

THE POPULATION IN HANDICRAFTS AND INDUSTRY IN SLOVENIA FROM THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY UNTIL THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Jasna Fischer

Introduction

The period covering the second half of the nineteenth century and the years leading up to the First World War brought the Slovene lands an economic transformation based mainly on non-agrarian activities, both as regards changes in industrial and handicraft production on the one hand and in communications on the other. With the beginning of the construction of the railway from Vienna to Trieste/Trst, and even more after its completion in 1857, the Slovene lands underwent a more intensive industrialization. This process was accompanied by the disintegration of agriculture, of cottage industries and of the peasantry, with the rural population increasingly moving to the towns in search of employment, and migrating to Western Europe and North America. The process of industrialization and its attendant changes in the social composition of the population in the Slovene lands during the last fifty years of Slovene existence under the Habsburg monarchy is one of the key, but unfortunately still not sufficiently explored, questions in the Slovene history of this period.

In this article I deal only with one segment of this large set of problems. I analyze the data of the Austrian statistical service concerning the active earning population employed in handicrafts and industry which were published as the final results of five censuses taken between 1869 and 1910. The occupational, and the resulting social, articulation of the population is undoubtedly one of the most important elements of any outline of economic and social development. Professional statistics provide an insight into the size, and into the directions of the divisions, of labor and social differentiation, thus also reflecting the articulation and the degree of economic growth. Moreover, the study of the occupational composition of the population, recorded at ten-year intervals, reveals a major developmental trend in the changes affecting the economic composition of the population. For this reason it is of the utmost importance to study occupational statistics in order to research the social and economic development of our past. Since I am interested in industrialization, it is important to analyze that part of the population that was employed in handicrafts and industry during this period.

Statistical Sources

I am not the first investigator to use the abundant materials in the Austrian statistical publications. I am however of the opinion that we historians have not sufficiently used and analyzed the published materials from occupational statistics: the majority of investigators have used them only fragmentarily. Some have merely taken data concerning demographic trends among the Slovenes; others, only data from individual censuses, especially the 1910 census; others again, data for individual regions.¹ Without prejudice I consider it safe to point out that the statisticians Dolfe Vogelnik and Živko Šifrer have, next to Fran Zwitter, made the most systematic study and use of all the available materials. Vogelnik published the results of occupational statistics based on the 1890, 1900 and 1910 censuses, but only for the territory of Slovenia as it existed between the World Wars. Šifrer outlined the

growth of population in Slovenia according to sex, whereas the economic structure of the population was presented only as agrarian vs. non-agrarian for the period beginning 1857; and he, too, covered only the territory of the present-day Slovene Republic.²

Regular censuses had already been introduced through the reforms of the empress Maria Theresa when, on the occasion of conscription for military service, a census of the population was also taken; but only in the second half of the nineteenth century did the census results become really important for the study of social and economic history. The two census acts that were passed in 1857 and 1869, together with the administrative reform which improved the administration and the work of the institutions, initiated regular and general modern censuses.

The materials published in a whole range of publications are very abundant and varied. In addition to general demographic data (fertility, mortality, growth rate, etc.) a great amount of other data were published that are relevant to the study of the history of economic development, health, education, elections, etc. In the present article I deal exclusively with the composition of the population, in order to show the importance of demography as a major economic factor.

The Austrian statistical service took no special censuses based on the occupations of the members of the population, but questions concerning occupations were included in the questionnaires used for the general censuses. After the data on the occupational composition of the population had been processed, the results were published along with the results of the general censuses.³ Until the disjunction of the Empire, general censuses were taken in 1857, 1869, 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1910. The 1857 census, with the critical date of October 31, was already administered according to modern statistical principles following the 1846 census in Belgium, and was no longer based on military criteria alone. No comparison is however possible between data from this census and those from later ones administered in accordance with the 1869 act. In 1857 the permanent (so-called 'native') residents were recorded, and the distinction between the permanent or stable population and the actual population was not consistently observed.⁴ The census administered in 1869 and all the subsequent censuses through 1910, with the critical date of December 31, recorded the actual population, and are modern and reliable. The census forms underwent only slight changes from one census to another, with new headings being added only.

