Chapter Six.

Gainful labour and the labour force in the 1939 Philippines Census.

By general agreement (Eviota 1992; Kurihara 1945; UN 1960), the 1939 Census counted the workforce in accord with the established principles of gainful labour (see Chapter 5). Vague criteria of income earned and time spent in an occupation during any part of the census year remained the standards of measurement. Except for apparently minor adjustments in interpretation of the gainful labour concept, instructions to enumerators probably resembled those likely in 1903. They still appeared to discriminate against women who divided their time between household duties and outside work. But Census tabulations, superficially similar to those of 1903, reveal much confusion and perhaps another story. This chapter aims to examine the management of the 1939 gainful labour statistics, while in the process it puts forward a tentative, new explanation of the irregularities and inconsistencies in the account.

Philippines Census officials (see Section 1) in 1939 were aware of the disputed meaning[1] of the gainful labour concept. Opening comments in Census Chapter 10, Volume 2, (p. 473) mentioned it briefly: "As the classification embraced all persons 10 years old and over, it included students, housewives and others who may or may not be considered as following a gainful occupation, depending on the definition accepted for a gainful occupation". Census officials did not note in either the instructions or the Report how they defined gainful labour for the 1939 survey. Statisticians compiled the occupation data as Tables of Usual Occupation, but separated the population into two groups, those with non-gainful occupations and those with gainful occupations. Inclusion of the housewives in the gainful occupation category was a major change from U.S. Census practice. The Report gave no reason for the alteration, although the UN (1960) stated that it was an arbitrary rule, supplementary to the Census instructions and established at the time of tabulation of Census results[2]. Whether the change might have been in response to arguments about women's position in gainful employment statistics, or perhaps in response to requirements for a greater social dimension in occupation data[3], only conjecture is possible. It might have simply been an experiment before the imminent abandonment of the gainful labour concept[4].

I suspect, however, that the statistical placement of the housewives was the consequence of an unacknowledged and perhaps hasty conversion to a labour force measurement (see page 108) in the 1939 Census. It appears likely that officials instituted the new strategy while still using the incompatible and inadequate gainful labour method of counting. Questions relating to employment status and some descriptive labour force terms appeared in the Census. Perhaps more significantly, examination of the account reveals two crucial contradictions that this proposition might make comprehensible.

Placement of the housewives was the first paradox. Under a new labour force approach, persons would be located either in or out of the labour market. There is evidence to show that officials in 1939 endeavoured to establish which persons were out of the labour market, and by doing so, the Philippines Census Commission determined the labour force. Because housewife was not an excluded classification, women so deemed must be in the labour force by default. It was possible therefore, that this attempt to determine the labour force, defined by attitude and behaviour, as it were entrapped housewives within the gainfully employed, defined by occupation. This placement of the housewives then produced the second major inconsistency of the account.

The classification of housewives as gainfully occupied created a fundamental contradiction with the concept of gainful labour and its assumption of women's dependency. That the contradiction was unexplained adds to the suspicion that officials introduced a labour force measurement. If we accept that gainful labour premised housewives' exclusion from gainful employment records on their assumed dependency, then their appearance in the 1939 account seemed to imply that officials had discarded the assumption and the theory. I argue, however, that this was deceptive, and officials probably retained the assumption and their perception of women's position within the statistical survey and market labour.

Census authors gave no justification for counting the housewives as gainfully employed. They drew particular attention to the difference between what they called gainful workers (that is, including housewives) and the gainfully employed (excluding housewives) (Volume 1, p. xv; Volume 2, p. 483). Moreover, in their attempt to gather the data catering to the new position, they wrote ambiguous and contradictory instructions for enumerators. It suggests that the authorities had inadequately

considered the implications of their management decision, so that they then had to reconcile two incompatible methods of counting. Institution of the supplementary rule about housewives at the time of tabulation appears to support this possibility. Although the evidence is circumstantial, one reason for the contradictions in the 1939 account might therefore be that the authorities superimposed a labour force measurement over an unsuitable gainful labour structure.

Underlying this proposition, however, is an assumption that the U.S. Census Bureau, through the Philippines Census Commission, influenced the 1939 Philippines count. Section 1 of this chapter presents evidence to support the assumption, with a brief chronology of the Census preparation in Manila. In Section 2, I put the argument for my proposition in detail, examining the instructions and national data. The inquiry reveals the illogical and inconsistent treatment of married women in the production of the gainful employment record. Section 3 places the problem in the context of the statistical management of the Census and Section 4 considers the implications for my investigation of Census representations and women's occupations in Chapter 7.

1. Background to the 1939 Philippines Census.

Although it is difficult to verify, available evidence suggests that U.S. Census Bureau influence on the process and style of the 1939 Philippines Census was perhaps over-riding if indirect. The Philippines National Assembly passed Commonwealth Act No. 170 on 12 November 1936, to authorise the taking of a census. The preparation chronicled in the *Manila Daily Bulletin* indicated that until sometime between October 1937 and February 1938, Filipinos prepared and organised the Census without the help or interference of the U.S. Bureau. Thereafter, an appointed U.S. Census Bureau expert instigated considerable change in the scope and type of inquiries. There were also three postponements of the designated Census Day until 1 January 1939, although other political factors might have contributed to the later deferments.

President Quezon named Leonardo Festin as Census Commissioner on 25 November 1936. Festin had been majority floor leader in the disbanded (Philippines) House of Representatives and chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations until his recent electoral defeat. He had no census experience, no technical assistant and no suitable office space when he began work on 4 December 1936. Other

appointments to the new Census Commission proved difficult. There had been no previous Philippines census office, and Leon Ma. Gonzales, former chief of the statistics office in the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, had recently submitted his resignation to enter private business. Sometime before the end of 1937, President Quezon appointed Vicente Mills as Assistant Commissioner[5]. The planning included using education supervisors and teachers as Census supervisors and enumerators. Presidential Proclamation No. 128 of 25 October 1937 designated 16 April 1938 as Census Day (Manila Daily Bulletin, 26 November 1936, 17 December 1937, 10 January 1938; Millegan 1942).

