

Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON CHANGING  
HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY STRUCTURE IN MID-VICTORIAN  
HERTFORDSHIRE

Tom Heritage

Submitted to the University of Hertfordshire in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements of the degree of MA by Research

July 2014

## Abstract:

Despite the seminal studies dedicated to family structure and household composition, there has been a dearth of these studies since the 1980s, when it was perceived by social historians as outmoded in the context of the burgeoning cultural approach to historiography. Even in the most dedicated circles of historical demography, where the Census Enumerators' Books (CEBs) were (and still are) used extensively, little has been done in the study of family structure to compare earlier census records with the latest to have been publicly released. Research is particularly lacking when the agricultural and market town communities of southern England are considered. This study provides a comparative perspective on changing household and family structure through the digitised spreadsheets of the 1851 and 1891 CEBs for eight Hertfordshire parishes. Transcribed versions of the original CEBs enable a more detailed analysis of changing household size, extended kinship rates and patterns of co-residence between elderly and offspring. This analysis finds that household composition was linked with the economic circumstances and geographical settings of the local communities in question. By 1891, household size in Hertfordshire was generally consistent with 1851 due to population growth in the towns alongside a contraction in the agricultural communities. While wider kinship rates and co-residential patterns fell by the late nineteenth-century, across time familial relations with wider kin and with the elderly were more significant than previous studies have given credit for. Occupational structure, gender and migratory patterns produced variations by parish in the proportion of wider kin and elderly-offspring co-residence, with figures above the findings in previous studies. This thesis concludes that household composition cannot be solely explained by the expectations of a "rural" or "urban" parish, as households were governed by parish-level discrepancies. This thesis ends by discussing the benefits of digitised census data in encouraging further research and reinforcing the benefits of historical demography.

## Table of Contents:

|  | Page No. |
|--|----------|
| Abstract   | 2        |
| List of Tables   | 4        |
| List of Appendices   | 6        |
| Introduction: Family Structure and Household Composition: Background,<br>Historiography and Methodology      | 7        |
| Chapter One: Changing Household Size and Structure in Mid-Victorian<br>Hertfordshire, 1851-1891              | 22       |
| Chapter Two: Wider Kinship Inside the Household and Beyond in<br>Mid-Victorian Hertfordshire, 1851-1891      | 40       |
| Chapter Three: Residential Patterns of the Elderly in Mid-Victorian<br>Hertfordshire, 1851-1891              | 58       |
| Conclusion: Digitised Census Data, the Root Causes of Household<br>Composition and the Future for this Study | 76       |
| Appendices   | 81       |
| Bibliography   | 88       |

## List of Tables:

|            | Page No  |    |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 1.1  | Changing Household Size, 1851 and 1891   | 23 |
| Table 1.2  | Percentages of Households of Different Sizes, 1851 and 1891  | 27 |
| Table 1.3a | Mean Household Size and Social Group, 1851   | 30 |
| Table 1.3b | Mean Household Size and Social Group, 1891   | 30 |
| Table 1.4a | Components of the Household: Mean Numbers per Household, 1851  | 33 |
| Table 1.4b | Components of the Household: Mean Numbers per Household, 1891  | 34 |
| Table 2.1  | Percentages of Households Containing Kin, 1851 and 1891  | 42 |
| Table 2.2  | Percentages of Households Containing Kin by Occupational<br>Group, 1851 and 1891   | 44 |
| Table 2.3  | Components of Kin by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851<br>and 1891   | 48 |
| Table 2.4  | Proportions of Households Related to One Another by Kinship,<br>Alongside Percentage of Native-Born and Surnames Found in Two<br>or More Households, 1851 and 1891 | 53 |
| Table 3.1  | Residential Patterns of Elderly by Rural and Urban Collective Totals,<br>1851 and 1891   | 60 |
| Table 3.2  | Percentage of Elderly Co-Residing with Offspring by Parish and<br>by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851 and 1891  | 61 |
| Table 3.3  | Residential Patterns of the Elderly Recorded as Poor in Hertfordshire,<br>1851   | 69 |

List of Tables (Continued):

|  | Page No. |
|--|----------|
| Table 3.4 Percentages of the Elderly Recorded as Poor and Co-Residing<br>With Offspring by Region in Hertfordshire, 1851 | 69       |
| Table 3.5 Residential Patterns of Poor Relief Claimants over 65 in Hertford<br>Union, 1881                               | 72       |

## List of Appendices:

### Appendix One:

|          |   | Page No. |
|----------|---|----------|
| Table 1A | Components of the Household: Percentages, 1851  | 81       |
| Table 1B | Components of the Household: Percentages, 1891  | 81       |
| Table 3A | Residential Patterns of Elderly by Parishes in the Hertfordshire<br>Sample and by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851 | 82       |
| Table 3B | Residential Patterns of Elderly by Parishes in the Hertfordshire<br>Sample and by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1891 | 83       |
| Table 3C | Residential Patterns of Elderly Recorded as Poor by Region in<br>Hertfordshire, 1851                                      | 84       |

### Appendix Two:

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
| Social Status Scheme | 86 |
| Goose Coding Scheme  | 87 |

## Introduction:

### FAMILY STRUCTURE AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: BACKGROUND, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND METHODOLOGY

#### *Background to the Academic Study of Family and Household*

The study of family structure and household composition was popularised in the 1960s by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure (CAMPOP). They analysed census listings to develop an understanding of the social structure of early modern England. Co-founder of CAMPOP, Laslett, worked on 100 parishes that held census records from 1574 to 1821. His conclusions shattered the myths that households in England's past were composed of extended families, and that a wide range of kin were accommodated. In fact, small-scale nuclear families predominated across early modern and industrial England.<sup>1</sup> The school of quantitative history started to develop, encouraging other communities to be examined outside of Laslett's sample from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth-centuries.<sup>2</sup> The seminal studies of nineteenth-century England as seen through the Census Enumerators' Books (CEBs) for Preston and Rural Lancashire by Anderson and of York by Armstrong have inspired further analysis of local Victorian communities.<sup>3</sup> Family and household structure, therefore, has contributed towards understanding the social and economic behaviour of families regardless of social background, and to the further development of local history as an academic subject.

However, since the 1980s, there has been a decline in interest in family and households from a demographic perspective. A more "multifaceted" historiography inspired by postmodernism, where cultural identities and linguistic discourses began to be examined, meant that historians investigated the family to understand constructions of masculinity and

---

<sup>1</sup> The origins of CAMPOP and of Laslett's interest in household composition are detailed in P. Laslett, "Introduction: The History of the Family," in P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 1-90.

<sup>2</sup> For example, N. Goose, "Household Size and Structure in Early Stuart Cambridge," *Social History*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Oct. 1980), pp. 347-385; T. Arkell and A. Whiteman, "Mean Household Size in Mid-Tudor England: Clackclose Hundred, Norfolk," *Local Population Studies*, No. 60 (Spring 1998), pp. 20-33.

<sup>3</sup> M. Anderson, *Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1971); A. Armstrong, *Stability and Change in an English County Town: A Social Study of York, 1801-1851* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 175-194; M. Brayshay, "Depopulation and Changing Household Structure in the Mining Communities of West Cornwall, 1851-1871," in D. Mills and K. Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), pp. 326-345; N. Goose, *Population, Economy and Family Structure in Hertfordshire, Vol. 1: The Berkhamsted Region* (Hatfield, 1996), pp. 60-79 and *Vol. 2: St. Albans and its Region* (Hatfield, 2000), pp. 145-181.

femininity.<sup>4</sup> Tosh has reacted sceptically to the original demographic studies, describing the debate on household size as “rather narrow.”<sup>5</sup> In fact, studies of “size” and “structure” have fallen even in the academic journal most dedicated to historical demography, *Local Population Studies (LPS)*, founded by CAMPOP in 1968. This is despite the 1996 publication by *LPS* of a collection of essays revolving around the CEBs, with one chapter devoted to family structure.<sup>6</sup> Only 5 articles in issues 60-81 dealt specifically with “size” and “structure,” compared with 17 in issues 40-59.<sup>7</sup>

The study of family structure through the census has some underexplored facets. For example, the latest census returns publicly released under the 100-year closure rule, such as from 1891 to 1911, have been neglected in analysing household composition. However, in the 1990s, the University of Hertfordshire collaborated with volunteers outside the university sector to digitise the 1851 and 1891 census returns for the county of Hertfordshire.<sup>8</sup> This resulted in the published analyses of the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions in 1851 and the 2005 release of a CD-Rom covering the entire 1851 Hertfordshire census.<sup>9</sup> Unlike most studies covering only one census period, the 1851 *and* 1891 census returns can comparatively explore the local development of households based on the rapid social, economic and demographic changes occurring across 40 years. Several arguments within the historiography of family and household structure have required a comparative perspective from the mid to late nineteenth-century. Unfortunately, there have been very few assessments of these debates. An outline of the historiography behind three key themes in family and household structure is presented below.

---

<sup>4</sup> N. Goose and C. Galley, “Local Population Studies: Forty Years On,” *Local Population Studies*, No. 81 (Spring 2008), pp. 11-17; L. Dolezel, *Possible Worlds of Fiction and History: The Postmodern Stage* (Maryland, 2010), pp. 45-6; J. Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., Harlow, 2010), pp. 275-283, 298-299.

<sup>5</sup> Tosh, *Pursuit*, p. 276.

<sup>6</sup> Mills and Schürer, *Local Communities*, pp. 287-345.

<sup>7</sup> Goose and Galley, “Local Population Studies” Table 2, p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> A more detailed account is in Goose’s two publications: *Berkhamsted*, pp. 12-15 and *St. Albans*, pp. 14-17.

<sup>9</sup> N. Goose (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-ROM* (Hatfield, 2005).



## *Historiography*

### 1. Changing Household Size, 1851-1891

As mentioned earlier, interpretations about household size and structure in Victorian England originate from Laslett's studies of the household data of 100 communities, recorded from 1574 to 1821. Cross-checking the 100 communities alongside published census reports from 1851 showed that mean household size (MHS) was broadly consistent from the sixteenth-century until 1891, at 4.75. After 1891, MHS began a downward trend that has characterised the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.<sup>10</sup> One reason for this was the characteristics associated with the "demographic transition." The size of the domestic group fell when mortality and marital fertility declined.<sup>11</sup> Secondly, England held a nuclear-type household size for longer compared with other European countries as it maintained a substantial servant population. Several studies have revealed a strong correlation between the numbers of servants and household size.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, servants "may have dampened the operation of birth rates, marriage rates and death rates on mean household size."<sup>13</sup>

However, Anderson's study of nineteenth-century Lancashire seminally argued against industrialisation as responsible for increasing the number of small nuclear-family households. In fact, the MHS for both rural Lancashire and Preston town was above the national average, at 5.5 and 5.4 respectively.<sup>14</sup> The delayed fall in MHS across the Victorian period may be based on increasing child-parent co-residence, or, more simply, the numbers of wider kin in the same household.<sup>15</sup> In the twelve groups of communities representing Mills' English Rural Norm in 1851, the range lay between 4.09 and 6.07, confirmed by Cardington, Bedfordshire and Plumpton, Sussex, where they ranged from 5.1 to 5.7 across 1851 to 1871.<sup>16</sup> Market towns and industrial parishes similarly achieved an MHS of over 5.0.<sup>17</sup> Additionally, fewer

---

<sup>10</sup> P. Laslett, "Mean Household Size in England since the Sixteenth-Century," in Laslett and Wall (eds.), *Household and Family*, pp. 125-158.

<sup>11</sup> Laslett, "Mean Household Size," p. 139.

<sup>12</sup> N. Tranter, "The Social Structure of a Bedfordshire Parish in the Mid Nineteenth-Century," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 18, No 1, (1973), pp. 90-106; Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.13, p. 189.

<sup>13</sup> Laslett, "Mean Household Size," p. 156.

<sup>14</sup> M. Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution: Mid Nineteenth-Century Preston in Comparative Perspective," in Laslett and Wall (eds.), *Household and Family*, pp. 215-236.

<sup>15</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure," p. 235.

<sup>16</sup> Mills' Rural Norm referenced in Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 148; Tranter, "Social Structure," Table 3, p. 93; B. Short (ed.), *Scarpfoot Parish: Plumpton 1830-1880*, University of Sussex Centre for Continuing Education, Occasional Paper No. 16 (Brighton, 1981), cited in Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 148.

<sup>17</sup> M. Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries, 1840-1880* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 355-6; Brayshay, "Depopulation," pp. 326-345. Household size for Dupree's studies calculated in Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 148.

studies have examined changing MHS over time. However, Hunt and Brayshay's studies of Lincolnshire and Cornwall respectively show that 1871, rather than 1891, marked the turning point in changing family structure. For Hunt, agricultural downturn guided the youthful population to migrate, leaving an elderly population and many one-person households behind.<sup>18</sup> Brayshay confirms that the 1866 mining recession affected the families of three Cornish communities, resulting in emigration overseas and a number of households headed by wives with their husbands abroad.<sup>19</sup> In some communities, MHS increased towards the late nineteenth-century. In Highley, Shropshire, MHS changed from 4.3 in 1871 to 5.2 in 1881, due to the number of in-migrants taking advantage of the growing mining industries.<sup>20</sup>

Evidence also confirms that MHS was highest when the most affluent individuals were the head of the household, mainly due to the proportion of servants in high status families. However, Goose has found a proportion of individuals living independently in Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire that belonged to a high social group, comprised of proprietors of houses, landed proprietors and fund-holders. The MHS in Aldbury for a Status A head was 2.80, compared with 5.23 in houses owned by Status E heads.<sup>21</sup> Recent research has concluded that MHS became more uniform between social groups by the late nineteenth-century. In 1901 Bassingham, the MHS in households with a "Professional" head was 4.29, compared with only 3.79 for the lowest group of "Labourers."<sup>22</sup>

## 2. Changing Patterns of Kinship, 1851-1891

According to Macfarlane, "kinship seemed very weak; people were early independent of parental power and most relied mainly on their own efforts [...] The weakness of kinship showed itself in the household structure; this was nuclear, on the whole, with few joint and extended families."<sup>23</sup> Sociologists in the 1950s and 1960s argued that the extended family households, presumably attributed to pre-industrial England, became disrupted due to

---

<sup>18</sup> E. Hunt, "Household Size and Structure in Bassingham, Lincolnshire, 1851-1901" *Local Population Studies*, No. 75 (Autumn, 2005), pp. 56-74.

<sup>19</sup> Brayshay, "Depopulation," pp. 336-341.

<sup>20</sup> G. Nair, *Highley: The Development of a Community, 1550-1880* (Oxford, 1988), p. 201.

<sup>21</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, p. 67. Status A heads were comprised of gentry, land and property owners, magistrates, clergy, lawyers, accountants, farmers employing 20 or more labourers or owning over 350 acres, people of independent means, or any employer with over 25 employees. Status E heads were comprised of unskilled workers, road labourers, hawkers, errand boys etc. For further information on social status and coding for such, see Appendix Two, p. 86.

<sup>22</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," p. 63.

<sup>23</sup> A. Macfarlane, *The Culture of Capitalism* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 145-151.

industrialisation, where the extended family-run agrarian economy was replaced by the nuclear-led factory economies.<sup>24</sup>

Anderson's study of Lancashire in 1851 demonstrates how industrialisation actually reinforced wider contacts with kin. Consequently, both Preston and rural Lancashire exhibited 23% and 27% respectively of its households as containing a non-nuclear relative.<sup>25</sup> A kinsperson would frequently offer jobs to nephews and siblings in a manner easily sanctioned compared with unrelated employers.<sup>26</sup> Regarding rural areas, 18% to 24% of households in the St. Albans region housed kin, in line with York, Oldham and Nottinghamshire.<sup>27</sup> However, based on a subsample of a sample procured by Anderson,<sup>28</sup> Wall concluded that rural areas were more likely to house kin than urban areas, which is interesting given the proportion of kin in industrial Preston.<sup>29</sup>

Another theme centres upon the rise in extended family households that occurred towards the late nineteenth-century. Ruggles argues that extended families increased due to greater income, changing life expectancy and the romantic glorification of home and family in response to rapid socio-economic change. In Ruggles' opinion, extended families "were something of a luxury."<sup>30</sup> However, according to Howlett, increasing co-residence occurred not because "this was the ideal household structure which they sought, but because by living together they could mutually overcome the problems which faced all families and individuals."<sup>31</sup> Nearly 30% of households in Appledore, Devonshire in 1871 contained relatives; they co-resided in houses where the head of the household was absent at sea. Howlett concedes that co-residence was only a temporary solution to the problem of absent parents, but this indicates a rise in the extended family that transcended social barriers.<sup>32</sup> In three West Cornwall mining communities, co-residence increased from 1851 to 1871, arising from the 1866 recession in the copper-mining industry. This has challenged Ruggles'

---

<sup>24</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 1-5.

<sup>25</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," Table 7.3, p. 220.

<sup>26</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 111-135, 171.

<sup>27</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 28, p. 166; Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.8, p. 185; R. Smith, "Early Victorian Household Structure: A Case Study of Nottinghamshire," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1970), pp. 69-84.

<sup>28</sup> This is a one-sixteenth subsample of a one-fiftieth sample from the 1851 Census, derived from Wall's communication with Anderson, see R. Wall, "The Household: Demographic and Economic Change in England, 1650-1970," in R. Wall *et al* (eds.), *Family Forms in Historic Europe* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 493-512.

<sup>29</sup> Wall, "The Household," Table 16.2, p. 497.

<sup>30</sup> S. Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections: The Rise of the Extended Family in Nineteenth-Century England and America* (Madison, 1987), pp. 127-138, quote on p. 128.

<sup>31</sup> N.T. Howlett, "Family and Household in a Nineteenth-Century Devonshire Village," in Mills and Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities*, pp. 298-305, quote on p. 300.

<sup>32</sup> Howlett, "Family and Household," pp. 300-2.

argument that “extended families were far more common among the bourgeoisie than the industrial working-classes.”<sup>33</sup> “Parentless” children started residing with grandparents as parents emigrated from Cornwall to escape economic depression.<sup>34</sup>

Historians have also investigated kinship *beyond* households. In 1851, 60% of the households of Hernhill, Kent were related to one another, whereas only 14% of households were individually extended. Reay attributes this phenomenon to the extent of the inhabitants sharing “strong local origins” to their native parish.<sup>35</sup> The relationship between the number of natives to the parish, and the proportions of kin in the parish, are particularly evident in 1851 St. Albans, where the parishes of Wheathampsted and St. Stephens exhibit a strong correlation between the proportions of native-born inhabitants and kin populations.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the more insular a community, the more likely that wider kin links were prominent due to the absence of geographical mobility.

### 3. Changing Situation of the Elderly, 1851-1891

Another historiographical debate concerns the role of the elderly. In 1851 Preston, 68% of people aged 65 and over lived with married, unmarried and widowed children, whereas only 19% either lived with their spouses or in isolation.<sup>37</sup> Co-residence was effectively a cost-cutting measure, as a young married couple residing with their parents saved in rent and lodgings. Furthermore, widows cared for their grandchildren while the latter’s parents worked in the cotton factories.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, the elderly were primarily supported by their families, for both economic and emotional reasons.

However, Thomson has considered Anderson’s studies atypical. Initially, Thomson critiqued a political campaign of the 1980s for families to return to the “principles of 1834,” where families shouldered responsibility for their elders in accordance with new Poor Law legislation. Presumably, the family primarily cared for their disadvantaged members. Only “modern” societies (that is, post-war British society) produced the complex forms of social organisation enabling the state to care for the elderly. Thomson, however, argues that state intervention occurred across the nineteenth-century and that there was little familial support

---

<sup>33</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, p. 128.

<sup>34</sup> Brayshay, “Depopulation,” pp. 338-341.

<sup>35</sup> B. Reay, *Microhistories: Demography, Society and Culture in Rural England, 1800-1930* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 164-6.

<sup>36</sup> Calculations from Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 13 and Table 25b, p. 128, 161.

<sup>37</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, Table 38, p. 139.

<sup>38</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 139-144.

for their elders. This was based upon the lack of a complex household structure due to high mortality and migration. The elderly benefitted more from institutions outside the family, such as almshouses and poor relief. Thomson's census data for four counties demonstrates how only 40% of elders lived with offspring.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, Thomson proposes that "the late nineteenth-century attempt to shift responsibility for such expensive dependants as the elderly from the community to the family was of major significance."<sup>40</sup> Poor Law pensions halved in 1890 compared with 1860, and a higher presence of co-residence between the elderly and children/wider kin is expected in the 1891 census than 1851.<sup>41</sup>

Parish-level analysis has found a more complex picture. In Colyton, Devonshire, over half of the elderly in 1871 that were aged 50-59 in 1851 were cared for by their offspring, especially daughters.<sup>42</sup> In Hertfordshire, differences were identified between the rural and urban parishes of the St. Albans region in terms of the unemployed widowed elderly. As dependants (that is, not the household head), only 26% in two urban parishes were housed with offspring, compared with 40% in four rural villages. The absence of almshouse accommodation and out-relief in rural parishes meant more reliance on family in these parts.<sup>43</sup> Again, wider studies into the changing situation by 1891 are lacking. However, Charles Booth's contemporary studies of old age in the 1890s detected continuity between 1851 and 1891: familial and neighbourly support for the elderly was more present in rural areas than towns.<sup>44</sup>

### *Methodology*

The foregoing historiography shows that gaps in the study of family and household structure exist, particularly the absence of detailed knowledge from the latest accessible CEBs as compared with the earliest (such as, for example, 1901 with 1851). The propositions by Ruggles over the rise of extended families over time, or whether such a rise was conditioned by the social policies expressed by Thomson, have been under-researched *locally*. However, the digitised 1851 and 1891 CEBs for the county of Hertfordshire will allow examination of those under-researched issues. It must be realised that there are pitfalls in using census data.

---

<sup>39</sup> D. Thomson, "Welfare and the Historians," in L. Bonfield *et al* (eds.), *The World We Have Gained: Essays Presented to Peter Laslett* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 355-378.

<sup>40</sup> Thomson, "Welfare," p. 373.

<sup>41</sup> Thomson, "Welfare," p. 374.

<sup>42</sup> J. Robin, "Family Care of the Elderly in a Nineteenth-Century Devonshire Parish," *Ageing and Society*, No. 4 (1984), pp. 505-516.

<sup>43</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 93-4.

<sup>44</sup> C. Booth, *The Aged Poor in England and Wales* (London, 1894), pp. 339-380; B. Reay, *Rural England* (Hampshire, 2004), pp. 84-5.

For example, while one enumerator may record a lodger as related to the household head, another would class lodgers as independent occupiers in the actual house of the head, as reflected in a couple of Hertfordshire census returns. In 1851 Ware Urban, district 1c, one enumerator separated the lodgers' families from the household head's into three separate schedules. The Edwards and Powell families were designated under schedule 70a and 70b, from the Neale family at schedule 70.<sup>45</sup> Thus, Anderson's recommendation to start with the household head in order to designate a new household can be problematic.<sup>46</sup> While lodgers only represented 19.2% of Ware's population in schedules marked with a letter (a, b) or a cross (x) next to the number, the majority in these schedules in Hertford St. Andrew parish were lodgers, at 90.9%. One enumerator even recorded three people as "Head-Lodger."<sup>47</sup>

In the Butcherley Green Lodging House in Hertford St. John parish, houses in schedules 88 to 91 were comprised of lodgers and their families. In schedule 90, William Hobbs, lodger, was married to Ann Hobbs, "Wife", and Henry and Jane Daws, both lodgers, raised eight-month-old Henry Daws, "Son". In this study, Ann Hobbs would be immediately corrected as a "Lodger's Wife" and Henry Daws as a "Lodger's Son," so that they could be grouped under lodgers for analysis. However, it was difficult to incorporate these schedules in the analysis of household composition, and they were eventually excluded from analysis.<sup>48</sup> Enumerators also interchangeably added "Son's Wife," or simply "Wife," to describe the spouse of a son under the household head, which makes it difficult to distinguish the numbers of wives from that of extended kin. According to Armstrong, "visitor" might have been a genteel term for a "lodger," which is problematic since visitors will be excluded from household size analysis in the earlier tables for Chapter One.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, designating a new household by starting with "Head" in the relationship column causes problems when the enumerators refuse to record a spouse as the household head if the head was absent.<sup>50</sup> Sometimes, enumerators classify the household head as a "Widow" in the relationship column.

