

THE DEMOGRAPHY AND EMPLOYMENT OF DOMESTIC GROUP MEMBERS IN AN ENGLISH VILLAGE: 1851-1901

E. Curie Smith

Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois, U.S.A.

Résumé — Dans cette étude des données du recensement du dix-neuvième siècle, provenant des registres des enquêteurs d'un village au sud de l'Angleterre, on constate que les modèles démographiques et économiques des groupes familiales variaient, tout comme l'incidence de différents types de groupes de membres domestiques. Cette période était caractérisée par des difficultés en agriculture qu'on a appelé la dépression agricole qui sévissait pendant la dernière partie des années 1870. Une population décroissante pour la période d'après 1881 en particulier, une remarquable augmentation des taux de masculinité, et une fécondité déclinante, sont quelques-unes des plus importantes tendances démographiques pendant cette période. Quelques-uns des changements dans les groupes familiales découlant des changements démographiques et économiques comprenaient le départ des filles du toit paternel, une augmentation dans la proportion des ménages avec parents, et une tendance croissante vers l'emploi des parents pendant la période en question.

Abstract — From this study of 19th century census data, derived from enumerators' books recorded in a village in the south of England, one finds that the demographic and economic patterns of domestic group membership varied, as did the incidence of different types of domestic group members. The period was characterized by difficulties in agriculture (the Agricultural Depression occurred in the late 1870s). A declining population, particularly after 1881, a marked increase in the sex ratio, and declining fertility were some of the more important demographic trends during this period. Some of the changes in domestic group membership resulting from the demographic and economic changes included the earlier departure of daughters from home, an increase in the proportion of households containing kin, and an increasing tendency for kin to be employed during the period in question.

Key Words — population, historical, family structure

I. Introduction

Our image of individual life cycles in the past has become more complex: in addition to the roles of child and parent and grandparent, we have added those of servants, lodgers, visitors, and other kin as part of the life cycle of individuals. Detailed accounts of one family (Macfarlane, 1970), of households over several generations (Segalen, 1977), of households in industrial areas (Anderson, 1971), as well as those of proto-industrial areas (Levine, 1977), have indicated that, first of all, the composition of the family and of the household varies over the life cycle; and secondly, that individuals will play a variety of household roles, depending upon their stage of the life cycle and the resources available to new household formation.

A study of the age distribution by sex of household members can give us some idea of the timing of different household roles. It can also make clear to us whether certain roles were clustered at certain ages and could thus be seen as part of the individual life cycle. Since our data span a 50-year period, we can also observe changes in the timing of roles in response to larger scale economic conditions.

The availability of occupational data has meant that the employment status and the age of household members can be related. One can thus ascertain to what extent sons and daughters were employed and whether unemployed older children remained at home; whether kin were mostly dependent economically or whether they were employed; whether wives worked and if so, how frequently; and whether the relative employment status of different household members changed over time. It is probable that between the independent status of the household head, who may have provided for economic dependents, and the totally economically dependent members, there existed a range of individuals who may be characterized as semi-dependent. By this I mean that they did not have enough resources to maintain their own households, but that they could contribute enough to an existing household either in terms of labour or income from outside employment to pay their share of household expenses. Older children, many kin, servants, and lodgers would tend to fall in this category. As the relative cost of maintaining households has declined quite significantly with the spread of cheap energy and increasingly efficient domestic design and technology, the number of such semi-dependent roles has declined dramatically. It is easy to forget the time and labour it took to lay fires, wash laundry, prepare even simple meals; and the cost of fuel to heat a single dwelling was large in comparison to wages.

The basic data for this study consist of the 1851, 1861, 1871, 1881, and 1901 census enumerators' books. These census books provided the characteristics of name (except for the 1901 census), sex, age, relation to head of household, occupational status, marital status, and birthplace. Houses and households were clearly marked off from each other. Persons not living in households — tramps, for instance — were not included in the household analysis. The latter were few in number. The data for this study are unique in that the 1881 census materials are not yet generally available, nor are the 1901 census books, even with the names blanked out. The census data have been sufficiently discussed elsewhere (Anderson, 1972) not to require discussion here.

II. *The Case of Puddletown*

The Village of Puddletown is located near the south coast of England, in Dorset. During the period which interests us, it was primarily agricultural in its economy: sheep and dairying were important, with subsidiary agricultural activity in wheat, beans, hemp, and flax. Industrialization did not affect Puddletown directly in the 18th and 19th centuries: it remained rural as did most of the south in that period.

Since the transformation of agriculture was one of the conditions of industrialization and economic growth, however, there was a change in this area during the 18th and 19th centuries. In the first place, enclosures had occurred in Dorset from the 16th century onward in various areas, reaching their peak during the 18th and 19th centuries (*Victoria History*:257).

Secondly, the increasing demand for agricultural produce which occurred in a rapidly urbanizing society, particularly in the 19th century, stimulated the rationalization of land use. Part of this rationalization involved the concentration of landholding even further and the proletarianization of agricultural labour. Rather than living with farmers and being part of the farm household, agricultural labourers increasingly became propertyless workers who were hired by the day or week or, if they were lucky, perhaps by the year.

Thirdly, the repeal of the Corn Laws in the middle of the 19th century, which had protected domestic agriculture by imposing tariffs on incoming agricultural products, meant stiffer competition for rural landlords, though obviously favouring the industrial

population. This competition, as is often the case, was passed on in the form of increasing impoverishment of the agricultural labourer, particularly in the south where industry did not compete for labour and hence wages could easily be kept down. While wages in the north increased 66 per cent from 1770 to 1850, they only increased 14 per cent during the same period in the south. In Dorset, an agricultural worker's wage could often be as low as 10 shillings per week in the 1870s (Heath, 1884:64).