Reports in the Manila press during January and February 1938 detailed the organisation, regulation, extent and format of the proposed Census. The Commissioners reported that in an attempt to obtain the most complete data possible on the political, social, economic and cultural conditions of the Filipino people, questionnaire booklets were already prepared. For example, the Manila Daily Bulletin of 12 January 1938 recorded that:

> "The economic standing of the average Filipino family will be determined by answers to questions regarding the kind of gainful occupation, if any, the individual possesses at the time of the census. If he is employed, the census will try to find out how long he has been working, whether he has been paid regularly.
>
> The number of unemployed will also be determined, by means of a questionnaire which will ask among other things for information regarding the reason or reasons of non-employment. Among the causes of unemployment listed for the individual's guide are hardship in finding work, seasonal lay-off, strike or lock-out, accidental injury, illness, physical disability and retirement from business.
>
> It will likewise be determined if the average Filipino family saves part of its income or whether the family is extravagant."

It is difficult to know if this report were an interpretation or a copy of the proposed questions. To experienced census takers, the questions as they stand might have indicated a lack of definitional clarity and some contradictions, as well as confusion over their purpose. It is also difficult to assess from such a report the relative importance given to the economic contribution of Filipino women. On the other hand,

we should regard the possible questions as being indicative of a legitimate attempt by the Filipino Census Commissioners to establish data and information relevant to the government as the nation approached independence.

Meanwhile, President Quezon began to employ U.S. advisers to assist his administration on a wide range of matters[6]. On 17 August 1937, he requested the services of a census expert. The Philippines appointment of Acting Chief Statistician of Territorial, Insular, and Foreign Statistics of the U.S. Census Bureau, Ray Hurley, on 2 years' leave of absence from the U.S. Bureau, was effective from 9 October 1937 (Millegan 1942)[7]. The *Manila Daily Bulletin* (1 October 1937) drew attention to Hurley's purported comment that U.S. methods of investigation and tabulation would be employed in the Philippines Census.

No other descriptions of the Census content appeared in the press from mid February until 30 December 1938. The abandonment of the proposed use of teachers as enumerators and Proclamations deferring Census Day constituted the only public information about the Census during that period[8]. Although the precise role of Hurley in the Commission is unclear[9], the Census Report in the Introduction to Volume 2, page 9, noted that "...upon further examination and upon the obtaining of help cognizant of the problems and difficulties involved in census taking in other countries, considerable reduction was made in the scope of the Census as originally planned." It appears most likely that Hurley, using his knowledge from the U.S. Bureau, directed the reduction and re-organisation of the scope and content of the count, including new Schedules, as well as the compilation and tabulation of data.

Two comments in the Census document tend to confirm this view. In the Explanatory Text of Volume 1, page xi, the author noted that the "census was taken, compiled, and the results prepared for publication in accordance with plans developed by and under the supervision of Mr. Ray Hurley, Census Expert", assisted by eleven named Filipino supervisors. Second, Jorge Vargas, Acting Commissioner of the Census (see Note 9) wrote in his letter of transmission of Volume 2 to the President, that the Volume "was prepared under the supervision of Mr. R. Hurley", assisted by five Filipino supervisors. On the one hand, there is no evidence to suggest that the U.S. Bureau directed Hurley to transform the Philippines count into a deliberate U.S. Census Bureau exercise. Moreover, the acknowledgement and naming of the Filipino supervisors perhaps indicated that the Census was not purely an American artefact. On

the other hand, I tend to think that Hurley's direction was sufficient for current U.S. Bureau interests and practice to be incorporated into the 1939 Philippines Census. This view supports the proposition that I present in this chapter.

2. The identification of women with work.

Non-gainful occupations and dependency.

Unlike the Census of 1903, the published 1939 volumes included instructions to the enumerators. Paragraph numbers given in this chapter refer to those instructions, given in Volume 2 of the 1939 Census, pages 9-21. Enumerators in 1939 were instructed to record each person's *usual occupation* (the kind of work each person performed), as well as the site where the work took place (farm, business, mill, shop, that is, the nature of the industry) (Paragraph 49). Differing from the probable directions of 1903, the instructions then defined the persons considered to be without a usual occupation. This proclaimed a labour force approach, which excluded the persons considered to be out of the labour market from the enumeration[10]. Paragraph 52 listed these as invalids, retirees, students, inmates of institutions and "persons who work only occasionally or only a short time each day". Four points arise from the Paragraph.

First, there is apparent inconsistency between the instructions for those without a usual occupation and the Census Tables of Usual Occupation, where statisticians re-identified the persons as having non-gainful occupations. This corresponded to the statistician's difficulty of attempting to define the labour force (by defining those outside the labour market) when using the gainful labour approach. Second, Paragraph 52 appeared to imply that Census officials still considered women to be dependants of households. It did not explain the terms "occasionally" and "only a short time"[11]. The examples of enumeration given in the Paragraph were listed in such a way that "None – dependent" described persons who worked only occasionally or only for a short time. The instruction appeared to be written from the point of view of gainful labour, with its assumption of women's dependency. Yet, the Report explained dependent persons as those who were "too young, too old or not physically or mentally able to follow a usual occupation" (Volume 2, Chapter 10, p. 483). Furthermore, Paragraph 56 (see

below) directed that women without other employment should be reported as housewives. In short, there was contradiction and ambiguity within Paragraph 52, as well as discrepancy between the instructions and the Report and between Paragraphs.

Third, one group of women perhaps testified to the difficulty enumerators faced because of the uncertain meaning of dependency. Of the 121,072 women counted as retired or with an unknown occupation, enumerators reported more than half (68,577) were under 20 years of age (Volume 2, Chapter 10, Table 28). Only speculation is possible about this group. Were they students, housekeepers, housewives, financially independent, gainfully employed, or were they in reality dependent on households for their livelihood? If so, why did statisticians not count them in the dependency category? Why were enumerators not clear about so many? Possible answers might include the inadequate instructions that illustrated official confusion, and insufficient training of enumerators. Moreover, enumerators reported 4,320 of the retirees with additional occupations (Volume 2, Chapter 12, Table 13), an anomaly to which I shall return later. The enumeration of women without a usual occupation was at least, puzzling.