Additionally, as Mills and Schürer argue, the CEBs are not an original source, but "a transcription of an original document," since the household head initially filled in the original

---

<sup>45</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators' Books, 1851, Ware Urban, originally from The National Archives (hereafter TNA), HO 107/1705.

<sup>46</sup> M. Anderson, "Standard Tabulation Procedures for the Census Enumerators' Books, 1851-1891," in E.A. Wrigley (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 134-145.

<sup>47</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators' Books, 1851, Hertford St. Andrew, originally from TNA, HO 107/1711.

<sup>48</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators' Books, 1851, Hertford St. John, originally from TNA, HO 107/1711.

<sup>49</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, p. 184.

<sup>50</sup> Anderson, "Standard Tabulation Procedures," pp. 136-137.

schedules, before the enumerator transferred the contents to the CEBs. The books were then tabulated by clerks in the central Census Office in London and they may have reinterpreted the schedules for tabulation.<sup>51</sup> Certain household components may have been specified incorrectly. Higgs found that in the CEBs for Rochdale in 1851 to 1871, a substantial number in domestic service occupations were in fact recorded as related by kinship to the household head, rather than as servants, meaning that a portion of servants may have been overlooked in the tabulation process.<sup>52</sup> Based on a National Sample for 1851, however, Anderson concluded that there was variation by region in the misspecification of servants by county in England and that, overall, 81.0% of the population involved in domestic service occupations were recorded as servants to the household head.<sup>53</sup> It was more complicated in the St. Albans region in Hertfordshire in 1851, as the majority of “housekeepers” were not related to the household head as servants, although nearly all “housemaids” were recorded as servants.<sup>54</sup>

Furthermore, Thomson found variation in accurate age reporting by the elderly. There was a tendency for professional men in Ealing, Middlesex to downplay their age, while the poor may have exaggerated their age so as to receive more generous poor relief. The familiarity of the small Dorset community of Puddleton may explain that enumerators accurately reported the age of the elderly, compared with the more mobile Ealing, which could affect the larger-scale towns of Hertfordshire.<sup>55</sup> Regarding migratory patterns, some enumerators record a hamlet within the parish as the birthplace rather than the parish itself, which may be overlooked. For example, in the 1851 census for Lilley, several people listed their birthplaces as “Mangrove,” a hamlet within Lilley.<sup>56</sup> Across both the 1851 and 1891 CEBs for Aldenham parish, several birthplaces confirm Radlett, a hamlet within Aldenham.<sup>57</sup> Therefore, careful analysis of the address listings is necessary to ensure that all native-born people are represented in their communities.

---

<sup>51</sup> D. Mills and K. Schürer, “Communities in the Victorian Census: An Introduction,” in Mills and Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities*, pp. 1-15, quote on p. 5.

<sup>52</sup> E. Higgs, “The Tabulation of Occupations in the Nineteenth-Century Census, with Special Reference to Domestic Servants,” in N. Goose (ed.), *Women’s Work in Industrial England: Regional and Local Perspectives* (Hatfield, 2007), pp. 250-259.

<sup>53</sup> M. Anderson, “Mis-specification of Servant Occupations in the 1851 Census: A Problem Revisited,” in Goose (ed.), *Women’s Work*, pp. 260-268.

<sup>54</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 146-147.

<sup>55</sup> D. Thomson, “Age Reporting by the Elderly and the Nineteenth-Century Census,” in Mills and Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities*, pp. 86-99.

<sup>56</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators’ Books, 1851, Lilley, originally from TNA, HO 107/1710.

<sup>57</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators’ Books, 1851 and 1891, Aldenham, originally from TNA, HO 107/1714 and RG 12/1117.

There is no reassurance that the census spreadsheets are free from the human error of volunteers that transcribed census returns. Goose, in analysing these for Hertfordshire in 1851, noted that errors were identified when it came to data analysis.<sup>58</sup> In an 1891 digitised manuscript for Barley, one person was inadvertently enumerated as 202 years old and further examination was needed to determine if the individual was 2 years old or 20. A pilot survey of the transcribed 1881 census for Hertfordshire, cross-checked with photocopies of the original manuscripts, also revealed some transcription errors. While the 1881 census transcription was regarded highly overall, Goose argues that the variation in the quality of transcription means it is uncertain which parishes are subjected to the most severe errors.<sup>59</sup> Despite these concerns, those that have scrutinised certain errors such as Perkyns for six Kentish parishes have concluded that a high proportion recorded their ages correctly for the CEBs.<sup>60</sup> Regardless of its pitfalls, the census is a valuable source that has furthered our understanding of families in the local context. Digitised census records mean going beyond local studies that, due to the time-consuming nature of census manuscript study, employ only one or two parishes. In fact, eight Hertfordshire communities would provide analysis of family and household structure based on particular socio-economic characteristics.

One characteristic was the straw plaiting cottage industry that engaged many female and child workers in southern England. It was reported in 1831 that earnings from straw plait were between 8 to 12s per week for a female worker and 3 to 5s per week for a child. The most professional straw bonnet sewers were reported in 1860 by Luton hat manufacturer A.J. Tansley to have earned a weekly wage of 16 to 20s, nearly double the average agricultural labourer's weekly income.<sup>61</sup> Based on the high incomes from straw plait, Goose has found that the trade governed the retention of children in the parental household, thereby keeping families intact.<sup>62</sup> However, it collapsed between 1851 and 1891 due to rising cheap imports from Asia, possibly altering the parent-offspring relationship as children began to migrate in search of work.<sup>63</sup> Therefore, the two "straw-intensive" parishes of Lilley in the Hitchin region and Great Gaddesden in the Hemel Hempstead region will be examined. In Lilley, just over a

---

<sup>58</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, p. 21; Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 25.

<sup>59</sup> N. Goose, "Evaluating the 1881 Census Transcription: a Pilot Survey for Hertfordshire," *History and Computing*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2001) (published 2004), pp. 181-198.

<sup>60</sup> A. Perkyns, "Birthplace Accuracy in the Censuses of Six Kentish Parishes, 1851-1881," in Mills and Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities*, pp. 229-245.

<sup>61</sup> N. Goose, "Cottage Industry, Marriage and Migration in Nineteenth-Century England," *Economic History Review*, Vol. 61, No. 4, (2008) pp. 798-819, quote on p. 804.

<sup>62</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, p. 45.

<sup>63</sup> J. Moore, "The Impact of Agricultural Depression and Land Ownership Change on the County of Hertfordshire, c. 1870-1914" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hertfordshire, 2010), p. 61.



third of the entire population worked in straw plait, and over half of its working population participated in that industry. Great Gaddesden's totals were slightly lower: 20% of the population and over a third of those employed were involved in straw plait.

Hertfordshire was essentially an agricultural county in 1851. It was the dominant occupation for men, proportions so employed ranging from 34% in the Berkhamsted region to 44% in the St. Albans region.<sup>64</sup> Particular attention will be paid to the "agriculturally-charged" communities situated in north-east Hertfordshire, such as in the Royston region, where a low proportion worked in straw plaiting.<sup>65</sup> Its agriculture was characterised by heavy land, chalk hills, turnip and sheep farming, "so suggestive of Cambridgeshire," according to contemporary Henry Evershed.<sup>66</sup> By 1891, the short-term effects of bad weather on heavy-clay soils and the long-term trend of rising wheat imports depressed the region's economy. Between 1851 and 1901, Royston suffered a 26% decline in population, as people migrated to areas with easier access to the railways and London markets.<sup>67</sup> The declining population is likely to show the dramatic alteration of household size locally. Based on these issues, the communities of Barley and Therfield from the Royston region will be analysed. Barley was known as economically stagnating in the mid nineteenth-century. The recent demolition of the cottages of Little Chishill in the late 1840s in order to lower the poor rates produced 28 paupers in Barley, matching the number in the machine-readable returns. There was early population growth towards the 1840s, which was likely caused by earlier marriages and large families.<sup>68</sup> Since the offspring of these large families were more likely to migrate from an agriculturally depressed parish, there may have been a violent change in MHS in 1891 from 1851.

Hertfordshire experienced suburbanisation in the Southern regions, witnessed through railway development and growing populations across the nineteenth-century. In 1864 Evershed pointed out how "villa residences, occupied by families from London, have largely encroached on [Watford's] grass farms."<sup>69</sup> Recent research has indicated a substantial demographic group residing in suburban Hertfordshire, comprising of clerks, engineers and

---

<sup>64</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 2, p. 30; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 2, p. 41.

<sup>65</sup> Goose, "Cottage Industry," Table 2, p. 802.

<sup>66</sup> H. Evershed, "Agriculture of Hertfordshire," *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society*, No. 25, (1864), pp. 269-302, quote on p. 271.

<sup>67</sup> Moore, "Agricultural Depression," pp. 50-62, from data procured by Nigel Goose for the article, "Population, 1801-1901," in D. Short (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Hertfordshire* (Hatfield, 2011), pp. 56-7.

<sup>68</sup> J. Wilkerson, *Two Ears of Barley: Chronicle of an English Village* (Royston, 1969), pp. 79-80.

<sup>69</sup> Evershed, "Agriculture," p. 283.

barristers.<sup>70</sup> Since MHS is generally higher where the household head is of higher status, investigating areas with closer proximity to London may show a slow decline in MHS. The parishes of Aldenham and Bushey from the Watford region will represent the “suburban” communities: Aldenham was a suburban magnet containing the growing hamlet of Radlett, which experienced the development of two suburban estates.<sup>71</sup> Bushey also encountered extensive building work “rather oddly about the village and old hamlets of the parish,” based on having its own station on the main line of the London and North Western Railway.<sup>72</sup>

Finally, this project will investigate Hertfordshire’s market towns. While they were not strictly urban in the industrial sense, they were small towns that interacted with the countryside in the provision of markets and fairs for the sale of agricultural and manufactured products.<sup>73</sup> Changes in 1891 from 1851 will again be considered to witness the impact of population growth and urbanisation on family and household structure.<sup>74</sup> The towns analysed will be the urban part of Ware parish, and the three parishes in the Hertford region of All Saints, St. Andrew and St. John, amalgamated throughout this study as Hertford Urban. Despite Hertford’s geographical connections with Ware, they were quite different from one another: Hertford was the county and assize town of Hertfordshire; a political borough represented by two MPs.<sup>75</sup> A higher degree of “genteel” inhabitants immersed themselves in urban life, contributing to charity and improving the town’s conditions.<sup>76</sup> Ware Urban, however, was not associated with political administration, attracting 48 fewer people in the highest social group than in Hertford in the 1851 census. Regardless, it was highly concentrated on the brewery industry, of which there were “as many as 80 maltings”.<sup>77</sup>

In Chapter One, the changing household size of eight Hertfordshire communities in 1851 and 1891 will be assessed. Subsequently, MHS will be examined in relation to socio-economic groups, using status codes recorded in the digitised CEBs.<sup>78</sup> This will be discussed for both 1851 and 1891 to test whether nearly all social groups shared a similar MHS from 1891

---

<sup>70</sup> Moore, “Agricultural Depression,” p. 55.

<sup>71</sup> Moore, “Agricultural Depression,” p. 54.

<sup>72</sup> Bushey Museum Trust, *Bushey Then and Now: Introduction* (1986), pp. 11-13; Kelly’s Trade Directory (1890), Bushey, p. 732; Moore, “Agricultural Depression,” p. 54.

<sup>73</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 51.

<sup>74</sup> Moore, “Agricultural Depression,” pp. 50-52.

<sup>75</sup> Post Office Trade Directory (1855), Hertford, p. 208; F.M Page, *History of Hertford* (Hertford, 1959), pp. 136-145.

<sup>76</sup> Page, *Hertford*, pp. 136-137.

<sup>77</sup> Post Office Trade Directory (1855), Ware, p. 241.

<sup>78</sup> For further information, see Appendix Two, p. 86.

onwards, as previous studies have shown.<sup>79</sup> Household components can be filtered. For example, offspring can be calculated individually based on their mean numbers per household and by percentages in the parish. Anderson's 1851 rural and urban samples, which mostly parallel the rural parishes and market towns representing this study's sample, will be useful for comparative purposes. Dissecting each component of the household for the 1891 results explains changing household composition. For example, MHS may have fallen as the proportions of servants in the parish fell more dramatically than other household components.

A consideration of marital status, age structure and sex ratio will confirm how demography affects family compositions. In Bassingham, MHS fell not only because of agricultural changes, but because its population became much older, which made the presence of small/lone households more likely.<sup>80</sup> However, an overview of occupational structure will indicate how the economy played a role in family structure. This will take into account the significance of family industries in strengthening MHS, such as in the straw plaiting industries, or the brewery industry in urban Ware, the latter of which has been less well-researched for Hertfordshire.

In Chapter Two, the proportion of households with kin will be examined to reveal patterns within the selected parishes (for example, rural to urban fluctuations). The 1851 data will be cross-checked against 1891 in order to determine the extent to which extended households increased in accordance with Ruggles' argument.<sup>81</sup> Calculating the numbers of households with kin by the household head's occupation can reveal the type of economy responsible for producing the percentage of kin inside the household. This can include the relationship between kinship and craft occupations as identified by Reay in Hernhill, Kent.<sup>82</sup> The digitised census enables an examination of the types of kin in households, such as grandchildren, nephews, nieces and siblings. Kinship beyond the household will be assessed by calculating the number of identical surnames in different schedules. Relationships will be examined through the household head, age and birthplace to logically speculate if, for example, two heads of the household were blood related. This is because reconstituting families through parish registers would be time-consuming. Furthermore, it is more practical to investigate kinship links between households through small-scale rural communities and a sample of sub-enumeration districts from larger parishes.

---

<sup>79</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," p. 63.

<sup>80</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," p. 58.

<sup>81</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, *passim*.

<sup>82</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, p. 166.

The role of the elderly will be assessed in Chapter Three. The age at which one becomes “elderly” has been disputed, although individuals over 65 years will represent the elderly to facilitate comparisons with Anderson’s data.<sup>83</sup> To determine if changes to the Poor Laws encouraged greater family support towards their elders, results from 1891 will be compared with 1851. The elderly will be broken down based on their roles as household head and dependants, employed against unemployed and by gender, to chart where care by offspring was most likely. Some census enumerators recorded whether certain individuals received parish relief. This would opportunistically assess Reay’s argument that “life was seldom a simple choice between family or Poor Law or collectivity; instead, we should think of life-course strategies, of a constant negotiation which drew upon available resources.”<sup>84</sup> Therefore, this study will consult the CD-Rom of the 1851 census for Hertfordshire to chart variations by region in the support of the elderly on poor relief by offspring and kin. Furthermore, the 1881 census will examine the household arrangements of the elderly that were recorded in poor relief application books for the Hertford Union from 1876 to 1881.

#### *The Benefits of a Comparative Assessment through Digitised Census Data*

The digitised 1851 and 1891 census will provide a fruitful path into a comparative assessment of changing household composition. Despite this, using two digitised records spaced across 40 years can pose problems. The events in-between are not taken into account, which means one cannot pinpoint the exact period when local demographic or economic changes took place. Therefore, this thesis will chart the extent of the decline (or increase) in MHS in the 1891 records compared with 1851. According to the published census reports, MHS fell marginally to 4.60 in 1891 from 1851’s 4.73, although MHS could fall by a greater percentage based on the community.<sup>85</sup> Also, since the initial project to digitise the 1891 census was incomplete, some parishes lack occupational codes and individual status designation. The solution was to add the status and occupational codes manually, based on an Excel spreadsheet that covered all occupations from the 1851 census and its status designation.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> P. Thane, *Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues* (Oxford, 2000), p. 167; S.O. Rose, “The Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly in Three English Villages: Nottinghamshire, 1851-1881,” *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (May 1988), pp. 101-122.

<sup>84</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, p. 174.

<sup>85</sup> Laslett, “Mean Household Size,” Table 4.4, p. 138.

<sup>86</sup> I am wholly indebted to Professor Nigel Goose for supplying me spreadsheets outlined with detailed occupations, occupational codes and social statuses associated with occupations.

This project is innovative in the consideration of changing household and family structure from a comparative *and* local perspective. This study will also appreciate the changing society and economy of Victorian Hertfordshire across 40 years, closer to Anderson's recommendation of 50 years.<sup>87</sup> The hypothesis is that family structure was not consistent throughout the nineteenth-century. It was governed by the changing local economic environment, not entirely by demographic circumstances such as falling fertility. For Hertfordshire, this concerned rural depopulation, urbanisation, a declining cottage industry and the railway boom. The variation in household composition would affect the proportions of wider kin and residential care by offspring of the elderly. This thesis will examine revisionist views that wider kin were more significant to community life than believed and familial care towards the elderly more widespread. From these hypotheses, this thesis will test the historiographical issues that have long needed a local and regional investigation.

---

<sup>87</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," p. 56.

## Chapter One:

### CHANGING HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND STRUCTURE IN MID-VICTORIAN HERTFORDSHIRE, 1851-1891

This chapter examines changing household size and composition across eight Hertfordshire communities over 40 years. The parishes will be grouped as “the Hertfordshire sample” to facilitate comparisons with previous studies. To understand how household composition changed, the digitised Census Enumerators’ Books (CEBs) of 1851 and 1891 for Hertfordshire will be compared and contrasted. When these records are digitised, they allow a comprehensive account of household size. This means clearer understanding of the relationship between size and occupation, age profile and social status. Components of the household head can be broken down by percentages of the population and mean numbers per household. A comparative assessment for both 1851 and 1891 will test the argument that household structure was not consistent across all parishes throughout the nineteenth-century through local perspectives.<sup>1</sup> As we will see, there were local differences rather than a uniform picture, and these were evident when analysing communities with the same economic characteristics. While household size and structure appeared consistent when the populations and households of all eight communities are combined, in some localities, household size appeared to sharply fall or increase. It was not only economic circumstances that determined these results, but geography, cultural ideals and administrative policies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Laslett, “Mean Household Size,” pp. 125-158.

Table 1.1 - Changing Household Size, 1851 and 1891

|           | 1851  |         |      | 1891  |         |      |
|-----------|-------|---------|------|-------|---------|------|
|           | Pop   | H'holds | MHS  | Pop   | H'holds | MHS  |
| Lilley    | 498   | 102     | 4.88 | 507   | 108     | 4.69 |
| Great Gad | 1129  | 223     | 5.06 | 839   | 190     | 4.42 |
| Barley    | 840   | 175     | 4.80 | 544   | 134     | 4.06 |
| Therfield | 1310  | 258     | 5.08 | 962   | 223     | 4.31 |
| Aldenham  | 1566  | 330     | 4.75 | 1738  | 374     | 4.65 |
| Bushey    | 2567  | 565     | 4.54 | 5351  | 1176    | 4.55 |
| Hert Urb  | 4371  | 963     | 4.54 | 5341  | 1138    | 4.69 |
| Ware Urb  | 4010  | 894     | 4.49 | 5267  | 1161    | 4.54 |
| RURAL     | 3777  | 758     | 4.98 | 2852  | 655     | 4.35 |
| URBAN     | 12514 | 2752    | 4.55 | 17697 | 3849    | 4.60 |
| TOTAL     | 16291 | 3510    | 4.64 | 20549 | 4504    | 4.56 |

*Notes:* These results exclude visitors, lodging houses, public houses, inns, prisons and the workhouse. The “Rural” collective totals are represented by the parishes of Lilley, Great Gaddesden, Barley and Therfield; the “Urban” collective represented by the parishes of Aldenham, Bushey, Hertford Urban and Ware Urban.

*Source:* Digitised Census Enumerators’ Books (CEBs). Unless otherwise stated, all subsequent tables in this thesis are sourced from the digitised CEBs provided by Professor Nigel Goose.

Table 1.1 presents changing household size in 1851 and 1891. The only households excluded are quasi-institutions comprising inns, lodging houses, hotels, schools and Union Workhouses. The only individuals excluded from the recorded households are visitors, which other historians have excluded from their studies, as it is unclear whether they permanently resided in the household.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, Table 1.1 examines 16,291 souls in 1851 from the original total of 19,091 and 20,549 individuals from 22,831 in 1891.<sup>3</sup>

For 1851, the results appear unsurprising, as household size ranged from 4.49 in Ware to 5.08 in Therfield, indicating that households were predominantly of moderate size. The range is slightly wider than Laslett’s calculations for the 100 pre-industrial communities recorded from 1574 to 1821, which ranged from 4.47 to 4.77 but less so compared with the Berkhamsted region, ranging from 4.36 to 5.10, the St. Albans region at 4.25 to 5.45 and Mills’ Rural Norm at 4.09 to 6.07.<sup>4</sup> The overall mean household size (MHS) for the Hertfordshire sample is 4.64, a few points behind the published national figure of 4.73 and

<sup>2</sup> Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, pp. 355-356.

<sup>3</sup> Population totals for the eight communities calculated from Moore, “Agricultural Depression,” Appendix 2A, p. 256, and based on data produced by Nigel Goose.

<sup>4</sup> Laslett, “Mean Household Size,” Table 4.4, p. 138; Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 10, p. 61; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 20, p. 149; Information from Mills’ Rural Norm quoted in Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 148.

Anderson's national sample of 4.75.<sup>5</sup> The straw-intensive parishes of Lilley and Great Gaddesden collectively exhibited the highest MHS at 5.01, on par with Cardington in Bedfordshire, another straw-intensive parish with a low sex ratio and high female employment.<sup>6</sup> Coming second were the farming parishes of Therfield and Barley, at 4.97, echoing the traditional agricultural communities of rural Lancashire and Borden in Kent, totalling 5.50, and 4.90.<sup>7</sup> This is plausible given the high employment patterns of parents and offspring in agricultural labour, coupled with the maintenance of offspring in households.

The suburban parishes of Aldenham and Bushey collectively totalled 4.62, with the market towns of Hertford and Ware lagging behind at 4.51. The low MHS may be associated with the high proportions widowed and living alone, despite the wild fluctuation of towns in the wider context, from 4.26 in St. Albans town, to 5.40 in Swindon, Wiltshire.<sup>8</sup> In parishes with high MHS, Great Gaddesden and Therfield, 18.8% and 28.9% of household heads in households of one to two people were widowed, compared with two of the lowest in Bushey (4.54) and Ware Urban (4.49), where the widowed represented 37.1% and 34.6% respectively. The relationship between low MHS and high widowhood is also positive in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions.<sup>9</sup> Of all individuals aged 65 and over and residing in small households, 50.0% in Ware Urban were either independent housing proprietors, paupers or poor relief recipients. In Hertford Urban and Bushey, around a quarter to a third of individuals aged 65 and over in small households were independent proprietors or paupers, and the reason for Ware's high result is the number of almshouses. Overall, the Hertfordshire sample for 1851 fairly reflects Wall's conclusions from Anderson's samples: rural households were proportionately larger than urban ones owing to child employment in rural areas, and the ageing demographic profile in towns.<sup>10</sup>

When it comes to 1891, however, the tendency for rural households to be larger than urban houses is reversed. Three of the four rural parishes suffered depopulation and a housing

---

<sup>5</sup> Laslett, "Mean Household Size," Table 4.4, p. 138; M. Anderson, "Households, Families and Individuals: Some Preliminary Results from the National Sample from the 1851 Census of Great Britain," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Dec. 1988), pp. 421-438.