Agricultural labourers in Dorset faced a rather uniform labour market. To add to their problems, two trends occurred: population increased more rapidly in rural than in urban areas, and increased foreign competition meant the decline in the market for local agricultural produce:

The agricultural prosperity of Dorset ended abruptly and dismally with the farming depression which began in the late 1870s. The depression lasted virtually until 1914 marked by rapidly declining prices, and by very great hardship and distress among farmers. The price of corn fell dramatically. There was also a similar fall in the price of livestock, and for Dorset a particularly serious and permanent fall in wool prices. . . . A similar fall in the price of flax in the face of foreign competition led to a spectacular decline in the acreage devoted to this crop in Dorset (Bettey, 1974:57).

The fall in wool and livestock prices was particularly critical for Puddletown, as it was in the middle of the sheep and dairy area of Dorset.

TABLE 1 OCCUPATION OF LAND: 1841
PUDDLETOWN AND ASHWORTHY

NUMBER OF ACRES	PUDDLETOWN		ASHWORTHY	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 50	46	73.0	39	52.7
50-100	3	4.8	13	17.6
101-150	1	1.6	11	14.9
151-300	5	8.0	8	10.8
Over 300	8	12.6	3	4.0

Puddletown households were particularly vulnerable to the effects of economic change because of the pronounced concentration of landholding in that area. This kind of land distribution left many — in fact, most — households without any independent means of getting a living apart from their labour. The extent of the concentration becomes clear when one compares Puddletown with Ashworthy, a village also located in the West Country, (see Table 1, Ashworthy figures from Williams). The most marked difference between the two was the lack of middle-sized holdings in Puddletown and the corresponding concentration of landholding at the upper end of the scale. This was not a situation peculiar to the 19th century: even in the 18th century only about five per cent of the population of Puddletown actually leased land. The actual ownership of the land was in the hands of the Earl of Orford until 1860, when the estate was sold to J. Brymer.

III. Changes in the Demographic Structure of the Village

One of the first things that is clear about the demography of Puddletown is that the population began to decline slowly after 1851, and more rapidly after 1871 (Table 2). A

TABLE 2 SELECTED CHANGES IN POPULATION: PUDDLETOWN 1851-1901

DATE	POPULATION	MALE/FEMALE SEX RATIOS	GENERAL FERTILITY RATE (Births/Women Aged 15-44)	MOVEMENT INTO VILLAGE**		MOVEMENT OUT OF VILLAGE***	
				M	F	M	F
1851	1296	95.1					
1861	1227	100.8	329/268 = 1.23	38.7%	57.8%	51.0%	56.2%
1871	1254	103.4	254/250 = 1.02	44.1%	47.9%	55.4%	57.6%
1881	1175	106.1	271/238 = 1.14	54.1%	51.9%	59.5%	64.7%
1901	936	107.1					

** Percentage of population at next census that moved into village

*** Percentage of population at previous census that moved out of village.

proportion of the decline is attributable to the number of women who were leaving the village in ever greater numbers, and to the decline in the number of women entering the village. The latter was particularly important initially and parallels G. Bouchard's finding that "immigration played an important replacement role . . . whence the idea that the ensuing fall in the total population was caused by a drop in immigration rather than a rise in emigration" (Bouchard, 1977:363). The effects of this movement become quite clear in the changing sex ratio, which increased from 95.1 to 107.1 from 1851 to 1901. Since men and women occupied somewhat different household status, one might expect that this change would affect household structure.

The rise in the sex ratio was paralleled by a decline in the marriage rates of young labouring men: by 1901 there was not a single married male under the age of 30 who was an agricultural labourer. The sex ratio changes were peculiar to Puddletown. From 1851 to 1901, the sex ratio for all of England *fell* from 96 to 93.6. The sex ratio in Ashworthy, mentioned above, also increased, but only from 100.5 to 102.3. This may well be a result of the fact that the land-holding pattern in Ashworthy was not as concentrated and hence there was not as much pressure on the bulk of households.

When one examines the age-specific sex ratios (Table 3), one finds that the only consistently increasing sex ratio was for those under 15 years of age. One might expect this result if daughters were sent away from home earlier than sons: a pattern which did in fact occur, as will be made clear below. For individuals in the family-forming ages (15 to 44), one finds that the sex ratio increased from 97.9 in 1851 to 114.9 in 1881, followed by a sharp drop to 99.5 in 1901. Women in the marriage and child-bearing years were becoming scarcer, until 1901. This scarcity was a function of (1) the declining marriage rate which fell from 15.4/1,000 to 12.6/1,000 in the period 1851-1881; since men were unavailable who could support them, women were not coming in to the village; (2) the decline in the employment of women, particularly in agriculture. Whereas in 1851, the proportion of employed women in agriculture was 31.4 per cent, by 1901 this proportion had fallen to 9.3 per cent; the proportions for men remained relatively constant at 61.2 per cent and 57.5 per cent.

The age distribution of Puddletown changed gradually until 1881. In 1851, 63.4 per cent of the population were under 30 years of age. By 1881, this proportion had declined slightly to 62.6 per cent — mainly as a result of the smaller numbers of younger females. There was actually a slight increase in the relative proportion of younger males: partly a result of their inability to find employment, as will become clear later. By 1901, the popu-

Domestic Group Members in an English Village

TABLE 3 DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX:
PUDDLETOWN 1851-1901

AGE	PERCENTAGES									
	1851		1861		1871		1881		1901	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0-14	16.5	18.9	18.9	18.3	19.1	17.6	19.2	18.7	16.3	14.0
15-29	13.7	14.2	12.8	12.1	11.5	12.1	14.2	10.5	12.1	12.3
30-44	8.3	8.3	7.6	7.9	9.0	8.2	7.4	8.3	9.2	9.1
45-59	5.8	5.6	5.7	6.1	5.9	6.1	6.6	6.2	7.8	8.1
60+	4.4	4.1	5.2	5.5	5.2	5.0	3.9	4.8	5.4	4.9