Comparability of Occupational Statistical Data

The use of official results by the investigator of social history is rendered more difficult by virtue of the different methodologies used in the processing of materials. From one census to another the occupational schemata underwent changes, though it must be added that the modifications were not so extensive as to prevent reasonable comparisons after the requisite reappraisals. This statement applies particularly to the last three censuses, and to a lesser degree to the censuses administered in 1869 and 1880.⁵ The occupational schemata must be reconciled among themselves to make the comparability of the data possible. It is reasonable to base this reconciliation on the occupational schema used for the last Austrian census of 1910.

Before each census the Austrian statistical service made the necessary adjustments in the occupational schemata, to facilitate processing and the presentation of results. Only with the 1890 census was the following division into four classes introduced: Class A for agriculture, forestry and hunting; Class B for handicrafts and industry; Class C for commerce and communications; and Class D for the army, the public and civil service, the free professions, persons of independent means, and others. The occupational groups

that were recorded for the two preceding censuses can easily be included into this basic distributional model. On this level the results of all five censuses can be compared without difficulty. Comparisons of this kind shed light on the global shifts in the economic occupational distribution of the population in the Slovene lands in the period under discussion here, i.e., the period of developmental processes which effected an economic change centered on non-agrarian production. Comparisons of data between individual branches of the economy, as well as within them, make possible a more detailed study of shifts of this kind.

Although we historians are often less particular than statisticians and make do with comparisons between somewhat more loosely-defined groups, we must admit that, unfortunately, detailed comparisons of data within the branches of the economy recorded at the 1869 and 1880 censuses on the one hand with those recorded at the 1890, 1900 and 1910 censuses on the other, are neither possible nor meaningful. This applies in particular to handicrafts and industry, since the occupational schemata used in the Austrian statistics for these classes underwent the most radical changes. Thus in 1869 the results pertaining to this branch of the economy were recorded under seven headings, in 1880 they were recorded under only two, in 1890 and 1900 under fifteen, and in 1910 under fourteen headings. No reappraisals can be meaningful because only the data referring to those earning their living in mining and iron-smelting on the one hand, and the data on those active in all other branches of industry and handicrafts on the other, are comparable over the entire period. Without much difficulty, however, comparisons can be made between the results of the censuses of 1890, 1900 and 1910 for thirteen sub-groups of individual sectors in industry and trade.⁶

The distribution of population did not undergo major changes. It was divided into the gainfully employed population and those supported by them; and within each category were several subgroups. In the 1869 and 1880 censuses the employed population was subdivided into independents, employees, and workers; and the supported population was subdivided into relatives and household servants. In 1880 special mention was made of the total number of day-laborers for the four classes. The distribution of the supported population remained unchanged also in the later censuses; but there were changes in the internal distribution within the employed population: thus in 1890 there were four, in 1900 five, and in 1910 seven subgroups. In 1890 the day-laborer subgroup was introduced; in 1900 the subgroup 'helping family members', and in 1910 another two subgroups—tenants, and apprentices—were added. When more detailed comparisons between particular censuses are made, the best results can be obtained with the distribution pattern used in 1890, when the employed population was subdivided into independents, employees, workers, and day-laborers.