<sup>6</sup> Tranter, "Social Structure," pp. 90-106.

<sup>7</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," p. 219; D.G. Jackson, *The Population of Borden in 1851: A Study of a North Kent Village Based on the 1851 Census Enumerators' Books* (private publication, Congleton, 1997), p. 13.

<sup>8</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 148-9; D. Constable, *Household Structure in Three English Market Towns*, Geographical Papers, No. 55, University of Reading, (1977), calculations from Goose, *Berkhamsted*, p. 62n

<sup>9</sup> Calculations from Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Tables 3 and 10, pp. 31, 61 and Goose, *St. Albans*, Tables 1 and 20, pp. 34, 149.

<sup>10</sup> Richard Wall's studies represent a one-sixteenth subsample of a one-fiftieth sample from the 1851 Census, derived from his personal communication with Anderson: "The Household," pp. 493-512.



shortage, which inevitably lowered MHS. In fact, Barley's fall from 4.80 in 1851 to 4.06 in 1891 is very similar to figures for Bassingham, Lincolnshire of 4.82 to 4.00 over 40 years.<sup>11</sup> Lilley, on the other hand, experienced an increase in the non-visitor population and a housing boom, in spite of the straw plait industry's decline by 1891. Its MHS fell to 4.69 from 1851's 4.88, but this was a less severe decline. Therefore, a fall in cottage industry did not speed up the decline in MHS as witnessed in many rural parishes. 9.1% of individuals in Lilley still worked in straw plait or hat manufacturing in 1891. In Great Gaddesden, despite experiencing a sharper fall in MHS, 8.8% of individuals plaited or manufactured straw. Out of all occupations for offspring aged between 15 and 29, 31.3% in Lilley and 17.3% in Great Gaddesden were in straw. The MHS for households hosting offspring/kin aged 15-29 and working in straw was 5.26 in Lilley and 5.25 in Great Gaddesden, governed by the retention of offspring in cottage industry. Henry Evershed's comments in 1864 that straw work "retains [children] at home" rings true for the late nineteenth-century, despite the economic dislocation found in rural parishes.<sup>12</sup>

The farming-intensive areas entirely reflect previous research identifying a correlation between declining household size and agricultural depression.<sup>13</sup> The MHS for Barley and Therfield combined totalled 4.22, lower than the straw parishes at 4.52, and conforms to recent research that rural depopulation in Hertfordshire was very severe in the north-eastern clay districts.<sup>14</sup> Between 1851 and 1901, Therfield and Barley exhibited a decrease in population of 42% and 36% respectively. The price of wheat, barley and oats in Hertfordshire reached their lowest peak in 1895.<sup>15</sup> The Buntingford Union, subsumed under the Royston Superintendent Registrar's District, was reported in 1893 in the *Royal Commission on Labour*. Assistant Poor Law Commissioner Cecil M. Chapman described Buntingford as almost a ghost town, "by no means a busy or flourishing place," with cottages "shockingly bad," "squatters [...] who built their own cottages of clay and sticks," and a "difficulty about water supply."<sup>16</sup> There are also references to agrarian workers lured by the prospects of London. Chapman writes: "although the proximity of the district to London has the effect of drawing away most of the best labourers, it has not resulted in a rise of wages for those who remain behind." He further adds, "There do not appear to be any opportunities in the Union

---

<sup>11</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 2, p. 61.

<sup>12</sup> Evershed, "Agriculture of Hertfordshire," p. 315.

<sup>13</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," pp. 57-8.

<sup>14</sup> Moore, "Agricultural Depression," pp. 56-7, from data procured by Nigel Goose.

<sup>15</sup> Moore, "Agricultural Depression," p. 88.

<sup>16</sup> British Parliamentary Papers, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour: The Agricultural Labour*, Vol. 1, England, Part II, p. 148.

of earning money by other employments, although in the adjoining Union of Hitchin both glove-making and straw-plaiting are common enough.”<sup>17</sup> Employer Mr. Bolton commented: “The further from London, the better is the feeling between masters and men[.] Everybody has relatives in London, and young men constantly say to their employers, ‘I don’t care nought for you.’”<sup>18</sup> The Buntingford report reflects the contrasting results in MHS for Barley and Therfield in 1891 from 1851. A declining youthful population anticipated a more ageing and isolated community living in smaller households. Chapman comments: “The young men of intelligence have left the country, and nothing but oldish men, or men hampered by their circumstances, are left behind.”<sup>19</sup>

As for suburban communities, Aldenham and Bushey collectively fell from 4.62 in 1851 to 4.57 in 1891, reflecting the steady fall recorded nationally over 40 years. Conversely, MHS in market towns increased over 40 years: Hertford climbed from 4.54 to 4.69, with Ware rising to 4.54 from 4.49. Collectively, they totalled 4.61, one point above the 1891 national total.<sup>20</sup> Population increase and demand for housing produced this rise. However, despite doubling population and housing figures in Bushey, and steady increases in Aldenham, this did not produce a rise in MHS in Aldenham, while Bushey’s MHS rose by only one point. Conversely, immigration violently changed MHS in industrialising Highley, Shropshire, at 4.3 in 1871 to 5.2 in 1881.<sup>21</sup> The relationship between greater economic opportunities, urbanisation (or suburbanisation) and in-migration cannot account alone for an increase in household size.

While the overall MHS for the 1891 data, slightly below the national average of 4.60, was affected by the selection of agriculturally depressed parishes, it was the growth in population in the urban and suburban parishes that produced a stable MHS in the sample. Despite this, rural Lilley, thanks partly to the straw industry’s maintenance of offspring, contained the highest MHS. The historian, therefore, must examine communities in the light of their unique economic and demographic characteristics regardless of an assumed rural-urban dichotomy.

---

<sup>17</sup> BPP, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour*, pp. 149-153.

<sup>18</sup> BPP, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour*, p. 157.

<sup>19</sup> BPP, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour*, p. 157.

<sup>20</sup> Laslett, “Mean Household Size,” Table 4.4, p. 138.

<sup>21</sup> Nair, *Highley*, p. 201.

Table 1.2 - Percentages of Households of Different Sizes, 1851 and 1891

|                             | 1851 |        |        |      | 1891 |        |        |      |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|------|
|                             | Lone | 1 to 2 | 3 to 6 | 7+   | Lone | 1 to 2 | 3 to 6 | 7+   |
| <i>Hertfordshire Sample</i> |      |        |        |      |      |        |        |      |
| Lilley                      | 2.9  | 13.7   | 59.8   | 26.5 | 1.9  | 20.4   | 57.4   | 22.2 |
| Great Gad                   | 3.6  | 14.3   | 60.5   | 25.1 | 6.8  | 23.7   | 61.1   | 15.3 |
| Barley                      | 4.6  | 21.1   | 55.4   | 23.4 | 11.9 | 32.8   | 49.3   | 17.9 |
| Therfield                   | 1.6  | 17.4   | 54.3   | 28.3 | 9.4  | 27.8   | 50.7   | 21.5 |
| Aldenham                    | 6.4  | 22.7   | 53.9   | 23.3 | 4.9  | 21.9   | 55.2   | 21.1 |
| Bushey                      | 6.0  | 20.5   | 59.6   | 19.8 | 4.8  | 19.5   | 61.6   | 19.0 |
| Hertford                    | 5.8  | 22.0   | 57.7   | 20.2 | 4.9  | 21.1   | 56.9   | 22.0 |
| Ware                        | 6.0  | 22.7   | 59.5   | 17.7 | 8.0  | 24.1   | 55.3   | 20.6 |
| RURAL                       | 3.0  | 16.9   | 57.1   | 26.3 | 4.7  | 26.4   | 54.5   | 19.1 |
| URBAN                       | 6.0  | 22.1   | 58.2   | 19.7 | 5.8  | 21.6   | 57.8   | 20.6 |
| TOTAL                       | 5.4  | 21.0   | 58.0   | 21.1 | 5.7  | 22.3   | 57.3   | 20.3 |

Table 1.2 examines the proportions of households of different sizes in 1851 and 1891. These are broken down by lone households (1 in a household only), small households (1-2), moderate households (3-6) and large households (7+). In 1851, 3.0% of all rural households contained a sole occupant, compared with 6.0% in urban ones. Comparatively, the number of rural solitaires is much lower than rates for the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions at 3.7% and 6.5% respectively, York at 5.1% and especially against Brough, Westmorland, where over one in ten lived alone.<sup>22</sup> However, while the rate of Hertfordshire's rural solitaires is on par with the rural Lancashire sample, it is still above the number in towns such as Preston, Hanley in Staffordshire and far behind rural Boughton and Dunkirk in Kent, which reached 8.9% and 9.9% respectively.<sup>23</sup> Despite this, cottage industry and agriculture are more conducive to family labour, extending the numbers in a household. As already explained, urban parishes exhibit a greater degree of isolation in the household, at 6.0%, due to the numbers widowed and the prominence of retired independent proprietors and paupers.

In 1891, there was a higher number of lone households in Hertfordshire, conforming to previous studies of Hernhill, Brough and the suburban Claremont/Woodside estate in Glasgow.<sup>24</sup> Lone households declined slightly in three of four urban parishes, while they rocketed in three of four rural communities. The worst affected was Barley, with 11.9% of all

<sup>22</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 151; Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," p. 219; Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 4, p. 63.

<sup>23</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," p. 219; D.A. Gatley, *Hanley in 1851 Revisited: A Survey Based on the Census Returns* (Staffordshire University, 1996), Table 3.4, p. 8; Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.1, p. 159.

<sup>24</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.2, p. 159; Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 4, p. 63; E. Gordon and G. Nair, *Public Lives: Women, Family and Society in Victorian Britain* (London, 2003), Table 3, p. 36.

its households solitary; in fact, it is similar to Bassingham's 12.4%, and both experienced a changing demographic profile conditioned by agricultural depression.<sup>25</sup> In Great Gaddesden, Barley and Therfield's 50 lone households, 82.0% contained individuals aged 50 and over, with 54.0% widowed. As already discussed, the continuance of the straw trade in Lilley warded off a declining family structure in the 1890s, and could account for the decrease in lone households. Alternatively, Lilley's geographical position away from the Royston region, characterised by its inadequate railway links to London and heavier soils, meant that agriculture relatively prospered in the Hitchin region.<sup>26</sup>

Small households were also mainly associated with rural parishes, with a jump from 16.9% in 1851 to 26.4% in 1891. 32.8% of Barley households were small, and again, this corresponds to Bassingham's 33.5%.<sup>27</sup> Lilley, despite a fall in solitary households, saw small households soaring as well, characterised not by an ageing population, but the relative youthfulness of its household heads. Small households were less prominent in urban areas, with the exception of Ware, as nearly one in ten of Ware's small household occupants resided in almshouses, coupled with a proportion of 9.3% recorded as "living on own means." In these respects, the decline of small households over time is consistent with population growth in the majority of urban communities.

Population growth meant a rise in large households in market towns. Kelly's Trade Directory for Ware in 1890 describes the principal trade in the town as the malting industry.<sup>28</sup> In terms of household heads working in malt-making and bricklaying, 26.8% lived in large households, compared with 17.9% in small households. In Hertford, 29.1% of general labouring heads hosted seven or more individuals, perhaps involved in the town's iron foundries, or working in the local oil mill at Thornton Street, as recorded for three individuals.<sup>29</sup> Hertford's trade directories confirm the development of the Great Eastern Railway in 1888, when a new passenger station was constructed nearer the town from the main line at neighbouring parish Broxbourne.<sup>30</sup> Ware also had its own station on the Broxbourne and Hertford branch of the Great Eastern Railway.<sup>31</sup> The MHS for Ware and Hertford's railway-occupied heads were 6.00 and 5.82 respectively. An explanation for the

---

<sup>25</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 4, p. 63.

<sup>26</sup> Moore, "Agricultural Depression," p. 65.

<sup>27</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 4, p. 63.

<sup>28</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Ware, p. 847.

<sup>29</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Hertford, p. 765.

<sup>30</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Hertford, p. 764.

<sup>31</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Ware, p. 846.

increasing moderately-sized households in Aldenham and Bushey is also the railway boom on the London and North Western Railway for Bushey and the Midlands railway in the hamlet of Radlett in Aldenham.<sup>32</sup> The MHS for railway-occupied heads in Bushey was 5.31, although in Aldenham, it was 3.80, possibly attributed to agricultural labour cancelling out the number of railway workers.

A new institution established in 1888, a School of Art held at Bushey House, may explain the 103 individuals recorded as “painters,” “student of art,” and “paperhanger.”<sup>33</sup> It was opened by Professor Hubert Von Herkomer and is considered to be the first art school in the country to be located in ruralised settings. Landscape paintings were to be produced outdoors to capture, as an account expressed in 1897, “the quiet and other surrounding charm of the country.”<sup>34</sup> It further adds that “not only are [students] householders to a considerable extent, but they are distributed all over the village and neighbourhood where lodgings are to be found.”<sup>35</sup> Over one-fifth of the artists recorded were lodgers, although they only represented 14.3% of the non-public house lodging population. A substantial portion headed their own households, over half of which comprised less than two rooms.<sup>36</sup> Their presence may explain why MHS rose very little in Bushey over 40 years, for the collective MHS of households comprising heads affiliated to the school was 4.00, under the average of 4.55. Conclusively, educational establishments and the cultural appreciation of the rural landscape governed changing household structures alongside in-migration and economic prospects.

---

<sup>32</sup> Kelly’s Trade Directory (1890), Bushey, p. 732 and Aldenham, p. 695.

<sup>33</sup> Kelly’s Trade Directory (1890), Bushey, p. 733.

<sup>34</sup> Quoted in F.A. Barrett, *Ernest Ibbetson: Military Artist and Adventure Story Illustrator* (Toronto, 2008), p. 10.

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in Barrett, *Ernest Ibbetson*, p. 10.

<sup>36</sup> The 1891 census gives details on the number of rooms based in a particular schedule.

Table 1.3a – Mean Household Size and Social Group, 1851

|           | A     | B    | C    | D    | E    | F    | Z    |
|-----------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lilley    | 8.50  | 7.00 | 5.38 | 4.56 | 4.25 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Great Gad | 10.00 | 6.06 | 4.94 | 4.89 | 4.53 | 5.00 | 3.67 |
| Barley    | 4.36  | 6.33 | 4.50 | 5.06 | 5.33 | 3.47 | 4.00 |
| Therfield | 8.40  | 4.95 | 5.20 | 5.14 | 3.67 | 3.08 | 0.00 |
| Aldenham  | 8.14  | 4.68 | 4.88 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 2.31 | 3.00 |
| Bushey    | 4.30  | 3.96 | 4.79 | 4.65 | 4.67 | 2.77 | 3.78 |
| Hertford  | 5.34  | 4.92 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 2.34 | 4.25 |
| Ware      | 4.85  | 3.67 | 4.95 | 4.41 | 4.20 | 2.27 | 5.00 |
| RURAL     | 6.83  | 5.75 | 4.95 | 4.97 | 4.48 | 3.61 | 3.80 |
| URBAN     | 5.25  | 4.36 | 4.79 | 4.49 | 4.41 | 2.36 | 4.00 |
| TOTAL     | 5.45  | 4.62 | 4.81 | 4.68 | 4.42 | 2.69 | 3.96 |

Table 1.3b – Mean Household Size and Social Group, 1891

|           | A     | B              | C    | D    | E    | F    | Z    |
|-----------|-------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lilley    | 12.00 | 6.29<br>(6.29) | 5.05 | 4.39 | 2.67 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Great Gad | 12.20 | 4.00<br>(4.36) | 4.52 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 1.67 | 2.00 |
| Barley    | 6.50  | 4.00<br>(5.14) | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Therfield | 4.67  | 3.85<br>(5.08) | 4.08 | 4.51 | 3.42 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Aldenham  | 7.13  | 4.38<br>(5.48) | 4.81 | 4.74 | 4.30 | 1.73 | 3.00 |
| Bushey    | 6.12  | 3.83<br>(4.22) | 4.85 | 4.39 | 4.56 | 3.33 | 5.50 |
| Hertford  | 7.75  | 3.90<br>(4.72) | 5.00 | 4.54 | 4.82 | 3.04 | 3.86 |
| Ware      | 5.95  | 4.06<br>(4.98) | 4.77 | 4.76 | 4.57 | 2.35 | 4.80 |
| RURAL     | 9.33  | 4.23<br>(5.05) | 4.41 | 4.35 | 3.29 | 1.83 | 2.00 |
| URBAN     | 6.66  | 3.96<br>(4.67) | 4.86 | 4.60 | 4.62 | 2.66 | 4.33 |
| TOTAL     | 6.96  | 3.99<br>(4.72) | 4.83 | 4.52 | 4.56 | 2.60 | 4.19 |

*Notes:* Figures in parentheses exclude households where head is recorded as “living on own means.” For further information about the Social Code Scheme, see Appendix Two, p. 86.

Tables 1.3a and 1.3b discuss the relationship between MHS and the status of household heads. Table 1.3a reveals a positive association between social group and MHS at the upper and lower scales. In some parishes, unskilled households in Group E are larger than semi-skilled ones (Group D), and, overall, skilled households (C) are larger than lesser-professional ones (B). The latter phenomenon was not replicated in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions.<sup>37</sup> As for unskilled households, Class V households in 1851 York averaged 4.80, far above the total for semi-skilled households at 4.15.<sup>38</sup> Both Group E households in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions and Class V houses in York contained a higher concentration of children, attributed to the lower proportions of servants.<sup>39</sup>

The four designated rural parishes exhibit a somewhat positive association, as St. Albans' rural communities did, although the MHS of Group D households were slightly higher than in Group C households.<sup>40</sup> Urban households present a more complex picture: semi-skilled households (D) were larger than lesser-professional households (B) and, apart from Group A, Group C has the highest MHS. Household size for Group B individuals overall was depressed by the figure in urban parishes of 4.36, attributed to those of independent means and public service workers. Previous research reveals that they contained fewer spouses and children due to the ageing profile of the household head.<sup>41</sup> In contrast, skilled households in urban parishes were larger. In Ware, which exhibited the highest MHS for Group C in urban areas, the local malt-making industry was an occupation performed by 25.9% of male offspring.

The conclusion that MHS was highest in more affluent households needs reconsideration. Barley had an incongruously low MHS for Group A of 4.36 and this is again ascribed to public service work. Contrastingly, Group D households in Barley and Therfield, which primarily represent agricultural labourers, had a high MHS of 5.06 and 5.14. Since the Royston region, throughout the mid nineteenth-century, produced higher fertility rates than other Hertfordshire regions, demography may have affected MHS through the numbers of offspring raised.<sup>42</sup> Group D household sizes for Barley and Therfield are higher than all the

---

<sup>37</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 13, p. 67; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 23, p. 156.

<sup>38</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.13, p. 189.

<sup>39</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 16, p. 73; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 29a, p. 168; Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.13, p. 189.

<sup>40</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 23, p. 156.

<sup>41</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 30a, p. 170.

<sup>42</sup> Goose, "Cottage Industry," p. 810; N. Goose, "How Saucy did it Make the Poor? The Straw Plait and Hat Trades, Illegitimate Fertility and the Family in Nineteenth-Century Hertfordshire," *History*, Vol. 91, No. 304, pp. 530-556.

Berkhamsted and St. Albans communities apart from Wigginton.<sup>43</sup> Bushey was unorthodox in that Groups A and B produced an average MHS of only 4.14, a far cry from York's 5.31 for Groups I and II, or Bassingham's 6.07 for professionals and farmers.<sup>44</sup> As discussed earlier, a strong correlation exists between fundholders, annuitants and housing proprietors and an unmarried and widowed population. An examination of the birthplaces of Bushey's Group A and B individuals that resided in small households shows that nearly half were native to Middlesex and London parishes, so perhaps people in old age were inclined to retire in the Hertfordshire countryside away from a more urban environment.

In 1891, Group B households exhibited smaller household sizes irrespective of rural to urban discrepancies. However, this is based on categorising those "living on own means" in the lesser-professional category. Excluding these household heads reveals that MHS and social group was fairly positive in the late nineteenth-century regardless of economic and social change. This is despite the higher MHS of skilled households over lesser-professional households, and that found for unskilled over semi-skilled households. In spite of agricultural depression, the MHS of Group B in the rural group was still over five. It was in groups beyond B where MHS declined to below average levels for 1891 in Hertfordshire. In Groups C to F in the rural parishes, the number of households declined over 40 years, particularly in Group D, primarily represented by agricultural labourers, with a fall from 485 households to 430. Rural Group E households only fell by one from 1851 to 1891, yet it registered the biggest decline from 4.48 to 3.29. Strikingly, there were only 1.83 persons in Group F. Three of five Group F heads in Barley were recorded as widowed and receiving poor relief, reflecting the Buntingford Union report regarding the numbers of ageing people seeking the parish for assistance.<sup>45</sup> With no recourse to kin, this created a polarising effect in household size. Rather than a narrowing range in household sizes for each social group over time, as seen in Bassingham and in twentieth-century census reports, a widening range was identified for the rural parishes.<sup>46</sup> Subtracting the highest social group MHS, 9.33 in Group A, against 1.83 in Group F, gives a result of 7.50, whereas the range in rural households in 1851 was 3.22.

---

<sup>43</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 13, p. 67; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 23, p. 156.

<sup>44</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.3, p. 189; Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 5, p. 63.

<sup>45</sup> BPP, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour*, p. 149.

<sup>46</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," Table 5, p. 63; D. Marsh, *The Changing Social Structure in England and Wales, 1871-1961* (London, 1965), pp. 50-55.



The household sizes of Groups C, D and E in urban parishes were above the average for the Hertfordshire sample overall, since these social groups increased in population and households. The range across all household sizes for each social group was less polarised, compared with the rural parishes, at 4.00, an increase from 2.89 for 1851. Furthermore, Group A households experienced a surge in their household sizes over 40 years, contrasting with Bassingham and Brough, where the MHS for professionals was 2.50 in 1891 Brough and 4.40 in 1891 Bassingham.<sup>47</sup> This is a far cry from 6.96 overall, and especially 7.75 in Hertford. As Hertford Urban was the seat of county government and haven for the elite, it boasted above average proportions of servants per 100 families.<sup>48</sup> In Hertford's Group A households, the number of offspring and servants increased; servants averaged from 2.04 per household in 1851 to 2.83 in 1891, and offspring from 1.04 to 2.67. The Panshanger Estate, owned by Earl Cowper in 1851 and Francis J. de Gray Cowper in 1891, housed 34 servants, producing a distortion in the figures. However, excluding the estate, Hertford's elite housed 1.42 servants per household, above the average number of servants per household in 1891.

