

Occupational Multiplicity and Rural Development Patterns in the Third World

Michael A. Costello

“Occupational multiplicity” refers to a situation in which a person who is already gainfully employed takes on an additional job. The worker earns extra money after hours from his regular job (“moonlighting”) or becomes a “jack of all trades” who is available on call for various odd jobs—today a carpenter, tomorrow someone to tune up a car engine or repair a simple household appliance. Because occupational patterns of this type imply a turning away from the sort of full-fledged economic specialization emphasized in such classic treatises as Durkheim’s (1964, originally published in 1893) *The Division of Labor in Society*, labor force analyses have tended to ignore them completely or to view them as being inherently antidevelopmental in nature. Multiple job-

holding is, however, not at all uncommon in the more developed world; nor is it necessarily confined to the poorer classes. Statistics show, for example, that large numbers of agriculturists in Europe, Japan and the United States hold off-farm jobs (Sanders, 1977, pp. 77-79; Barlett, 1986). Indeed, part-time farming may be viewed as a “regular feature of almost all farming societies” (Barlett, 1986, p. 289). Furthermore, there is evidence to link such patterns to higher living standards, at least among the farm populace of industrialized societies (e.g. Deseran, Falk and Jenkins, 1984).

This paper represents an attempt to review some studies which have touched upon the issue of occupational multiplicity, with a view towards classifying the variant

patterns which are subsumed under this general concept, commenting upon the functions and dysfunctions associated with multiple job holding, and identifying the ecological, social, and economic conditions which give rise to this type of behavior. My interest is chiefly in occupational multiplicity as it exists within the rural Third World context, particularly as revealed by studies which have been conducted in the Philippines. This concern is an appropriate one since much less attention has been given to the topic in the less developed countries than in the United States or Europe, where a fair amount of research has already been conducted on part-time farmers and multiple job holders (e.g. Barlett, 1986; Bryant, Dudley, Shoemaker and Shifflett, 1985).

In addition to codifying the work which has already been conducted on this topic, the present study may also help to clarify some of the conceptual problems arising with regard to employment and economic development in the Third World setting. Vlassoff's (1988) discussion of this topic, for example, begins by stressing the inherently developmental nature of "economic diversification," arguing that this process has been tied historically to the emergence of newer cropping technologies and the diffusion of certain urban-based amenities and infrastructures to the countryside. Subsequently, how-

ever, this same author appears to take a somewhat contradictory stand by noting that economic diversification is most widespread in those locales characterized by "fewer economic options" (i.e. greater poverty).

Vlassoff appears to be describing different types of economic adaptation, thereby implying that two separate concepts are needed, rather than the single term, "economic diversification". The first of these two patterns is the well-known sociological concept of the division of labor. This may be measured at the level of entire social systems, such as communities, regions, or nation-states. In a rural setting, this sort of economic diversification is generally associated with the growth of non-farm employment, often as linked to other developmental trends such as the spread of modern technology and a market economy. A second type of diversification, however, takes place at the individual (or household) level. This pattern is better termed as occupational multiplicity and will be the chief concern of the present paper. In general, aggregate-level diversification need not show any positive empirical relationship to individual or household-level occupational multiplicity. Indeed, impoverished regions characterized by a poorly developed division of labor may be populated by large numbers of individuals who earn

their income from various sources.

A more general concept still is that of multiple sustenance activities. This phenomenon may be manifested in a number of ways, only one of which falls under the rubric of occupational multiplicity. This is demonstrated in Figure 1, in which a typology of multiple sustenance activities is outlined by cross-classifying the number of occupational roles held by an individual actor with his or her patterns of geographic mobility. Consider, for example, the case of nomadic pastoralists. These follow a sort of occupational multiplicity insofar as they continually move on to exploit new sources of sustenance (i.e. new rangelands) even though the particular economic activity which they carry out remains relatively unchanged throughout the course of any one year.

Four occupational types thus emerge from this classification. The

first is the specialized job-holder in the classic sense —one full-time occupation as carried out in one geographic setting. The second type—“occupational nomads”—continue to perform the same economic role, but they do so while moving spatially from one place to another. In many instances the route to be followed will be circular in nature. Examples include not only pastoralists but also travelling salesmen and shifting cultivators. What occurs in these cases is that the person or group in question exploits to the point of diminishing returns some renewable environmental resource (grasslands, fertile soil), thereby necessitating further movement to a new locale in which similar but as yet unexploited resources may be found. After some time has passed and the life-sustaining resource found in the original locale has been restored somewhat, the option of returning there is again presented to the occupational nomad.¹

Figure 1. Typology of multiple sustenance activities

Residential/Mobility Pattern	Number of gainful occupations	
	One	Two or More
Fixed residence	Occupational Specialization	Occupational Multiplicity
Repeated movements	Occupational Nomadism	Circulation

A third type which emerges from the four-fold classification found in Figure 1 represents those persons who stay more-or-less permanently in a single place, but who hold two or more occupations therein. This is occupational multiplicity in the pure sense.

A final category consists of "circulators". This group exercises both geographic and occupational mobility, as exemplified by the case of a Third World farmer who works temporarily in the urban informal sector during periods when there is little opportunity for agricultural employment.

While the emergence of full-time specialists, "nomads" and circulators all represent theoretically rich topics, spatial constraints do not allow for further analysis of these sustenance types within the scope of this paper. Fortunately enough, increasing attention is now being accorded to at least one of these types—namely, the case of circular migrants from the LDC (less developed country) context (e.g. Goldstein, 1978; Stretton 1981).