Last, the 1903 proportion of non-gainfully occupied women should not be compared with the non-gainfully occupied proportion of 1939. The 1903 Census excluded only those persons who reported no gainful occupation. The occupation count included but did not identify retirees, invalids and students who reported that they worked. Women enumerated as having no gainful occupations comprised 59 per cent of all females aged 10 years and over in 1903 and included housewives. In 1939, women who were counted as having non-gainful occupations made up just 22 per cent of the 5,446,514 females aged 10 years and over and excluded housewives. The two non-gainfully occupied categories were disparate.

Housewives and housework.

For persons with a usual occupation, the instructions to enumerators indicated a semantic muddle over work, employment, occupation and gainful labour. As well, explanatory instructions to enumerators were imprecise and ambiguous in relation to housewives and women who worked part-time. In the case of housewives, the instructions directed enumerators to note the usual occupation of women who had "no

other employment'' as housewife, ''working at home'' (Paragraph 56). Most likely, officials intended the instruction to mean simply that women who were not in wage employment should be classified as housewives. Accordingly, of the 4,247,215 women enumerated with gainful occupations, 3,145,763 (74 per cent) were "housekeepers[12] and housewives'' included in the Domestic and Personal Service sector. They constituted 93.8 per cent of that sector. We cannot tell how many women chose the classification for social status and thus concealed their economic occupation. In effect, the enumeration of housewives perhaps reduced the scope and affected the distribution of women's occupations.

Ambiguous terminology allowed subjective interpretations, however, and it was possible that enumerators read the instruction differently. Folbre and Abel (1989) argue that the wording ''no other employment'', used earlier in the 1870 U.S. Census, implied that housekeeping in the women's own homes was employment (see also Chapter 5, Note 3). They suggest that it showed Census officials implicitly accepted the notion that housework was gainful labour paid in kind by a husband's support. Certainly, the new position of Filipino housewives in the list of gainful occupations seems to support that proposition. It suggests that officials no longer assumed women's dependency. Yet, statements in the Census Report about the difference between gainful workers and gainfully employed (noted earlier) appear to counteract the interpretation.

Besides, if one accepts Folbre and Abel's hypothesis, then it might be argued that the tabulation of housewives in the 1939 Philippines Census reveals a possible contradiction in the feminist argument. The effect of the tabulation was to allocate housewives a position amongst the gainfully employed that was not given to women in the U.S. or elsewhere, as feminist scholars have shown. It perhaps indicated that the gainful labour concept did not necessarily deny women's place in market labour. The claim contrasts with the feminist criticism that the concept downgraded women's work. For these reasons, Folbre and Abel's hypothesis cannot be supported. The chance of their interpretation being feasible, however, perhaps better illustrates the need to examine action in its context.

Understanding of the counting and tabulation of the Filipino housewives in 1939 is difficult. If indeed officials introduced a labour force strategy, then housewives potentially presented a quandary for the statisticians, given that the latter counted the

population by occupation, not attitude or activity. The direction to record the housewives as working at home was perhaps a means of overcoming the difficulty of counting women "without other employment" in the labour force. It might explain why the statisticians saw it as necessary to add a supplementary rule to the gainful employment instructions at tabulation time. From another view, it was possible that the decision to include housewives in the gainful employment category reflected a requirement for greater social information. Housewife, a social classification, might be included in occupational statistics in this view. The enumeration, however, measured the workforce according to an economic concept, and hence the 1939 data lacked consistency (see Section 4 of this chapter). In either case, the decision created incongruity with the concept of gainful labour and mystery for subsequent readers. The tabulation of the housewives revealed a lack of clarity in official thinking. As well, there were possible implications for the counting of women with additional occupations (see Section 4).

The instructions about part-time or occasional employment further confused the issue for enumerators. Paragraph 57 stated: "Where a woman not only does her own housework or looks after her own home, but has other employment outside or does work at home for which she receives payment, the outside or gainful employment should be reported as the woman's usual occupation rather than housewife, unless the outside employment takes only a very small fraction of the woman's time". Again, it is possible to read the instruction as meaning housework was employment. As for Paragraph 56, I would argue that that was not the intention. It was not clear, however, and nor was the reference to outside employment.

More notably, the instruction directed that outside or gainful employment was more important than housework when enumerators recorded the usual occupation for women. First, despite the obscurity, the instruction probably intended that outside employment meant paid employment, as gainful employment did. Second, the ranking suggests that perhaps Census officials instituted a hierarchy of gainful occupations or that, perhaps more likely, they did not fully accept housework as a legitimate form of gainful employment. Last, the final clause appeared to categorise women's employment by time. It potentially denied the importance of income earned, compromising the structure of gainful employment and upsetting the principle of

neutrality for classifying gainful occupations. It resembled instructions used in the 1903 prescription of women's gainful employment.

Other apparent contradictions contained in the instructions about women's occupations and employment showed similar confusion. Paragraph 58, for example, instructed enumerators that "...a member of the family or relative who usually helps the husband or son operate a farm is to be reported as a farm laborer". But, a woman who worked "only occasionally or only a short time each day at outdoor or other farm work should not be reported as a farm laborer" (Paragraph 60). Once more, officials invoked time as a measure of gainful employment for women but not for men. As well, the instruction again appeared to support the preconceived dependency of women and it repeated the discrimination, probably present in the 1903 Census, against women who helped with family farm work.

Even more startling were the instructions about women's employment status. Questions about employment status related directly to a labour force concept. Paragraph 75 required enumerators to ask respondents in question 26 if they were employed on a specific day, 3 January 1939. Accordingly, a woman enumerated as a housewife was considered to be employed on that day. A woman, however, with a regular gainful occupation (for example, an embroiderer), but who did not have work on 3rd January, was to be reported as not employed, "although she may continue to perform her household duties" (Paragraph 75). In effect, different women doing the same household maintenance tasks at the same time might be employed or not employed. Such an absurdity in all likelihood resulted from the imposition of a labour force approach when statisticians identified women, not by their labour market activity or willingness to work, but by their occupation and social status.