Much more work is required if we wish to calculate data for the Slovene ethnic territories from the census results. No difficulties are encountered with regard to Carniola or Slovene Styria, but it is more difficult in the case of Slovene Carinthia, the Gorica/Gorizia region, the Littoral (including Trst/Trieste), and Prekmurje. The last-named is in a special category because before the disjunction of Austro-Hungary it came under the districts of Železo (Vasvármegye) and Zal (Zalavármegye) and the general censuses were administered, and their results were published, in the Hungarian half of the dual monarchy. With respect to the other Slovene ethnic territories just mentioned, the data must be calculated on the basis of the smallest administrative units for which results were published, i.e., for administrative districts (*Bezirkshauptmannschaften*). It must be borne in mind that the boundaries of these districts did not always coincide with Slovene ethnic boundaries, and the district may

include non-Slovene populations. The relevant administrative districts may be enumerated as follows:

In Carniola: Ljubljana, Postojna, Kočevje, Krško, Kranj, Ljubljana environs, Litija, Logatec, Radovljica, Novo mesto, Kamnik, Črnomelj (12). In Styria: Celje, Maribor, Ptuj, Celje environs, Ljutomer, Maribor environs, Ptuj environs, Brežice, Slovenj Gradec (9). In Carinthia: Celovec/Klagenfurt, Šmohor/Hermagor, Celovec environs, Beljak/Villach, Velikovec/Völkermarkt, Volšperk/Wolfsberg (6). In the Littoral, including the Gorica district: Trieste, Gorica, Gorica environs, Sežana, Tolmin, Koper (6).

In the two last-listed lands it is impossible to draw a precise line between, respectively, the Slovene and German, and between the Slovene and Italian, ethnic territories. Special methodological problems are raised by the cities of Celovec, Trst and Gorica: but, in spite of all considerations to the contrary, they have been included in the analysis because of the large percentage of Slovenes who lived there before the First World War. The inclusion of these cities into Slovene ethnic space and the study of their history within this kind of framework is an accepted procedure in Slovene historiography.

Active Population Engaged in Handicraft and Industry in Slovene Ethnic Territories

Calculations show that the growth of the population earning its living in industry and handicrafts was faster than the overall growth of the population in the Slovene ethnic territory. Unfortunately, owing to the manner in which the census results were processed and published it is, however, impossible to make a distinction between those engaged in industry and those engaged in handicrafts. This would, of course, provide a more detailed account of the industrialization process.

The numerical growth of those employed in handicrafts and industry, together with the increase in the proportion of population listed in classes C and D (see above), brought about structural changes in the occupational involvement of the Slovene population in favor of the non-agrarian sectors. It should be borne in mind that the relative growth of the non-agrarian population among the ethnic Slovenes was higher than that of any other ethnic group in Austria. In spite of showing the fastest relative growth, however, in 1910 the proportion of agrarian population in the Slovene lands was still 67%, compared to a figure of 30% for the German-speaking population of the monarchy.⁷ This is of course a generalized mean, which conceals some interesting details. In the territory of the administrative district of Radovljica, for example, which in the eighteenth century had been one of the regions where Slovene capital had accumulated, only 45% of the population in the second half of the nineteenth century still earned its living through agriculture, forestry and hunting.⁸

TABLE I shows that the fastest growth in the active population occurred in handicrafts and industry between the 1900 and 1910 censuses, by a figure as high as 26%. The correspondings increases over periods between earlier censuses are somewhat lower: 1869-1880, nearly 16%; 1880-1890 and 1890-1900, 12%. There were considerable differences, also, in the growth rates among the groups of 'independents,' 'employees,' 'workers' and 'day-laborers.' The slowest relative growth was recorded for the two last-named groups, and the highest for 'employees.' The groups of 'employees' and 'day-laborers' in this distribution are, however, only marginal numerically, and affect the ratios within handicrafts and industry to only a small degree. Of decisive importance are shifts in the

groups of 'independents' (entrepreneurs and plant-owners) and 'workers.' Over the forty-year period between the 1869 and the 1910 censuses the number of 'independents' in handicrafts and industry grew by about 131%, while the number of 'workers' grew by only 60%. In 1869 the 'independents' accounted for less than 20% of active persons in this sector of the economy, whereas in 1910 they accounted for almost one quarter. The proportion of 'workers' in the total population active in handicrafts and industry over this period fell by almost 10%, from 78.9% to 68.8%.