Types of occupational multiplicity

Occupational multiplicity appears to be a relatively widespread phenomenon in the Third World countryside. Not all survey studies held in this setting bother to ask about secondary occu-

pations, but when this is done it is common to find one-third or more of rural household heads to be holding more than one job (Hackenberg, 1988; Madigan, 1988). Furthermore, the proportion of agriculturalists engaged in this form of behavior becomes even higher when economic activities are defined more broadly. In the Central Luzon village of Bukiran, for example, Kerkvliet found that very few households were able to rely entirely upon the meager returns which farming offers:

Nearly all households are peasants in a broad sense of the term: 'rural cultivators of low economic and political status'. But they do not constitute a socioeconomic class in either livelihood or living standard terms. Less than 10 percent rely principally on cultivating. The others include landholders and non-landholders who, besides planting, plowing, harvesting, or doing other agricultural work, also forage, buy-and-sell, hire out as laborers, raise and sell pigs, or in other ways earn cash and rice.

During the last two or three decades classes within the peasantry became more numerous. Elderly villagers' remarks point to this. One man, for instance, observed:

'You can't just farm any-more...in order to support your family; you must also have a job.' (Kerkvliet, 1980, p. 36).

Indeed, longitudinal data from the Philippines show a clear trend towards increased off-farm employment, for supplementary income-generating purposes, among both farm owners and tenants (e.g. Pal and Polson, 1973). Data from the Philippine Census of Agriculture show the same pattern. In Northern Mindanao, for example, the percentage of farmers who were also employed in nonagricultural jobs rose from only 17.7 percent in 1970 to 59.9 percent a mere ten years later (Costello, 1986, Table 6.4; also see Castillo, 1993, p. 18 for similar findings for the country as a whole). As hinted at by Kerkvliet's above-cited analysis, these patterns may well be linked to corresponding declines in average farm sizes which occurred during the same period (e.g. Costello, 1986; Hayami, et.al., 1989).

Time allocation studies show much the same pattern. When asked specifically about the various types of "market" and "home" production that they engage in, Third World villagers typically give a wide variety of responses. A time allocation analysis by Evenson, Popkin and Quizon (1980), for example, used a coding scheme for

productive activities which was based upon 27 major categories.² Most rural households were found to engage in a large number of these activities. As such, Benjamin White has argued that the idea of high levels of "unemployment" in the LDCs is basically a myth. Far more typical are those households with "a lot of work to do with very low returns" (White, 1980, p. 22). For the most part, agricultural work pays little but the earnings from subsidiary sustenance activities are lower still, often amounting to only a few pennies for a full day's work (e.g. Nag, White and Peet, 1980, Maquiso, 1985).

In his review of developmental changes found throughout eastern Asia, Gavin Jones (1983, pp. 26-27) notes that rural-based patterns of occupational multiplicity may be found in both the Newly Industrialized Countries and those characterized by lower levels of productivity and development:

"Developing Asian countries are already copying the Japanese pattern whereby much of the rural workforce is engaged in both agricultural and nonagricultural activities. In Japan, Taiwan, and the Republic of Korea, off-farm incomes are about 60 percent, 50 percent, and 40 percent, respectively, of total farm-family incomes....

Even in the poorer parts of Asia such patterns are of considerable importance. A recent study of Kelantan, the poorest state of Malaysia, showed that 50 percent of the income of the paddy farming families was derived from off-farm activities.... In the state of Karnataka in India, off-farm employment is becoming increasingly important in larger villages on main roads.... In Bali, an extraordinary range of 'micro-economic niches' is used to supplement the meager income from tiny farms....."

Occupational multiplicity is also characteristic of particular ecological settings (e.g. the uplands) and time periods. When sugar prices plummeted dramatically on the world market, the result was a severe economic recession for Negros and Panay islands in the Philippines. Not surprisingly, occupational multiplicity was commonly resorted to in these circumstances as an adaptive activity. Ardales, David, Salas and Banas (1988, p. 2) thus note that a local term ("remedio general"—"all purpose remedy") was coined in these settings as a means of describing the activities of those who live on a day-to-day basis, always searching for one or another source of additional employment.

These sorts of findings suggest a generally inverse association between the standard of living found in an area and its overall incidence of occupational multiplicity. Such a conclusion, however, should not be arrived at prematurely. For example, and as noted earlier, rural settings in the more industrialized world are also characterized by widespread resort to off-farm employment. Indeed, some of the statistics which may be found to support this conclusion are really quite striking: 55 percent of the farmers in Germany are part-time agriculturists, 87 percent in Japan and a full 92 percent in the United States (Bartlett, 1986). Longitudinal data in such societies show a steady increase in off-farm employment, so much so that Jones (1983) sees this historical shift as representing a major component of what he terms the "rural occupational transition." This observer sees two major trends—increased commuting between rural and urban areas and a centrifugal drift of industry outward from the major cities—as accounting for this pattern. Also of interest is the fact that similar trends are now underway in such Pacific Rim countries as Taiwan and South Korea (Jones, 1983; Kim, 1988).

Nor is it necessarily the case that Third World occupational multiplicity is limited exclusively to the rural poor. For one thing, the

strategy of taking on additional economic activities is also found among city dwellers, albeit on a somewhat more limited scale (e.g. Costello and Palabrica-Costello, 1985. pp. 115-116). Furthermore, occupational multiplicity is by no means uncommon among members of the middle and upper classes. Rural-based agriculturists, for example, may decide to directly involve themselves in the marketing of their crops by personally selling them in nearby cities. One survey of produce vendors in the Chinese town of Jinan found nearly half of these persons to be farmers who were selling their own crops (Goldstein and Goldstein, 1985). Interestingly enough, this type of marketing strategy has been viewed as a viable strategy for raising the incomes of Southeast Asian farmers (e.g. Olofson, 1981; Costello and Palabrica-Costello, 1985).