Amongst the questions on employment status, perhaps Schedule question 27 provided the most telling evidence that the Commission introduced the labour force concept. The question, which asked "Is this person able to work?", was an attempt to identify the number of persons *unable* to work in their usual occupation because of age, accident, sickness, mental or physical disability, etc. (Paragraph 76). It implied a willingness to work. Together, questions 26 and 27 in all likelihood attempted to define and count the unemployed, in order to calculate the sum of the labour force. Furthermore, I suggest that in particular, question 27 illustrated the depth of U.S. Bureau influence on the Philippines Census. Although the question was subjective and

open to enumerators' interpretations, its wording and purpose were direct transfers fi-om the then current Bureau method of assessing unemployment and the labour force (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1975). In contrast, the proposed Philippines determination of unemployment (see Section 1) might be seen as a quite different, wider investigation of factors affecting the burdens of Filipino families. Census Expert Hurley had most probably changed the topic focus to be in line with U.S. ideas and practice.

Housewives with additional occupations.

The enumeration and tabulation of women with additional occupations symbolised the confused thinking of the Census authorities. Enumerators gathered information about additional occupations, described variously in the introduction as part-time or supplementary occupations, even amazingly as partial employment (Volume 1, page xv). For one thing, the terminology is confusing. A part-time occupation need not necessarily be an additional paid occupation, and perhaps the description was an attempt to characterise gainful employment in labour force terms. Paragraph 73, which dealt with additional occupations at home or elsewhere, cautioned enumerators: "The work in a household industry may be the person's usual occupation. If so, the nature of this work should be reported in Column 18 (Usual Occupation) and not in Column 24 (Additional Occupation)". Of the women who reported an additional occupation (see Table 6A), those with primary employment in domestic service appeared to be preponderant, but 97.8 per cent (701,685) of that group comprised housewives.

TABLE 6A
WOMEN REPORTING AN ADDITIONAL OCCUPATION, PHILIPPINES, 1939

Non-Gainful Labour		**Gainful Labour**			
Students	17714	Agriculture	120732	Mining & Quanying	53
Dependents	17940	Dom. & Personal	717489	Manufacturing	41118
Retired &	4320	Professional	771	Transport &	49
Unknown		Public Service NEC	26	Communication	
		Fishing	862	Clerical	70
		Forestry & Hunting	525	Trade	400
Total	**39974**			**Total**	**891095**

Source: 1939 Census, Volume 2, Chapter 12, Table 7, p. 772 and Table 13, pp. 776-779.

Table 6A encapsulates the problem created by the officials' confusion. First, statisticians listed persons identified as being out of the labour force (the named non-

gainful labour category) with occupations. It is assumed that the women earned income from their part-time employment[13], which contradicts their listing as non-gainful labour. These women were the equivalent to the group of retirees and students included but not identified in the 1903 gainful employment account.

Second, statisticians counted in the principal gainful employment record none of the additional occupations for the gainfully employed women shown in Table 6A. Whilst that avoided double counting, it relegated housewives with part-time employment to a category effectively outside the gainful labour record. That outcome contrasted with the placement of housewives who had no paid employment but who were counted as gainful workers. The statisticians' action contradicted the instructions to enumerators and was illogical. Both cases from this table indicate the difficulty of interpreting 1939 statistics. As the statistical management so affected in this way no other group of identified gainfully employed women (or men), I examine the case of the housewives with additional occupations in more detail.

It is reasonable to infer from Census evidence that we might legitimately count the excluded housewives as gainfully employed persons. First, we might assume that they earned income from the part-time work. Tables 9 and 12 in Census Chapter 12, Volume 2, recorded the income earned by women from their additional occupations, although they did not separately identify the earnings of housewives. The average annual income earned by all women from their additional occupations ranged from 10 pesos for farm labourers and mat makers to 81 pesos for clerical and professional work. The actual income varied considerably. More than half the farm labourers earned less than 10 pesos in 1938, although we do not know if they received other payment in kind. Of the 546 women who earned more than 500 pesos during the year, over two-fifths were dealers. The major criterion of gainful labour therefore appeared to be satisfied. Second, the Census Report stated that the total number of workers employed in an industry should be the sum of the persons in that usual occupation and the persons reporting that work as an additional occupation (Volume 1, p. xvi).

Why did statisticians not record the additional occupations for housewives under the tabulated gainful occupations, as the instructions so directed? We can only surmise about this anomaly. Perhaps there were enumeration errors, although that does not explain why Census staff failed to make the change. I suspect that it might have been conditional upon the solution to the statistical problem of counting housewives.

Once the statisticians decided, for whatever reason, to include housewives in the gainfully employed, they then probably had little option but to treat housewives with additional occupations the same as other women with additional occupations. The anomaly indicated the problem officials had created, and suggested that they did not fully think through the implications of their management decisions. Moreover, the effect of the statisticians' action in placing so many women outside the workforce appeared to confirm that they assumed women's dependency, consistent with the notion of gainful labour.

TABLE 6B
ADDITIONAL OCCUPATIONS OF WOMEN, PHILLPPWES, 1939.

Additional Occupation	Total	Gainfully employed		Non-gainfully employed
		Housewives	Others	
Total	**931069**	**701685**	**189410**	**39974**
Agriculture	427800	291968	110896	24936
Farm labour	417355	283608	109112	24635
Farmers, owners	10445	8360	1784	301
Fishing	6886	3788	2716	382
Gathering forest products	4335	2416	1646	273
Manufacturing	364903	306641	49910	8352
Weaving	90282	75154	13806	1322
Hat making	36067	30624	3824	1619
Baskets	12315	9980	2136	199
Mats	134992	115017	18131	1844
Embroidery, Dress-Making	70769	59571	8198	3000
Shoes	2438	2100	270	68
Nets	10406	7971	2297	138
Other Manufacturing[a]	7634	6224	1248	162
Domestic Service	33118	23481	7220	2417
Clerical and Professional	2070	1420	476	174
Dealers	64194	52314	9970	1910
Other occupations[b]	27763	19657	6576	1530

Source: 1939 Census, Volume 2, Chapter 12, Table 7, p. 772 and Table 13, pp. 776-779.