Table 1: Active Population in Handicrafts and Industry, 1869-1910

Year	Self-Employed	Employees	Workers	Day-labourers	Total Active Population in Handicrafts and Industry	Index	Population in the Slovene Ethnic Territory	Index
1869	19,949	1,331	80,040	-	101,320	100	1,431,667	100
1880	33,341	2,359	81,600	-	117,300	115.7	1,519,422	106.1
1890	35,413	1,656	91,410	3,156	131,635	129.9	1,587,711	108.6
1900	36,480	2,462	104,872	3,698	147,512	145.6	1,652,653	115.4
1910	46,154	3,865	128,389	8,112	186,520	184.1	1,788,022	124.9

Distribution by Region

The criticism, above, with respect to averages applies also to the data on developments in individual regions. It may be stated that regional differences were considerable. As a rule, over the period under discussion, Carniola and Styria had relatively fewer people earning their living in handicrafts and industry, whereas Carinthia and the Littoral (including Gorica) had more; this is revealed by comparative calculations. The figures in TABLE II show that the greatest number engaged in these occupations were in the Littoral, and the least in Styria.

Table 2: Active Population in Handicrafts and Industry by Lands, 1869 - 1910

Year	Carniola	% of Population	Styria	% of Population	Carinthia	% of Population	The Littoral	% of Population	Slovene Ethnic Territory	% of over-all total population
1869	29,064	6.3	20,802	5.1	22,815	9.5	28,639	8.9	101,320	7.1
1880	29,535	6.1	22,561	5.3	26,067	10.4	39,137	10.8	117,300	7.7
1890	34,894	6.9	25,900	5.8	28,340	10.8	42,501	11.1	131,635	8.3
1900	40,550	7.9	28,982	6.3	29,225	10.8	48,755	11.7	147,512	8.9
1910	50,735	9.6	34,501	7.2	36,978	12.6	64,306	13.0	186,520	10.4

The methodological problems of including data on Trieste in an analysis, and the reasons for the decision to include these data, have been explained. In fact, the inclusion of these data makes an essential difference to the analytical results. It should be pointed out that, despite the accepted procedures of Slovene historiography, the proportion of population engaged in handicrafts and industry in Trieste is of the utmost importance with respect to the Slovene ethnic territory, even though these figures show a constant relative decrease between 1869 and 1900 and a small increase between 1900 and 1910. Of the population of Trieste, as many as 71.2% were engaged in these occupations in 1869; the figure dropped to 68.5% in 1880, to 66.7% in 1890 and to 64.8% in 1900; and it rose slightly to 65.1% in 1910. With respect to the population actively involved in handicrafts and industry in the entire Slovene ethnic territory, the proportion living in Trieste was 28.2%; this fell to 22.8% in 1880, 21.5% in 1890, and 21.4% in 1900; and it rose to 22.4% in 1910. These data speak to the specific position of Trieste, which is so often justifiably invoked, within the Austrian and the Slovene economic sphere.

In Carniola and the Littoral (including Gorica) the numbers of those employed in handicrafts and industry grew faster than in Styria and Carinthia. Between 1869 and 1910 their number grew by over 124% in the Littoral (with Gorica), by a good 74% in Carniola, by almost 66% in Styria and by 62% in Carinthia. Throughout the whole Slovene ethnic territory the overall growth figure was 84%. The extremely rapid growth rate in the Littoral can be explained, again, by the growth of the working population in Trieste and its immediate environs, in which region the increase over this period was 107%.