In yet other cases, prosperous rural businessmen and professionals buy up farmland for speculative or cash cropping purposes, engage in usury, act as "silent partners" in small businesses, or in other ways seek out ways of diversifying the productive uses of their capital acquisitions. The same rural village may thus be characterized by similar levels (though perhaps different types) of occupational multiplicity among both the poorest and richest

members of the community. As Kerkvliet (1980, p. 33) has noted,

"only 14 percent of the households (in Bukiran) rely on only one occupation. The others, from the poorest to the wealthiest, have two or more ways of earning food and money. The poorest do this in order to get by day-to-day, week-to-week. The wealthy, on the other hand, are diversifying their wealth in order to multiply it."

We may therefore speak of at least three major types of occupational multiplicity. In line with Clifford Geertz's (1963) well-known portrayal of the process of agricultural involution in central Indonesia, the first of these may be termed involutory multiplicity. The emphasis here is upon sheer subsistence, with poor rural peasants engaging in an often desperate search to obtain sustenance for themselves and their families. When farm sizes are too small to produce sufficient food or cash, the proprietors of such enterprises must necessarily hire themselves out as agricultural laborers for at least some months during the year or move temporarily to the city in search of employment. Declining soil fertility, continued population growth, the "urban bias" in government policies—all

combine to push the small farmer into an ever greater dependence upon a variety of sustenance activities.

The situation of Southeast Asia's rapidly expanding landless class is, of course, even more extreme. Not only are members of this class denied the prospect of harvesting their own crops, they are also generally unable to engage in the gardening or livestock-raising activities that small farmers and tenants can use to supplement their incomes. As such, they are thrown back upon whatever opportunities they may have to obtain gainful employment, whether this comes in the form of an offer to work for one of their neighbors or a perceived right to exploit publicly owned or commonly held lands, such as forests and public waterways:

"Aside from farm work in season they live precariously, *isang kabig, isang tuka* (one scratch, one peck), by every family member taking on any short-run income producing activity available—as vendors on buses, numbers runners in the Jueteng, by selling green fodder to the buffalo owners, by combing the water-courses for fish, frogs, crabs and snails, while the women hem handkerchiefs, sew shirts, and weave fishnets in the home or go vending, on capital

borrowed daily and for tiny profit margins, in the marketplace, glean, and beg from better-off neighbors. A few landless laborers are lucky enough to get relatively steady jobs as drivers, policemen, road workers and the like, but they have to compete for these with tenant farmers who have better education and more extensive extra-village contacts" (Fegan, 1983, p.41).

Even these opportunities, poor as they are, may well become less readily available as the number of persons living by such a hand-to-mouth existence continues to increase. Deforestation, overfishing, denial of access to commonly held lands, strict enforcement of anti-squatting laws, the refusal of harvesting rights to the general public—all of these loom as an ever increasing threat to the landless poor.

The type of worker who must resort to the involutory type of occupational multiplicity will generally be someone with little in the way of skills, tools or extra-familial social contacts. As such, financial returns are almost inevitably of the lowest order. The work is carried out more from a lack of other economic options than from any hope of really improving one's lot in life.

A second type of occupational multiplicity may be termed adaptive multiplicity. "Pull" factors—such as the prospect of working in a rural factory at hourly wage levels which exceed those obtainable from farming—play a more dominant role in these cases. Of course, this will not be possible in severely depressed and isolated regions where employment opportunities of this sort are not available. Adaptive multiplicity may therefore be limited chiefly to those areas where urbanization and industrialization have begun to make inroads into the traditional rural landscape.

It is also likely that several individual or household-level factors will be correlated with this type of multiplicity. In general, multiple job holders of the adaptive type will probably be better educated and possessed of some financial capital, thereby holding out the hope of upward economic mobility. The farmer who sells his produce in the city falls in this category, as do many rural-urban circulators (Ulack, Costello and Palabrica-Costello, 1985).

Adaptive multiplicity may be hypothesized to increasingly come to the fore as a society moves toward higher levels of economic productivity; it is this type of multiplicity that Jones seems to have in mind in his discussion of the rural occupational transition. Appropriate government policies

which act to stimulate rural industry and temporary mobility (circulation, commuting) may also help to facilitate the transition from involutory to adaptive multiplicity, even in cases where the gross national product per capita is still low.

A third type of occupational multiplicity may be termed the entrepreneurial type. This type of activity will generally be limited, almost by definition, to relatively prosperous individuals, such as businessmen and professionals. Sharp business skills and considerable capital are often a prerequisite for this sort of activity, although lower-level white collar workers (e.g. government functionaries) may sometimes act in a similar manner, albeit on a much smaller scale. Land speculation and usury are two examples of entrepreneurial multiplicity which are commonly found in the Third World countryside. In other cases, entrepreneurs may take up Green Revolution-type agriculture (involving large capital outlays and a relatively high probability of earning a substantial profit); invest in farm machineries (for rent), commercial vehicles, or rice/corn mills; underwrite the capital needs of a cadre of small-scale businessmen; or put some of their money into a town-based service industry (e.g. a private school or an agricultural supply store). Economic returns from such enterprises will

often be quite good and easily hidden from government tax collectors.³

To date, relatively little research has been conducted on the topic of entrepreneurial multiplicity. This is unfortunate since this concept is likely to be related closely to several key issues in rural development—e.g. landholding patterns. It may be linked as well to the patterns of involutory multiplicity found among the very poorest rural folk. That is, to the extent that landholdings are becoming increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small, and possibly urban-based, elite, one result might well be the onset of even greater economic difficulties for those tenants and small farmers who are thereupon forced off the land (cf. Hackenberg and Hackenberg, 1971, pp. 11-12 for some illustrative cases).