Notes: [a] Listed in Chapter 12 as manufacture of tools, implements and utensils, manufacture of brooms and furniture, and skilled labour.

[b] Includes public works and road construction, listed separately in Chapter 12. Of the 689 women involved, 274 were housewives.

Because the exclusion involved 701,685 (22.3 per cent) of the 3,145,763 enumerated housewives, I suggest such regulation of the statistics was sufficient to influence our views of women's occupations in 1939. First, we should establish the occupations in which the housewives did work. Table 6B, assembled from data in Census Chapter 12, Volume 2, gives the additional occupations of gainfully and non-gainfully employed women in 1938. For the purpose of this exercise, I have retained the Census placement of housewives as gainfully employed. Housewives constituted

75.4 per cent of the 931,069 women reporting an additional occupation (see Table 6A for a breakdown of the other gainfully employed women). Although more housewives engaged in manufacturing sector occupations (43.7 per cent) than in agriculture (41.6 per cent), the single occupation from which the largest proportion of housewives earned an income was farm labourer. One in six of the housewives wove mats and just over one-tenth engaged in fabric weaving. In contrast, 58 per cent of the other gainfully employed women had additional occupations as farm labourers and just 26.3 per cent in manufacturing occupations. That is, the distribution of additional occupations for housewives differed slightly from that for other gainfully employed women.

Enumeration of the women as housewives instead of in their paid occupations affected the overall position of women in the occupation data. Scholars (for example, Eviota 1992) exclude the housewives from any consideration of the proportion of women engaged in gainful employment. Thus, citing Census data, they tend to assert that the de facto female activity rate fell from 41.9 per cent in 1903 to 20.2 per cent in 1939. I cannot argue with the direction of change, but the 1939 calculation excluded women who might have been counted as gainfully employed if statisticians conformed to the 1903 measurement. It might have been that the 1939 proportion of women in paid employment fell by less than half the official Census decrease, to approximately 33 per cent[14], if there had been consistency between the two Censuses.

I am reluctant to advocate precise proportions because there are so many unknown factors concerning the housewives. Nevertheless, if we were to add the numbers of housewives with additional occupations to the official Census records, it might reveal another possibility about women's position in the 1939 workforce. Speculation is possible that the Census classification of these housewives outside the official record affected the reported proportions of women in some economic sectors. This in turn might have affected the perceived movement of women among sectors from 1903 to 1939. To take one possibility, in 1939 the proportion of gainfully employed women engaged in manufacturing occupations was perhaps over 31 per cent compared with the given Census proportion of 24.3 per cent. It might have been that approximately 13 per cent of gainfully employed women engaged in domestic and personal occupations, instead of the 18.9 per cent shown in the Census. If that were so, it suggests that women did not leave small-scale manufacturing occupations at quite

the rate previously thought (but see the following chapter for changes amongst manufacturing occupations). As well, the perceived movement of women from 1903 to 1939 out of manufacturing into domestic service in particular perhaps cannot be accepted as fact. Chapter 7 examines this issue in more detail.

Further supposition is possible about the sex ratio of some economic sectors. In the manufacturing sector for example, the ratio might have been reversed from that shown in the Census, where males comprised 55.5 per cent and females, 44.5 per cent of the sector workforce. If we add the 306,567 housewives with manufacturing occupations to the number officially recorded (333,976 males, 267,359 females), then the ratio in manufacturing occupations becomes 1 male to 1.7 females. Similar exercises show that possibly domestic and personal services were more strongly female (from 62.8 per cent to about 65 per cent), and that one-fifth of the agricultural labour force was female (compared with the Census figure of 13.7 per cent). The exercise is conjectural, but it shows that official Census data might have imparted inaccurate information, which perhaps has become accepted over time as the true picture. That is, Census officials might have regulated the data sufficiently to affect our views of women's occupations in 1939. Speculation, however, neither proves nor disproves that part of my hypothesis, so that the proposition remains a possibility only.

Officials therefore produced occupational and employment data for Filipino women in 1939 that need careful sifting. While income earned appears to have had pre-eminence as the 1903 measure of gainful labour, one possible effect of the 1939 instructions was a greater measurement by time of women's part-time paid work. By including housewives in the Census statistical Tables of Usual Occupation and in the report's descriptive analysis, Census authorities inflated the female gainful worker representation in 1939, compared with the gainfully employed of 1903. Conversely, the classification as housewives possibly diminished the scope and distribution of women's gainful occupations. Evidence from the record of additional occupations suggested that some misrepresentation of women's occupations might have occurred. On the broad scale, there was inconsistency between the two Censuses in the categories of gainfully employed and non-gainfully employed.

3. Statistical management.

The 1939 Census raises serious questions. Over time, did Census authorities fundamentally change their attitude towards women's position in a survey of market labour? Second, did the Philippines Commission of the Census, under the influence of the U.S. Census Bureau, covertly introduce a labour force method of organisation in 1939, and if so, how did it affect the account? These are questions about the management of the statistics. They imply that the authorities' regulation of the 1903 and 1939 accounts might have been sufficiently different to make comparison of the data difficult. What were the implications of the regulation and the possible distortion? None of the questions has a straightforward answer because of the puzzle of the housewives, about whom so little is known. As well, since Census officials published little explanation of their actions, there is only circumstantial evidence and supposition, but it is proper to assess the evidence as best as possible.

First, was there a basic change in the official position concerning women's work? In retrospect, it is hard to assess the intent of Census authorities towards women's occupations in 1939. There was confusion over the function of occupational statistics and officials failed to record the changes in their thinking on gainful labour. The published Census appeared to suggest that officials no longer assumed women's dependency and perhaps officials did not intend to degrade women's work. Unusually, statisticians placed housewives amongst the gainfully employed. Nevertheless, we cannot assert that enumeration as a housewife occurred only because of the concept and structure of gainful labour or only because of the actions of Census staff and enumerators. Perhaps the authorities thus recognised and acknowledged the possible social dimension of occupational identification that was relevant to Filipino women. In doing so however, they left the statistics open to misinterpretation.

