19 : Uneven patterns of emigration among the Anglophone diaspora

Daryl Lloyd

Not surprisingly, when we compare the contemporary data from the five main Anglophone countries (plus the data from GB 1881), we see an uneven pattern of spread and locations. Names which are relatively common in Britain, for instance, may not be quite so widespread in Australia or Canada. There are a number of reasons for this – for instance, emigration may not be in the same proportion of surname densities, and immigration to the affected countries may come from elsewhere other than Britain.

Comparing countries

The percentage of the total population any surname makes up can be used as a basic guide to compare countries. When this is carried out for GB (1998 and 1881), the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and immediate problem becomes apparent. Names of a non-British origin make up a not insignificant proportion of many of the countries. Australia, for instance, has a very large Asian population – people who have emigrated from Korea, the Philippines and so on. Whilst there may people with the same name in Britain, it is most likely that the Australian population is made up of individuals who, or whose parents, emigrated directly from Asia, rather than going via the UK. In many cases these names do not exist in Britain in large enough numbers to even be recorded in the database. In the US and Canada, only 66 and 61 per cent respectively of the entries in the databases have surnames that appear in Britain in either 1881 or 1998. The Australian and New Zealand figures are considerably above this, at 82 and 93 per cent respectively.

In total there are 6,833 unique surnames which appear across all countries and time spans, and an additional 3,897 appearing in all but one location (in most cases, the country missing is Australia). The complete breakdown is provided in Table 1.

No. of	No. of unique
countries	surnames
6	6,833
5	3,898
4	4,458
3	4,821
2	3,002
1	174

Table 1: Breakdown of number of names appearing in number of countries

Range across countries

The names with the greatest variation all tend towards being very large in size, and, on the whole, tend to show the greatest difference between GB and Canada. Names such as *Smith, Jones* and *Williams* all account for 1.38, 1 and 0.7 per cent of the population in Britain, but only 0.6, 0.2 and 0.2 per cent in Canada. This, therefore, indicates that some of the most common names in Britain do not have the same penetration in other Anglophone countries.

In addition, not only are some of the greatest differences in the largest names, there are some examples of smaller names (at least in British terms) which are much better represented in one or two countries above all else. Some excellent examples of this are the names Bouchard and Morin, which are the 17th and 20th largest names in Canada (accounting for 0.187 and 0.182 per cent of that database population). However, in Britain in both 1881 and 1998 they rank only as roughly 17,500th (Bouchard) and 15,000th (Morin), and in 1998 made up less than 0.0005 per cent of the population each. In both cases the names are much better represented in the US (making up 0.006 and 0.01 of the database population), and worse in New Zealand (0.0001 and 0.0002 respectively), and are completely non-existent on the Australian database. This indicates that either a very large number of Bouchards and Morins left emigrated from Britain to North America, seriously denting the population here (in much the same that Richard Webber suggests happened to Cornish when the tin mines closed, and they moved northwards to Cumbria); the name became very common in North America once it arrived there; or, the most likely cause, the name was more common elsewhere in Europe, and was taken to North America by other colonists. Reaney and Wilson {, 1997 #1} suggest that both names come from an Old French and Old German origin, hence making it likely that the French, in particular, are more likely to have caused the significant larger numbers in Canada over the rest of the world. To demonstrate this, however, a similar database of modern French surnames would provide a better indicator of such a spread. There are many other examples of similar names, such as R_{0y} , which is the 4th most common name in Canada (0.3 per cent), but fails to make such in impact on the eastern side of the Atlantic (0.01 per cent in Britain in 1998). Once again, Roy comes from Old French, meaning that it was probably not the British colonists who were reasonable for it reaching North America.

A second way of viewing the range is to standardise the difference in percentages by the highest value. This will take into account the fact that a very small name cannot have as great a range as a large name, as the values start off much smaller.

As with the earlier results, the surnames with the highest range here are names which are more common in Canada than elsewhere: *Bouchard*, *Girard*, *Martel* and *Dupont*, for instance. Again, as before, many of these names are of French and mainland European origin, so tell us very little about emigration from Britain. A further clue to the non-British origin of some of these names is that they seem to be virtually non-existent in Australia. Yet although they are missing from here, their Antipodean cousins in New Zealand have as many examples of the names as Canada has. This, therefore, suggests that some of the results seen are due more to the databases than actually true patterns. Australia employs a minimum cut-off of 100 individuals with any given name, the same of GB98. However, as the base population is so significantly different (c. 60m against 20m) it could be argued that this will lead to an under-representation of the scarce names. Couple this cut-off with the discussion in the earlier paper on international sources of data indicates that it is very difficult to compare the data from Australia with elsewhere.