Some Correlates of Occupational Multiplicity

The various types of occupational multiplicity appear to be differently distributed in space, according to local economic, demographic and environmental conditions. For its part, involutory multiplicity is more commonly found in the poorer countries than in the industrialized world and, within these, in the least developed regions (e.g. Aramburu, 1988). Agriculturists attempting to eke out

a living in upland areas are particularly likely to adopt this economic strategy (e.g. Ganapin, 1983; Cruz, n.d.; Fujisaka, 1986). This is so for a number of reasons. First, upland agriculture is rain-fed; as such, no crops may be grown during the dry season and some other means of livelihood must be arrived at. Secondly, upland areas are generally poor, again implying the need to resort to the subsistence-oriented involutory mode of multiple job-holding. Finally, population densities are generally lower in the uplands and access to some publicly-held resources (forests, mineral deposits, streams) may be somewhat easier. The variety of alternative employment patterns available in this setting will therefore tend to be somewhat wider.⁴

In line with the above speculation, the more general proposition may now be put forth that occupational multiplicity varies directly with environmental diversity. Agricultural communities which are located near forests, lakes and streams or the seacoast offer more opportunities for part-time work in fishing and foraging activities (e.g. Cadelina, 1986; Belsky and Siebert, 1983). Historically, this factor has served to provide a safety net for the poorest of the rural poor. At present, though, various environmental threats (deforestation, overfishing, water pollution) are reducing

accessibility to these ecological niches.

Another source of environmental diversity can be found in the case of those rural communities which are located near to cities. Accessibility to the urban market opens up various opportunities for part-time employment, as exemplified by rural-urban circulators, farmers who travel to the city to sell their produce, and rural housewives who engage in small-time "buy and sell" activities.

Viewed from the micro-level, a number of observers have noted an inverse relationship between socioeconomic status and multiple job holding (e.g. Aramburu, 1988; Ardales, David, Salas and Banas, 1987; Kerkvliet and Sittitrai, 1979). This pattern, no doubt, refers largely to the involutory type of occupational multiplicity. Other studies identify small farmers (Samper, 1988; Anderson and Leiserson, 1978), tenants (Madigan, 1988), and landless agricultural workers (Veneracion, 1985; Anderson and Leiserson, 1978) with this type of subsistence strategy. At the same time, however, we must again point out the apparent frequency with which the more well-to-do inhabitants of rural areas are able to engage in those types of "entrepreneurial" multiplicity by which they diversify their already steady sources of income.⁵

One difficulty faced by the very poorest rural groups lies in their lack of access to income-generating resources, including those needed for a second source of subsistence. Bouis and Haddad (1978, p. 116), for example, note the "extremely diverse" sources of income found in their sample of Bukidnon farmers, most "especially for households with access to land." Backyard gardening, livestock and poultry raising, sari-sari store ownership—all of these are beyond the reach of the landless. The very poorest households may also lack the capital required to sponsor a rural-urban circulator or the social contacts needed to obtain employment, even of a temporary variety. "In order to obtain wage labor outside the village," notes Gillian Hart (1980, p. 195), "a laborer generally has to establish a relationship with a supervisor...." (also see Stretton, 1981). It is therefore likely that the highest rates of occupational multiplicity, particularly those of a more adaptive variety, will not be found among the very poorest households.

Theoretical Issues

The analysis of occupational multiplicity may be undertaken within the framework provided by at least three major sociological "schools of thoughts": human ecology, structural functionalism, and conflict theory.

Human ecology takes, as its major focus, the adaptation of the human community to its environment (Hawley, 1950). A major concern of ecological analysis deals with the study of community-wide patterns of sustenance organization (Gibbs and Martin, 1959). As such, this perspective should be particularly relevant for investigating variations in multiple sustenance activities.

A key focus of human ecology relates to the human "ecosystem," a concept which is meant to direct the investigator's attention to a broader set of factors than those which relate solely to the social system (i.e. institutions, values, etc.). Demographic factors, technological inputs, and the social and physical environments are routinely included in those studies which take the ecosystem as their initial point of reference. Our initial observations about the impact of population growth upon involutory forms of occupational multiplicity (e.g. Anderson, 1972; Fegan, 1983) fit readily within this general framework. We have also seen how environmental diversity might well serve to encourage higher levels of occupational multiplicity.

Technological factors, too, may affect both circulation and occupational multiplicity. Improved transportation linkages open up

possibilities for temporary mobility. Rural electrification allows for a greater movement of industry to the countryside, thereby making possible what the Chinese call "half worker/half peasant" households (Goldstein, 1985, p. 67). The spread of irrigation systems and high yielding rice varieties throughout Southeast Asia implies a diminished reliance upon rainfed agriculture. As such, planting and harvesting activities can now be spread out more evenly throughout the year, a pattern which may in turn work to reduce traditional, seasonally-based forms of circulation and occupational multiplicity. (In some cases, though, spread of HYVs within lowland areas may bring about new employment opportunities in this setting, thereby encouraging temporary, off-farm mobility from the uplands—cf. Kikuchi and Hayami, 1983.)

As is the case with human ecology, structural functionalism tends to see increased occupational multiplicity as a response to other social changes. If the incidence of multiple job holding has tended to increase noticeably over time, this perspective would argue that it must be somehow adaptive to prevailing conditions. For example, involutory-type sustenance patterns do serve the function of helping the very poorest farm families to tide themselves over until the next crop is harvested. An

illustration of this pattern is found in the study of rural economic activities in Nueva Ecija province, the Philippines (Kerkvliet and Sittitrai, 1979). This analysis found a significant and positive relationship between occupational multiplicity and income levels among the very poorest category of respondents to be interviewed, although no relationship could be found for the sample as a whole.