FREQUENCIES										
0-14	214	246	232	224	240	220	226	219	153	131
15-29	177	183	157	148	144	153	167	124	114	115
30-44	108	108	93	97	121	102	87	97	85	85
45-59	75	73	70	75	74	87	78	73	72	75
60+	57	54	61	67	65	62	46	56	60	46
Total	631	664	616	611	635	614	604	569	484	452

SEX RATIOS										
0-14	87.3		103.3		108.5		103.2		116.8	
15-29	96.5		105.8		95.0		134.7		99.1	
30-44	100.0		96.2		109.8		89.7		100.0	
45-59	104.6		93.4		85.1		106.8		96.0	
60+	107.3		94.5		104.8		82.1		130.4	

lation under 30 had fallen to 51.7 per cent of the total. We have the emergence of an older population as declines in both fertility and mortality proceed. It is also probable that the village ceased to attract younger people as a result of restricted economic opportunity. Since no nominal data are available after 1881, this hypothesis cannot, unfortunately, be checked in detail. The decline in fertility resulted both from a decline in the marriage rate, which had been lower for Puddletown than for England as a whole (13/1,000 for Puddletown in 1871-80 as compared to 16.2/1,000 for England in the same period), and from declining marital fertility. Rural poverty probably did much to restrict the marriage rate within the village, particularly after 1871. One might comment that one way in which a local population resource balance was reached was to restrict the supply of women available for marriage and reproduction. One might further hypothesize that

"push" migration is characterized by a high sex ratio at the source (shortage of women) whereas "pull" migration is characterized by a low sex ratio at the source (England as a whole, for example).

IV. Changes in Domestic Group Membership

From 1851 to 1901 one finds a number of rather interesting changes in the frequencies with which various types of domestic group members were present in households, and in the mean number of such members per household (Table 4). First of all, there was an increase in the proportion of childless households from 17.3 per cent in 1851 to 33.2 per cent in 1871, to 19.6 per cent in 1901 (a pre-industrial listing indicates about one-third of

TABLE 4 TYPES OF DOMESTIC GROUP MEMBERS: PUDDLETOWN 1851-1901

TYPE	1851	1861	1871	1881	1901
<u>Children:</u>					
Proportion of households with no children	17.3%	27.4%	33.2%	27.9%	29.5%
Mean no. of children per household	2.75	2.79	3.06	3.26	2.64
<u>Kin:</u>					
Proportion of households with no kin	85.0%	82.0%	79.0%	78.0%	81.0%
Mean number of kin per household	2.57*	1.46	1.26	1.35	1.35
<u>Female Servants:</u>					
Proportion with no female servants	92.0%	89.0%	89.0%	93.0%	92.0%
Mean number of female servants	.16	1.45	1.66	1.94	1.94
<u>Male Servants:</u>					
Proportion with no male servants	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%	98.0%	97.0%
Mean no. of male servants	1.67	1.14	1.75	1.33	1.00
<u>Male Lodgers</u>					
Proportion with no male lodgers	91.0%	94.0%	90.0%	92.0%	91.0%
Mean number of male lodgers	1.12	1.20	1.11	1.24	1.10

* excludes family of 7 siblings

TABLE 4 (cont.)

<u>Female Lodgers:</u>	1851	1861	1871	1881	1901
Proportion with no female lodgers	99%	97%	99%	98%	99%
Mean number of female lodgers	1.00	1.14	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Visitors</u>					
Proportion with no visitors	93%	89%	96%	96%	96%
Mean number of visitors	1.05	1.19	1.00	2.67	2.22

the households without children in 1724). The decline in numbers of households with children is balanced somewhat by the increase in the mean number of children in those households that had them. Fewer families were having more children, but even these began to have fewer children after 1881.

Nearly as important as the doubling of childless households from 1851 to 1871, was the increase in the proportion of households with kin in them from 15 per cent in 1851 to 22 per cent in 1881 (the pre-industrial figure was very low, as only 11 per cent of the households contained kin). The increase in the number of households with kin coincided with a decline in the mean number of kin per household from 2.57 to 1.35. Kin were being "spread" somewhat more than they had been. The typical extended household rarely had more than one kin-group member present — quite often a grandparent or grandchild. The presence of children and kin tended to be complementary. From household summary data published elsewhere (Smith, 1978), one finds that the number of kin was least for households containing both older and younger children.

The proportions of households with female servants also increased slightly from 1851 to 1901 as women were less likely to be employed in agriculture and sought employment in service instead. The male servants were rarer than female servants and their proportions remained fairly constant. Men were better able to obtain higher paying jobs, if not in agriculture, then in the towns. Male lodgers, on the other hand, were more prevalent than female lodgers. The gender difference in lodging had to do with the different labour-force status of men and women: men who were unmarried were more likely to have employment outside the household and hence to pay for household services whereas women were more likely to be domestically employed and hence not to have the need or money to pay for lodging, particularly in an area like Dorset.

V. *Changes in the Age and Sex Characteristics of Domestic Group Members*

The relationship of household status to the individual life cycle, as measured by age, can tell us not only the sequence of roles that individuals were likely to assume in the household, but the relative spacing of the sequence. Comparisons between groups on this basis can provide some highly interesting results (Glasco, 1977), as can a comparison over time which is undertaken here. Because of the size of the population, I divided individuals into five age groups so that the cell sizes would not be too small: those aged under 15,

TABLE 5 RELATION TO HEAD BY AGE: MALES
(Percentages)