The rates of growth according to the different decades differed from region to region. Thus, for the decade 1869-1880, the number of persons included here for Carniola increased by less than 2%, while those in the Littoral (here and in what follows, with Gorica) grew by over 36%; and the figures for Styria (8.5%) and Carinthia (14%) are in between the two extremes. In the following decade, 1880-1890, the highest growth rate for the working population was recorded in Carinthia (24%), followed by Carniola (18%), Styria (nearly 15%) and with the Littoral last with 8.6%. In the last decade of the century, the order changed again, as follows: Carniola (16%), the Littoral (almost 15%), Styria (almost 12%), with the Carinthia showing a very low growth rate of 3%. Finally, if we look at the decade 1900-1910, we find that each region recorded its highest growth rate for the entire period: the Littoral headed the list with nearly 32%; Carinthia was next with 26.5%; Carniola had an increase of 25%; and Styria had the smallest increase, 19%.

Statistical Breakdown according to Occupation

It was pointed out above that comparisons between individual branches of industry and handicrafts can only be made with respect to the last three general censuses of the Habsburg monarchy, due to the way in which the results were analyzed and presented. Between 1890 and 1910 six occupational groups were the strongest in terms of the number of people employed in them, viz., mining and smelting; the metal industry and its trades; the building trades; the timber industry and its trades; the food industry and its trades; and the clothing industry. In 1890, these groups accounted for 81.1% of the whole working population engaged in industry and handicrafts in the Slovene lands; by 1900, this percentage dropped to 80.7%, and by 1910 it sank to 77.6%.

We know that for the period preceding the First World War it is not possible to categorize certain groups as branches of industry, due to the organization of their production; this applies to the building and, especially, to the clothing trades, and also, essentially, to the food industry and allied trades, where only a few breweries and mills could be considered

as industrial plant. These occupational groups were fragmented and consisted mostly of small enterprises with small numbers of workers, indeed often with the owner being the sole worker. At that time these three groups employed a good half of all the persons engaged in handicrafts and industry, viz., 55.4% in 1890; 52.4% in 1900; and 52.8% in 1910. Regardless of the fact that it is impossible to make separate calculations for those engaged in handicrafts as opposed to those working in industry, it can be safely claimed that in the second part of the nineteenth century more than half of those employed in the non-agrarian sector were still engaged in trades, although their number decreased between 1890 and 1910.

It is interesting to note the development of the above-mentioned six branches of trade and industry having the greatest numbers of workers over this period, as shown in TABLES III and IV. Only one of the branches shows a constant growth, viz., the food industry and its trades. In two of these branches the numbers dropped during both decades, namely, in the metal industry and in clothing. In the other occupational groups, changes were inconsistent.

Table 3: Active Population, according to type of handicraft and branch of industry and trade

Branch	1890	1900	Index 1890=100	1910	Index 1890=100
1. Mining, smelting	10,618	13,216	124.	12,690	119.5
2. Industry of stones and clays	4,436	6,037	136.	8,072	181.9
3. Metal industry, trade	12,180	13,273	108.9	16,204	133.
4. Machine engineering, trade	4,349	6,233	143.	11,387	261.8
5. Chemical industry	1,294	2,753	212.7	4,190	323.8
6. Building trades	12,954	18,242	140.8	22,712	175.
7. Printing trades	970	1,431	147.5	2,291	236.
8. Textiles	4,331	5,388	124.	6,979	161.
9. Paper and leather	5,047	6,698	132.7	7,411	146.8
10. Timber	11,041	15,203	137.7	17,427	157.8
11. Food	22,920	26,591	116.	35,173	153.
12. Clothing trade	37,075	32,660	88.	40,756	109.9
13. Others	4,420	776	17.5	1,228	27.8

TABLE 4: Active Population according to type of handicraft and branch of industry and trade (Percentages)

Branch	1890	1900	1910
1. Mining, Smelting	8.1	8.9	6.8
2. Industry of stones and clays	3.4	4.1	4.3
3. Metal industry, trade	9.2	8.9	8.7
4. Machine engineering, trade	3.3	4.2	6.1
5. Chemical industry	0.9	1.8	2.2
6. Building trades	9.8	12.3	12.2
7. Printing Trades	0.7	0.9	1.2
8. Textiles	3.3	3.6	3.7
9. Paper and leather	3.8	4.5	3.9
10. Timber	8.4	10.3	9.3
11. Food	17.4	18.0	18.8
12. Clothing trade	28.2	22.1	21.8
13. Others	3.3	0.5	0.6
	100	100	100