In societies where farm-generated incomes have stagnated or declined over time, a general movement towards multiple job holding may well be expected. Again, this pattern may have functional overtones, as shown by one analysis carried out in the Bicol region (San Andres and Illo, 1978). The authors of this study argue that declines in farm-based income have generated heightened levels of occupational multiplicity adding that, to date at least, these changes in work and employment patterns have helped to keep total household incomes relatively stable during the period in question.

Patterns of occupational multiplicity can also play an important role in insuring that incomes do not fall too far below the minimum level which is required to meet the most basic subsistence needs of the family. Farming, of course, cannot always guarantee such an outcome, especially in regions characterized

by highly variant rainfall patterns. Further attention might thus be called to the risk-minimization functions of acquiring nonagricultural employment skills.⁶

Another function served by occupational multiplicity, or at least that of the adaptive variety, is to foster rural-urban linkages and the general process of social change in the countryside. Irwin Sanders (1977, p. 77) lists a number of changes associated with part-time farming including a greater emphasis upon cash incomes, exposure to new political and cultural ideas, changing conceptions of self, and declines in the strength of intracommunity ties and social controls.

To this point we have generally assumed that occupational multiplicity is associated inversely with the societal-wide extension of the division of labor. Where most members of the labor force are generalists, a relative dearth of specialists would appear to be implied. As Bryant, Dudley, Shoemaker and Shifflett (1985) point out, however, some types of occupational multiplicity actually serve the function of extending the division of labor found in rural areas. Their logic may be summarized as follows. If occupational specialization is limited by the extent of the market, smaller towns will necessarily have fewer specialists since they do not contain

enough customers or clients to support full-time physical therapists, real estate agents, barbers, and the like. To the extent that such specialists are able to partially support themselves from farming (or some other subsidiary occupation), however, they may continue to exercise their more specialized calling in such settings, albeit on only a part-time basis. As such, the division of labor found at the community level is extended somewhat, thereby benefiting the group as a whole.

Possible dysfunctions of occupational multiplicity might also be mentioned at this point. A major concern in this regard is the increased pressure which is brought to bear upon the natural environment by poor and landless rural workers as they seek to find for themselves some meager means of subsistence from the forests, streams or upland areas which are still accessible to their village. Garrett Hardin (1968) has termed the symptoms of environmental overload which result from such patterns as the "tragedy of the commons." Examples include overgrazing and the harvesting of fuelwood from publicly-owned lands. Policies to effectively regulate such activities are clearly needed in many areas of the Third World countryside. Unfortunately, their adverse economic effects can be expected to fall most harshly upon those households which are already

experiencing the greatest difficulty in meeting their subsistence needs.

The social conflict model is a third perspective which may be used for addressing the question of occupational multiplicity. According to this perspective, social and cultural changes are to be viewed more as the outcome of competitive relations between various status groups than as an "adjustment" which has developed over time for the common good.

Viewed from this standpoint, occupational multiplicity becomes a lifestyle which has been unfairly imposed upon the rural poor by the combined influence of unhampered market forces and inequitable government policies. As Randolph David (1979, p. 51) has observed, the various "coping strategies" utilized by lower status households (among which we may list the need to find additional sources of employment) "are not adaptive behaviors—they are what the poor are mercilessly driven to do."

The resort to subsidiary job holding has also been cited by some observers as functioning to undermine prospects for a class-based political movement, whether of a reformist or revolutionary character. Graeme Hugo (1982, p. 76) has thus pointed to the manner by which circular migrants in Indonesian society have functioned to depress urban wage rates and to

undercut attempts to set up labor unions. Circulators also demand less in the way of urban services, thereby easing tax burdens on members of the urban elite. In like fashion, Ganapin (1983) sees temporary migrants from upland communities who work in the lowlands during periods of peak agricultural activity as functioning to weaken the bargaining position of the agricultural laborers already residing in such areas.

High levels of occupational multiplicity, whether measured at the individual or household level, also operate to dilute the clear-cut distinctions between "capitalists" and "proletarians" that Marxists see as being needed for the formation of a strong sense of class consciousness. Thus, some small farmers (tenants or even owners) may hire themselves out on a short-term basis as agricultural laborers on adjoining farms, just as a landless agricultural worker or his wife may function temporarily as petty capitalists by means of small-scale buy-and-sell activities. More generally, Third World "peasants" cannot be considered as constituting a true social class since their sources of income are so diverse. As a result, class divisions are muted and the probability that equity-seeking political movements will succeed in ascending to power are reduced considerably (Kerkvliet, 1980).

Issues for research and policy formulation

The scant attention heretofore paid to the issue of occupational multiplicity is symptomatic of the relatively undeveloped state of theories and concepts pertaining to the Third World village economy. More specifically, "the failure to recognize the multiplicity of occupations in peasant societies may be a reflection of the Western stereotype that each person normally has one 'job' or means of livelihood" (Nag, White and Peet, 1980, p. 268). Further efforts to overcome this limitation are sorely needed, first by gathering data from a wider variety of contexts about this phenomenon and then by developing a set of indigenous conceptual tools which can best codify and extend the findings entailed by such an analysis.