<u>1851</u>							
<u>AGE</u>	<u>HEAD</u>	<u>CHILD</u>	<u>KIN</u>	<u>SERVANT</u>	<u>LODGER</u>	<u>VISITOR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
0-14	--	94.9	4.2	-	0.5	0.5	100.0
15-29	22.6	54.2	5.6	4.5	9.6	3.4	100.0
30-44	78.7	9.3	1.9	4.6	3.7	1.9	100.0
45-59	93.3	2.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	-	100.0
60+	84.2	-	5.3	3.5	5.3	1.8	100.0
<u>1861</u>							
0-14	--	93.1	5.2	0.4	-	1.3	100.0
15-29	18.5	59.2	9.6	3.2	7.0	2.5	100.0
30-44	79.6	10.8	3.2	2.2	1.1	3.2	100.0
45-59	90.0	5.7	1.4	1.4	1.4	-	100.0
60+	85.9	-	6.2	-	6.2	1.6	100.0
<u>1871</u>							
0-14	--	92.5	5.4	0.8	0.8	0.4	100.0
15-29	23.6	53.5	6.9	4.2	11.1	0.7	100.0
30-44	81.8	9.1	4.5	0.9	3.6	-	100.0
45-59	87.7	1.4	2.7	1.4	6.8	-	100.0
60+	86.2	-	9.2	-	4.6	-	100.0
<u>1881</u>							
0-14	--	89.8	8.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	100.0
15-29	15.6	64.1	6.0	2.4	10.8	1.2	100.0
30-44	89.7	6.9	-	1.1	1.1	1.1	100.0
45-59	92.3	-	1.3	3.8	2.6	-	100.0
60+	89.1	-	6.5	-	4.3	-	100.0
<u>1901</u>							
0-14	--	86.3	11.1	0.7	-	2.0	100.0
15-29	11.4	65.8	4.4	3.5	14.9	-	100.0
30-44	71.8	15.3	3.5	1.2	5.9	2.4	100.0
45-59	95.8	4.2	-	-	-	-	100.0
60+	93.3	-	6.7	-	-	-	100.0

15 to 29, 30 to 44, 45 to 59 and those aged 60 or more. Individuals were of course, separately analyzed by sex (Tables 5 and 6).

One of the clearest patterns that emerges is that men and women occupied rather different household status at different times in their respective life cycles. Men were nearly 10 times as likely to head households as were women. Women succeeded to the headship

Domestic Group Members in an English Village

TABLE 6 RELATION TO HEAD BY AGE: FEMALES
(Percentages)

<u>1851</u>								
AGE	HEAD	WIFE	CHILD	KIN	SERVANT	LODGER	VISITOR	TOTAL
0-14	-	--	95.1	3.3	0.4	0.4	0.8	100.0
15-29	1.6	22.4	47.0	8.2	17.5	-	3.3	100.0
30-44	6.5	72.2	9.3	4.6	5.6	-	1.9	100.0
45-59	8.2	76.7	2.7	4.1	6.8	-	1.4	100.0
60+	24.1	57.4	-	16.7	-	1.9	-	100.0
<u>1861</u>								
0-14	-	-	90.2	7.6	-	1.3	0.9	100.0
15-29	1.4	23.6	37.2	5.4	23.0	2.0	7.4	100.0
30-44	3.1	76.3	4.1	3.1	8.2	1.0	4.1	100.0
45-59	17.3	66.7	4.0	5.3	5.3	-	1.3	100.0
60+	26.9	56.7	-	7.5	3.0	1.5	4.5	100.0
<u>1871</u>								
0-14	--	--	91.3	5.5	1.8	0.9	0.5	100.0
15-29	0.7	23.5	39.9	9.2	20.3	1.3	5.2	100.0
30-44	3.9	83.3	5.9	2.9	2.9	-	1.0	100.0
45-59	9.1	76.6	5.2	5.2	3.9	-	-	100.0
60+	24.2	45.2	-	27.4	1.6	1.6	-	100.0
<u>1881</u>								
0-14	--	--	89.5	10.0	0.5	-	-	100.0
15-29	1.6	29.0	35.5	12.1	18.5	2.4	0.8	100.0
30-44	6.2	80.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	-	1.0	100.0
45-59	8.2	80.8	2.7	1.4	5.5	1.4	-	100.0
60+	32.1	39.3	-	21.4	5.4	1.8	-	100.0
<u>1901</u>								
0-14	--	-	88.5	6.9	1.5	0.8	2.3	100.0
15-29	0.9	17.4	49.6	7.0	21.7	-	3.5	100.0
30-44	5.9	67.1	17.6	2.4	4.7	-	2.4	100.0
45-59	14.7	70.7	--	9.3	5.3	-	-	100.0
60+	17.4	69.6	--	10.9	-	-	2.2	100.0

only if widowed or never married. Women alone were listed as spouses of the head. Sons were initially as likely as daughters to be living with their parents in 1851; but after this date one finds that a smaller proportion of women were classified as daughters than were men as sons. Much of the difference is accounted for, first of all, by the fact that many more women than men became servants, and secondly, by the somewhat earlier marriage

of women. Women thus tended to have weaker ties with their families (we know that kin were more likely to be related to the husband than to the wife, from other data). Some of the differences between sons and daughters quite probably had to do with differences in employment patterns that will be discussed below.

It is also true that women were more likely to become kin than were men and less likely to become lodgers. One of the main sources of increase in the proportion of kin in Puddletown households was that of larger numbers of women taking on the status of kin. From 1851 to 1881 the proportion of all women who were kin increased from six per cent to 9.5 per cent, and then declined to 6.9 per cent. The proportion of men who were kin increased from four per cent in 1851 to 5.7 per cent in 1861, and then remained relatively stable. It is yet an unsolved question to what extent female kin served as unpaid domestic help in the household. Certainly Anderson (1971:142) indicated that kin may have been useful in child care when mothers had the opportunity to work.

As mentioned before, men were generally more likely to be boarders, whereas women were somewhat more likely to be visitors. The number of boarders did not seem to vary greatly, though the maximum proportion reached occurred in 1901. The numbers of visitors declined between 1851 and 1881 as the resources required to support visits were probably not available, and visiting may have also been tied to searching for jobs.

The age patterns of various household members reflected the demographic and economic changes of the time. One of the most noticeable patterns is the increasing age of headship. From 1851 to 1901 the proportion of males under 29 who were household heads fell from 22.6 per cent to 11.4 per cent. At the same time, the changes in the age distribution meant that younger males had become less numerous, so that their contribution to the headship of households diminished considerably.