Non-migration surnames

At the opposite end of the scale, there are a whole raft of names which are not represented at all outside of Britain. Almost 3,000 names fall into this category with the largest, *Odedra*, having 1,118 individuals in the 1998 British population. One advantage that such patterns can help with is checking the original typology of names drawn up in CASA. *Odedra* has been classified as a East Midlands name, yet did not exist in Britain in 1881 or in any other of the Anglophone countries. This brings the above classification into contention – if it truly were a British name then it is unlikely that it would not have existed in 1881 and it would not have emigrated to any of the colonies. A brief Internet search produces a number of Indian cricket players with this surname, confirming that it has been allocated the wrong typology in the first place.

There are other names, though, which can be called British which have no representation outside of Britain. The most significant example is *Iddon*, of which there are 1,015 examples in the 1998 database, yet cannot be found in any of the other countries. This name was around in 1881, but was fairly small at 758 individuals, meaning that it is

possible that no one of such name ever left for elsewhere. Or, if they did, their name has not survived through to today for one reason or another.

Perhaps the most interesting question to answer with names that are under- or overrepresented in the ex-colonies is whether it was the original British distribution that caused the later world-wide distribution. If we were to look at Irish type names, such as *O'Sullivan*, we can see a very distinctive difference between the British 1881 data and the later ones. In 1881 only 503 individuals (or 0.0017 per cent of the population) with that name lived in Great Britain, yet by 1998 this had increased to 12,168 (or 0.032 per cent of the population). Across the world we see similar patterns, with *O'Sullivans* representing 0.05 per cent in Australia, 0.04 per cent in New Zealand and 0.01 per cent in the US. Once again, Canada seems the most different to elsewhere, with only 0.007 per cent called by the aforementioned name. Undoubtedly such a pattern is explained by known emigration patterns – either people of Irish heritage moved to Britain at the same time as leaving for the other colonies, or many went straight abroad when given the chance. The Irish Potato Famine of the 1840s was responsible for many of the Irish emigrating from Ireland to the US and other colonies around that time – some estimates suggest that over 2 million people emigrated from Ireland to the US during the 1840s and 1850s.

Post 1881, there is still evidence for immigration to Britain. Again, looking at Irish names highlights this most. If we take the Liverpool postal area and find the largest names with their highest peak falling here, almost all are Irish names: *Murphy*, *O'Brien*, *Byrne* and *Farrell* for instance. This pattern still remains today, as does Liverpool's closer cultural links to Ireland, as a result of Liverpool being the main port for Irish ferries and thus increasing the number of Irish who settled in the area after immigrating.

Top ten names

One interesting comparison that can be made is how the top ten names in each country compare. The main data for this is provided in

UK 1881	81 %	UK 1998	98 %	Aus	Aus %	NZ	NZ %	US	US
SMITH	1.497	SMITH	1.381	SMITH	1.216	SMITH	1.013	SMITH	1.0
JONES	1.200	JONES	1.051	JONES	0.609	JONES	0.448	JONES	0.5
BROWN	0.699	BROWN	0.651	BROWN	0.584	BROWN	0.518	BROWN	0.5
WILLIAMS	0.761	WILLIAMS	0.717	WILLIAMS	0.586	WILLIAMS	0.497	WILLIAMS	0.5
TAYLOR	0.677	TAYLOR	0.633	TAYLOR	0.483	TAYLOR	0.506	TAYLOR	0.2
WILSON	0.488	WILSON	0.467	WILSON	0.500	WILSON	0.564	WILSON	0.3
		JOHNSON	0.372	JOHNSON	0.354			JOHNSON	0.7

				ANDERSON	0.327	ANDERSON	0.354	ANDERSON	0.3
DAVIES	0.540	DAVIES	0.544						
EVANS	0.463	EVANS	0.434						
THOMAS	0.437	THOMAS	0.388						
				MARTIN	0.329				
								MILLER	0.5
								DAVIS	0.4
ROBERTS	0.398								
				WHITE	0.328				
						THOMPSON	0.324		
						SCOTT	0.302		
						WALKER	0.297		

Table 2, which shows the ten largest names, as a percentage, organised by combined size. What is immediately obvious is that the names are not always the same across each country. The most similar places are between GB81 and GB98, with only one name difference (*Roberts* being replaced by *Johnson*), but aside from this even the relative sizes are similar.