The widespread prevalence of multiple sustenance activities within the LDC context may likewise call into question many of the most basic of our sociological concepts. How, for example, is one to measure a family's social class position when the household head is a tenant farmer, his wife a petty trader, his daughter a governmental clerk, and all of them engaged in occasional sideline activities? And why should we categorize as "rural" a community in which villagers increasingly take on nonfarm work

roles, even to the point of moving temporarily to the city? Clearly, a more fluid conceptualization of class and residence is called for in these settings.

The distinction between involutory and adaptive forms of occupation multiplicity may also contribute to the debate between "differentiation" and "polarization" models of rural class relations (Vlassoff, 1988; Eder, 1993). At present, advocates of both perspectives interpret the spread of occupational multiplicity in favor of their own models—the former seeing it as a basically functional outgrowth of an expanding village economy, the latter as symptomatic of heightened exploitation and deteriorating class relations.

Perhaps both viewpoints are correct, or at least partially so. Involuntary trends clearly bespeak a worsening situation in the countryside, particularly for the landless groups. As such, they support the hypothesis of class polarization. In contrast, more adaptive types of multiple job holding can be said to provide evidence for the differentiation model. What is therefore needed at this point is an empirical analysis in which this conceptual distinction is clearly made and accurately measured, so as to determine which of the two types is found most frequently within specific geographic and temporal settings.

At the micro-level, too, occupational multiplicity can represent a variable which is well deserving of further consideration. In their qualitative analysis of urban, middle-class kinship patterns in the southern Philippines, for example, Yu and Liu (1980, pp. 233-234) observe that upwardly mobile couples who approximate the adaptive or entrepreneurial type of occupational multiplicity must do so only at the cost of reducing their traditional commitment to an extended kin network. Other sociological factors and processes which might well be related to the phenomenon of multiple job holding can also be cited. Stages in the family life cycle, patterns of parent-child interaction, community power, and job productivity (including the conflicts of interest which are likely to beset multiple job holders) represent only a few of these.

The relevance of this issue for policy formulation represents a final area in which further work is needed. Some general issues which might be raised herein include, first, the means by which adaptive forms of occupational multiplicity may be encouraged instead of the widespread involutory patterns now prevailing. For example, it might prove possible to schedule labor-intensive rural public works projects during periods when the demand for agricultural workers is a minimum. Mechanisms for

encouraging the growth of nongovernmental organizations which would attempt to take on those services now offered exclusively by multiple job holders of the entrepreneurial variety could also be of help in reducing the apparently exploitive nature of these activities. Money-lending, farm machinery rentals, and land acquisition patterns all exemplify areas in which coops or NGOs could serve in this capacity.

Finally, the utility of part-time employment patterns as a mechanism for extending governmental service to small and isolated rural communities might well be explored. There might, for example, be some LGU administrators who would like to provide a wider variety of specialized health services to their constituents but

who feel that local caseloads cannot justify hiring a full-time specialist. One possibility, therefore, might be for two or three adjacent LGUs to form a consortium for the hiring of one or more doctor-specialists, each of which would approximate the "occupational nomad" pattern by visiting the Rural Health Unit of each LGU according to some mutually agreed-upon schedule.

This study was supported by a study grant from the Population and Development Planning and Research Project (PDPRP) of the Region X Office of the National Economic and Development Authority, Republic of the Philippines. Original funds for the PDPRP came from a larger grant to the Philippine government from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities.

Notes

¹A problematic issue confronted by all occupational nomads is the manner in which increased population pressure, or competition from other persons seeking to exploit the same series of environmental niches, may force members of this group to accelerate their cyclical movements. This can lead not only to diminished living standards among group members but also to permanently damaging

the environmental niche, due to overexploitation. Shortened fallow periods in agriculturally exploited upland areas of the Philippines have thus been linked to increased soil erosion and depleted soil fertility (e.g. Porter, 1988, pp. 28-29).

²These included the following: wage activities, professional activities, business activities, rice

farming (pre-harvest work), rice farming (harvesting and postharvest work), coconut production, sugar cane production, vegetable production, home gardening, livestock/poultry work, home production of goods and services (e.g. handicrafts), marketing of farm produce or home-produce goods and services, fishing, repairs/construction activities, travel to and from work, hunting and gathering of wild plants, other economic activities, cooking/preparing food, breast-feeding, bottle-feeding, childcare activities, playing with children, reading/telling stories to children, marketing, fetching wood or water, household chores (e.g. washing clothes), and attending school/lectures.

³The contrast between "involuntary" and "adaptive" or "entrepreneurial" types of occupational multiplicity is in many ways parallel to the distinction made in migration studies between the mobility patterns found among lower status (landless, poorly educated) and middle- or higher-status villagers. Members of the former category respond more to push factors, are more prone to engage in rural-rural movements and generally make only miniscule economic gains as result of their move. In contrast, wealthier migrants (e.g. the better educated children of businessmen or large farmers) generally experience the opposite type of mobility patterns. For a migration

review which accords considerable emphasis to this distinction, cf. Connel, Dasgupta, Laishley and Lipton, 1976, Chapter 1.

⁴This, however, may change over time, as shown by Fujisaka's (1986, p. 28) comment that "settlers (in upland communities of the Philippines) initially obtained cash incomes from carabao logging, charcoal making, carpentry, and remittances from communities of origin. As they became established, and as forest resources are depleted, cash incomes come from the sales of farm produce and remittances from family members earning off-farm wages."

⁵As was the case with several observers cited earlier, Benjamin White (1979, p. 100) emphasizes the way in which occupational multiplicity will vary from one social strata to another. "Several studies," he argues, "have found that both landless, near-landless, small farm and large farm households obtain significant proportions of their income from non-agricultural activities, but it must be remembered that they do so for different reasons: the landless and small farm households, as 'agricultural deficit' households, must supplement agricultural incomes with relatively open-access occupations requiring little or no capital and offering very low returns.... On the other hand, the large farm and landowning

households, as 'agricultural surplus' households, are able to invest this surplus in relatively high capital, high return activities from which the capital-starved, low income groups are excluded...."