Despite the change in style, there was a dominant sense that officials had not altered their view about women's position in a survey of market labour. Some of the enumerators' instructions appeared to uphold the original rationalisation of gainful labour. Instructions were ill-defined, ambiguous and contradictory about women's occupations – it was as though officials equivocated. The Report cautioned readers about the interpretation of data for women's occupations. Officials counted the paid,

part-time occupations of the housewives as additional occupations, not as ordinary gainful employment. It implied that the officials accorded secondary importance to the information. Even as the Census account of women's occupations conveyed conflicting stories, that condition itself suggested that officials had not discarded the underlying assumption of women's dependency.

It has not been possible to determine precisely what the 1939 Philippines Census officials (including enumerators) thought about women's gainful employment. On balance, the evidence suggests that they adhered to the implicit notions of gainful labour. Perhaps Census officials did not grant women's paid work the same value as men's employment. To that extent, there was probably little change since 1903 in official attitudes. The investigation tends to support M. Anderson's (1992) contention that officials concealed the concept's inherent gender bias through the contradictions and confusing evidence. At the same time, there is no essential evidence to suggest that **U.S.** officials intentionally or deliberately built in extra bias against Filipino women.

The second question concerns a strategic decision of the Census authorities in 1939. During the Depression, the **U.S.** Census Bureau decided to replace gainful labour with a labour force structure in the 1940 **U.S.** Census. It would enable the Bureau to differentiate employed and unemployed within the labour force. I tend to think that the Census Commission superimposed the new concept on the 1939 Philippines Census without abandoning gainful labour as the method of counting employment. Instructions to the enumerators about exclusions from the workforce support that opinion. Inquiries about employment status over the year or on a particular day and about attitudes to work linked directly to a labour force approach, and descriptions of part-time workers portended the new typology.

But the two methods of measurement were incompatible. Contradictions and ambiguity appeared in the instructions and in the Report, for example over dependants. Housewife as an occupational classification was inconsistent with gainful labour and the labour force. The listing of the housewives possibly affected the recording of the housewives' additional occupations, which by the gainful labour regulations, perhaps should have been counted as gainful employment. The evidence suggests that officials were aware of the some of the logistical problems of a labour force approach, but they disregarded the basic contradictions created by the strategy. Those contradictions tend to confirm that officials retained gainful labour as the primary organising structure

while simultaneously instituting a labour force approach. The conflict perhaps meant that the 1939 account required considerable management.

Although it is difficult to establish the sequence of management decisions in 1939, regulation of the account was perhaps more pervasive in that year than in 1903. Confusion over the statistical approach probably meant that officials closely managed the instructions to enumerators and the presentation of the information. Ambiguous instructions on their own might have indicated a lack of clear thinking, but they might also have meant an intention to apply a double-edged strategy. Post-enumeration supplementary rules denote extra regulation. The record of the part-time gainful occupations of housewives implied that statisticians controlled and manipulated the representation of women's occupations. There is sufficient evidence therefore to support the proposition that management of the 1939 account of gainful labour was probably focused and intrusive.

That such management caused misrepresentation of women's occupations is however, only supposition. Perhaps the Census excluded 700,000 women from the count of gainful employment. The women seemed to fulfil the conditions necessary to be counted thus. If that were so, then the Commission's actions probably affected the number of women recorded in gainful employment, the proportions in each sector and the spatial distribution of occupations. As well, the sex ratio of each sector might have been different from that recorded in the Census. The possibility that officials interfered with the records to that extent has implications for a study of change since the 1903 Census. Nevertheless, we cannot tell to what degree women themselves modified the count and until there is further research, verification of the proposition or estimation of the possible degree of statistical manipulation is not possible. If women did influence the count in this way, then we cannot accuse the Census of deliberate misrepresentation on this matter.

Over time, however, the 1939 Census record has become accepted. In association with the corresponding changes shown in men's occupational data, fixed images emerged that the change in the industrial composition of the female workforce was analogous to substantial change in the economic structure of occupations. Previously, I have argued that Census management regulated the 1903 classification scheme sufficiently to distort economic sector data. Examination of the 1939 gainful labour count extends that hypothesis. The management of the 1939 Census probably

distorted 1939 sector data also, but in a different way. Together, the findings suggest that sector data from 1903 and 1939 most likely presented an inaccurate account of women's employment at the time. They also suggest that the sector data may be of limited use in determining the transformation of women's occupations before World War 2. Change in the patterns of representation or classification might not indicate real change in the occupations or employment of women. Yet, we have to work with the data and the portrayal of women's employment and occupations as gainful labour therefore governs my study. The next Section considers some of the implications for the survey of individual occupations in Chapter 7.

4. Implications.

The 1903 and 1939 Censuses provide the best guide we have to women's employment and the range and distribution of their occupations at the time. The disregard of employment status during the census year and at the time of enumeration is an advantage. Both Censuses recorded the employment of women who might be excluded under later labour force definitions, such as unemployed seasonal or casual workers. In that sense, the record of women's occupations is wider than it might have been. On the other hand, my investigation exposes inherent difficulties with the data. All women's paid work was not included in either Census and official policy clouded issues of measurement and classification. Consequently, there are questions of data comparability over the period.

Primarily, the statistical category of gainful worker changed in nature from 1903 to 1939. Of most significance to the women's statistics was the classification, housewife. The 1939 account encompassed housewives as a separate employment classification, whereas statisticians in 1903 excluded housewife as a classification of gainful employment. One option is to restrict any examination of women's employment to one of occupations statistically categorised by a stated economic return for services provided, that is, to the gainfully employed. Consideration of the housewife classification indicates that it was economically vague with a likely social element, and as such, it was inconsistent with other classifications.