Perhaps the interesting pattern is that of *Anderson*, which in Britain is still fairly large (76,111 in 1998, or 0.2 per cent of the population), but is much more significant across all the other countries. In NZ it accounts for 0.35 per cent of the population – that would be 132,000 if it were in Britain today, a not inconsiderable difference. The opposite pattern also is present – *Daries* is a large name in both years in Great Britain, but is much less significant overseas. In comparison to the c. 0.54 per cent in Britain, the best anywhere else can provide is 0.2 per cent in Australia, and the US is as low as 0.01 per cent. However, as can be noted, *Davis* does appear in the top ten for the US with a much higher figure – 0.44 per cent. It might be hypothesised from this that the names *Davies* and *Davis* in the US became more standardised to latter version, therefore leading the loss of *Davies*.

Sum	6.811	3.842	3.391	3.120	2.849	2.649	1.755	1.276	1.084	0.897	0.825	0.654	0.520	0.439	0.398	0.328	0.324	0.302	0.300	0.297	0.288	0.252
Can %	0.676		0.386		0.251	0.298	0.275	0.243				0.325							0.300		0.288	0.252
Canada	SMITH		BROWN		TAYLOR	WILSON	NOSNHOL	ANDERSON				MARTIN							ROY		MACDONALD	CAMPBELL
NS %	1.028	0.534	0.553	0.559	0.298	0.333	0.754	0.352					0.520	0.439								
NS	SMITH	JONES	BROWN	WILLIAMS	TAYLOR	WILSON	NOSNHOL	ANDERSON					MILLER	DAVIS								
% ZN	1.013	0.448	0.518	0.497	0.506	0.564		0.354									0.324	0.302		0.297		
NZ	SMITH	JONES	BROWN	WILLIAMS	TAYLOR	WILSON		ANDERSON									THOMPSON	SCOTT		WALKER		
Aus %	1.216	0.609	0.584	0.586	0.483	0.500	0.354	0.327				0.329				0.328						
Aus	SMITH	JONES	BROWN	WILLIAMS	TAYLOR	WILSON	NOSNHOL	ANDERSON				MARTIN				WHITE						
98 %	1.381	1.051	0.651	0.717	0.633	0.467	0.372		0.544	0.434	0.388											
UK 1998	SMITH	JONES	BROWN	WILLIAMS	TAYLOR	WILSON	NOSNHOL		DAVIES	EVANS	THOMAS											
81 %	1.497	1.200	0.699	0.761	0.677	0.488			0.540	0.463	0.437				0.398							
UK 1881	SMITH	JONES	BROWN	WILLIAMS	TAYLOR	WILSON			DAVIES	EVANS	THOMAS				ROBERTS							

size
ative
rel
ined
omb
oy ce
ed b
ang
arr
atry,
rnoc
ach
n e
ies j
nan
çest
larg
ten
top
The
5
able
Ĩ

International - sub-national migration relationships

In addition to comparing countries directly, a further area for interesting work is in looking at the relationship between sub-national areas. For instance we could ask whether the names of emigrants from Scotland or Cornwall are more commonly found in any particular state in Australia or the US.

Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3 all demonstrate the distribution of emigrates to the various countries came from.



Figure 1: Emigration from Britain to Canada.

These maps have been produced in a relatively simple method. The largest 10,200 indigenous British names have been identified in Canada, Australia and the US. The peak postcode areas in Britain for each of these numbers were then located. The combination of these names were then weighted by the proportion of the total population which that name accounts for overseas, and the difference between the relative percentages of the population with a name from the postcode of Britain and the foreign country was

calculated. This allows the mapping of such simple patterns to explore whether any particular part of Britain was most responsible for emigration.



Figure 2: Emigration from Britain to Australia



Figure 3: Emigration from Britain to the US

In a similar way to this, we can map smaller areas than whole countries. Figure 4 shows the sum of index scores (weighted by the Australian surname totals) for each peak postcode area for two separate states (Queensland Victoria). As can be seen, both patterns are actually very similar, which suggests that there is relatively little difference between these two states, though it should be noted that the total index values are considerably difference, which means that much of the pattern is being suppressed by the chloropleth mapping.



Figure 4: Scores for peak postcode areas for sum of weighted mean index scores for: Left – Queensland; Right - Victoria