"James Anderson (1969, p. 646) has suggested the importance of this factor for the case of small-

scale (urban-based) traders. As he notes, "multiple occupations, which frequently include trading activities and small-scale enterprises... reflect the value of spreading risks not only to increase chances of success but to assure against complete economic failure."

References

Anderson, Dennis, and Mark W. Leiserson

1978 *Rural Enterprise and Non-farm Employment*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Anderson, James N.

1969 "Buy-and-Sell and Economic Personalism: Foundations for Philippine Entrepreneurship." *Asian Survey* 9:641-668.

1972 "Social Strategies in Population Change: Village Data from Central Luzon," SEADAG Seminar Paper on Population Change and Development in Southeast Asia. New York: The Asia Society.

Aramburu, Carlos E.

1988 "Family and Labor in Rural Peru: New Interpretations." Pp. 83-108 in Carol Vlassoff and Barkat-e-Khuda (eds.), *Impact of Modernization on Development and Demographic Behavior: Case Studies in Seven Third World Countries*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

graphic Behavior: Case Studies in Seven Third World Countries. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Ardales, Venancio B., Fely David, Jessica C. Salas and Renato Banas

1987 "Living Conditions and Adaptive Strategies of the Displaced Sugarcane Workers in Region VI (Western Visayas)," Research Digest Series No. 2, PDPR Project, National Economic and Development Authority, Iloilo City.

Barlett, Peggy F.

1988 "Part-time Farming: Saving the Farm or Saving the Lifestyle?" *Rural Sociology* 51:289-313.

Belsky, Jill M., and Stephen Siebert

1983 "Household Responses to Drought in Two Subsistence Leyte Villages." *Philippine*

Quarterly of Culture and Society 11:237-256.

Bouis, Howarth E., and Lawrence J. Haddad

1988. *A Case Study of the Commercialization of Agriculture in the Southern Philippines: The Income, Consumption, and Nutrition Effects of a Switch from Corn to Sugar Production in Bukidnon*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Bryant, Clifton, Charles J. Dudley, Donald J. Shoemaker, and Peggy Shifflett

1985 "Rural Occupational Diversity: Impact of Multiple Job Holding on Job Satisfaction and Traditional Life." Pp. 225-242 in Clifton D. Bryant, Donald J. Shoemaker, James K. Skipper, Jr. and William E. Snizek (eds.), *The Rural Workforce: Nonagricultural Occupations in America*. Bergin and Garvey.

Cadelina, Rowe V.

1986 "Poverty in the Upland: Lowland Migrant Swidenera in the Balinasayao Forest, Negros Oriental." pp. 165-188 in Ricardo G. Abad (ed.), *Faces of Philippine Poverty: Four Cases from the Visayas*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Castillo, Gelia T.

1993 "Rural Development Reconsidered: Some Emerging Niches for Population Studies." Paper presented at 22nd General Conference of the IUSSP, Montreal, 23 August.

Connel, John B., P. Dasgupta, R. Laishley, and M. Lipton

1976 *Migration from Rural Areas*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Costello, Michael A.

1986 *Trends in Farm Size and Structure, Northern Mindanao, 1970-1980*. Final project report to National Economic Development Authority, Region X, Cagayan de Oro: Research Institute for Mindanao Culture.

_____, and Marilou Palabrica-Costello

1985 *Mobility and Employment in the Southern Philippines*. Final project report to the International Development Research Centre, Cagayan de Oro: Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University.

Cruz, Ma. Concepcion J.

n.d. *Population Pressure and Migration in Philippine Upland Communities*. Los Baños: Program on Environmental Studies, Univer-

sity of the Philippines at Los Baños.

David, Randolph

1979 "The Sociology of Poverty or the Poverty of Sociology?" Pp. 49-56 in *Selected Readings: The Philippines and the Third World*. Diliman, Quezon City: Third World Studies Program, University of the Philippines.

Deseran, Forrest A., William W.

Falk and Pamela Jenkins

1984 "Determinants of Earning of Farm Families in the U.S.," *Rural Sociology* 49:210-229.

Durkheim, Emile

1964 *The Division of Labor in Society*. Translated by George Simpson. Paperback edition. New York: The Free Press.

Eder, James F.

1993 "Family Farming and Household Enterprise in a Philippine Community, 1971-1988: Persistence or Proletarianization?" *The Journal of Asian Studies* 52(3):647-671.

Evenson, Robert E., Barry M.

Popkin, and Elizabeth King-Quizon

1980 "Nutrition, Work, and Demographic Behavior in Rural Philippine Households: A Synopsis of Several La-

guna Household Studies." Pp. 289-364 in Hans P.

Binswanger, Robert E.

Evenson, Cecilia A.

Florencio and Benjamin

N.F. White (eds.), *Rural Household Studies in Asia*. Singapore University Press.

Fegan, Brian

1983 "Establishment Fund, Population Increase and Changing Class Structures in Central Luzon," *Philippine Sociological Review* 31:31-43.

Fujisaka, Sam

1986 "Pioneer Shifting Cultivators, Upland Ecosystem, and Social Forestry Policy in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review* 34:26-36.

Ganapin, Delfin J.

1983 "Livelihood and Appropriate Technology in the Uplands." Paper presented at Participatory Approaches to Development Seminar Series II. Manila: Integrated Research Center, De La Salle University.