A dissimilar pattern obtained for women for two reasons: first, young women were rarely household heads anyway; second, as mortality declined, fewer women were left widowed and consequently had to head households broken by death. This latter fact is reflected in a marked decrease in the proportion of females over 60 who were heads of households, particularly in 1901. Women at younger ages were increasingly likely to be married, particularly in the age group 15 to 29. The sex ratio increasingly favoured the marriage of the remaining women; unmarried women very probably had difficulty in finding employment and either did not come into the village or left.

The pattern of child dependency also changed over time. The proportion of males under 15 who were sons of the head dropped from 94.9 per cent in 1851 to 86.3 per cent in 1901. This was paralleled by the rise in the numbers of male kin under the age of 15. Whereas only 4.2 per cent of males under 15 were listed as kin in 1851, by 1901 we find 11.1 per cent of this age group are kin of the head. A similar, though less consistent, pattern is observable for female offspring and kin. It appears that the burden of child care was spread through different households by sending children to their relatives in increasing proportions — most often their grandparents. Perhaps it was the case that young children could provide some support for themselves (at about sixpence per day for tasks such as bird-scaring) but not enough to allow parents to find larger accommodation as the family increased in size. Relatives, on the other hand, might be able to defray some of the costs of cooking, heating, and so forth by having a child who worked with them. Girls may well have served as unpaid domestic help.

Older sons, aged 15 to 29, who earned the wages of adults, more than offset the cost of their upkeep and were kept on at home in increasing proportions from 1851, when 54.2 per cent of them stayed at home, to 65.8 per cent in 1901. Daughters were correspond-

ingly less likely to stay at home, and less likely to be employed if they were at home. In 1851, 47 per cent of women aged 15 to 29 were still at home, and this proportion declined to 35.5 per cent in 1881, just over half the percentage of males remaining at home. By 1901, women once more tended to remain at home with their parents at a rate similar to that of 1851. It seems, then, that when times were more difficult female children left in greater numbers. From what we know of other English communities studied by Richard Wall (1978:194) it seems that females were somewhat more likely to leave than males, unless there were clear-cut employment opportunities favouring females, such as in Cardington. In an urban area such as Preston, one finds that males were somewhat more likely to leave home after the age of 15 than females (Anderson, 1971:126). The different patterns may well be a reflection of the relative importance of "push" (negative) vs. "pull" migration in different areas. We may hypothesize that, when and where times were economically difficult, women were more likely to leave; when employment opportunities were improving, males were more likely to leave.

What positions did women who had left home occupy? Many in the village, as the sex ratios indicate, left to go elsewhere — probably into service. They were somewhat more likely to either get married or live with kin than were men. The image of the country girl dutifully staying at home while her brother sought adventure elsewhere does not correspond to the picture our data yield. Macfarlane (1972) reported that two centuries earlier among the children of a clergyman, the girls left home a couple of years before the boys.

Older women were more likely to be kin than were men. First of all, women were approximately one-third more likely to be widowed than men — except in 1881 when they were twice as likely to be widowed. Secondly, women were more apt to accept dependent status, since their wages were lower than those of men (about 40 per cent seems to be the average), though they might not do badly if they set up a small shop or an alehouse. The proportion of women over 60 who were kin increased to some extent in parallel to the proportions of women who were widowed. About 16.7 per cent of women over 60 were kin in 1851 increasing to 27.4 per cent in 1871 and then declining to 10.9 per cent in 1901.

Kinship thus seemed to be a mechanism used to cope with overly heavy dependency in the case of economic difficulty and of widowhood. "Living with relatives and lodgers was yet another way in which the number of co-resident wage earners could be increased." (Levine, 1977:57). From our data, kinship appeared to be most important in the first and last parts of the female life cycle, and in the first part of the male life cycle.

Non-related status in the household was as important for women as for men. The major difference was that such status for women was predominantly as servants, concentrated in the age range 15 to 29. Between one-fifth and one-sixth of women aged 15 to 29 were in service at any given time. Given the high turnover among servants, it is probable that this status formed an important part of the life cycle for quite a large proportion of young women. Unfortunately, we do not have the kinds of yearly enumeration nor the geographic inclusions necessary to trace young women through their changes of status in more detailed fashion.

Males were much more likely to be lodgers once they reached age 15. On average one in ten young men aged 15 to 29 could expect to be in lodging at any one point in time. These proportions are somewhat similar to those found by Anderson (1971:124-5). Until 1881, visitors of both sexes also seemed to be in the age range 15 to 29. It could be that visiting was one way that young men and women might seek work. This interpretation is supported by the parallel decline in both agricultural employment in Puddletown and in the number of visitors to the village. The least numbers of kin, lodgers, and visitors

coincides with those ages when individuals would be expected to be raising their own families; that is, the ages between 30 and 59.

VI. The Employment Status of Domestic Group Members

The extent to which ties between household members depended upon resources, particularly employment, was pointed out both by Levine (1977) and by Anderson (1971:165). The data for Puddletown allow me to examine more closely not only the employment patterns of domestic group members, but the changes which occurred in these employment patterns over time. We may thus establish some relationships between patterns of co-residence and patterns of employment over the life cycle of individuals under changing circumstances.

The employment status of domestic group members varied by status in the household, by age, and by sex (Tables 7 and 8). I divided the employment status variable according to Armstrong's (1972) classification of occupations. Classes I to III were defined as upper, classes IV and V (semi-skilled and unskilled workers) were defined as lower status. Individuals for whom no employment was given or who were listed as retired were defined as unemployed. This simple division was used because I also desired to control for the age, sex, and household status of individuals, and the cell sizes would have become too small if a more complex occupational scheme had been used. I also restricted analysis to individuals in the following statuses: heads, spouses, offspring, and kin. Lodgers and servants were virtually always employed; and the number of visitors was not sufficiently large to break down further meaningfully by occupational category.