In the first decade of the present century, mining and smelting was the only branch of non-agrarian production in the Slovene lands where the number employed dropped not only in relative but in absolute terms. In the building and timber industries the numbers employed rose, but the relative percentage of the total workforce dropped. In addition to the food industry, a constant growth (both absolute and relative) in the number of those employed occurred in the stone-and-clay industry,⁹ in machine engineering, in the chemical and textile industries and in the printing trades.

Although individual branches of industry and handicrafts showed varying developments, their rank ordering with respect to the overall working population did not change substantially between 1890 and 1910. The growth rate was the highest in the chemical industry and the printing trades as well as in machine engineering. In the first of these, the number of working persons more than tripled; in the second-named, the number rose by less than two and a half times; and in the last-named, it rose by over 250%. If we note, however, their place in the rank orders for 1890, 1900 and 1910, we note that the chemical industry rose from 12th place in 1890 to 11th in 1900 and 1910; in 1890, the printing trades were in last place, and in 1900 and 1910 they rose to next to last; whereas machine engineering rose from ninth position in 1890 and 1900 to seventh in 1910, out of the thirteen branches.

Conclusion

Regardless of the constraints imposed on the investigator by the manner of analysis and of presentation of data used by the Austrian statistical service, these materials are a valuable source for the analysis of structural changes undergone by Slovene society in the decades prior to the First World War. It is true, however, that the data of occupational statistics record only the changes in the proportions between different branches of the economy, and do not shed any light on the numerous developments which were, during this time, altering

the interrelationships within the various branches. We are, moreover, still lacking a number of quantitative analyses of the migration of population from the Slovene ethnic territories; this was, evidently, a reason for the very high percentage of employed women in Slovenia. We do not know, either, enough about the qualifications of industrial workers for this period. Only the first attempts at quantitative analyses of the professional and geographical mobility of the population have been made to date.¹⁰ We Slovene historians do not shun the study of questions of this kind, but we are hampered by a scarcity of available sources.