Geertz, Clifford

1963 *Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Gibbs, Jack P., and Walter T. Martin
1959 "Toward a Theoretical System of Human Ecology," *Pacific Sociological Review* 29-36.
- Goldstein, Sidney
1978 "Circulation in the Context of Total Mobility in Southeast Asia." Papers of the East-West Population Institute, No. 53. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- 1985 "Urbanization in China: New Insights from the 1982 Census." Papers of the East-West Population Institute, No. 93. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- _____ and Alice Goldstein
1985 "Population Mobility in the People's Republic of China." Papers of the East-West Population Institute, No. 95. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Hackenberg, Robert A.
1988 "Upending Malthus: The Household's Role in Philippine Food Gains and Fertility Losses, 1970-1980." Pp. 7-20 in Carol Vlassoff and Barkat-e-Khuda (eds.), *Impact of Modernization on Development and Demographic Behavior: Case Studies in Seven Third World Countries*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- _____ and Beverly H. Hackenberg
1971 "Secondary Development and Anticipatory Urbanization in Davao, Mindanao," *Pacific Viewpoint* 12:1-20.
- Hardin, Garret
1968 "The Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162:1243-1248.
- Hart, Gillian
1980 "Patterns of Household Labour Allocation in a Javanese Village." Pp. 188-217 in Hans P. Binswanger, Robert E. Evenson, Cecilia A. Florencio and Benjamin N. F. White (eds.), *Rural Household Studies in Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Hawley, Amos H.
1950 *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Hayami, Yujiro, M. Kikuchi, L. Bambo and E. Marciano
1989 Transformation of a Laguna Village in the Two Decades of Green Revolution. Agricultural Economics Paper No. 89-17. Los Banos: International Rice Research Institute.

Hugo, Graeme J.

- 1982 "Circular Migration in Indonesia," *Population and Development Review* 8:59-83.

Jones, Gavin

- 1983 "Structural Change and Prospects for Urbanization in Asian Countries." Papers of the East-West Population Institute, No. 88. Honolulu: East-West Center.

Kervliet, Benedict J.

- 1980 "Classes and Class Relations in a Philippine Village," *Philippine Sociological Review* 28:31-59.

_____ and Werasing Sittitrai

- 1979 "Differences Among Philippine Peasants: A Provincial Sample," *Philippine Sociological Review* 27:133-259.

Kikuchi, Masao, and Yujiro

Hayami

- 1983 "New Rice Technology, Intrarural Migration, and Institutional Innovation in the Philippines," *Population and Development Review* 9:247-258.

Kim, Won Bae

- 1988 "Population Redistribution Policy in Korea: A Review," *Population Research and Policy Review* 7:49-77.

Madigan, Francis C.

- 1988 "Income and Health: The Welfare Status of Lower-Level Rural Households in Region Ten." Final project report to the PDPR Project, National Economic and Development Authority. Cagayan de Oro: Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University.

Maquiso, Teresita R.

- 1985 "Home Industry Workers in Nueva Ecija: A Case Study," *Philippine Sociological Review* 33:40-48.

Nag, Moni, Benjamin N.F. White, and R. Creighton Peet

- 1980 "An Anthropological Approach to the Study of the Economic Value of Children in Java and Nepal." Pp. 248-288 in Hans P. Binswanger, Robert E. Evenson, Cecilia A. Florencio and Benjamin N.F. White (eds.), *Rural Household Studies in Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Olofson, Harold

- 1981 "Mang Ruben and Mang Jeremias: Permanent Hillside Farmers of Laguna." *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 9:111-134.

- Pal, Agaton P., and Robert A. Polson
1973 *Rural People's Response to Change: Dumaguete Trade Area, Philippines*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Porter, Gareth
1988 "Resources, Population and the Philippines' Future: A Case Study." WRI Paper No. 4, Washington, D.C.: World Resources Institute.
- Samper, Diego Giraldo
1988 "Agricultural and Socio-demographic Relationships: A Study of Three Areas at Different Levels of Development in Tolima, Colombia." Pp. 58-72 in Carol Vlassoff and Barkat-e-Khuda (eds.), *Impact of Modernization on Development and Demographic Behavior: Case Studies in Seven Third World Countries*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- San Andres, Ricardo R., and Jeanne Frances I. Illo
1979 *Beyond Share Tenancy Reform Programs in the Bicol River Basin, Camarines Sur, 1974 and 1977*. Quezon City: Social Survey Research Unit (Naga City), Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Sanders, Irwin T.
1977 *Rural Society*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Stretton, Allan W.
1981 "The Building Industry and Urbanization in Third World Countries: A Philippine Case Study," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 29:325-340.
- Ulack, Richard, Michael A. Costello, and Marilou Palabrica-Costello
1985 "Circulation in the Philippines," *The Geographical Review* 75:439-450.
- Veneracion, Ma. Corazon J.
1985 "Coping with Crisis: Landless Agricultural Workers in Central Luzon," *Philippine Sociological Review* 33:2-34.
- Vlassoff, Carol
1988 "Impact of Development on Household Demographic Behavior." Pp. 109-118 in Carol Vlassoff and Barkat-e-Khuda (eds.), *Impact of Modernization on Development and Demographic Behavior: Case Studies in Seven Third World Countries*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

White, Benjamin

1979 "Political Aspects of Poverty, Income Distribution and Their Measurement: Some Examples from Rural Java," *Development and Change* 10:91-114.

1980 "Rural Household Studies in Anthropological Perspective." Pp. 3-25 in Hans P.

Binswanger, Robert E.
Evenson, Cecilia A. Florencio
and Benjamin N.F. White
(eds.), *Rural Household Studies in Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Yu, Elena, and William T. Liu
1980 *Fertility and Kinship in the Philippines*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.