Table 1.4a – Components of the Household: Mean Numbers per Household, 1851

|           | Head | Wife | Offspring | Kin  | Servant | Lodger | Visitor | Pop   | H'holds |
|-----------|------|------|-----------|------|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
| Lilley    | 1.00 | 0.78 | 2.52      | 0.33 | 0.24    | 0.00   | 0.21    | 528   | 104     |
| Great Gad | 1.00 | 0.80 | 2.56      | 0.26 | 0.36    | 0.11   | 0.05    | 1160  | 226     |
| Barley    | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.40      | 0.29 | 0.16    | 0.20   | 0.04    | 868   | 179     |
| Therfield | 1.00 | 0.79 | 2.80      | 0.27 | 0.13    | 0.08   | 0.01    | 1335  | 262     |
| Aldenham  | 1.00 | 0.74 | 2.07      | 0.26 | 0.55    | 0.12   | 0.12    | 1653  | 337     |
| Bushey    | 1.00 | 0.65 | 2.07      | 0.33 | 0.27    | 0.27   | 0.12    | 2751  | 576     |
| Hertford  | 1.00 | 0.67 | 1.88      | 0.35 | 0.40    | 0.24   | 0.15    | 4735  | 998     |
| Ware      | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.02      | 0.30 | 0.28    | 0.21   | 0.17    | 4296  | 912     |
| RURAL     | 1.00 | 0.78 | 2.60      | 0.28 | 0.22    | 0.11   | 0.06    | 3891  | 771     |
| URBAN     | 1.00 | 0.69 | 1.98      | 0.32 | 0.36    | 0.22   | 0.14    | 13435 | 2823    |
| TOTAL     | 1.00 | 0.71 | 2.11      | 0.31 | 0.33    | 0.20   | 0.13    | 17326 | 3594    |

<sup>47</sup> Hunt, "Bassingham," pp. 65-6.

<sup>48</sup> J. Ayto, "The Contribution by Women to the Social and Economic Development of the Victorian Town in Hertfordshire," (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hertfordshire, 2013), pp. 17-8.

Table 1.4b – Components of the Household: Mean Numbers per Household, 1891

|           | Head | Wife | Offspring | Kin  | Servant | Lodger | Visitor | Pop   | H'holds |
|-----------|------|------|-----------|------|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
| Lilley    | 1.00 | 0.76 | 2.40      | 0.36 | 0.12    | 0.08   | 0.01    | 526   | 111     |
| Great Gad | 1.00 | 0.72 | 1.98      | 0.36 | 0.28    | 0.04   | 0.05    | 870   | 196     |
| Barley    | 1.00 | 0.69 | 2.02      | 0.17 | 0.12    | 0.08   | 0.01    | 574   | 140     |
| Therfield | 1.00 | 0.71 | 2.22      | 0.21 | 0.06    | 0.11   | 0.03    | 996   | 229     |
| Aldenham  | 1.00 | 0.78 | 2.03      | 0.29 | 0.32    | 0.28   | 0.10    | 1882  | 389     |
| Bushey    | 1.00 | 0.74 | 2.15      | 0.27 | 0.25    | 0.17   | 0.07    | 5623  | 1203    |
| Hertford  | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.07      | 0.26 | 0.32    | 0.41   | 0.09    | 5832  | 1195    |
| Ware      | 1.00 | 0.68 | 2.24      | 0.24 | 0.19    | 0.22   | 0.05    | 5563  | 1196    |
| RURAL     | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.14      | 0.27 | 0.15    | 0.08   | 0.03    | 2966  | 676     |
| URBAN     | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.14      | 0.26 | 0.26    | 0.27   | 0.07    | 18900 | 3983    |
| TOTAL     | 1.00 | 0.72 | 2.14      | 0.26 | 0.24    | 0.24   | 0.07    | 21866 | 4659    |

*Notes:* The population and housing figures in Tables 1.4a-1.4b take into account visitors and lodgers in lodging houses, but exclude hospitals, prisons, schools and the Union workhouses. Populations that did not represent each of these groups above were calculated but excluded from these tables. A further breakdown by percentages can be found in Tables 1A and 1B of Appendix One, p. 81.

Tables 1.4a and 1.4b calculate each component of the household through mean numbers per household. To facilitate easier comparisons with Anderson and Armstrong's studies, visitors and lodgers from lodging houses are incorporated into these tables.<sup>49</sup> However, calculations of lodgers in *domestic* households will receive attention. In 1851, spouses were more prominent in rural than urban areas, reflected in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions as there were higher proportions of widowed and late marriages.<sup>50</sup> There was an average of 2.60 children per household in rural parishes against the 1.98 in urban areas. The percentages of children in Lilley and Great Gaddesden are slightly higher than the Berkhamsted and St. Albans communities at 49.6% and 49.8%.<sup>51</sup> Although the mean numbers are behind Cardington's 2.86, where straw plaiting also featured heavily, this reasserts the relationship between high proportions of children and high child labour.<sup>52</sup> Therfield had a remarkably high 2.80 children per household. The numbers of children per Group D household (primarily composed of agricultural labourers) were substantially high, at 2.98 and 2.78 in Therfield and Barley respectively. The higher proportion of lodgers in Barley could have depressed the rates of offspring, at 2.40. Studies have shown that the Royston region, where Therfield was

<sup>49</sup> This decision was a response to the problems about the definition of households as expressed in Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 158-9.

<sup>50</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 15, p. 70; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 25a, p. 160.

<sup>51</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 15, p. 70; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 25b, p. 161.

<sup>52</sup> Tranter, "Social Structure," Table 4, p. 94.

based, produced high fertility rates throughout the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>53</sup> As for child employment patterns, nearly four-fifths aged 15 and under and occupied were classed as agricultural labourers. The retention of adult offspring in agricultural labour may reflect those in straw plaiting. Of all the 279 sons and daughters aged 15-29 recorded in Barley and Therfield, 58.1% were in agriculture, extending to 75.4% of those in an occupation.

Therfield and Barley's above average numbers of offspring mean that our sample contradicts Wall's conclusions from the 1851 Rural and Urban samples that servants were more prominent in rural than urban areas.<sup>54</sup> Servants in Barley and Therfield represented only 3.2% and 2.5% of their populations. Therfield only contained six farm servants and Barley two, representing 1.3% and 1.0% of their respected agricultural workforce, compared with Aldenham's 12.8% and Lilley's 11.3%. For Therfield, it appears that the number of family-based smallholding farms diminished farm service as a resource. Remarkably, three-quarters of Therfield's farms were less than 59 acres, considering that smallholding was phased out in southern England by 1851, making Therfield atypical.<sup>55</sup> However, the Royston region contained higher proportions of 'family farms', those under 50 acres, at 27.1%, above the average of 23.3% for Hertfordshire. At the same time, farm service was limited, averaging at 3.4% of the agricultural workforce in the Royston region.<sup>56</sup> Interestingly, in 1804, Arthur Young commented on Royston's farm size that "there are some small ones, of 40l. or 50l. a-year; and all these farmers are very poor, notwithstanding the high price of corn."<sup>57</sup> A total of 18 individuals in Barley and Therfield were unemployed or pauper farm-workers representing 28.1% in the whole Royston region.<sup>58</sup> In these cases, smallholding intertwined with poverty, and such explains the lower rates of servants in Barley and Therfield.

Wall was initially perplexed that, in Anderson's 1851 sample, rural households contained more domestic servants than urban ones, for domestic servitude was "the mechanism by which people were channelled into towns."<sup>59</sup> The figures in Table 1.4a are reassuring. Even if Aldenham, a relatively agrarian parish, was grouped with the rural parishes, the remaining three urban parishes would still contain higher percentages of servants, at 7.0% compared

---

<sup>53</sup> Goose, "Cottage Industry," p. 810.

<sup>54</sup> Wall, "The Household," p. 510.

<sup>55</sup> L. Shaw-Taylor, "Family Farms and Capitalist Farms in Mid Nineteenth Century England," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2, (2005), pp. 158-191.

<sup>56</sup> N. Goose, "Farm Service, Seasonal Unemployment and Casual Labour in Mid Nineteenth-Century England," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2, (2006), Tables 1 and 2, pp. 280, 285.

<sup>57</sup> A. Young, *General View of the Agriculture of Hertfordshire* (London, 1804), p. 25.

<sup>58</sup> Calculated from Goose, "Farm Service," p. 301.

<sup>59</sup> Wall, "The Household," p. 510.

with 6.1%. However, in Aldenham, one in ten people were servants, supporting the argument that servants were heavily concentrated in rural parishes. Despite this, since Barley and Therfield fell behind even in terms of non-agrarian service, geographical differences are revealed.

Furthermore, the numbers of kin in urban areas are higher than in rural areas, not the reverse presented by Wall.<sup>60</sup> The more politically administrative town of Hertford could explain its high rates of kin: the Simson family was headed by a proprietor for the county press, and contained three sisters, a brother and two servants. In terms of lodgers, urban households contained more lodgers than rural ones, and this is easily explained by what Anderson found for Preston: in-migrants were more likely to be housed in lodgings than with kin.<sup>61</sup> Out of 73 lodgers aged 15-29 in Bushey, only 21.9% resided in their native parish, but out of 46 kin, 37.0% did so, despite that more kin were present in Bushey than lodgers. Contrastingly, in York and Preston, more lodgers were present than kin.<sup>62</sup> This is explained by Bushey's concentration of kin among wealthy households. Four grandchildren feature in the household of Maria West, a 76-year-old widow recorded as a "proprietor in past of Houses," and all her family were born in Middlesex and London, reinforcing ideas of Bushey as a retirement haven in Hertfordshire.

Furthermore, Ware and Hertford contained far more kin than lodgers, which contradicts the Urban sample.<sup>63</sup> This reinforces Goose's conclusions that small towns were demographically very different from largely urban areas, where in-migration and population growth were higher.<sup>64</sup> Conversely, Ware Urban was a small town where approximately three-fifths of all inhabitants were native-born, although Ware's urban and rural components are not distinguished. The two occupations associated with Ware were malt-making and barging, which exhibited substantial rates of native-born individuals (69.5% and 92.2%). Malt-makers and bargemen were generally in Group C and D households, where there were a substantial number of children and kin per household (2.23/2.11 and 0.35/0.28), above the 1851 Urban sample. From these cases, kin relationships were strengthened by the relative immobility of the town's population.

---

<sup>60</sup> Wall, "The Household," p. 510.

<sup>61</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 39, 52-5.

<sup>62</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," Table 7.12, p. 235.

<sup>63</sup> Wall, "The Household," p. 510.

<sup>64</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 159.

By 1891, the rural-urban gap for children had narrowed, although a slight skew was found in urban areas. However, in percentage terms, children were still more likely to be raised in rural households. Interestingly, in Lilley, they slightly increased from 1851. The retention of children in the continuing straw industry was a factor, but so was the decline in farm service, from 13 occupants in 1851, to only one in 1891. This boosted Lilley's numbers of recorded offspring in the households of farmers, at 3.80 per household in 1891 from 2.50 in 1851. In Barley and Therfield, their percentage rates for children declined only gradually, possibly because the Royston region exhibited higher fertility patterns in the 1890s than Hertfordshire generally.<sup>65</sup> Why Great Gaddesden suffered the biggest decline cannot be fully explained. Perhaps, since the numbers of offspring per household in Group B collapsed the most, the children of farmers may have reacted to the severe farming depression in rural Great Gaddesden and migrated to the neighbouring town. Based on a population increase in the towns, the numbers of offspring in urban Ware were surprisingly large, from 2.02 in 1851 to 2.24 in 1891, a statistic above the average for all eight communities.

Ruggles argued that, by the late nineteenth-century, the presence of kin in households had risen due to the greater affordability to accommodate kin and the greater cultural ideal of the extended family.<sup>66</sup> However, rates slumped in Hertfordshire from 6.4% to 5.6% over 40 years. Despite this, both straw communities, Lilley and Great Gaddesden, experienced a rise, as well as suburban Aldenham. In agrarian Barley and Therfield, kin did not increase over time in the manner of three Cornish mining communities where an economic downturn was experienced in the 1870s.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, immigration to market towns and suburban parishes (excluding Aldenham) could have lowered the rates of kin over 40 years. While kin fell, lodgers increased, as evident in Ware and Hertford Urban.

Laslett concluded that domestic service prolonged the stability of household structure in England in the late nineteenth-century.<sup>68</sup> However, Aldenham, which contained the highest proportions of servants, lost its servant population substantially, although its household structure was stable in 1891 from 1851. As for Hertford Urban, there was a surge in lodgers. This is partly explained by the numerous lodgers recorded as "militiamen," since the town held the Hertford Militia headquarters, forming the fourth battalion of the Bedfordshire

---

<sup>65</sup> Goose, "How Saucy?" pp. 530-556.

<sup>66</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, pp. 127-138.

<sup>67</sup> Brayshay, "Depopulation," pp. 326-345.

<sup>68</sup> Laslett, "Mean Household Size," p. 156.

Regiment.<sup>69</sup> There was a high figure of 0.41 lodgers per household in Hertford Urban, although excluding inns would result in 0.31 lodgers per household. This would strengthen the case for the Hertford Militia affecting the proportions of lodgers, and may be another non-economic determinant, like the Bushey School of Art, explaining Hertford's household size.

Contrastingly, Ware only experienced a narrow increase in the number of lodgers, from 0.21 to 0.22, compared with Hertford's accelerated rise of 0.24 to 0.41. The rise in offspring may have cancelled out the proportions of lodgers in Ware. The mechanism behind this was Ware's more locally-defined industries, such as its prolific malt-making industry. Barging and boat-building work, associated with geographical links with the River Lea, was mostly represented by fathers and sons. Brick-making was significant enough to be recognised in the local trade directory for Ware.<sup>70</sup> Combining the 396 that were working in malt, barging, boat-building and brick-making shows that 74.7% were native to the parish. The accommodation of lodgers as identified in Hertford Urban was diminished by the numbers of native individuals and locally-defined occupations.

### *Conclusions*

There are conclusions that conform to the wider literature. Firstly, the relationship between high MHS and high child employment was captured for 1851, because it required the maintenance of offspring within the household. Straw plaiting was documented as keeping children in the parental household for longer. However, households were smaller in the towns, as child employment was relatively lacking. Despite this, Hertfordshire's data contradicts Wall and Anderson's samples in that kin and service were more skewed towards urban and suburban parishes than rural communities. However, this emphasises how the economic value of children in rural parishes had an effect on household structure. This was especially true in Therfield, where fertility was high, which was the case for the Royston region in which Therfield was situated.<sup>71</sup>

By 1891, agricultural depression in north-eastern Hertfordshire was severe, and Barley and Therfield confirm the effects of the agrarian downturn on household size and population. They lacked economic resources allowing the retention of children in the household, such as straw plaiting, which partly stabilised household structure in Lilley. It perhaps rescued Great

---

<sup>69</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Hertford, p. 765.

<sup>70</sup> Kelly's Trade Directory (1890), Ware, p. 846.

<sup>71</sup> Goose, "Cottage Industry," p. 810; Goose, "How Saucy?" pp. 530-556.

Gaddesden from collapsing on a par with Barley. Economic problems promoted migrating to the towns, having an effect on the numbers of children per household. Aldenham and Bushey, as suburbanised parishes, also experienced population and housing increases, which stabilised household size. This contributed to a stable household size overall for the Hertfordshire sample, producing a gradual fall from 4.64 in 1851 to 4.56 in 1891. For Hertfordshire, it was not domestic service which made household structure consistent across the Victorian period, since service fell over time, but increasing urbanisation. Offspring and lodgers primarily stabilised household structure in suburban communities and market towns.

Economic circumstances alone cannot account for the surprisingly small households amongst Bushey's affluent groups. Cultural reasons must be taken into account. Retirement to the Hertfordshire countryside was prized, thus creating an ageing profile in the parish. As for the lodgers representing the Hertford Militia, the administrative and governmental content of a town also affects household structure. Furthermore, rather than the two parishes in the four economic components (straw, farming, suburban and towns) sharing similar characteristics, some contrasted. In towns, Ware housed more offspring and fewer lodgers than Hertford, characterised by Ware's locally-defined industries. Since the majority in Ware were native-born (at 61.3% in 1891, compared with Hertford's 48.1%), this cancelled out the numbers of mainly migrant-born lodgers.

This chapter has supported Wall's campaign to fully assess "the role of economic combined with demographic factors" in analysing household structure.<sup>72</sup> While changes in agriculture and urbanisation dictated household structure, Hertfordshire's institutions and administrative elements also explain why household structure maintained stability across Victorian Hertfordshire. The manner in which Professor Herkomer founded Bushey's art school as a place for outdoor landscape painting highlights cultural understandings in demographic studies. This is because *attitudes* regarding suburban Bushey and its ideal rural sceneries affected household structure as much as its occupational structure. Specifically, parishes need examining in their minute details to gauge the economic, demographic, cultural and administrative elements that influence household structure. This approach means that the long neglected study of household structure can advance.

---

<sup>72</sup> Wall, "The Household," p. 512.

## Chapter Two:

### WIDER KINSHIP INSIDE THE HOUSEHOLD AND BEYOND IN MID-VICTORIAN HERTFORDSHIRE, 1851-1891

The extent of wider kinship outside the nuclear family in community life has been rigorously debated. Anderson's analysis of 1851 Lancashire was the first major study to conclude that wider kin formed a substantial part of the population, as reinforced through employment for kin and the role of relatives as welfare resources.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, Ruggles has suggested that extended families increased towards the late nineteenth-century due to the growth of the middle-classes and their greater financial capacity to house more relatives.<sup>2</sup> Despite these discoveries, historians are still generally adamant that extended relatives played little part in English community life. Three-generational households, composed of a head, offspring and grandchildren, or parent, head and offspring, were rare.<sup>3</sup> However, Wall and Reay have highlighted substantial variations in the number of households with kin based on the household head's occupation.<sup>4</sup> In the St. Albans region, Hertfordshire, Goose found that 10.2% of the textile household population were kin, compared with 4.5% where household heads worked in transport.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, Reay's analysis for Hernhill parish in 1851 concluded that nuclear-based households had relations with wider kin in the same community, but beyond the household.<sup>6</sup>

Since Ruggles' research, there has been little analysis of whether a rise of the extended family occurred locally by the late Victorian period. There has been little research on the changing rates of co-residence of grandchildren or siblings over time, apart from an examination of Glasgow.<sup>7</sup> This chapter will expand the knowledge on the changing composition of wider kin in Victorian England through comparative analysis of the 1851 and 1891 censuses. It will argue that, although a rise of the extended family was not universally realised in our sample, kinship was persistently significant over time, based on occupational

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 111-135.

<sup>2</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, pp. 127-138.

<sup>3</sup> P. Laslett, "Family, Kinship and Collectivity as Systems of Support in Pre-Industrial Europe: A Consideration of the 'Nuclear-Hardship' Analysis," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (August 1988), pp. 153-175; K.D.M. Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England, 1660-1900* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 365.

<sup>4</sup> Wall, "The Household," Table 16.5, p. 509; Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.3, p. 159.

<sup>5</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 30b, p. 171.

<sup>6</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, pp. 164-168.

<sup>7</sup> Gordon and Nair, *Public Lives*, Table 4, p. 37.



structure, solutions to poverty, type of kin and the degree of mobility in the parish. It will conclude that kinship was a dominant element of community life, depending on the migratory patterns of the parish.

*Kinship inside the Household: Percentages*

The percentage of households containing extended kin in the eight Hertfordshire sample communities is presented in Table 2.1. On average, 21.0% of households in 1851 contained kin, reflecting Ruggles' analysis of nine English communities between 1851 and 1881.<sup>8</sup> The average for the St. Albans region was 20.8%, almost identical to the total in our sample.<sup>9</sup> Suburban and urban parishes were more likely to accommodate kin than strictly rural communities. The percentages in 1851 found for Bushey and Hertford, represented as urban parishes, closely reflect York and Preston's rates of 22% and 23% respectively.<sup>10</sup> Ware Urban, on the other hand, contained the lowest proportions of households with kin. Consequently, it is problematic to conclude that urban households generally accommodated more kin than rural ones, as rural Lilley exhibited a substantial rate at 22.1%. Lilley shares similarities with agrarian-based Harpenden and Sandridge in the St. Albans region and Bingham, Nottinghamshire, where 22.1%, 22.2% and 23.1% of its households respectively contained kin.<sup>11</sup> Based on this, there was no distinction between town and countryside in the numbers of households with kin.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, Table 1.1, p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 28, p. 166.

<sup>10</sup> Anderson, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution," Table 7.3, p. 220.

<sup>11</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 28, p. 166; Smith, "Early Victorian Household Structure," Table 9, p. 81.

<sup>12</sup> As was also discovered in Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 166-7.

Table 2.1 - Percentage of Households Containing Kin, 1851 and 1891

| Parish          | 1851 | 1891 |
|-----------------|------|------|
| Lilley          | 22.1 | 24.3 |
| Great Gaddesden | 19.5 | 21.9 |
| Barley          | 19.6 | 14.3 |
| Therfield       | 19.5 | 16.6 |
| Aldenham        | 20.5 | 20.6 |
| Bushey          | 22.0 | 19.5 |
| Hertford Urban  | 23.2 | 17.9 |
| Ware Urban      | 19.1 | 17.8 |
| RURAL           | 19.8 | 18.9 |
| URBAN           | 21.3 | 18.6 |
| TOTAL           | 21.0 | 18.7 |

These results sit uneasily with Ruggles' argument that extended-family households peaked in the late nineteenth-century. In fact, only three of our eight communities witnessed an increase of kin inside the household in 1891 from 1851. Households with kin increased by over two percentage points in Lilley and Great Gaddesden, although, in Aldenham, the rise was very small. The other five communities saw a fall in kin-based households. This contradicts previous studies that compare two or more census periods for one community, such as Howlett for Appledore, Devonshire, where 30% of households in 1871 compares with 23% for 1851.<sup>13</sup> However, our results fit nicely with Hernhill, Kent where 13.9% of households in 1891 accommodated kin from 18.3% in 1881.<sup>14</sup> The Claremont/Woodside estate in Glasgow experienced similar patterns, where extended families reached 31.2% in 1871, before decreasing to 28.7% in 1891.<sup>15</sup>

Overall, households were generally consistent in the proportions of accommodated kin, witnessed in the steady fall from 21.0% in 1851, to 18.7% in 1891. However, this should not mask the more extreme falls in Barley, Therfield and Hertford Urban. Barley and Therfield did not conform to Brayshay's three Cornish communities, where the increase in households with wider kin coincided with economic depression.<sup>16</sup> In fact, both communities contained the lowest proportions of households with kin, suggesting that economic dislocation severely

---

<sup>13</sup> Howlett, "Family and Household," p. 300.

<sup>14</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.1, p. 159.

<sup>15</sup> Nair and Gordon, *Public Lives*, Table 3, p. 36.

<sup>16</sup> Brayshay, "Depopulation," pp. 326-345.

affected kinship bonds. However, in Therfield, a quarter of the 38 households with extended kin saw the household head co-reside with grandchildren. Presumably, while the offspring's parents migrated from the parish, as seen in 1860s Cornwall, grandparents stepped in to look after their grandchildren. Grandchildren in the Cornish sample represented more than one-third of the co-resident group in 1871; in 1891 Therfield, it was 55.3%.<sup>17</sup>

While Hertford Urban exhibited the highest proportions of kin-based households in 1851, it contained one of the lowest in 1891. Ruggles' 1871 sample of Lancashire and Nair and Gordon's studies of Glasgow emphasised that the middle-classes were essential to the rise of the extended family.<sup>18</sup> However, this produced little change in Hertford Urban, which contained a substantial professional/middle-class group.<sup>19</sup> This may have been based on the in-migration of social groups below the professional classes. In Hertford, there was an increase in people represented by Group D and E household heads, at 22.0% in 1851 to 23.3% in 1891 and 13.3% to 15.1% respectively. Conversely, Group A and C household heads witnessed a decline. In Bushey, although there was a drop in semi-skilled and unskilled households, Group A households declined from 9.3% to 5.2%, while skilled households (C) rose by 8%. Based on research that kin were more prominent in households higher up the social hierarchy, households further down governed the fall in kin-based households.<sup>20</sup>

### *Kinship and Occupational Structure*

Wall and Reay highlighted the substantial variation in the number of households with kin based on the occupation of the household head.<sup>21</sup> The "Goose Code", adapted from the Booth codes employed by Armstrong in analysing 1851 York, neatly analyses the occupational correlates of kin-bound households.<sup>22</sup> Table 2.2 presents the percentages of households with wider kin based on the household head's occupation. This is coupled with the overall percentages of each occupation practiced by the household head in our sample. Comparisons with Reay's examination of the Blean region will be used by combining Groups 2-8, 13 and 15 from the Goose Code into a "Trades and Crafts" category, Groups 1 and 16 into the "Ag Lab/Lab" category, and there will be a newly created "Farmers" group in this study.