Responsible for considerable household work including child-care, subsistence farming and perhaps other work outside the home, housewives might have been

unpaid, or paid in kind, by exchange, or by support. There are, however, no records on which to base a judgement about consistency of payments to them. Continuing scholarship further clarifies the difficulty of measuring and valuing household labour[15]. Floro's (1995) study of the time allocation of Filipino women under late twentieth century economic restructuring discusses women's household production. She details the problem of assessing the value of non-marketed goods and services as well as the labour time involved. The difficulty includes translating labour-time units, for the non-market work, to monetary units. Floro points out that there has been no measurement of labour time units or assessment of the value and volume of non-marketed production in the past. As well, current data sources, she argues, only measure direct market use, ignore overlapping activities and incorporate subjective views of work and non-work (the separation of social activity and work activity). In short, there are problems not yet solved of measuring time in production and the value of non-market goods and services, difficulties that statisticians did not consider in the early Censuses (see Chapter 5, Note **3,** for one view offered by the Bureau on the difficulty of evaluating housework).

Furthermore, if housewife as a classification had social connotations rather than a clear economic style, then perhaps we cannot consider all classifications equal. It is not my intention to devalue Filipino housewives' activities, or their contribution to the community and the economy. If married women considered both work and home-life were necessary for their social identity, then it should be asked if it were possible for a demographic count to chart this. The census statistical unit was the household, rather than the individual respondent of a social survey. It says little about how the process of social identification worked, or about internal social relationships of the household, much less about systems such as gender relations (S. Duncan 1991). As Duncan argues, different processes can lead to the same geographic result and it is inappropriate to infer these from the spatial patterns shown in aggregated demographic statistics. A higher proportion of women enumerated as housewives, for example, might be a statement by women about their social status or might only signify that Census officials considered paid work outside the home more important than work at home. Either way, the housewife classification was most likely a representation of a social relationship and difficult to compare with an economic classification.

On the other hand, some compromise is possible. Even if married women did consider themselves as housewives for social reasons, then that did not necessarily exclude them from participating in paid employment. Although their enumeration as housewives hid much of that employment, more than one-fifth of the housewives nominated another paid occupation, the so-called additional occupations of 1939. I therefore include the data for those women where possible in Chapter 7 (and see Appendix 2 for the provincial distribution of the housewives and their additional occupations). This corresponds to the enumeration practice of 1903. My investigation in Chapter 5 suggested that although statisticians of 1903 excluded a classification of housewives from the record of gainfully employed persons, at least one-quarter of women so counted in that year were ever married, that is, they were housewives. To avoid double counting other gainfully employed women in 1939 however, I omit the additional occupations nominated by other women in the distribution, for example for farm labourers who also wove mats.

Unfortunately, Census officials limited the information available about the housewives who worked part-time and this affects the usefulness of those data. The list of additional occupations conceals information by imposing further levels of occupational uniformity on the women and it confuses any reassessment of the housewives' employment in specific occupations. In this variation of statistical management, Census officials combined the additional occupations into just 19 classifications (see Table 6B), which created some anomalies and difficulties. The descriptive list of manufacturing occupations given for the additional occupations, as recorded in Table 6B, was inconsistent with the official occupation listing in Chapter 10 of the Census. The supplementary list, for example, included basket making and net making, occupations that the official account did not register at all. Census authors gave no reason for this anomaly. Did statisticians exclude the occupations from the primary account because they considered the crafts to be remnants of the subsistence economy and perhaps incompatible with an accepted manufacturing industry classification? Yet, at least 17,951 housewives earned income from employment in those two occupations (Table 6B).

Second, other classifications in the supplementary list are amalgamations of many occupations. All domestic and personal service occupations constituted one classification, as did the combined clerical and professional occupations another.

Reductions of those service classifications suggest that the officials retained the bias against non-productive occupations that was evident in the 1903 Census. Third, the classification, dealers, which included agents, appeared to combine occupations listed in different economic sectors in the official account (for an example, see embroiderers in the next chapter). By such practices, the Census Commission limited the usefulness of the additional occupation data. Together, these features indicate considerable overall management of the additional occupation account, in addition to the regulation of the primary record of 1939.

Chapters 4 to 6 have disclosed problems with the official and supplementary occupation data. Consequently, any survey of the Census accounts of women's occupations can only be a guide, not a definitive, accurate description. The given statistics for 1903 especially are at best a minimum indication. It is not possible to show any further breakdown of the amalgamated data for each 'occupation' for either the 1903 or 1939 Censuses, and it is not always possible to indicate the precise distribution of occupations across the provinces. Unless research is possible into enumerators' completed schedules, we cannot know exactly the degree of such official regulation or distortion.

I have not been able to investigate those archival resources. Archives in Washington of the 1903 Census are accessible, but whether they include enumeration schedules is unclear. It is possible that the World War 2 destruction of Manila destroyed some or all of the 1939 Census archives there. Retrieval and cataloguing any census records was not a priority in difficult post-war conditions. If those resources are no longer available, then perhaps it might not be possible to investigate questions that I have already posed or the further queries that Chapter 7 asks. At least until there is a full examination of what archival resources do exist, we cannot make any solid claims about the management of the Census occupation accounts.

In addition to the unusual conditions in the Philippines in early 1903 that might have disturbed the Census enumeration (see Chapter 5), at least two other factors might affect any description of census representations and occupational change. First, some provincial boundaries changed between 1903 and 1939 (Maps 1 and 2). Second, the 1903 coverage of occupations in the then frontier zone was so inadequate as to be of very limited use. Section 1 of the next chapter draws attention to this difficulty and I indicate relevant boundary alterations in the appropriate occupation sections. With all

these considerations in mind, Chapter 7 then examines in detail how the ordering of the data for particular occupations left them open to misinterpretation or presented a possibly distorted picture of change.

---

[1] See Anderson (1992) and Folbre and Abel (1989) for the arguments raised, for example, by the American Association for the Advancement of Women. For a description of internal divisions within the Census Bureau over the concept of gainful labour, see Conk (1978). Hauser (1949) gave an outline of the modifications to the measure from 1910 onwards in response to its perceived inadequacies. The 1930 Fifteenth Census of the U.S. instructions concerning gainful labour read: "The entry should be either (1.) the gainful occupation pursued. . . ; or (2.) *none* (that is, no gainful occupation). . . A "gainful occupation" in Census usage is an occupation by which the person who pursues it earns money, or money equivalent, or in which he assists in the production of marketable goods." (Hauser 1949, p. 339). It was to be the last U.S. version before the 1939 Philippines Census. For criticism of this particular instruction, see Folbre and Abel (1989).