Inštitut za zgodovino delavskega gibanja, Ljubljana

NOTES

- * Note: handicrafts, trades = Slovene *obrta*, *obrtna dejavnost*, German *Handwerk*.
1. There are several works whose authors used these materials and I offer here a small selection only: Etbin Kristan, *Narodno vprašanje in Slovenci* (Ljubljana: Delavska tiskovna družba, 1908); Filip Uratnik, *Prebivalstvo in gospodarstvo Slovenije* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1929-30); Anton Melik, *Slovenija I* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1936); Fran Zwitter, *Prebivalstvo na Slovenskem od XVIII. stoletja do današnjih dni* (Ljubljana: Znanstveno društvo, 1936); Janko Pleterški, *Položaj Slovencev pred prvo svetovno vojno*, 761-88 in *Jugoslovenski narodi pred prvi svetski rat* (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnost, 1967); and Bogo Grafenauer, *Zgodovina slovenskega naroda V* (Ljubljana: Državna založba, 1974).
 2. Adolf Vogelnik, "Gradivo k poklicni statistiki slovenskega prebivalstva za razdobje od 1890 do 1931," *Tehnika in gospodarstvo* 6/1-2 (1940) 17-48; Živko Šifrer, "Razvitak Slovenije u poslednjih sto godina," *Stanovništvo* 1 (1963) 339-64.
 3. The occupational statistics arising from the general censuses of 1869, 1880, 1890 and 1910 appeared in the following: *Bevölkerung und Viehstand der im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreichen und Ländern dann der Militärgrenze nach der Zahlung von 31. Dezember 1869*, II Buch (Vienna: K.k. statistische Central-Comission, 1871); *Österreichische Statistik I* Buch, Heft 3 (Vienna: K.k. statistische Central-Comission, 1882); *Österreichische Statistik XXIII* Buch, Bänder 4, 5, 6 (Vienna, K.k. statistische Central-Comission, 1894); *Österreichische Statistik LXV* Buch, Bänder 4, 5, 6 (Vienna: K.k. statistische Central-Comission, 1904); *Österreichische Statistik*, Neue Folge, III Buch, Bänder 4, 5, 6 (Vienna: K.k. statistische Central-Comission, 1915.)
 4. For 'permanent population' Zwitter 55 also uses the term 'competent population' [Slovene *pristojno prebivalstvo*]. Cf. also Igor Vrišer, *Razvoj prebivalstva na območju Ljubljane* (Ljubljana: Knjižnica Kronike, 1956) 22.
 5. Cf. also Vogelnik 18-19.
 6. For a more detailed analysis of the occupational schemata, see Jasna Fischer, "O virih za gospodarsko in družbeno zgodovino Slovencev od sredine 19. stoletja do prve svetovne vojne," *Prispevki za zgodovino delavskega gibanja* 23 (1983) 32-35.
 7. Pleterški 768.
 8. Jasna Fischer, "Populacijski razvoj in socialna struktura okrajnega glavarstva Radovljica med leti 1869 in 1910," *Kronika. Časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino* 33.2-3 (1984) 143-144.
 9. I.e., glass, cement, brick and ceramics works.
 10. Results from the computer-processing of the data from the staff records of the *Ljubljanska tobačna tovarna* in Jasna Fischer, "Delavke tobačne tovarne v Ljubljani v letih 1871-1914," *Prispevki za zgodovino delavskega gibanja* 24 (1984) 5-62.

POVZETEK

**PREBIVALSTVO V OBRTI IN INDUSTRIJI V SLOVENIJI
OD SREDINE DEVETNAJSTEGA STOLETJA
DO PRVE SVETOVNE VOJNE**

Proces intenzivnejše industrializacije slovenskih dežel v obdobju zadnjih desetletij habsburške monarhije je spremljalo spreminjanje sestave prebivalstva. Poklicna statistika omogoča vpogled v obseg in smer delitve dela in s tem odslikava stopnjo gospodarskega razvoja, zato se je avtorica odločila za analizo sprememb v skupini prebivalstva, ki je bilo zaposleno v obrti in industriji. Študijo je zasnovala na podlagi objavljenih rezultatov ljudskih štetij v avstrijski polovici habsburške monarhije v letih 1869, 1880, 1890, 1900 in 1910. Podatki so dani za celotno slovensko etnično ozemlje. Rast števila prebivalstva, ki se je preživljalo z industrijsko in obrtno dejavnostjo, je precej hitrejša kot rast vsega prebivalstva na slovenskem etničnem ozemlju. Zaradi načina obdelave ni možno izračunati aktivne posebej v obrti in posebej v industriji. Možna je ocena, da se je vse do prve svetovne vojne še vedno več kot polovica prebivalstva v neagrarni proizvodnji preživljala z obrtjo. Na Kranjskem in Primorskem je število zaposlenih v obrti in industriji raslo hitreje kot na Koroškem in Štajerskem. Najhitreje je raslo aktivno prebivalstvo v obrti in industriji v desetletju 1900-1910. Primerjave razvoja med posameznimi panogami so možne le z gradivom zadnjih treh popisov. Vseskozi je najmočnejših po številu zaposlenih šest panog, ki so zaposlovale skupaj okoli osem desetih vsega aktivnega prebivalstva v neagrarni proizvodnji — rudarstvo in plavžarstvo, kovinska industrija in obrt, gradbeništvo, lesna in prehrambena industrija in obrt ter oblačilne obrti.