---

<sup>17</sup> Brayshay, "Depopulation," p. 341.

<sup>18</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, p. 37; Gordon and Nair, *Public Lives*, pp. 35-6.

<sup>19</sup> See Introduction, p. 18.

<sup>20</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.13, p. 189.

<sup>21</sup> Wall, "The Household," pp. 508-10; Reay, *Microhistories*, pp. 158-63.

<sup>22</sup> See Appendix Two, p. 87, for further information on the Goose Coding Scheme; Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 24.

Table 2.2 – Percentages of Households Containing Kin by Occupational Group, 1851 and 1891

| <i>Occupation</i>   | Kin 51   | Kin 91   | Total 51 | Total 91 |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Agriculture         | 19.2     | 15.5     | 22.3     | 13.4     |
| Farmers             | 26.3     | 30.6     | 2.6      | 1.6      |
| Textiles            | 28.9     | 30.1     | 3.8      | 2.6      |
| Misc. Manu          | 18.8     | 18.9     | 0.9      | 0.8      |
| Leather             | 21.1     | 9.6      | 3.2      | 2.0      |
| Building            | 16.6     | 16.4     | 5.0      | 7.5      |
| Metal               | 23.5     | 15.9     | 2.3      | 1.8      |
| Wood                | 18.3     | 14.5     | 6.1      | 4.9      |
| Food/Drink          | 24.3     | 20.9     | 12.4     | 12.7     |
| Transport           | 15.2     | 14.6     | 4.6      | 6.9      |
| Dom. Service        | 16.0     | 15.7     | 4.2      | 9.7      |
| Public Service      | 23.8     | 20.5     | 6.5      | 8.4      |
| Independent         | 33.7     | 26.1     | 4.5      | 6.3      |
| Straw               | 41.5     | 41.7     | 1.1      | 0.3      |
| Quarry/Mining       | 0.0      | 100.0    | 0.3      | 0.0      |
| Retail/Dist.        | 18.9     | 23.8     | 2.1      | 2.7      |
| Misc.               | 16.2     | 15.9     | 9.6      | 8.9      |
| Dependent           | 20.3     | 21.0     | 8.6      | 9.5      |
| TOTAL               | 21.0     | 18.7     | 100.0    | 100.0    |
| <i>Reay's Group</i> | Herts 51 | Herts 91 | Blean 51 | Blean 81 |
| Farmers             | 26.3     | 30.6     | 23.3     | 24.4     |
| Trades/Crafts       | 22.5     | 19.2     | 22.0     | 26.0     |
| Ag Lab/Lab          | 18.4     | 14.8     | 10.6     | 12.7     |

*Notes:* "Agriculture" includes all occupations coded as Group 1 in Goose code, excluding "farmer". "Ag.Lab/Lab," a group conceived by Reay in *Microhistories*, p. 159, combines agricultural labourers, excluding gardeners, hay binders etc. in Group 1 and all of Group 16.

Table 2.2 confirms the wide variation in the percentages of kin based on the occupation of the household head. In 1851, nearly 42% of households headed by straw workers accommodated kin, compared with those household heads working in transport at 15.2%. Similarly, in the 1851 St. Albans region, straw workers contained more kin in their households than that found on average in the population, at 7.1%.<sup>23</sup> In our sample, 33.7% of those heading households as independents housed kin and 28.9% of textile households featured kin, which was above the 21.0% for the whole sample. The reasons why straw and independent households accommodated kin is based on marital status. In Great Gaddesden, 8 out of 15 straw plait heads contained kin; seven of the eight were female and five of those were widowed. In Bushey, where 35% of houses headed by those of independent means housed kin, 17 out of

<sup>23</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 30b, p. 171.

these 23 household heads were widowed, with only three married. 38% of all households under an “independent” head in Hertford Urban contained kin, and 10 of the 16 households were headed by the widowed. The average ages for independent heads in Bushey and Hertford were 62 and 57 respectively, while Great Gaddesden’s straw worker heads averaged 43. Therefore, kin most likely featured in the later stages of the family’s developmental cycle, and were valued when the household head lost their spouse.

Hertford Urban’s high percentage of households with kin was partly governed by the local textile industry. In the 1855 publication of Kelly’s Trade Directories, it was reported that Robert Cocks owned a company of “silk mercers, drapers, milliners and dressmakers.”<sup>24</sup> The 1851 census shows that his household boasted 23 individuals, two of whom were kin: his sister, recorded as a housekeeper, and his niece, a dressmaker. Kin were often recruited in households as employees, as identified in Preston.<sup>25</sup> For example, 14-year-old William Dear, recorded as nephew, travelled from Farnham, Surrey to George Dear’s household and was recorded as an “apprentice.” The circumstances in Preston, where employers from factory towns employed their relatives from the countryside, parallel the smaller-scale trading town of Hertford.

In Hertford Urban, a town with substantial administrative and professional services, kin were recorded in 28% of professional service households. Only one household head in public service was widowed, and public service heads, on average, were aged 41. This conforms to Ruggles’ view that kin were more likely to belong in affluent households based on affordability.<sup>26</sup> However, for “independent” occupiers, there was a bias towards the widowed and aged. Their average age was 57, similar to the 58 in the St. Albans region. 14 out of the 16 were unmarried, 10 of the 14 widowed.<sup>27</sup> This is in line with expectations that those at the later stages of their life-cycle “welcomed kin into their homes for companionship and support.”<sup>28</sup> This undoubtedly contributed to Hertford’s high figure of households with kin, at 23.2%.

By 1891, 11 of the 18 economic groups experienced a fall in the percentages of kin. However, farming, textile and straw households witnessed an increase in kin. In the Kentish Blean region, farming households climbed from 23% in 1851 to 24% in 1881, although, in

---

<sup>24</sup> Post Office Trade Directory (1855), Hertford, p. 210.

<sup>25</sup> Anderson, “Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution,” p. 228.

<sup>26</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, p. 128.

<sup>27</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 174.

<sup>28</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 174.

Hertfordshire, 26.3% of farming households in 1851 accommodated kin compared with 30.6% 40 years later.<sup>29</sup> Great Gaddesden's concentration of farmers with kin was particularly high, with 6 out of 13 housing kin. Considering that its population declined due to the effects of agricultural depression, this is particularly interesting.<sup>30</sup> Despite this, there were two less farming household heads in the parish in 1891 than 1851, suggesting that the impact of depression on farmers varied by parish. Contrastingly, the effects of the depression were far worse in the Royston region, where the number of farmers in Barley parish fell by 4 and Therfield by 11 in 1891 from 1851.

Furthermore, there was continuity in the proportions of kin in straw plaiting households. 41.7% of straw households accommodated kin in 1891 from 41.5% in 1851. The relationship between kin and straw worker heads was equally high in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions in 1851, demonstrating how locally-associated occupations affected particular household structures across time and space.<sup>31</sup> Straw plait was predominantly an occupation practiced by women. When they assumed headship of their households at the end of their life-cycle, they funded their economic security in old age through straw plaiting, while their relatives resided with them.

Leather workers' households were less likely to recruit kin by 1891, reaching a lowly 9.6%. It is likely that, by 1891, the leather trade was dying out as independent boot-making was replaced by imported materials and mechanised production. This was reflected in three Cumbrian market towns, where a fall in craft occupations by men was witnessed across the Victorian period.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, Hertford and Ware saw a decrease in household heads practising leather-based occupations, from 82 in 1851 to 58 in 1891. Contrastingly, household heads working in retail increased, where nearly a quarter of retail households housed kin, reflecting the growth of retail stores in thriving cities.<sup>33</sup> It appears that the rates of kin are affected by the decline, stability or rise in occupations. However, the numbers of household heads working in farming and textiles fell in 1891 from 1851, whereas the rates of these households containing kin increased. Nevertheless, only 19.2% of households headed

---

<sup>29</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.3, p. 159.

<sup>30</sup> Details on the population rates for each Hertfordshire community from 1851 to 1901 taken from Moore, "Agricultural Depression," Appendix 2A, pp. 256-259, Great Gaddesden's rates on p. 257, based on data procured by Nigel Goose.

<sup>31</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Tables 30a and b, pp. 170-1; Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 16, p. 73.

<sup>32</sup> M.E. Shepherd, *From Hellgill to Bridge End: Aspects of Economic and Social Change in the Upper Eden Valley, 1840-1895* (Hatfield, 2003), pp. 55-7.

<sup>33</sup> S. Mitchell, *Daily Life in Victorian England* (Greenwood Press, 1996) p. 65; K.T. Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation, 1846-1886* (Oxford, 1998), p. 351.

by a trades and craftsperson contained kin in 1891 compared with 22.5% in 1851, contradicting the increasing kinship rates in trade and craft households in the 1881 Kentish Blean region.<sup>34</sup>

Table 2.2 makes it clear that certain occupations were more conducive to forming relationships with extended family members. For example, in spite of the rates of extended households headed by those of independent means falling to 26.1% in 1891 from 33.7% in 1851, its rates were still above the average of 18.7% for all occupations. Despite Ruggles' insistence to consider psychological and cultural factors, economic circumstance remains an important factor for why some households were extended.<sup>35</sup>

### *The Components of Wider Kin*

Particular components of kin were more likely to appear than others, and research has identified geographical differences. For example, the town of York in 1851 showed that the majority of kin were siblings of the household head. This was also found for the urban parishes of the St. Albans region in Hertfordshire and for Hanley, Staffordshire.<sup>36</sup> Contrastingly, Borden in Kent, and the rural parishes of the St. Albans region were more likely to contain grandchildren, and in Anderson's National Sample grandchildren represented the majority of relatives at 36.9%.<sup>37</sup> Table 2.3 examines the rates of four major (but not all) categories of kin for both 1851 and 1891 in the four collective "rural" parishes and "urban" parishes representing our Hertfordshire sample.

---

<sup>34</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.3, p. 159.

<sup>35</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, pp. 131-3.

<sup>36</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.12, p. 188; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 31, p. 175; Gately, *Hanley in 1851 Revisited*, Table 3.7, p. 10.

<sup>37</sup> Jackson, *The Population of Borden in 1851*, Tables 11 and 12, pp. 15-6; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 31, p. 175; Anderson, "Households, Families and Individuals," p. 426.

Table 2.3 – Components of Kin by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851 and 1891

|           | RUR 51 |       | URB 51 |       | RUR 91 |       | URB 91 |       |
|-----------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
|           | No.    | %     | No.    | %     | No.    | %     | No.    | %     |
| SIBLINGS  | 56     | 25.8  | 248    | 27.6  | 41     | 22.7  | 281    | 27.0  |
| GRANDCH   | 77     | 35.5  | 266    | 29.7  | 77     | 42.5  | 293    | 28.1  |
| NIECE/NEP | 28     | 12.9  | 181    | 20.2  | 22     | 12.2  | 212    | 20.4  |
| PARENTS   | 26     | 12.0  | 91     | 10.1  | 25     | 13.8  | 159    | 15.3  |
| TOTAL     | 217    | 100.0 | 897    | 100.0 | 181    | 100.0 | 1041   | 100.0 |

  

|           | TOT 51 |       | TOT 91 |       |
|-----------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
|           | No.    | %     | No.    | %     |
| SIBLINGS  | 304    | 27.3  | 322    | 26.4  |
| GRANDCH   | 343    | 30.8  | 370    | 30.3  |
| NIECE/NEP | 209    | 18.8  | 234    | 19.1  |
| PARENTS   | 117    | 10.5  | 184    | 15.1  |
| TOTAL     | 1114   | 100.0 | 1222   | 100.0 |

*Notes:* For a definition of what parishes represent the “Rural” and “Urban” group, see Chapter One, note, p. 23.

For 1851, in our rural parishes, grandchildren represented 36% of all kin, compared with 29.7% in the urban parishes. Conversely, siblings/siblings-in-law and nieces/nephews were more prominent in the urban parishes, conforming to results found in the St. Albans region. As also reflected in the St. Albans region, there was a gender bias in favour of females for both categories.<sup>38</sup> In the St. Albans region, 33.3% of kin in the urban parishes were represented by siblings, compared with 22.7% in rural parishes; our sample, however, is lower.<sup>39</sup> 27.6% of kin were siblings in the urban parishes, against the 25.8% in rural parishes. The inclusion of Aldenham, a relatively agrarian parish represented as urban, may have lowered the figures. However, the collective total of siblings in Ware, Hertford and Bushey reach 28.1% of all kin components. Within the four urban parishes, grandchildren still predominated over all other kin, contrary to the results for York and the urban parts of St. Albans region.<sup>40</sup> The differences between Hertford Urban and Ware Urban explain this. Grandchildren represented 32.1% of all kin in Ware, compared with 23.6% in Hertford. It is not unusual to discover a substantial proportion of grandchildren in urban areas. They were

<sup>38</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 31, p. 175.

<sup>39</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 31, p. 175.

<sup>40</sup> Armstrong, *Stability and Change*, Table 7.12, p. 188; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 31, p. 175.



more prevalent in the town of Preston than in Rural Lancashire, having been looked after by their grandparents while their parents worked in the local textile factories.<sup>41</sup>

While the number of brothers in Hertford and Ware was roughly identical, there was a difference in sisters: 68 in Hertford and 46 in Ware. It appears that sisters were more likely to reside in the household of a sibling who worked in professional service and headed their households. The household heads in Hertford shared similar characteristics: the majority were unmarried, in their twenties and thirties and 80% were male. Two of these men were surgeons and three were printers, recalling George Simson from Chapter One, where three sisters resided with him, two of whom were recorded as “stationers from home.”<sup>42</sup> Similarly, Stephen Austin, a “printer and bookseller employing 30 persons,” housed two sisters-in-law, alongside his brother-in-law, although the sisters-in-law were recorded as receiving “no employment.” If Ware had acquired the same economic characteristics as Hertford, then the numbers of households with kin could have been more substantial.

By 1891, a rural bias in favour of grandchildren replicated 1851, as well as the urban bias favouring siblings and nieces/nephews. The 250 households in Glasgow also present consistency in the high numbers of siblings in an urban environment over time.<sup>43</sup> The rise in grandchildren in the four rural parishes was affected by the changing agricultural economy, which saw the rise of “parentless” children recorded as grandchildren. There was a tendency for granddaughters to appear more than grandsons, identical to Anderson’s findings for 1851.<sup>44</sup> In the urban parishes, there was a slight skew for grandchildren as the most represented kin, although if Aldenham was excluded then siblings would predominate, unlike in 1851. In 1891, sisters were again in a majority compared with brothers; Hertford Urban exhibited a high majority with 45 sisters alongside 20 brothers. The majority of sisters lived with professional service household heads. 80% of professional service households with sisters featured an unmarried household head, whose average age was 38. The same gender bias occurred in nieces and nephews, conditioned by the rates in Bushey: 41 nieces against 19 nephews. Geography may explain this, for 36.5% of Bushey’s nieces moved from their birthplace in Middlesex and London to Hertfordshire. The majority resided with heads of household working in professional service, or lived on their own means in retirement, characterising Bushey as a haven for the retired.

---

<sup>41</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, pp. 142-3.

<sup>42</sup> See Chapter One, p. 36.

<sup>43</sup> Calculated from Nair and Gordon, *Public Lives*, Table 4, p. 37.

<sup>44</sup> Anderson, “Households, Families and Individuals,” p. 426.

Zhao argues that the demographic transition of falling mortality and fertility rates produced “an increasing vertical extension in a person’s kin connections,” which included a rise in grandparents.<sup>45</sup> However, by 1891, there was an increase in recorded parents from 1851, long before the effects associated with the demographic transition. There were more mothers than fathers; the former enjoyed an increase in the four urban parishes from 3.7% in 1851 to 5.4% in 1891. 15.1% of all kin in 1891 were parents, an increase from 10.5% in 1851, as well as above the 11.1% in the National Sample in that year.<sup>46</sup> In line with demographic studies of late Victorian Norfolk, falling mortality and increasing life expectancy may have resulted in a rise of the number of parents in Hertfordshire.<sup>47</sup> Despite this, the steady rates for grandchildren, siblings and nephews/nieces were associated with the pre-demographic transition period. Siblings fell slightly from 27.3% to 26.4%, whereas nieces and nephews increased from 18.8% to 19.1%, conforming similarly to Glasgow.<sup>48</sup>

Despite Goose’s argument that “households that were vertically extended were relatively rare,” some parishes were more likely to contain vertically structured households than others, that is, households containing a parent dependent on the household head and an offspring-in-law.<sup>49</sup> Out of 3,594 households in 1851, 193 were vertically extended, or 5.4%. This is higher than that found in the St. Albans region, at 3.1%.<sup>50</sup> Only 9% of households with kin were vertical in Great Gaddesden, whereas 40% in Therfield contained vertical structures. In 1891, 45% of kin-based households were vertical in Barley. Six of the eleven recorded mothers in 1851 Therfield were recorded as “paupers” or as receiving poor relief. The 1891 return for Barley unfortunately provides less detail on poverty, aside from one reference to an “agricultural labourer (out of work).” If cross-checked with the Buntingford Union parliamentary report in 1894, however, where there are concerns that the decline in outdoor relief “during each of the last two decades [...] is but slight,” then it appears that vertically-extended households were a response to poverty.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Z. Zhao, “The Demographic Transition in Victorian England and Changes in English Kinship Networks,” *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 11, No. 2, (August 1996), pp 243-272, quote on p. 270.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson, “Households, Families and Individuals,” p. 426.

<sup>47</sup> A. Armstrong, *The Population of Victorian and Edwardian Norfolk* (Norwich, 2000), Table 3.4, p. 55.

<sup>48</sup> Calculated from Nair and Gordon, *Public Lives*, Table 4, p. 37.

<sup>49</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 177.

<sup>50</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 177.

<sup>51</sup> BPP, [C.6894-II], 1893-4, *Royal Commission on Labour*, p. 49. See Chapter One, pp. 25-26, where this source is used to uncover agricultural depression in the Buntingford Union and its ramifications for household structure.

The increase in the number of parents governed the overall rise in vertically-extended households from 1851 to 1891. This is despite the overall figure of 4.9% when the 4,659 households in our sample for 1891 are incorporated, a fall from 5.3% in 1851, although out of all households that featured kin, 26.5% were vertical compared with 25.7% in 1851. A rise in the extended family is evident through the upper range of kin. However, in the lower range, sons and daughters in-law fell over 40 years, with sons-in-law experiencing the biggest decrease at 5.4% to 2.7%. In Ware, where in-laws fell most, they resided primarily in the households of the widowed; the fall in in-laws coincided with the fall in recorded widowed, from 5% to 3% over 40 years.

### *Kinship, Migration and Neighbourhood in Hertfordshire, 1851 and 1891*

A published Coroner's Inquest, extracted from the *Royston Crow*, shows that extended relations were not necessarily confined to an individual household. On 8 July 1892, a fatal accident occurred in Therfield to William George King, who is recorded in the 1891 census as William King, aged 30, unmarried and son to widower George King at schedule 59. Fanny Emma Gatward, aged 22, is described in the extract as his sister, and lived with husband Frederick and her two children at schedule 25 on census night. Interestingly, a year later, the extract records King as unmarried and living with the witness, Gatward. She had not seen him until "he was brought home in a cart about half-past nine pm." Gatward explained that her dying brother was put to bed, caring for him throughout the night until his passing.<sup>52</sup> In this context, the arguments regarding households as isolated and insular needs reconsideration. Reay incorporated the 1851 census and family reconstitution data to show that, in Hernhill parish, 60% of households were related to one another.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, in 1841 Whiteparish, Wiltshire, 83% of households had "first-order kin" within the parish, while in 1851 Bulkworthy, Devonshire, the kinship web was slightly weaker, at 52.6%.<sup>54</sup> Conclusively, kinship was not peripheral in rural communities, but an integral part of neighbourhood.

---

<sup>52</sup> T. Gandy and A. Jones (eds.), *Village Chronicles: Kelshell, Rushdon, Sandon, Therfield and Wallington - Part 3: Mostly About Events* (The North Hertfordshire Villages Research Group, 1987), p. 36.

<sup>53</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, Table 6.5, p. 165.

<sup>54</sup> "First-order kin" refers to specific links with parents, children and siblings; see Reay, *Microhistories*, p.164. D. Moody, "Whiteparish 1841: Some Dynamics of a Rural Parish," *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, No. 104, (2011), pp. 237-250; C. Verney and J. Few, "Is Blood Thicker Than Water? Farm Servants and the Family in Nineteenth-Century North Devon," *Local Population Studies* No. 91, (Autumn 2013), pp. 10-26.

When explaining high kinship links between households, Reay acknowledged the “strong local origins” of these inhabitants.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, the higher the proportion of individuals that are born in the parish in which they reside, the more likely that kin would be present because the absence of geographical mobility enables contacts to be maintained. In Lilley, the increase in the kinship population (6.4% to 7.6%) coincided with an increase in the native-born population in 1891 from 1851 (57.9% to 65.2%), while wider kin increased in Great Gaddesden alongside a stable native-born population (58.8% in 1851; 58.1% in 1891). Granted, Hertford Urban had the highest percentage of kin in 1851 despite a native-born population of less than half, and in that year Bushey’s kinship rate was above the average despite a native-born population of fewer than 40%. Interestingly, however, in Therfield where the Gatward and King families resided, a high percentage was born native to the parish, at 71.1% in 1851 and 61.8% in 1891. Although more migrated from the parish over time, there was still a substantial native-born population to reinforce extended kinship ties beyond the household.

---

<sup>55</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, p. 165.

Table 2.4 – Proportions of Households Related to One Another By Kinship, Alongside Percentage of Native-Born and Surnames Found in Two or More Households, 1851 and 1891

| PARISH     | DIST. | POP. | H'HOLDS | %<br>H'HOLDS<br>RELATED | %<br>NATIVE<br>TO<br>DIST./<br>PARISH |      | % OF<br>SURNAME<br>IN TWO+<br>H'HOLDS | REGION | YEAR |
|------------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|            |       |      |         |                         |                                       |      |                                       |        |      |
| Barley     | All   | 868  | 178     | 75.8                    | 74.4                                  | 40.0 | Royston                               | 1851   |      |
| Barley     | All   | 574  | 140     | 67.1                    | 65.1                                  | 36.0 | Royston                               | 1891   |      |
| Gt. Berks  | 4b    | 641  | 129     | 24.8                    | 46.0                                  | 12.1 | Berkhamsted                           | 1851   |      |
| Hert. Urb  | 5b    | 617  | 142     | 21.2                    | 32.9                                  | 9.8  | Hertford                              | 1851   |      |
| Hert. Urb  | 4     | 474  | 94      | 19.1                    | 54.0                                  | 13.2 | Hertford                              | 1891   |      |
| Lilley     | All   | 528  | 104     | 48.0                    | 57.9                                  | 24.5 | Hitchin                               | 1851   |      |
| Lilley     | All   | 526  | 111     | 61.2                    | 65.2                                  | 29.0 | Hitchin                               | 1891   |      |
| St. Albans | 4b    | 975  | 206     | 36.8                    | 51.0                                  | 13.4 | St. Albans                            | 1851   |      |
| Therfield  | 2a    | 847  | 168     | 62.5                    | 71.1                                  | 29.6 | Royston                               | 1851   |      |
| Therfield  | 19    | 592  | 195     | 59.2                    | 61.8                                  | 21.2 | Royston                               | 1891   |      |
| Tring      | 7e    | 554  | 123     | 38.2                    | 55.0                                  | 16.8 | Berkhamsted                           | 1851   |      |
| Ware Urb   | 1b    | 807  | 160     | 51.2                    | 59.1                                  | 25.2 | Ware                                  | 1851   |      |
| Ware Urb   | 2     | 957  | 195     | 40.5                    | 58.5                                  | 20.7 | Ware                                  | 1891   |      |

Source (for the Berkhamsted and St. Albans data): see footnote 56.