The employment patterns of men in general reflected a two-fold change by age: young men (under 15) and older men (over 60) were employed less and less from 1851 to 1901.

TABLE 7 RELATION TO HEAD BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS:
MALES, PUDDLETOWN 1851-1901
(Row Percentages)

	1851			1861			1871			1881			1901		
	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW
<u>AGED UNDER 15</u>															
Offspring	85.2	--	14.8	78.7	1.4	19.9	79.7	--	20.3	90.6	--	9.4	91.7	--	8.3
Kin	88.9	--	11.5	58.3	--	41.7	61.5	--	38.5	77.8	--	22.2	82.4	--	17.6
All	84.6	--	15.4	78.0	1.3	20.7	77.9	--	22.1	88.1	--	11.1	90.2	--	9.8
<u>15 - 29</u>															
Head	--	22.5	77.5	--	27.6	72.4	--	50.0	50.0	--	15.4	84.6	--	61.5	38.5
Offspring	11.5	17.7	70.8	9.7	14.0	76.3	10.4	9.1	80.5	11.2	8.4	80.4	5.3	12.0	82.7
Kin	30.0	30.0	60.0	--	33.3	66.7	10.0	20.0	70.0	--	--	100.0	--	60.0	40.0
All	8.5	18.6	72.9	7.0	21.7	71.3	6.3	22.2	71.5	7.8	10.8	81.4	3.5	21.9	74.6
<u>30 - 44</u>															
Head	--	36.5	63.5	--	32.4	67.6	--	33.3	66.7	--	37.2	62.8	--	41.0	59.0
Offspring	10.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	7.7	23.1	69.2
Kin	--	50.0	50.0	--	33.3	66.7	--	20.0	80.0	--	--	--	--	33.3	66.7
All	1.9	32.4	65.7	1.1	34.4	64.5	1.8	32.1	66.1	2.3	35.6	62.1	2.4	35.3	62.4
<u>45 - 59</u>															
Head	--	35.7	64.3	--	41.3	58.7	--	39.1	60.9	4.2	30.6	65.3	2.9	27.9	69.1
Offspring	50.0	50.0	--	50.0	25.0	25.0	--	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Kin	--	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	100.0	--	--	--	--
All	1.3	34.7	64.0	2.9	40.0	57.1	--	16.7	83.3	3.8	30.8	65.4	2.8	26.8	70.4
<u>OVER 60</u>															
Head	6.3	33.3	60.4	12.7	40.0	47.3	25.0	28.6	46.4	31.7	34.1	34.1	21.4	17.9	60.7
Kin	--	--	100.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	--	66.7	100.0	--	--
All*	5.3	33.3	61.4	18.8	37.5	43.8	26.2	26.2	47.7	34.8	30.4	34.8	26.7	16.7	56.7

NOTE: UN = unemployed; UP = upper status; LOW = lower status

* All refers to all individuals in the age group, including those whose numbers were too small to subdivide by employment status

TABLE 8 RELATION TO HEAD BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS:
FEMALES, PUDDLETOWN 1851-1901
(Row Percentages)

RELATION TO HEAD	1851			1861			1871			1881			1901		
	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW	UN	UP	LOW
<u>AGED UNDER 15</u>															
Offspring	96.6	0.4	3.0	94.1	0.5	5.4	99.0	0.5	0.5	99.0	--	1.0	100.0	--	--
Kin	100.0	--	--	94.1	--	5.9	100.0	--	--	90.9	4.5	4.5	100.0	--	--
All	96.4	0.4	3.2	93.8	0.9	5.4	97.3	0.5	2.3	97.7	0.5	1.8	98.5	--	1.5
<u>15 - 29</u>															
Head	33.3	--	66.7	--	100.0	--	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--
Spouse	95.1	2.4	2.4	65.7	8.6	25.7	77.8	5.6	16.7	94.4	5.6	--	95.0	5.0	--
Offspring	31.4	25.6	43.0	41.8	21.8	36.4	39.3	19.7	41.0	47.7	9.1	43.2	41.1	16.1	42.9
Kin	66.7	26.7	6.7	75.0	--	25.0	35.7	--	64.3	53.3	6.7	40.0	75.0	12.5	12.5
All	43.7	15.3	41.0	39.9	14.2	45.9	40.5	9.8	49.7	53.2	6.5	40.3	44.7	9.6	45.6
<u>30 - 44</u>															
Head	42.9	57.1	--	--	--	100.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	60.0	20.0	20.0
Spouse	92.3	--	7.7	66.2	9.5	24.3	88.2	4.7	7.1	85.9	1.3	12.8	94.7	3.5	1.8
Offspring	10.0	60.0	30.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	--	75.0	13.3	53.3	33.3
Kin	40.0	20.0	40.0	66.7	33.3	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	75.0	--	25.0	50.0	--	50.0
All	73.1	11.1	15.7	56.7	9.3	34.0	79.4	6.9	13.7	78.4	2.1	19.6	72.9	12.9	14.1
<u>45 - 59</u>															
Head	50.0	33.3	16.7	30.8	46.2	23.1	14.3	42.9	42.9	16.7	33.3	50.0	45.5	54.5	--
Spouse	92.9	3.6	3.6	72.0	8.0	20.0	81.4	3.4	15.3	79.7	1.7	18.6	100.0	--	--
Offspring	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--	50.0	--	50.0	50.0	50.0	--	--	--	--
Kin	100.0	--	--	75.0	--	25.0	50.0	--	50.0	--	100.0	--	85.7	14.3	--
All	83.6	5.5	11.0	62.7	13.3	24.0	68.8	6.5	24.7	67.1	6.8	26.0	85.3	9.3	5.3
<u>Over 60</u>															
Head	69.2	15.4	15.4	72.2	11.1	16.7	86.7	--	13.3	61.1	16.7	22.2	50.0	50.0	--
Spouse	90.3	--	9.7	78.9	5.3	15.8	85.7	--	14.3	90.9	4.5	4.5	87.5	6.3	6.3
Kin	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--	82.4	--	17.6	75.0	8.3	16.7	100.0	--	--
All	87.0	3.7	9.3	76.1	7.5	16.4	83.9	--	16.1	73.2	8.9	17.9	82.6	13.0	4.3

The decline occurred first for older men, from 91.2 per cent in 1851 to 81.3 per cent in 1861, continuing down to a low point of 65.2 per cent in 1881. The decline for younger men occurred after the Education Act of 1870, which required compulsory school attendance. Employment rates for younger men declined from 22.1 per cent in 1871 to 11.9 per cent in 1881.