[2] I have not found any other reference to this Philippines alteration in either American or Philippines sources.

[3] See Conk (1978) and Scoville (1965) for discussion of the cross-purposes of the U.S. classification system. The extra classification of social categories in the 1939 Philippines Census occupation account was a simplified version of contemporaneous U.S. Census practice instituted by Alba M. Edwards in 1910. For example, within each occupation in the manufacturing, transport and communications, and service sectors, statisticians identified owners and officials, operatives and labourers.

[4] The U.S. Census Bureau conducted about 40 experimental surveys of unemployment in the U.S. between 1929 and 1937 during their development of the concept and measurement of the labour force (Hauser 1949).

[5] 1 have been unable to trace any information about Mills or his appointment. A *Manila Daily Bulletin* article dated 10 January 1938, justifying the use of teachers as enumerators, identified Festin and Mills as the Census Commissioners. Before that date, the newspaper reported Census information from Festin only. Neither Festin nor Mills appeared in any available biographical sources from the period.

[6] For example, for defence planning, forestry and agriculture, education, geology and mines, steamboat inspection, water supply, the National Psychopathic Hospital and even for military bands. The *Manila Daily Bulletin* (15 February 1938) listed 26 appointments, including General Douglas MacArthur and Lt. Col. D. D. Eisenhower. Most of the appointees had knowledge and experience of the Philippines, although the appointments aroused local political controversy.

[7] Press reports of the date of Hurley's arrival in Manila are contradictory and possibly inaccurate. News in the *Manila Daily Bulletin (MDB),* 1 October 1937, of his appointment indicated that he was due to leave the U.S. on 9 October. A later report *(MDB* 15 February 1938) suggested that Hurley had arrived in Manila in February 1937. Neither report was verifiable from ship passenger manifests.

[8] For dropping of teachers and Proclamation No. 266 of 31 March 1938 amending Census Day to 3 October, see *MDB* 1 April 1938. For Proclamation No. 320 (7 September 1938) amending Census Day to 15 November, see *MDB* 8 September 1938. For Proclamation No. 330 (11 October 1938) amending Census Day to 1 January 1939, see *MDB* 12 October 1938. In each case, time to select and train supervisors and enumerators was given as a reason for deferral. Proclamation No. 330 also acknowledged patronage and political influence to be a decisive factor:

> "The President has decided that census day be further postponed in order that the tremendous task of collecting data on the social, economic, cultural and other phases of the life of the people of the Philippines, may be completely removed from all political influence and in order to prevent the appointment of prospective census supervisors and enumerators from having any effect on the forthcoming elections.
>
> As January 1, 1939 will be almost two months after the elections, its designation as census day will give the commission of the census more time to consider the appointment of the best qualified persons available for the positions of census supervisors and enumerators. Ample time will also be afforded for the training of census supervisors and enumerators in order to acquaint them with their duties."

9 We do not know, for example, to what extent he influenced the change in supervisors for the population count to District Engineers and other employees of the Bureau of Public Works (1939 Census, Volume 2, Introduction). Similarly, we do not know Hurley's role in the decision to select enumerators from applications. The Report of the process in the Introduction to Census Volume 2, p. 22, noted that "the final selection and all appointments were made in the Manila office during November and December, 1938". There is no evidence that Hurley altered the make-up of the provincial advisory boards, whose job it was to list barrios in each municipality. It is not known why Acting Commissioner Jorge Vargas, Secretary to the President, replaced Commissioner Festin sometime after February 1938. Owing to Vargas's other duties, it is doubtful if he took an active part in the preparation and compilation of the Census.

10 Persons previously counted as gainful workers but who were to be excluded under the new arrangement in the United States Census - seasonal workers, inmates of penal and mental institutions, and retired or disabled persons (Hauser 1949).

11 Commentators have long argued that such indefiniteness affected some women with part-time work, particularly farm work (Cummings 1904; Smuts 1960).

12 Unfortunately, Census officials combined the two classifications in the Census Tables. I tend to think "housekeepers" referred only to the 1,557 men who maintained households on their own, and reported household duties as their occupation. It was unlikely that they were considered housewives. Women who were paid housekeepers were classified as cooks, maids or in the vague group, servants (Vol. 1, p. xiv, and see Vol. 2, Introduction, p. 15, Para. 56 for the relevant instruction). Women who worked as housekeepers in other households, in addition to housework in their own homes, were possibly recorded as housewives with additional occupations.

13 It is not possible to check this as the Census did not tabulate earnings for the non-gainful group.

14

1939 Census, female gainful workers	4,247,215
Less housewives	3,145,763
Gainfully employed	1,101,452
Plus housewives with additional occupations	701,685
Possible total, gainfully employed	1,803,137
Total female population, 10yrs and over	5,446,514

This calculation excludes the 39,974 students, dependents and retirees with gainful occupations (see Table 6A) who would have been included if the measurement were similar to that in 1903. If we were to include them, then the possible total of gainfully employed women in 1939 was 1,843,111, that is, 33.8 per cent of women aged 10 years and over.

15 Studies of housework increased in the West following the rising labour force participation of married women. Early studies established that time was a suitable measurement of women's work, but that separation of leisure and work was necessary (Gronau 1973). Analysis then shifted to measuring the time women spent working in the household (see Vanek 1974 for USA; Quizon 1978 for a study in Laguna, Philippines). Minge-Klevana (1980) notes the difficulties of measuring work in pre-industrial societies. Married women did not separate work from social activities, they engaged in multiple occupations, and there was simultaneous child care and food production. She suggests there were different notions from western stereotypes of work as labour, and of child labour, that affected the measurement of labour time. Following the UN commitment in 1985 to include women's unpaid work in national accounts, researchers have examined the problem with respect to individual countries, for example, Bryson 1996 (Australia); Folbre 1991 (USA); Luxton 1997 (Canada). Goldschmidt-Clermont (1990) outlines problems for international consideration. VanEvery (1997), while advancing the feminist viewpoint of gender inequality and the division of labour, suggests that the Western conception of housework is seriously flawed, which implies that studies of measurement and valuation need to be re-assessed.