Table 2.4 presents a selection of communities from the Hertfordshire sample as well as from published studies of the Berkhamsted and St. Albans region.<sup>56</sup> The percentage of households related by kinship to one another has been calculated through birthplaces and age profiles of the household head. Because family reconstitution is too time-consuming for this study, decisions determining households with kinship links were taken on plausibility. This approach will allow consideration of changing kinship networks across time, as Reay only analysed household kinship links in 1851.<sup>57</sup> Therefore, one can chart if kinship beyond the household was weakened by rural depopulation or urbanisation over time. Market towns will be examined, for there is little research on kinship beyond households in these parts. For the larger parishes, however, only a single enumeration district was analysed.

<sup>56</sup> The Berkhamsted and St. Albans parishes and sample enumeration districts consulted alongside the Hertfordshire sample communities were Tring 7e and Great Berkhamsted 4b (Berkhamsted region) and St. Albans parish 4b (St. Albans region). Calculated from published census data in Goose, *Berkhamsted*, pp. 130-145 for Great Berkhamsted 4b, pp. 299-312 for Tring 7e and in Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 480-503 for St. Albans parish 4b.

<sup>57</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, pp. 164-8. Since writing this chapter, a recent *Local Population Studies* publication on kinship in Victorian Devonshire has considered changes in wider kinship links across time in Varney and Few, "Is Blood Thicker than Water?".

The results reveal wide variations. In 1851, 75.8% of households in Barley were evidently related to one another, cross-referencing the percentage of those native to the parish at 74.4%. Contrastingly, district 5b of Hertford Urban saw 21.2% of households inter-related, and the percentage native-born in the district was only 32.9%. In Hertford district 5b, there were 205 individual surnames, although only 20 (9.8%) spread across two or more households. In Barley, however, 52 (40.0%) of the 130 surnames were recorded in two or more households; the Newling and Parker families featured in eight households. For the Parkers, the oldest is a 68-year-old widow from Clavering, Essex, named Sarah, who moved to Barley where she met her partner. Both native-born heads of household, Jonah Parker at district 9a, schedule 18, aged 52 and William Parker, aged 57 at schedule 44, are likely her brothers-in-law. Sarah's occupation reads "Supported by Sons." Presumably, 35-year-old James Parker, living only six doors from her, was related because Sarah resided with her granddaughter Mary, aged 9, who was possibly James' daughter. William Parker, aged 31, a son-in-law of the Negus family and living in the opposite enumeration district at schedule 69 and 26-year-old Joseph Parker at schedule 68 in Sarah's district could also have supported her. The remaining two households comprised of Thomas Parker at district 9b schedule 70, who owned a public house, the "King William Beer Shop," and perhaps the son of Jonah described above, who is similarly recorded as "innkeeper." Finally, there is 45-year-old Ann Parker, living as a "Gardener's Wife," whose husband was likely away on census night. From one case example, there are enriching details demonstrating wider kinship in the sense that households interacted through blood ties.

Surprisingly, Lilley contained a lower proportion of kinship links at 48.0% in 1851. Remembering that Offley was partly situated within Lilley means that kinship links would be higher if the population of Offley was incorporated into Lilley's.<sup>58</sup> Therfield produced a figure above Hernhill's results, at 62.5%. Therfield's enumerators recorded the surnames Anderson and Gatward in 10 and 9 households respectively – a total of one in ten for all households. The understanding that each family was related across households is borne out by the high proportions native to district 2a of Therfield: 88.1% (Anderson) and 100% (Gatward). By 1891, the Andersons and Gatwards became related to one another. James Anderson was aged 33, married and a household head in 1851, reappearing in 1891 as a 73-year-old widower and father-in-law to James Gatward, married to Clara.

---

<sup>58</sup> For a map covering the geographical position of the parishes in Hertfordshire, see Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 28.

Generally, market towns failed to match the rates of kinship beyond households in rural parishes. Great Berkhamsted was slightly higher than Hertford Urban at 24.8%, although rates were higher in St. Albans and Tring, where over a third of their households had a kinship link. Tring was a largely populated community containing a market town *and* rural districts, a matter possibly affecting the percentage of native-born at 55.0%, due to intra-parish movements from countryside to town.<sup>59</sup> Similarly, Ware Urban contained an unexpected kinship rate beyond the household, at 51.2%. The Page family were found in six households, two of which featured the Pages as lodgers. The remaining four saw two widows in their sixties as household heads, and two heads aged 26 and 37 respectively, plausibly highlighting a link through parent and offspring. Overall, neighbouring kinship surfaced in more urbanised places as well as rural districts.

Despite the decline of kin inside the household in Barley and Therfield over 40 years, 67.1% of households in 1891 Barley shared kinship links, rates higher than in Hernhill four decades ago. This suggests that extended kinship links were retained in periods of economic instability. Two-thirds of the surnames were also present 40 years ago, from Sapstead to Simmance and Newling to Parker. James Barnes (spelt as “Barns” in 1851) was 23 years old in 1851, and lived at schedule 88 district 9a as the oldest of six children. In 1891, at 122 Putty Hall, James was now 63, with a wife, Honnor, and son William, aged 31. At schedule 123 was another Barnes family, headed by James’ son, Allan, aged 36, married and living with two sons. If cross-checked with the proportions of native-born in Barley, at 74.4% in 1851 to 65.1% in 1891, then the relationship between kinship and immobility is realised. Contrastingly, in Bulkworthy, Devonshire, kinship was severely weakened by large-scale emigration. Just over a third of kinship links between households were recorded in 1871 from 52.4% in 1851. In Barley and Therfield, their fluid populations did not lead “to a dislocation of community cohesion in the parish” as found for Bulkworthy.<sup>60</sup> This may be due to occupational structure. In 1851, 84.5% of agricultural labourers were native to Barley; in 1891, 77.2% were. In district 19 of 1891 Therfield, which provided the sample to chart kinship links, it was 79.9% from 72.2% in district 2a in 1851.

The population increases in Ware and Hertford could indicate a fall in kinship-bound households by 1891. However, while kinship between households remained peripheral in

---

<sup>59</sup> For more information on the problems of defining which parts of a market town actually acquired urban characteristics, see Goose, *St. Albans*, p. 31 and fn. 10.

<sup>60</sup> Varney and Few, “Is Blood Thicker Than Water?” p. 25.

Hertford Urban, it was more substantial in Ware Urban, at two-fifths. Five households belonged to the Page family in 1891 Ware. Mary Page, aged 26 and married in 1851, became a widow aged 67 in 1891, living alone, although she may have received assistance from her nephew Joshua who lived six schedules away, aged 52 in 1891 from 12 in 1851. In both periods, half of all occupations by the Pages aged over fifteen years were associated with local Ware: barging and malt-making. This demonstrates that localised occupations as well as their non-migratory characteristics determined kinship links. Despite the decline of households with kinship links over time, there was a strong relationship between kinship and neighbourhood in late Victorian society. Especially in the agrarian-intensive Barley and Therfield, wider kinship bonds remained intact despite economic dislocation.

### *Conclusion*

Ruggles' argument that the number of extended families rose in late Victorian England is not supported for Hertfordshire. The majority of communities saw a decline in households with kin 1851-1891, aside from Lilley, Great Gaddesden and Aldenham. The persisting rates of households containing kin when headed by straw plait workers, and the stable proportions of farmers over time, governed the increase in extended households in the two communities. Contrastingly, the fluid population rates for Barley and Therfield resulted in the decline of individuals recorded as kin, and this affected communities where populations increased, particularly in Bushey, Hertford and Ware, although not in Aldenham.

The parallels in Table 2.2 with Wall and Reay's occupational data also highlighted the importance of occupational structure in extended family formation. The economy of the communities required stability for kin to be retained in the household. The leather, metal and wood trades contracted in Hertfordshire over time, possibly owing to rising imports or the growth of factory production, thus diminishing the proportions of kin in these households. Contrastingly, the rise in retail and distribution meant a rise in kin in households headed by retail workers. Based on this, Ruggles' cautions about predetermining the rates of extended families through functional terms has been tried and tested.<sup>61</sup> Society's inhabitants do function culturally and psychologically. However, economic circumstances produced some interesting familial patterns. For example, the proportions of sisters in 1851, higher in Hertford than Ware, were strongly associated with household heads working in public service.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, p. 134.



As for kin components, the decline in grandchildren and siblings/siblings-in-law 1851-1891 was small, although there was an accelerated rise in recorded parents. This was surprising given that the rise of parents would occur in the post-demographic transition period, when mortality fell. The rise in parents did not correspond with a rise in vertically-extended households when all households in the 1891 sample are included, but they increased when households containing kin were calculated in isolation. Consistent rates in vertical households were found for Barley and Therfield, where they were formed in response to poverty. From these cases, vertically-based households were by no means non-existent.

Despite the fall in extended families, there were strongly persisting kinship links beyond the household. The continuity in the same surnames recorded in Barley and Therfield meant that while kinship inside the household was broken by population change, kinship in terms of neighbourhood remained intact. In 1851 and 1891, two-thirds to three-quarters of Barley's households shared kinship links, compared with 19.6% to 14.3% of households where kin were recorded inside. Despite the absence of family reconstitution, the results regarding kinship beyond households appear feasible, based on careful scrutiny of birthplaces and age profiles of those sharing surnames across households. The figures for the rates of kinship beyond households conform to the wider literature that made use of family reconstitution. Market towns generally included more mobile inhabitants and thus could not forge kinship links, although contacts outside their communities remain unexplored.

It would be disingenuous to ignore wider kin whose origins lay further afield, such as in Bushey. The kinship bond was strong in both periods, despite high in-migration. However, kin relations more likely occurred in areas where inhabitants were relatively immobile. In this way, geographical differences are fundamental to understanding kinship. In Lilley and Great Gaddesden, kinship increased alongside a rise in the native-born. The high percentages of native-born contribute to high kinship links beyond households, as explored in the Anderson and Gatward families from Therfield. Kinship bonds were seen in young Mary Parker's visits to her grandmother's, who lived only a few doors away. From these examples, kinship was far from peripheral, but integral to community life throughout the Victorian period in Hertfordshire.

## Chapter Three:

### RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS OF THE ELDERLY IN MID-VICTORIAN HERTFORDSHIRE, 1851-1891

Thomson initiated the heavily debated issue of intra-household care of the elderly by offspring and kin. He argued that Anderson's percentage of co-residence between elderly and offspring in 1851 Preston, Lancashire, at 68%, was an exceptional statistic.<sup>1</sup> From a sample of census data, Thomson concluded that "the percentages of the elderly who lived with a child were not to be above 40, with a few more per cent living with some other kin."<sup>2</sup> Laslett further argued that the "collectivity" of poor relief, charitable institutions and neighbourly assistance compensated for the problems a nuclear-based family structure imposed on the elderly.<sup>3</sup> However, local studies highlight that the co-residence of elderly and offspring was more substantial than that calculated by Thomson. Between 45% and 56% of elderly lived with their offspring and other kin in three Kentish parishes, and a sample of anonymised census data from 1891 to 1921 concluded that 47% to 52% of elderly men and women lived in the same household as offspring.<sup>4</sup> According to Thane, familial assistance and poor relief were "shifting and variable components in the 'economy of makeshifts' in which poor old people had long struggled."<sup>5</sup>

There is little knowledge of the household arrangements of the elderly in rural southern England, compared with the in-depth examinations of industrialised Preston, Staffordshire and Nottinghamshire.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, Dupree argues that rural and small town communities relied more on the "collectivity" than industrial parishes, although no study has actually tested her argument.<sup>7</sup> Was co-residence a major household pattern in agricultural parishes as in industrial communities? Did elderly women receive a higher degree of familial support than elderly men? How far do census records highlight poor relief and family ties as "variable components"? This chapter will address these questions, using digitised census data, although

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, Table 38, p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> Thomson, "Welfare," p. 364.

<sup>3</sup> Laslett, "Family, Kinship and Collectivity," pp. 153-175.

<sup>4</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, p. 170; R. Wall, "Elderly Persons and Members of Their Households in England and Wales from Preindustrial Times to the Present," in D.I. Kertzer and P. Laslett (eds.), *Ageing in the Past: Demography, Society and Old Age*, (London, 1995), pp. 81-106.

<sup>5</sup> P. Thane, "Old People and their Families in the English Past," in M. Daunton (ed.), *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past: 1500 to the Present* (London, 1996), pp. 84-103, quote on p. 100.

<sup>6</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*; Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*; Rose, "Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly."

<sup>7</sup> Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, p. 328.

Charles Booth's studies of the aged poor in the 1890s will provide qualitative testimony. A complete analysis of the household patterns of the elderly poor in the 1851 census for Hertfordshire, as well as poor relief data from surviving application registers in the Hertford Union, will expand on an analysis of Hertfordshire's eight selected communities. These sources will help show that co-residence between elderly and offspring was more significant than Thomson believed.

Table 3.1 –Residential Patterns of Elderly by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851 and 1891

| Living with...             | 1851 |      |      | 1891 |      |      |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                            | RUR  | URB  | TOT  | RUR  | URB  | TOT  |
| Offspring                  | 28.6 | 23.1 | 24.1 | 23.0 | 22.7 | 22.8 |
| MALE                       | 29.2 | 24.0 | 24.9 | 25.5 | 25.0 | 25.1 |
| FEMALE                     | 28.0 | 22.2 | 23.4 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 20.8 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 83   | 99   | 95   | 129  | 98   | 103  |
| Wider Kin                  | 12.2 | 13.2 | 13.0 | 14.8 | 12.7 | 13.1 |
| MALE                       | 7.7  | 13.2 | 12.2 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| FEMALE                     | 15.9 | 13.2 | 13.7 | 19.4 | 15.0 | 15.7 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 38   | 91   | 79   | 55   | 54   | 54   |
| Off/Kin                    | 24.5 | 20.6 | 21.3 | 19.6 | 19.7 | 19.7 |
| MALE                       | 20.0 | 18.1 | 18.4 | 18.9 | 19.5 | 19.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 28.0 | 22.8 | 23.9 | 20.4 | 19.9 | 20.0 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 57   | 72   | 69   | 95   | 80   | 82   |
| No off/kin<br>(+spouse)    | 25.2 | 27.2 | 26.8 | 38.8 | 34.1 | 34.9 |
| MALE                       | 33.8 | 28.0 | 29.0 | 42.5 | 34.5 | 36.0 |
| FEMALE                     | 18.3 | 26.4 | 24.8 | 35.0 | 33.7 | 33.9 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 147  | 97   | 104  | 125  | 84   | 91   |
| As lodger/vis<br>/serv etc | 9.5  | 16.0 | 14.8 | 3.8  | 10.8 | 9.6  |
| MALE                       | 9.2  | 16.8 | 15.4 | 2.8  | 11.1 | 9.5  |
| FEMALE                     | 9.8  | 15.3 | 14.2 | 4.5  | 10.5 | 9.6  |
| SEX RATIO                  | 75   | 100  | 97   | 60   | 86   | 84   |
| Lodger only                | 6.8  | 8.0  | 7.8  | 1.9  | 8.5  | 7.3  |
| MALE                       | 7.7  | 9.9  | 9.5  | 1.9  | 9.7  | 8.2  |
| FEMALE                     | 6.1  | 6.3  | 6.3  | 1.9  | 7.4  | 6.6  |
| SEX RATIO                  | 100  | 143  | 135  | 100  | 107  | 107  |

*Notes:* Excludes the elderly in almshouses, hospitals and workhouses. A further breakdown by parish can be found in Appendix One, Table 3A and 3B, pp. 82-3. For a definition of what parishes represent the “Rural” and “Urban” group, see Chapter One, note, p. 23.

Table 3.2 – Percentage of Elderly Co-Residing with Offspring by Parish and by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851 and 1891

|           | PARISHES |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|           | Lil      | Gad  | Barl | Ther | Ald  | Bus  | Her  | War  | RUR  | URB  | TOT  |
| 1851      | 58.8     | 36.1 | 53.7 | 62.3 | 39.5 | 41.0 | 50.0 | 40.8 | 53.1 | 43.6 | 45.4 |
| MALE      | 60.0     | 26.7 | 52.6 | 57.7 | 34.1 | 34.2 | 55.0 | 38.6 | 49.2 | 42.1 | 43.4 |
| FEMALE    | 58.3     | 42.9 | 54.5 | 66.7 | 45.9 | 46.4 | 45.0 | 42.9 | 56.1 | 45.0 | 47.2 |
| SEX RATIO | 43       | 44   | 83   | 83   | 88   | 58   | 108  | 87   | 70   | 85   | 82   |
| 1891      | 39.3     | 40.9 | 42.0 | 46.2 | 27.2 | 41.3 | 41.0 | 50.9 | 42.6 | 42.4 | 42.5 |
| MALE      | 50.0     | 38.2 | 44.8 | 48.4 | 29.2 | 45.7 | 41.0 | 52.6 | 44.3 | 44.5 | 44.4 |
| FEMALE    | 31.3     | 43.8 | 38.1 | 44.1 | 25.5 | 37.6 | 41.0 | 49.4 | 40.8 | 40.8 | 40.8 |
| SEX RATIO | 67       | 93   | 163  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 74   | 95   | 112  | 89   | 93   |

*Residential Patterns of the Elderly in the Hertfordshire Sample, 1851 and 1891*

Table 3.1 examines households in 1851 and 1891 that accommodated the elderly aged 65 and over in Hertfordshire’s eight communities, with an analysis broken down by the collective totals of four communities in the rural and urban groups. Table 3.2 further examines the percentage of the elderly co-residing with offspring by parish. Those living with offspring only, with extended kin only, with offspring and extended kin in the same household, living alone or with a spouse, and as lodgers, servants and visitors were grouped separately. Those living with offspring only and with both offspring and kin were combined into another group and lodgers were also calculated separately. Institutions that represent Laslett’s definition of the “collectivity,” such as almshouses, workhouse and hospital populations were excluded from analysis.<sup>8</sup> As Table 3.2 reveals for 1851, the rural parishes of Barley, Lilley and Therfield exhibited a rate of co-residence much higher than Thomson’s barrier of 40%. In Barley, the percentage of elderly that lived with offspring only and lived with both offspring and kin totalled 53.7%. In Lilley, it was 58.8%, slightly higher than 57% in Staffordshire and higher than 56% in Colyton, Devonshire.<sup>9</sup> Therfield’s percentage of elderly co-residing with offspring peaked at 62.3%, close to the 68% found by Anderson for 1851 Preston, Lancashire.<sup>10</sup> Despite Great Gaddesden’s similar economic characteristics with Lilley as a straw plaiting community, only 36.1% of elderly co-resided with offspring. This was due to

<sup>8</sup> See Peter Laslett’s description of almshouses in *A Fresh Map of Life: The Emergence of the Third Age* (London, 1991), p. 133. Almshouses were “institutions in which personal and institutional life were mingled.”

<sup>9</sup> Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, p. 328; Robin, “Family Care,” pp. 505-516.

<sup>10</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, Table 38, p. 139.

the higher sex ratio (males per 100 females) of elderly in Great Gaddesden (71) than Lilley (42), in which the majority of men lacked co-residence with offspring, supporting similar circumstances in 1851 Preston.<sup>11</sup> However, this does not explain the higher sex ratios in Barley (86) and Therfield (96), both of which command higher co-residential rates. In Therfield, the majority of elderly men lived with offspring only, at 37.7%. Of these 10 men, 9 were married and 1 widowed, 9 of which held an occupation. Similar to Preston, the majority resided with unmarried children.<sup>12</sup>

The four urban parishes were less likely to contain co-residential structures, although the 43.6% of elderly that co-resided with offspring is still higher than Thomson's figures. Exactly half of the elderly analysed in Hertford Urban co-resided with offspring. Perhaps surprisingly, in Hertford Urban, there were more men living with offspring and kin than without any kin. A higher percentage of elderly women, even when almshouses and other institutions are excluded, lived without kin. This contradicts previous research arguing that women received more familial assistance in old age than men.<sup>13</sup> Over half of the elderly men in Hertford that co-resided with children were married. Of those married, only two had no occupation. Around 13% of offspring shared the occupation of their elderly fathers: two in labouring, one in agriculture, two in food and drink and two in building. While this figure is minimal, it shows that more elderly men co-resided with offspring than women in certain communities. This is because trade and craft occupations could be shared between the elderly and their offspring. The number of builders, retailers and other manufacturers were higher in urban than rural parishes, as found in the Berkhamsted and St. Albans regions of Hertfordshire in 1851.<sup>14</sup> The St. Albans region also shows that the sex ratio in towns favoured women, as in-migratory patterns to towns were higher amongst elderly females without familial ties.<sup>15</sup> In this case, familial support for elderly women was not as well-defined in towns as it was in rural communities. In Ware Urban, the sex ratio for those without kin reached 96. These statistics do not suggest a heavy skew towards elderly men in line with, for example, workhouse demographics.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140.

<sup>12</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140.

<sup>13</sup> N. Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender in Nineteenth-Century England: The Case of Hertfordshire," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Dec., 2005), pp. 351-384; Anderson, "Households, Families and Individuals," p. 426.

<sup>14</sup> Goose, *Berkhamsted*, Table 2, p. 30; Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 2, pp. 40-1.

<sup>15</sup> Goose, *St. Albans*, Table 1, p. 34, Table 13, p. 128, pp. 138-141.

<sup>16</sup> Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," Table 3, p. 360.

The numbers living with extended kin only favoured women. For the four rural parishes, a low sex ratio of 38 was discovered, slightly above 29 in Anderson's 1851 National Sample, while the sex ratio in the urban group was 91.<sup>17</sup> In non-conjugal households (that is, households without nuclear families but with extended kin), 52.6% of all elderly women were widowed, and another 22.8% unmarried. These results are reflected in 1851 Preston and in 1851 and 1881 for three Nottinghamshire communities. In Nottinghamshire, the sex ratio for the widowed in non-conjugal households was 72.<sup>18</sup> In the four urban communities, the lowest sex ratio was found for those in complex households (that is, with offspring *and* kin in the same household), at 72. The sex ratio in Bushey, at 44, was responsible for such results. It has been argued that Bushey was a relatively affluent community composed of retirees, explaining the four of eighteen elderly females in complex households in social group A, as fund-holders and housing proprietors.<sup>19</sup> Since wider kinship rates were more prominent amongst the highest social groups, and that 44.4% of Bushey's elderly females in complex households were recorded as dependent kin, this would affect their residential patterns. When all complex households in the eight communities are studied, the majority of female elderly were dependent, widowed mothers, representing a quarter of all elderly men and women in complex households. This reflects the three Nottinghamshire communities, where the sex ratio for the widowed in complex households in 1851 was 74.<sup>20</sup>

Contrastingly, the highest sex ratios were identified for the elderly living with no kin or as lodgers, servants and visitors, at 104 and 97 respectively, conforming to the wider literature in that men were less reliant on family support. 29.0% of elderly men lived with no offspring or kin compared with 24.8% for elderly women, and 15.4% of elderly men were lodgers, visitors or servants alongside 14.2% of women.<sup>21</sup> 9.5% of all male elderly were in lodgings only, compared with 6.3% of female elderly. The proportion of male lodgers out of the male widowed population was 17.6% against 5.3% for female lodgers out of all female widowed. Similarly in Preston, male lodgers represented 18% of the elderly widowers against 4% of female lodgers.<sup>22</sup> However, in Hertford Urban, women were most likely to live alone in old age. Therefore, it is questionable that men received less familial support due to women's innate domesticity. In fact, elderly men lived with their offspring as productive individuals of

---

<sup>17</sup> Calculated from Anderson, "Households, Families and Individuals," p. 436.