These patterns affected sons in particular, for their employment rose from 1851 to 1861, declining after 1871 as the declining labour market and the developing national education system became effective. It is probable that universal education became more acceptable precisely because of the labour surplus that the young represented.

Although no real overall trend is discernible for sons in the 15 to 29 age group (apart from an upward shift in employment in 1901), the employment status of such sons did alter. Whereas 70.8 per cent of employed sons aged 15 to 29 were classified as low status in 1881, one finds that 82.7 per cent were classified as low status in 1901. The deteriorating employment status of sons suggests that they remained at home because they were unable to find better jobs elsewhere and that their economic status was not sufficient to allow them to marry. The proportion of sons in upper status occupations declined until 1881, after which there was a mild recovery. Older sons (over 30) were more likely to have higher status and less likely to be unemployed than their younger counterparts. The numbers in these groups are too small to allow generalization concerning time trends. It is probable that some higher status sons remained at home because they were in some way linked to their father's business.

Heads of the same age as sons (15 to 29) had very much higher status, lending credence to the contention that sons remaining at home did so because they did not have the resources to set up their own households. The status of young heads improved from 1851

to 1871. There is, however, a dramatic drop in the proportions of higher status young heads from 50 per cent in 1871 to 15.4 per cent in 1881. It is unlikely that this was a shift in census classification alone, as marriage data revealed similar shifts in status groupings (Smith, 1978b). The status of young heads improved from 1881 to 1901, and we then find 61.5 per cent of young male heads classified as having higher occupational status. Lower status males particularly were not getting married: it is noteworthy that there was not one young male head under the age of 30 who was classified as an unskilled labourer in 1901, even though they were quite numerous in 1851.

Older heads seemed to be somewhat more stable in their characteristics. The 30 to 44 age group remained relatively stable in status, whereas the male heads over 45 did show some relative deterioration in status after 1861. The declining employment rates for these older men were probably symptomatic of the economic stagnation that also affected their status. Unemployment for men over 60 reached a peak in 1881 (at 31.7 per cent) dropping to 21.4 per cent in 1901 — a figure many times higher than the 6.3 per cent unemployed in 1851. Even though changes in reporting census occupations may have had some roles to play, the presence of a continuing and upward trend in unemployment among older men suggests that it was not simply a case of changing recording methods — the latter would tend to produce a single sharp discontinuity.

Particularly interesting were the changes in the employment status of male kin. After 1851, male kin were no longer in a dependent status similar to that of sons. Their employment rates increased and were thereafter always higher than those of sons. It was likely that the increase in young male kin was largely a result of the increase in employed male kin coming to stay with relatives from 1851 to 1861. Unemployment among young kin did increase from 1861 to 1901, largely as a result of the same economic and educational changes that affected young sons. Still, their economic participation was twice that of all males aged under 15, after 1861.

A similar pattern obtained for young adult male kin. After 1851 they were more likely to be employed than were sons aged 15 to 29. Their status was generally somewhat higher than that of the sons. This may reflect the choice of higher status heads who did not have sons of their own to help with a particular trade or profession. This interpretation is supported to some extent by the parallel decline in the number of higher status heads and higher status kin in 1881 and a parallel recovery in 1901.

For older kin, however, the reverse seemed to be true: sons had higher status than kinsman of the same age (over 30). Although older kin were more likely to be working than older sons, their status tended to be somewhat lower. Elderly kin (over 60) were increasingly the most likely to be unemployed. For elderly kin, there existed a transition from being wholly employed in low-status jobs in 1851 to a mix of employment and unemployment, to complete unemployment in 1901. The numbers are small and hence should be interpreted cautiously. The results are, however, suggestive in light of the declining employment of elderly males. Elderly kin were unemployed more often than elderly heads, and were quite clearly in an increasingly dependent status.

Turning our attention to female household members, we find they were generally less likely to work outside the households than were males. They were also less likely to work in low-status occupations, particularly as the market for agricultural labour declined. Daughters were much less likely to be employed than sons. It is reasonable to suppose that this led to their being considered purely an economic burden, especially if there were an older female (mother or sister) to do the domestic work. Young adult daughters (aged 15 to 29) tended to work outside the household in decreasing numbers until 1901, when a slight reversal occurred. Whereas 68.6 per cent of the daughters aged 15 to 29 were em-

ployed in 1851, only 52.3 per cent were employed outside the house in 1881. From our previous discussion of proportion of females aged 15 to 29 remaining at home, there seems to be relationship between declining numbers of daughters at home and the decline in their employment. Daughters were generally less likely to be employed than females in their age group, but the difference is not very large.

Older daughters (over 30) were somewhat more numerous than older sons. There was a consistent decline in the employment of daughters from 1851 to 1871, followed by an increase in the employment of the 30 to 44 age group. The decline in employment paralleled once more the decline in the absolute number of older daughters remaining at home. It is likely that few households could afford to support unemployed daughters and hence, with the shrinkage of employment for women in Puddletown, older daughters had to migrate elsewhere to find employment, rather than remaining with their families.

