anderson 1992; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1961, Table Series D 26-35, p. 7).

8 The 1899 Cuban Census Report (probably written by Henry Gannett) argued that there was evidence to suggest a possible difference between Cuban and American women's approach to this matter. It suggested U.S. women considered work outside and inside the home as "more often successive and less often simultaneous", in

contrast to Cuban women (U.S. War Dept. 1900, p. 162). U.S. scholars have strongly disagreed with this patriarchal interpretation, citing for example, the number of women who ran boarding houses from home but who were not counted as gainfully employed in U.S. Censuses (Fraundorf 1979). For a Southeast Asian perspective on the formal-publiclperipheral-domestic distinction in women's work, see Karim (1995), who argues that the concepts reflect Western views and are perhaps inappropriate and artificial in the non-Western context.

[9] Montiel and Hollnsteiner (1976) asserted that Filipino women's status derived from their marital condition.

[10] See also Medina (1991), who in discussing contemporary roles of wives, states that the paid work of wives "is now considered an extension of the traditional wife and mother role" particularly for lower class women (p. 126). That is, tradition now demands that the wifelmother contributes to the economic survival of the family. Medina ascribes no time-frame to "tradition".

[11] Another perspective may be that the categorisation as a housewife was a way of asserting a feminine character different from that of the male identity, when his social recognition depended partly on his paid work outside the home. But see Chapter 3, Note 9, for some of the difficulties linked to the concept of identity for women in a pre-industrial society.

[12] Ramona Tirona, addressing a Filipino women's graduation class in the 1920s, for example, advocated that women maintain their home roles as well as their public participation (Tirona 1928). One possibility is that this perspective might have developed as a Philippine refinement in response to the cult of domesticity imported by Americans and inflicted upon Filipino women from the beginning of U.S. rule. If that development were so, then in 1903: its effect would have been minimal compared with the 1939 result and leaves open the issue of women's attitudes in 1903.

[13] Although time spent in the occupation became a measurement of gainful labour, this was merely a demographic fact, not an economic fact. The measurement of gainful labour did not reflect a demand for labour, and often disguised considerable underemployment, especially in agriculture (Dovring 1967).

[14] *"Entre los Filipinos, no abundan los especialistas. Pocos son los Filipinos, hombres ó mujeres, que se consagran exclusivamente á una profesidn. Hay hombres que trabajan una parte del día en las faenas agrícolas y consagran une parte de la noche á la pesca, y es un accidente el hecho de que él anuncia su profesidn al enumerador del censo como agricultor ó como pescador. Otro tanta puede decirse respecto de otras muchas ocupaciones... Por consecuencia muchas de las cifras que se muestran... resultan de poca importancia..."* (1903 Census, Vol. 2, pp. 120-1)

[15] Volume 3 of the 1903 Census covered schools. There is a slight discrepancy in that account between the number of women teachers (2126) noted in the text describing the Table, and the total calculated from the Table (2116). Conversely, the number of men teachers was 10 more in the Table than noted in the text (1903 Census, Volume 3, pp. 652-654).

[16] In provinces where enumerators identified more Filipino women teachers than the schools listed, that might have meant only that the extra women were unemployed at Census time.

[17] For details, see Appendix 1 Table L. Note that for Masbate, Mindoro, Romblon and all frontier provinces except Nueva Vizcaya, Census officials omitted all professional women from the Table 60 record. At least three-quarters of professional women were missing from the account for Bataan, Capiz and Samar. No women teachers were recorded in the School Schedule in Paragua Sur, Siassi and Tawi Tawi.

[18] I have calculated proportions of women aged 10 years and over for this paragraph from Census Table 57, Vol. 2. The table in Vol. 2, page 108, which listed provincial proportions of women gainfully employed, referred to the total female population of each province, therefore its proportions are lower. The figure noted there for Bohol was 5.9 percent.

[19] The statement, however, did not clarify if supervisors or enumerators had misunderstood the instructions. Interestingly, in his annual report, L. T. Gibbens, the Division Superintendent of Schools, Bohol, noted that of the enumerators in the province, 29 were teachers, including 3 women, and that "10 pupils from the secondary school, 2 of whom are women, were also employed" (RPC4, 3, 1903, Report of the Secretary of Public Instruction, p. 741). Whether the students were enumerators or helpers of some sort is not clear. The list of approximately 225 enumerators for Bohol (1903 Census, Vol. 1, pp. 751-56) recorded only 5 women but that did not necessarily include the two female students. I am not suggesting any link between the recorded inaccuracies and these enumerators/assistants (they were too few to make any significant difference to provincial statistics), but instead note it was not usual for students to act as enumerators.