<sup>18</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140; Calculated from Rose, "Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly," Table 1, pp. 108-109.

<sup>19</sup> See Chapter One, p. 32.

<sup>20</sup> Calculated from Rose, "Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly," Table 1, p. 109.

<sup>21</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140.

<sup>22</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140.

society, where the relationship, according to Thane, was as much “one of reciprocity as of dependency.”<sup>23</sup> Nonetheless, in Hertfordshire, 47.2% of elderly women co-resided with offspring against 43.4% for men, similar to the 1851 National Sample where 46.0% of females lived with offspring against 44.6% for men.<sup>24</sup>

Table 3.1 shows that the proportions living with offspring in both nuclear and complex households fell by 1891, in contrast to previous research. In Chilvers Coton, Warwickshire, where the silk weaving industry declined, an increase occurred from 1851 to 1901 in the numbers of unmarried children living in parental households.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, a comparison of anonymised data for 13 English and Welsh communities between 1891 and 1921 with Anderson’s 1851 National Sample identifies a rise in elderly-offspring co-residence.<sup>26</sup> A breakdown by parish reveals that a very low 27.2% of elderly in Aldenham co-resided with offspring. Three women were given rented accommodation in the Red Lion Cottages, formed in 1846 from a public house which was originally Aldenham’s poorhouse.<sup>27</sup> Four houses in the Round Bush address were reported to be erected by “the late Mrs. Stuart of Aldenham Abbey, in the year 1839, for four aged labourers.”<sup>28</sup> Five houses were recorded in 1891, three of which contained the elderly without kin. They were migratory: George Giles and his wife Eliza came from Gloucestershire, two came from Watford parish and one from St. Stephens. From this, the high proportions of elderly that retired independently in the community partly account for the parish’s low co-residential patterns.

Great Gaddesden is the only community to witness an increase in co-residential patterns by 1891 besides Bushey and Ware. The declining straw trade in Great Gaddesden may have resulted in more children being kept at home, in line with the decline of silk weaving in Chilvers Coton.<sup>29</sup> However, unlike in Chilvers Coton, Great Gaddesden saw more offspring in employment in co-residential households in 1891 than in 1851.<sup>30</sup> A third of offspring in complex households worked in straw plait in 1851, compared with a gradual fall to 26.9% in 1891. It was also important that the elderly in complex households worked. Only five of these

---

<sup>23</sup> P. Thane, *Old Age*, p. 297.

<sup>24</sup> Anderson, “Households, Families and Individuals,” p. 436.

<sup>25</sup> J. Quadagno, *Aging in Early Industrial Society: Work, Family and Social Policy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 31.

<sup>26</sup> Wall, “Elderly Persons and Members of Their Households,” p. 92.

<sup>27</sup> W. Page (ed.), *Victoria County History: A History of the County of Hertford*, Vol. 2 (1908), pp. 149-161.

<sup>28</sup> Kelly’s Trade Directory (1890), Aldenham, p. 695.

<sup>29</sup> Quadagno, *Aging in Early Industrial Society*, p. 71.

<sup>30</sup> This analysis only considers households where the elderly are household heads, not dependent kin.



held no occupation in 1851 and 1891. Seven male elderly participated in agriculture in 1891, while three female elderly worked in straw plait.

The rates of co-residence in Ware Urban rose from 40.8% in 1851 to 50.9% in 1891. For male elderly, only 38.6% co-resided in 1851, compared with 52.6% in 1891. 30% of male elderly living in complex households and in an occupation worked in food and drink, especially the locally-renowned brewing industry, enabling high co-residential patterns. For example, 68-year-old Robert H. Sell, a malt-maker, co-resided with 31-year-old son Walter C.W. Sell, recorded as “assistant malt.” Charles Castle, a 67-year-old baker, lived with three sons also recorded as bakers, the oldest aged 24. The small town, with its proliferation of food and retail shops, encouraged the retention of children in the parental household.

The sex ratio for the elderly in nuclear households was higher than in 1851. However, this was based on an exceptional ratio for Barley, where ten men lived with offspring compared with four women. In four households, where all elderly men were widowers, an offspring was recorded as “Housekeeper to Father.” If the male elderly in the four households were excluded, the sex ratio would be 100, suggesting a distortion, although Aldenham and Bushey’s sex ratios were skewed towards elderly men. In Bushey (sex ratio for nuclear households 107), 21 of the 31 were in paid work, although only one shared a trade with offspring.

The lowest sex ratio in 1891 was found in non-conjugal households. The bias in favour of female widows for non-conjugal households was also discovered in Wall’s research.<sup>31</sup> In Hertfordshire, 15.6% of the female widowed population lived in non-conjugal households, compared with 9.6% of the male widowed population. For females, this was higher than the data for the three Nottinghamshire communities in 1881, where 10.9% of widows lived in non-conjugal households, although for males, the figure for Hertfordshire is lower than Nottinghamshire’s 11.4%.<sup>32</sup> This contrast could be based on Hertfordshire’s small towns that contained lower sex ratios for those living with offspring, kin or both. Out of the 131 women living in complex households, 74 were widowed mothers of the household head. The female widowed also represented over half of the elderly that co-resided with married children. This echoes Anderson’s conclusions for 1851 Preston, where “being widowed and alone, rather

---

<sup>31</sup> R. Wall, “Elderly Widows and Widowers and their Coresidents in Late 19- and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century England and Wales,” *History of the Family*, No. 7 (2002), pp. 139-155.

<sup>32</sup> Calculated from Rose, “Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly,” Table 1, p. 108.

than old age itself, [...] was crucial in leading to co-residence of married children and parents.”<sup>33</sup>

Interestingly, more elderly men over time lived in complex households in Bushey and Ware Urban, as indicated by the increased sex ratio in 1891. This conforms to Wall’s anonymised 1891 census data, where he noted an increase in the numbers of elderly men with children compared with Anderson’s 1851 sample, from 45% to 48%.<sup>34</sup> The increase in Hertfordshire was narrower: 43.4% of elderly men co-resided with offspring in 1851, rising to 44.4% in 1891. An improvement in life expectancy by the late nineteenth-century may have occurred, although this is speculative. More plausibly, there was greater pressure to accommodate elderly males after the reforms of the Poor Law in the 1870s, which cut government expenditure by half.<sup>35</sup> This may have contributed to the increasing co-residence in Ware Urban, where over half of males were co-residing.

Similar to 1851, the sex ratio for those living without kin was higher than the ratios for non-conjugal and complex households. By 1891, a higher number of elderly men lived without offspring or kin, at 36.0%, echoing the 34% in Wall’s anonymised data.<sup>36</sup> However, the sex ratio for those living without kin was lower in 1891 than 1851. This demonstrates that across the Victorian period, women too lacked family support in old age; it was not a predominating circumstance for old men. In Hertford Urban, there were 8 widowers to 27 widows in lone households, conforming to Wall’s data.<sup>37</sup> In terms of lodgers, the numbers were skewed towards elderly men, with a sex ratio of 107 in 1891 from 135 in 1851. The fact that the sex ratio fell meant that more women were granted lodgings by a non-related family. The numbers of elderly women living solitarily (*not* with non-relatives or with spouse) increased in Hertfordshire, with 11.3% out of the 415 in 1851, compared with 13.1% of the 655 in 1891, echoing Wall’s data in 1891 from Anderson’s in 1851.<sup>38</sup>

Overall, co-residence of the elderly with offspring fell from 45.4% to 42.5% over 40 years, although the latter percentage breaks the ceiling of Thomson’s co-residence rate, 40%. There were higher co-residential rates in Great Gaddesden, Bushey and Ware by the late nineteenth-century. However, other communities with similar economic characteristics, such as Lilley

---

<sup>33</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140.

<sup>34</sup> Wall, “Elderly Persons and Members of their Households,” Table 2.4, p. 91.

<sup>35</sup> Thomson, “Welfare and the Historians,” pp. 373-4.

<sup>36</sup> Wall, “Elderly Persons and Members of their Households,” Table 2.4 p. 91. The percentage was calculated from the percentages of elderly men living alone, with spouse only, and nonrelatives only.

<sup>37</sup> Wall, “Elderly Widows and Widowers and their Coresidents,” Table 1, p. 141.

<sup>38</sup> Wall, “Elderly Persons and Members of their Households,” p. 92.

and Hertford Urban, witnessed a decline in co-residential patterns by 1891. This demonstrates the degree of variation by parish, and that, in accordance with Wall's conclusions, co-residential patterns cannot be explained purely by economic characteristics.<sup>39</sup> However, six out of the eight communities witnessed a rise in the elderly without offspring or kin. If the Poor Law reform of the 1870s meant "a decided lurch towards the familial pole of the continuum of welfare responsibilities," it is surprising that fewer families in Hertfordshire were responsible for the welfare of the elderly over time.<sup>40</sup> Factors for this were the increasing in-migration to the suburban parishes, greater urbanisation and increasing population of the small towns, and the rising out-migration from the dislocated agricultural parishes of Barley and Therfield.<sup>41</sup> However, these matters are complicated by suburban Bushey and urban Ware's increase in co-residential patterns. The high patterns in the native-born population in Ware Urban, as explored in Chapter One, may have preserved the contact people held with elderly kin. Conversely, the increasing in-migration of Hertford Urban may have conditioned the elderly, most likely migrants, to live without contact.<sup>42</sup>

#### *Household Arrangements of the Elderly Poor in Hertfordshire County, 1851*

Little has been done to investigate the household structures of the elderly *poor*. The historiography of old age confirms an inextricable relationship between old age and destitution.<sup>43</sup> From 1850-1852, 73.9% of those receiving out-relief were "not able," or predominantly the elderly.<sup>44</sup> When Victorian philanthropist Charles Booth published his studies of the aged poor in 1894, he calculated that a third of the population over 65 years received some form of poor relief in 1892.<sup>45</sup> The circumstances in Victorian Hertfordshire reflect Thane's ideas that familial resources supplemented welfare from the "collectivity".<sup>46</sup> In January 1846, the rector of Shenley parish in the Barnet region, Thomas Newcome, had written to *The Times* newspaper in response to a Poor Law Guardian's refusal to issue outdoor relief to 70-year-old "Widow Shambrook." She had to be removed to her native St.

---

<sup>39</sup> Wall, "Elderly Persons and Members of their Households," p. 97.

<sup>40</sup> Thomson, "Welfare," p. 374.

<sup>41</sup> See Chapter One, pp. 38-39.

<sup>42</sup> See Chapter One, p. 39.

<sup>43</sup> Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," pp. 351-361; P. Thane, "Women and the Poor Law in Victorian and Edwardian England," *History Workshop*, Vol. 6 (1978), pp. 29-51; L.H. Lees, *The Solidarities of Strangers: The English Poor Laws and the People, 1700-1948* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 52.

<sup>44</sup> Calculated from Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," Table 1, p. 73.

<sup>45</sup> Booth, *Aged Poor*, pp. 419-420.

<sup>46</sup> Thane, "Old People and their Families," pp. 84-103.

Albans, in accordance with settlement laws. He explained that Shambrook deserved out-relief, complaining that

“The woman must quit her son’s roof (where she is lodged gratis by him, but not boarded gratis, because he has a wife and family), in order to live within St. Albans Union! [...] When I sat as ex-officio chairman of the vestry of my own parish, no poor person, except incurables or absolutely helpless souls, was forced to quit home.”<sup>47</sup>

The 1851 census for Shenley shows that, six years after Newcome’s report, “Widow Shambrook”, now 75 years old and forenamed Maria, received poor relief under her son’s household.<sup>48</sup> In this case, Thomas Newcome and Maria’s family are symbolic of the welfare system for the aged, since family and state welfare were equally valuable resources in old age. Such references are scattered across Flora Thompson’s biographical account of rural Oxfordshire, in *Lark Rise to Candleford*. One widow, Queenie, is described as managing to live through “parish relief and a little help here and there from her children and friends.”<sup>49</sup>

Further quantitative proof of this is indicated in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, which examines every 65-year-old and over in 1851 Hertfordshire classed in the occupation column as poor or receiving parish relief. Table 3.3 analyses the residential patterns of the 1,293 individuals over 65 described as paupers in their own households, not counting almshouse or workhouse residence, while Table 3.4 breaks down the percentage of elderly co-residing with offspring by Hertfordshire region. The machine-readable CD-Rom format of the 1851 census for Hertfordshire has enabled such an analysis. The types of residential patterns in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 are replicated in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 and all results are distinguished by Superintendent Registrar’s Districts (SRDs). This is with the exception of the Baldock area in Hitchin SRD and the Buntingford area, bordered as a Poor Law Union. Welwyn was incorporated into Hatfield SRD as was Edmonton in the Barnet SRD. Three parishes in the ancient county of Hertfordshire but enumerated in Bedfordshire Registration County were grouped under Hemel Hempstead SRD.

---

<sup>47</sup> J. Knight and S. Flood (eds.), *Two Nineteenth-Century Hertfordshire Diaries, 1822-1849* (Hertfordshire Record Society, 2002), p. 272.

<sup>48</sup> Digitised Census Enumerators’ Returns for Shenley in N. Goose (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-Rom* (Hatfield, 2005).

<sup>49</sup> F. Thompson, *Lark Rise to Candleford* (Oxford, 1954), p. 83.

Table 3.3 – Residential Patterns of the Elderly Recorded as Poor in Hertfordshire, 1851

|           | Offspring | Living With... |         |                  | As lodger, serv etc | As lodger only |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|
|           |           | Wider Kin      | Off/Kin | No Kin (+spouse) |                     |                |
| MALE      | 17.8      | 8.0            | 24.1    | 35.7             | 14.4                | 13.8           |
| FEMALE    | 17.4      | 13.0           | 28.4    | 28.1             | 13.0                | 10.3           |
| TOTAL     | 17.6      | 11.2           | 26.8    | 30.9             | 13.5                | 11.5           |
| SEX RATIO | 58        | 34             | 48      | 71               | 62                  | 75             |

*Notes:* Results exclude the elderly in almshouses, hospitals and workhouses. A further breakdown of residential patterns by Hertfordshire regions can be found in Appendix, Table 3C, pp. 84-5.

*Source:* N. Goose (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-Rom* (Hatfield, 2005).

Table 3.4 – Percentages of the Elderly Recorded as Poor and Co-Residing with Offspring by Region in Hertfordshire, 1851

| REGION          | TOTAL | SEX  |        |       |
|-----------------|-------|------|--------|-------|
|                 |       | MALE | FEMALE | RATIO |
| Baldock         | 40.9  | 47.5 | 35.8   | 100   |
| Barnet & Edm.   | 47.5  | 38.0 | 52.5   | 38    |
| Berkhamsted     | 53.3  | 59.4 | 50.0   | 66    |
| Bishop's Stort. | 38.3  | 39.3 | 37.5   | 80    |
| Buntingford     | 33.0  | 26.2 | 38.5   | 55    |
| Hatfield & Wel. | 57.8  | 57.9 | 57.7   | 73    |
| Hemel Hemp.     | 58.7  | 63.0 | 56.3   | 63    |
| Hertford        | 35.7  | 32.5 | 37.1   | 39    |
| Hitchin         | 45.7  | 42.9 | 47.2   | 48    |
| Royston         | 55.9  | 47.5 | 61.3   | 60    |
| St. Albans      | 55.6  | 53.8 | 56.1   | 30    |
| Ware            | 40.6  | 31.4 | 44.4   | 29    |
| Watford         | 41.2  | 37.3 | 43.1   | 43    |
| TOTAL           | 44.4  | 41.9 | 45.8   | 51    |

*Notes:* Results exclude the elderly in almshouses, hospitals and workhouses. The totals refer to the percentages of elderly residing with offspring only and offspring and kin only.

*Source:* N. Goose (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-Rom* (Hatfield, 2005).

As Table 3.4 shows, only 33% of the elderly co-resided with offspring in the Buntingford Union. Contrastingly, the Hemel Hempstead region witnessed nearly 59% co-residing with their children, with Hatfield and Welwyn narrowly behind at almost 58%. This is above Thomson's estimates, above the rates for Staffordshire, but still below Preston.<sup>50</sup> These figures question Dupree's argument that "collectivity, or the Poor Law [...] played such a central role in rural areas and small towns."<sup>51</sup> Only three regions featured co-residential rates under Thomson's percentage for his census data, 40%, while the Baldock and Ware regions narrowly break through the barrier, at 40.9% and 40.6% respectively. The top five regions with the highest percentages of elderly in complex households only were, in order, St. Albans, Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted, Hatfield and Welwyn, and Hitchin. Interestingly, they were the five most associated with the straw plaiting and hat manufacturing industries in Hertfordshire. Considering that elderly widows were most likely to co-reside with offspring, and the straw trade produced high levels of female employment and population rates, the straw and hat trades are responsible for the high patterns of elderly-offspring co-residence.<sup>52</sup> Daughters, participating in plaiting, were more inclined to accommodate their elders, as echoed in Colyton, Devonshire.<sup>53</sup> In the Hemel Hempstead region, the sex ratio of offspring living with elderly parents was 68, and of the 44 elderly co-residing with offspring over half were widows.<sup>54</sup>

It is interesting why Royston Registrars-District, despite its inadequate links to London and an economically backward nature, produced a high elderly-offspring co-residence rate of nearly 56%. Ashwell parish in Royston RD produced a high degree of straw plait workers due to its close proximity with the Hitchin region.<sup>55</sup> If Ashwell was excluded, then the co-residence rate for Royston RD would be much lower, at only 50%. This is further testament to the impact that the straw trade had on co-residential patterns. Contrastingly, in areas where the straw industry was less prominent, such as Bishop's Stortford and Buntingford, co-residential rates were lower, at 38.3% and 33.0% respectively. The sex ratio for Bishop's Stortford was 80, one of the highest of the thirteen selected regions. From this, co-residential patterns between elderly and offspring depended on a substantial female population in the

---

<sup>50</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140; Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, p. 328.

<sup>51</sup> Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, p. 328.

<sup>52</sup> Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," Table 6, p. 369.

<sup>53</sup> Robin, "Family Care," p. 510.

<sup>54</sup> This counted sons, daughters and step-children to the household head or wife.

<sup>55</sup> N. Goose, "Straw-Plaiting and Hat-Making," in Short (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Hertfordshire*, pp. 90-3.

region and their strong economic opportunities. This was based especially on whether a woman was widowed.

As in Table 3.1, the male elderly poor received less assistance from kin than females. The sex ratio of lodgers was 75, higher than that found for those living with offspring and kin at 48, those living with only kin at 34, living with offspring only at 58 and narrowly higher than those living without offspring and kin, at 71. Buntingford, Royston and Hertford's lodging populations favoured men, although Berkhamsted had the lowest sex ratio out of all Hertfordshire regions.<sup>56</sup> It is possible that Berkhamsted, as the most urban of all Hertfordshire regions, contained high proportions of lodgers in its two market towns.<sup>57</sup> Six of the thirteen regions had a sex ratio of 100 or over for those living as lodgers. Contrastingly, only the Bishop's Stortford region featured a sex ratio of 100 plus for non-conjugal households and no region held a sex ratio higher than 80 for complex households. The bias towards elderly women in households with offspring and kin is attributed to the domestic nature of the female elderly. In 1892, one Cambridgeshire Union reported in Booth's analysis of the aged poor that "aged women are often lodged and boarded by children in return for small household services."<sup>58</sup> For Hertfordshire, the Watford Union Guardians expressed that many elderly women "live with children and help in housework."<sup>59</sup> These contemporary accounts reflect Goose's research, where autobiographical accounts revealed that elderly women played a greater role in domestic affairs which entailed co-residential patterns.<sup>60</sup>

The presence of elderly men living with offspring only is interesting, reflecting Table 3.1. A high sex ratio of 200 was noted in the Hitchin region, alongside 122 in the Baldock region and 125 in the Bishop's Stortford region. 22 of the 30 male elderly in nuclear households in these three regions were married and slightly over half of these were recorded as employed; the majority in agriculture. When the same data was calculated for female elderly, 18 of the 20 were widowed. If elderly men were to co-reside with their children, then they needed to rely on the "economy of makeshifts," where families relied on complementary strategies to help them get by, such as low salaries, neighbourly support and charity.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless, in the

---

<sup>56</sup> Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," Table 6, p. 369.

<sup>57</sup> A breakdown of each Hertfordshire region by populations classed as "urban" is found in Goose, "Farm Service," Table 3, p. 287.

<sup>58</sup> Booth, *Aged Poor*, p. 151, 182.

<sup>59</sup> Booth, *Aged Poor*, p. 166.

<sup>60</sup> Lees, *Solidarities*, pp. 143-4; Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," p. 368.

<sup>61</sup> See A. Tomkins and S. King, "Introduction," in S. King and A. Tomkins (eds.), *The Poor in England 1700-1850: An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester, 2003), pp. 1-38.

Hitchin region, the sex ratio for complex households was 19, the lowest ratio in all Hertfordshire regions. All 26 women living in complex households were widowed, with just over half recorded as dependent to the household head. In fact, elderly women in Hertfordshire were slightly more likely to co-reside in complex households (28.4%) than live without kin (28.1%).

*Household Arrangements of the Elderly Poor in the Hertford Union, 1881*

If the census underestimates the number recorded as dependent on relief, then the surviving Hertford Union relief books for 1876-1885 allow a closer examination of actual relief applicants.<sup>62</sup> Table 3.5 examines the 1881 census to analyse the household structures of several poor relief claimants recorded in the relief books. A number of urban and rural parishes were selected, although the sample of over 50 individuals may be insufficient. This was more difficult when the earlier relief books were consulted, as many may have migrated from the parish between 1876 and 1881.

Table 3.5 - Residential Patterns of Poor Relief Claimants over 65 in Hertford Union, 1881

| LIVING WITH...              | MALE |       | FEMALE |       | TOTAL |       | SEX RATIO |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|
|                             | No.  | %     | No.    | %     | No.   | %     |           |
| Offspring                   | 3    | 16.6  | 4      | 11.7  | 7     | 13.4  | 75        |
| Kin                         | 3    | 16.6  | 5      | 14.7  | 8     | 15.3  | 60        |
| Offspring and Kin           | 5    | 27.7  | 9      | 26.4  | 14    | 26.9  | 56        |
| No kin (+ only spouse)      | 4    | 22.2  | 12     | 35.2  | 16    | 30.7  | 33        |
| As servant, lodger, visitor | 3    | 16.6  | 4      | 11.7  | 7     | 13.4  | 75        |
| TOTAL                       | 18   | 100.0 | 34     | 100.0 | 52    | 100.0 | 53        |
| As lodger only              | 2    | 11.1  | 2      | 5.9   | 4     | 7.7   | 100       |
| Offspring / Off + kin       | 8    | 44.4  | 13     | 38.2  | 21    | 40.4  | 62        |

*Sources:* Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies, Hertford Union Out-Relief Application Books, BG/HER/45, June-September 1876 and BG/HER/51, September 1880-March 1881; The National Archives, Hertford St. Andrew, RG 11/1425, Hertford St. John, RG 11/1423, Hertford All Saints, RG 11/1425, Little Berkhamstead, RG 11/1424, Hertingfordbury, RG 11/1424, Bengoe, RG 11/1424 and Brickendon, RG 11/1424.