Wives were usually the least likely of domestic group members to work. Differences by age were not very great in terms of proportions of wives working, although women aged 30 to 44 who were wives were the least likely to be employed outside the house. What is interesting about the time trend is the very sharp increase in wives working between 1851 and 1861, from approximately five to eight per cent to nearly one-third of wives of all ages under 60. After 1861, the employment rate of wives declines gradually until it reaches the 1851 level again. The increase in the employment of wives coincided with a decline in the employment of daughters. Perhaps in the face of declining values of wages, wives had to work to keep younger families together. Since employment in agriculture for women in general was declining, the increase in the employment of wives occurred at the expense of younger women. An alternative explanation is that the ways in which the occupations of women were recorded changed, particularly in the case of married women. The marriage records severely underestimated the number of women who were occupied in the labour force prior to marriage, and it may well be that in 1861 the census enumerator inquired more closely concerning the occupations of wives, whose main responsibilities had hitherto been defined as domestic.

Young female kin were similar in their employment patterns to daughters — except in 1881 when one in ten were employed as contrasted with one in 100 of daughters. Older female kin were *less* likely to be employed than daughters of the same age. They were also increasingly employed in lower status occupations as their labour force participation increased from 1861 to 1881.

Even elderly female kin were increasingly employed during the latter period, also largely in lower status occupations. It is thus likely that kinship did form a means of sharing insufficient resources by pooling costs of housing. It is probable that individuals who became kin, particularly women, either earned enough to contribute to the domestic economy but not enough to support them independently; or contributed household services similar to those of servants.

VII. *Conclusions*

From this study of census data of one village over time, one finds that demographic and economic patterns of domestic group membership varied, as did the incidence of different types of domestic groups' members. Significant demographic trends were: first, a decline in the village population characteristics of rural areas in England in general from 1851 to 1901; second, a marked increase in the sex ratio which was particular to Puddletown and which arose from both the out-migration and declining immigration of women; third, the village was characterized by an aging population a result of both declining fertility and changing composition as a result of migration patterns.

The economic changes during this period, first of all, involved a period of agricultural depression in the late 1870s, which one would expect to affect the 1881 and 1901 figures. Second, one found that the employment of women was declining in agriculture, to be replaced somewhat by their employment in service. It is probable that the declining employment of women was closely linked to their progressive absence from the village. The third trend in employment was the decline in the employment of elderly males and very young men.

The above demographic and economic patterns affected the patterns of household membership in a number of ways. The rising sex ratio was particularly a reflection of the tendency of daughters to leave home before sons did. The proportion of children who were offspring of the head in general declined, to be substituted for by young kin. This seems to have been a way to spread the burden of child care. Young kin, on the other hand, were increasingly employed relatively to children, particularly in the case of sons and male kin. The presence of daughters in households apparently paralleled their presence in the labour force: when daughters were decreasingly employed, they were also decreasingly present at home with their parents. Female kin, although increasingly employed, seemed to function more in a domestic context in that they were often less employed outside the house than daughters. In general, there was an increase in the proportion of households with kin during this period and the kin were increasingly working kin. The increase in kin membership coincided with a decline in the proportion of households with children. Although increasing numbers of kin may have worked, there were also many, such as the elderly and widowed, who represented economic dependents. Such dependency was probably incompatible to some degree with the presence of children.

The data from this study suggest, then, that economic and demographic factors interact in complex ways to shape the sequence and timing of domestic roles over the life cycle of individuals.

References

- Anderson, Michael. 1971. *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire*. Cambridge University Press.
- , Michael. 1972. The Study of Family Structure. In *The Study of Nineteenth Century Society*, E. A. Wrigley, (ed.):47-81. See also *Standard Tabulation Procedures for the Census Enumerators' books 1851-1891*, in the same volume. Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, W. A. 1971. The Use of Information About Occupation. In *Nineteenth Century Society*, E. A. Wrigley, (ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Betty, J. H. 1974. Dorset. Newton Abbot: David and Charles.
- Chambers, J. D. and G. E. Mingay. 1966. *The Agricultural Revolution, 1750-1880*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Glasco, Laurence A. 1977. The Life Cycles and Household Structure of American Ethnic Groups: Irish, Germans, and Native Born Whites in Buffalo, New York, 1855. In *Family and Kin in Urban Communities, 1700-1930*, Tamara K. Hareven, (ed.). New York: New Viewpoints.
- Griffiths, G. T. 1967. *Population Problems of the Age of Malthus*. London: Frank Case and Company, Ltd.
- Heath, Francis George. 1884. *Peasant Life in the West of England*. 4th ed. London: Sampson, Low, Marsh, Searle, and Livingston.
- Jones, E. L. and S. J. Woolf. 1969. *Agrarian Change and Economic Development, the Historical Problems*. London: Methuen and Co.
- Kebbel, T. E. 1883. *The Agricultural Labourer*. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.

Domestic Group Members in an English Village

- Kerr, Barbara. 1967. *Bound to the Soil: A Social History of Dorset, 1750-1918*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Laslett, Peter (ed.). 1972. *Household and Family in Past Time*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, David. 1977. *Family Formation in an Age of Nascent Capitalism*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Lorimer, F. 1965. The Economics of Family Formation under Different Conditions. In *World Population Conference, U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs*. New York:92-5.
- Segalen, Martine. 1977. The Family Cycle and Household Structure: Five Generations in a French Village. *Journal of Family History*. 2(3):223-236.
- Smith, E. Curie, 1978a. Family Structure and Complexity. Forthcoming in *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*.
- _____. 1978b. Cupid in a Depression. (Article under review.)
- Victoria History of Dorset. 1972. London: Government Printing.
- Wall, Richard. 1978. The Age at Leaving Home. *Journal of Family History*. 3(2):181-202.
- Weinstock, M. 1966. *Old Dorset*. Newton Abbot: David and Charles.
- Williams, W. M. 1963. *A West Country Village, Ashworthy: Family, Kinship, and Land*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Young, Michael, and Peter Wilmott. 1967. *Family and Kinship in East London*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Received January, 1978; revised October, 1978.