The percentage of elderly poor that co-resided with children was 40.4%, a figure almost on par with Thomson's data, but above the 35.7% identified in Table 3.4 for the Hertford region.

<sup>62</sup> Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies (hereafter HALS), BG/HER/45, Hertford Union Out-relief Application Books, June-September 1876 and BG/HER/51, Hertford Union Out-relief Application Books, September 1880-March 1881.



The sex ratio in complex households was lower than in nuclear and non-conjugal households. Interestingly, more men co-resided with offspring and kin than lived without them, at 27.7% against 22.2%. As applicants for out-relief were predominantly female, the sample for men is expected to be lower, and such could affect the data. Interestingly, two of the three men that lived in nuclear households co-resided with offspring and were married. As mentioned earlier, this forms part of the struggle for survival by poor families in nuclear households. However, as the Hertford Union commanded a high urban presence, this would affect the numbers that lived alone, in line with Tables 3.1 and 3.3.<sup>63</sup> The relief books and 1881 census data for the Hertford Union reinforce the conclusions that more elderly women lived without kin than men. The sex ratio for those living with no kin was 33, lower than the 56 for complex households. From this data, familial support for women in old age in towns was not as well-established as in rural communities.

According to Reay, familial support and poor relief formed a long-negotiating process at the later stages of one's life cycle.<sup>64</sup> The poor relief data and the 1881 census can indicate this, as seen through Mary Mumford. She received three shillings worth of relief in All Saints parish on April 28 1876 on account of her disability. Although described as having "no means of support," in the 1881 census she was living with her son in St. Andrew parish who was the household head. She also co-resided with his wife, his step-son and his daughter; receiving relief again three weeks after the census was taken.<sup>65</sup> If Mary received parish relief without any familial support in 1876, but continued to receive relief under her son's household in 1881, then familial support and collectivity were not mutually exclusive, confirming Reay's arguments.

### *Conclusion*

Thomson underestimates familial support as a survival strategy for the elderly. In particular rural and small town communities, over half of the elderly lived with offspring, with a peak of 62.3% in 1851 Therfield, ahead of the 58.8% in Lilley and 53.7% in Barley. Although suburban parishes produced a lower percentage of elderly-offspring co-residence, the small towns of Hertford and Ware produced a rate far higher than Thomson's limit of 40%, with

---

<sup>63</sup> It was estimated that 43.2% of the population in the Hertford region lived in urbanised settings. Goose, "Farm Service," Table 6, p. 287.

<sup>64</sup> Reay, *Microhistories*, p. 174.

<sup>65</sup> HALS, BG/HER/45, Hertford Union Out-relief Application Books, June-September 1876, p. 8. I am also indebted to Hertfordshire Names Online for a comprehensive index on Mary Mumford: [https://www.hertsdirect.org/ufs/ufsmain?ebz=2\\_1391620176030&ebd=0](https://www.hertsdirect.org/ufs/ufsmain?ebz=2_1391620176030&ebd=0) (accessed February 5 2014); The National Archives (hereafter TNA), RG 11/1425, Hertford St. Andrew, District 16b, p. 16.

50.0% in 1851 Hertford and 50.9% in 1891 Ware. This was partly based on the low sex ratio in favour of elderly women living with both offspring and kin only, at 86 in 1851 Hertford and 94 in 1891 Ware, the majority of whom were widowed. The high numbers recorded as dependent kin of the household head indicate that they relocated to another household after losing their spouse. Since the evidence shows that elderly women were more domesticated than men, co-residence with widows was more desirable. More widowers lived without kin or as lodgers than in non-conjugal and complex households, reflecting previous conclusions by Anderson.<sup>66</sup> However, there was a high sex ratio in nuclear households; most elderly men headed their households, were married and had an occupation. The majority worked as general labourers; although the degree of their work cannot be detected, there were others involved in shoemaking, carpentry, plastering and butchering. Revealingly, women represented the majority living without kin in market towns. The high rates of elderly women migrating to and living independently in the town may account for this, including the gap in life expectancy between men and women in market towns, which was wider than in rural communities.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, there is no clear-cut argument that the majority of family support was directed towards elderly women.

Over time, fewer elderly men and women co-resided with their offspring. This was despite the contemporary campaign for greater familial assistance towards old age under the changing Poor Laws, and these conclusions break from previous historiography.<sup>68</sup> The inclusion of communities with wildly changing population rates over time, such as in the agriculturally depressed parishes, may have affected the results. The decline in native-born and the surge in migrant-born in these communities may have lowered the number of elderly that held contact with families. For example, in 1891 Aldenham, only 33% were native-born and 27% of elderly co-resided with offspring.

The household structures of the elderly poor were also examined through a county-wide analysis. The data supports Thane's argument that the poor received assistance from family as well as Poor Law officials.<sup>69</sup> Nearly three-fifths of the elderly receiving poor relief co-resided with offspring in the Hemel Hempstead region, alongside the high percentages found in the Berkhamsted, St. Albans, Hatfield/Welwyn and Royston regions. The former three regions produced the lowest sex ratios due to the high female employment in the straw plait

---

<sup>66</sup> Anderson, *Family Structure*, p. 140; Anderson, "Households, Families and Individuals," p. 436.

<sup>67</sup> R. Woods, *The Demography of Victorian England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2000), Table 9.4, p. 369.

<sup>68</sup> Wall, "Elderly Persons and Members of their Households," pp. 91-2.

<sup>69</sup> See footnote 5, p. 58.

and hat trades. This helped produce elderly and offspring co-residential rates far higher than Thomson's data, conforming to Goose's research.<sup>70</sup> Contrastingly, a low percentage of elderly-offspring co-residence coincided with higher sex ratios in the Bishop's Stortford and Baldock regions. Relying on traditional agricultural labour, there was a skew in the Bishop's Stortford population towards men, and since elderly men were more likely to live without family, co-residential patterns would be minimal. Urbanised parishes were less likely to produce co-residential patterns; hence the 35.7% in the relatively urban Hertford region in 1851 and the 40.4% from the poor relief registers of the Hertford Union. As already explained, the elderly in urban parishes were migratory and could have lacked the co-residential ties found in a community where the majority were native-born.

The fact that, in both census periods, under half of all elderly in the eight Hertfordshire communities received help from offspring would support Thomson's argument that the majority of elderly did not receive direct care from family. However, over half of elderly in both census periods received some form of familial care. 58% of all elderly in 1851 received intra-household care from not only offspring, but wider kin, alongside 56% in 1891. Relying on state welfare was one survival strategy among many, as up to three-fifths in a Hertfordshire region received both familial assistance and poor relief. Co-residence was a significant survival strategy for the elderly in Victorian England. For it to occur, communities required a population bias towards women, employment by the elderly, and the prevalence of widows over widowers.

---

<sup>70</sup> Goose, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender," pp. 368-71; A case example of four villages in the St. Albans region can be found in Goose, *St. Albans*, pp. 93-4.

## Conclusion:

### DIGITISED CENSUS DATA, THE ROOT CAUSES OF HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND THE FUTURE FOR THIS STUDY

This thesis has extensively used digitised census data in order to address topics neglected in the historiography of family and household structure. Firstly, household size in Hertfordshire was not wholly consistent across its eight selected communities over time, as testified by the agrarian-intensive parishes of Barley and Therfield. Agricultural depression caused a population decline in these two communities, producing household sizes in line with early twentieth-century totals. Some communities had a more consistent household size than others, such as Ware Urban and Bushey; the latter's household size only increasing by one point across 40 years. Hertford Urban accelerated in household size to figures above the 1891 national totals. This was based partly on a healthy population increase and a high concentration of non-public house lodgers involved mainly in the Hertford Militia. Communities did not only experience a heavy fall in household size, but evidence reveals that some parishes saw an unprecedented rise before the twentieth-century began. When these results were grouped together, they produced a steadily declining household size in line with the national fall.

The Hertfordshire sample conformed to the growing revisionist historiography on wider kinship and elderly-offspring co-residence. While wider kinship rates fell by the late nineteenth-century, inside and outside the household it was still a significant form of social and economic cohesion. This was not only based on the recruitment of wider kin in the textile industries or in agriculture, but on geographically immobile populations that kept in contact with wider kin. The families that stayed on in the parish and the same surnames that appeared in a community's census across 40 years meant that interactions with members outside the nuclear family were likely and formed at particular stages in the life-cycle. This was despite the population decline in Barley and Therfield by the late nineteenth-century, where the offspring growing up to form their own households could retain relationships with their parents through neighbourly kinship. This may have alleviated the isolation shared by the elderly inside the household, as elderly-offspring co-residence fell by the late nineteenth-century. Agricultural depression, suburbanisation and urbanisation broke down co-residential patterns over time, as they entailed migration from the family household. Nevertheless, co-

residential rates for some communities were higher than those estimated in previous studies. For example, half of households in Hertford Urban 1851 and Ware Urban 1891 saw the elderly co-reside with offspring, owing to the income provided by the elderly in employment, and the proportion of women, especially widows, who formed the majority of those living with offspring. The significance of elderly widows was reinforced through a study of the elderly poor in Hertfordshire in 1851, where the majority in the straw plait intensive regions relied on familial support as well as parish relief.

This thesis has also addressed methodological issues. Ruggles argues that not all of the determinants of changing family and household composition can be rationalised through economics.<sup>1</sup> However, this thesis highlights the strong association of economic circumstance and familial patterns. For example, there was a wide variation in the percentage of wider kin belonging to occupational-specific households: households where the head worked in textiles, farming and straw plait hosted more kin than the average figures in the Hertfordshire sample. Interestingly, local occupations in Ware, such as malt-making and barging, governed the retention of children in the household for longer and established ties with parents entering old age, as seen with the Page family examined in Chapter Two.<sup>2</sup> Cultural factors were also considered in this study. Chapter One showed that suburbanisation and the rural idyll governed the smaller households inhabited by students and staff at the Bushey School of Art, as well as the inclination of elderly people to retire to the outskirts of London.<sup>3</sup>

This study has also shown that households were governed by the circumstances of the parish, rather than by any reductionist “rural” or “urban” causes. For example, Lilley and Barley were both grouped as “rural” parishes, although while farm service remained substantial in Lilley, it was virtually non-existent in Barley. Also, family farms figured very little in other Hertfordshire parishes, although Therfield contained the highest concentration of small farms, which cancelled out farm service and increased the proportions of offspring. As for towns, Hertford Urban carried a more “elite” population than Ware Urban, which affected the number of recorded siblings in the town as they were strongly associated with public service household heads. Ware Urban, however, shared many “rural” characteristics in the prominence of grandchildren and in the fact that the majority of the population were native-born. Using selected parishes to generalise conclusions about the impact of agriculture and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ruggles, *Prolonged Connections*, pp. 131-133.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter Two, pp. 55-6.

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter One, pp. 29, 32.

urbanisation on household structure can be dangerous. However, a parish-intensive study confirms the problematic uses of employing a “Rural Sample” or an “Urban Sample” in the manner of Wall’s research, when household structure was vulnerable in the face of parish-level discrepancies.<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, a “Hertfordshire sample” inspires ideas about the regional influences of changing household structure. Household size in Hertfordshire was fairly stable across the nineteenth-century, owing to the thriving population growth of urban and suburban parishes. Thus, an appreciation of regional circumstances must be balanced with the specific characteristics of the parish in question.

Census records only scratch the surface of complex issues regarding, for example, the household economy, or actual interactions with extended kin. There is also the question of whether the co-residential patterns found in the households of the elderly occurred permanently at the end of their life-cycle, although Maria Shambrook’s long-term circumstances in Chapter Three encourage further research.<sup>5</sup> There is no testimony that confirms that a mother-in-law was taken into the household by adult offspring specifically because of the changing welfare system, or compassion, or that she would contribute to the running of the household. How far was Sarah Parker from Barley cared for by her adult offspring besides the bald references to being “Supported by Sons” in the occupation column? Did her sons visit her often? Naturally, historians have to hypothesise events. That being said, a micro-study allows a closer examination of the complex processes of household composition. Despite the problems of predetermining household patterns by linking “x” with “y,” a micro-study demonstrates the pitfalls of predetermining how the households of an urban or rural community would function. If the link between occupational structure and wider kinship relations is seen by some as simplistic, then the data needs comparisons with the wider literature to give the results further credit. Through contextualisation of the wider literature, this thesis has further questioned the orthodoxy that extended kinship only appears in the imagined conceptions of a community, or that familial care for the elderly was “buttressed by charity and the poor law”.<sup>6</sup> Up to 24% of households in a community representing the Hertfordshire sample in both census periods housed extended kin; this is raised to around one-third of households where the head lived on independent means or worked in farming and textiles. Notably, around 60% to 75% of households in Barley and

---

<sup>4</sup> As seen in Wall, “The Household,” pp. 493-512.

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter Three, p. 68.

<sup>6</sup> A. Plakans and C. Wetherell, “Households and Kinship Networks: The Cost and Benefits of Contextualisation,” *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 18, No.1 (May, 2003), pp. 49-76; Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor*, p. 365.

Therfield in both census periods appear related by kinship, due to the residential propinquity of kin themselves and the high percentages of native-born. In domestic households (excluding almshouses), up to half in some communities saw the elderly co-reside with offspring, rising to almost 60% in a Hertfordshire region when the elderly poor were analysed. These statistics are explained by marital status, gender and occupational structure, going beyond bald generalisations about the elderly made in previous studies.

The benefits of micro-studies also inspire further thematic and chronological research. An investigation is required into how urbanisation was the crucial factor in stabilising household size in late nineteenth-century Hertfordshire, rather than fertility or the servant population as Laslett argued.<sup>7</sup> More intensive examination of strongly agricultural regions, such as the Royston or the Hatfield/Welwyn regions, might reveal the extent of kinship inside and beyond the household and the extent of co-residential patterns and their changes in 1891 from 1851.<sup>8</sup> This would further test Dupree's argument that familial assistance to the elderly was lacking in agriculture and small towns, compared with industrial areas.<sup>9</sup>

Overall, the success of using personal technology to analyse digitised census data reasserts the advantages of quantitative history as a discipline. If Tosh felt there was a "greater scarcity" of materials relating to working-class autobiographies, then quantitative history can rescue the detailed lives of families whose stories may have remained lost forever.<sup>10</sup> Without the census, one would never know that Sarah Parker from Barley was supported by her family into old age, outside and inside the household, or that Mary Mumford was equally dependent on family and poor relief in her last remaining years of life. The census also allows a close examination of people of higher status, such as printer Stephen Austin, who employed 30 people in his printing business and Earl J. Cowper, head of the Panshanger Estate. In this manner, the census does not discriminate people of a particular social or economic disposition, allowing families from an array of social backgrounds to be compared and contrasted. It is short-sighted to think that quantitative history is too positivistic or oversimplifies historical understanding.<sup>11</sup> It is an engaging enterprise, as it examines themes that contemporary discourse associates with a distant past. The close-knit households bound

---

<sup>7</sup> Laslett, "Mean Household Size," pp. 125-158.

<sup>8</sup> There was a link between a high agricultural population and a 0% urban population rate in the Royston and Hatfield/Welwyn regions: Goose, "Farm Service," Table 3, p. 287.

<sup>9</sup> Dupree, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries*, p. 328.

<sup>10</sup> Tosh, *Pursuit*, p. 299.

<sup>11</sup> K.H. Jarausch and K.H. Hardy, *Quantitative Methods for Historians: A Guide to Research, Data and Statistics* (North Carolina, 1991), p. 1.

by neighbourly kinship, representing the rural idyll and evidently found in Barley and Therfield, are brought to life. The decline of community, rural isolation and loneliness in old age, as seen when the elderly are analysed from the census, are issues pertinent today.<sup>12</sup> The totality of a society, its families and households, can be discovered through family demography, with many insights about the past and the present. Further examinations of household composition and family structure, which would elaborate on these explorations, are to be encouraged.

---

<sup>12</sup> See W. Kay, "Ageing in Rural Communities: From Idyll to Exclusion?" in G. Bosworth and P. Somerville (eds.), *Interpreting Rurality: Multidisciplinary Approaches* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 251-266.



## Appendix One:

Table 1A - Components of the Household: Percentages, 1851

|           | Head | Wife | Offspring | Kin | Servant | Lodger | Visitor | Pop   | H'holds |
|-----------|------|------|-----------|-----|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
| Lilley    | 19.7 | 15.3 | 49.6      | 6.4 | 4.7     | 0.0    | 4.0     | 528   | 104     |
| Great Gad | 19.5 | 15.6 | 49.8      | 5.1 | 7.0     | 2.1    | 1.5     | 1160  | 226     |
| Barley    | 20.6 | 14.9 | 49.4      | 6.0 | 3.2     | 4.1    | 0.9     | 868   | 179     |
| Therfield | 19.6 | 15.6 | 55.0      | 5.4 | 2.5     | 1.6    | 0.2     | 1335  | 262     |
| Aldenham  | 20.4 | 15.2 | 42.1      | 5.4 | 11.2    | 2.4    | 2.4     | 1653  | 337     |
| Bushey    | 20.9 | 13.6 | 43.3      | 6.9 | 5.7     | 5.7    | 2.5     | 2751  | 576     |
| Hertford  | 21.1 | 14.2 | 39.6      | 7.3 | 8.5     | 5.1    | 3.1     | 4735  | 998     |
| Ware      | 21.2 | 15.3 | 42.8      | 6.3 | 6.0     | 4.6    | 3.6     | 4296  | 912     |
| RURAL     | 19.8 | 15.4 | 51.5      | 5.6 | 4.3     | 2.1    | 1.1     | 3891  | 771     |
| URBAN     | 21.0 | 14.5 | 41.7      | 6.7 | 7.5     | 4.7    | 3.0     | 13435 | 2823    |
| TOTAL     | 20.7 | 14.7 | 43.9      | 6.4 | 6.8     | 4.1    | 2.6     | 17326 | 3594    |

Table 1B - Components of the Household: Percentages, 1891

|           | Head | Wife | Offspring | Kin | Servant | Lodger | Visitor | Pop   | H'holds |
|-----------|------|------|-----------|-----|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
| Lilley    | 21.1 | 16.0 | 50.6      | 7.6 | 2.5     | 1.7    | 0.2     | 526   | 111     |
| Great Gad | 22.5 | 16.2 | 44.7      | 8.0 | 6.3     | 0.9    | 1.1     | 870   | 196     |
| Barley    | 24.4 | 16.7 | 49.3      | 4.2 | 3.0     | 1.9    | 0.3     | 574   | 140     |
| Therfield | 23.0 | 16.4 | 51.1      | 4.7 | 1.4     | 2.6    | 0.7     | 996   | 229     |
| Aldenham  | 20.7 | 16.0 | 42.0      | 6.1 | 6.6     | 5.8    | 2.0     | 1882  | 389     |
| Bushey    | 21.4 | 15.8 | 46.0      | 5.8 | 5.4     | 3.7    | 1.5     | 5623  | 1203    |
| Hertford  | 20.5 | 14.7 | 42.4      | 5.3 | 6.5     | 8.4    | 1.8     | 5832  | 1195    |
| Ware      | 21.5 | 14.7 | 48.5      | 5.2 | 4.1     | 4.8    | 1.1     | 5563  | 1196    |
| RURAL     | 22.8 | 16.3 | 48.8      | 6.1 | 3.3     | 1.8    | 0.7     | 2966  | 676     |
| URBAN     | 21.1 | 15.2 | 45.2      | 5.5 | 5.4     | 5.7    | 1.5     | 18900 | 3983    |
| TOTAL     | 21.3 | 15.3 | 45.7      | 5.6 | 5.2     | 5.1    | 1.4     | 21866 | 4659    |

*Notes:* The population, and housing figures in Tables 1A and 1B take into account visitors and lodgers in lodging houses, but exclude hospitals, prisons, schools and the Union workhouses.

*Source:* Digitised Census Enumerators' Books (CEBs).

Table 3A – Residential Patterns of Elderly by Parishes in the Hertfordshire sample and by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1851

| LIVING WITH                | PARISHES |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                            | Lilley   | Gad  | Barl | Ther | Ald  | Bus  | Hert | War  | RUR  | URB  | TOT  |
| Offspring                  | 11.8     | 19.4 | 31.7 | 37.7 | 18.5 | 26.0 | 23.5 | 21.8 | 28.6 | 23.1 | 24.1 |
| MALE                       | 0.0      | 20.0 | 31.6 | 38.5 | 20.5 | 23.7 | 29.2 | 20.5 | 29.2 | 24.0 | 24.9 |
| FEMALE                     | 16.7     | 19.0 | 31.8 | 37.0 | 16.2 | 27.8 | 18.5 | 23.1 | 28.0 | 22.2 | 23.4 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 0        | 75   | 86   | 100  | 150  | 67   | 140  | 86   | 83   | 99   | 95   |
| Wider Kin                  | 11.8     | 25.0 | 7.3  | 7.5  | 12.3 | 12.7 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 13.0 |
| MALE                       | 0.0      | 26.7 | 0.0  | 3.8  | 13.6 | 11.8 | 9.4  | 18.2 | 7.7  | 13.2 | 12.2 |
| FEMALE                     | 16.7     | 23.8 | 13.6 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 13.4 | 12.0 | 15.4 | 15.9 | 13.2 | 13.7 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 0        | 80   | 0    | 33   | 150  | 69   | 69   | 114  | 38   | 91   | 79   |
| Off/Kin                    | 47.1     | 16.7 | 22.0 | 24.5 | 21.0 | 15.0 | 26.5 | 19.0 | 24.5 | 20.6 | 21.3 |
| MALE                       | 60.0     | 6.7  | 21.1 | 19.2 | 13.6 | 10.5 | 26.0 | 18.2 | 20.0 | 18.1 | 18.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 41.7     | 23.8 | 22.7 | 29.6 | 29.7 | 18.6 | 26.9 | 19.8 | 28.0 | 22.8 | 23.9 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 60       | 20   | 80   | 63   | 55   | 44   | 86   | 89   | 57   | 72   | 69   |
| No off/kin<br>(+spouse)    | 11.8     | 30.6 | 29.3 | 22.6 | 38.3 | 29.5 | 22.5 | 25.1 | 25.2 | 27.2 | 26.8 |
| MALE                       | 20.0     | 40.0 | 42.1 | 26.9 | 40.9 | 35.5 | 18.8 | 25.0 | 33.8 | 28.0 | 29.0 |
| FEMALE                     | 8.3      | 23.8 | 18.2 | 18.5 | 35.1 | 24.7 | 25.9 | 25.3 | 18.3 | 26.4 | 24.8 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 100      | 120  | 200  | 140  | 138  | 113  | 64   | 96   | 147  | 97   | 104  |
| As lodger/vis<br>/serv etc | 17.6     | 8.3  | 9.8  | 7.5  | 9.9  | 16.8 | 16.7 | 17.3 | 9.5  | 16.0 | 14.8 |
| MALE                       | 20.0     | 6.7  | 5.3  | 11.5 | 11.4 | 18.4 | 16.7 | 18.2 | 9.2  | 16.8 | 15.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 16.7     | 9.5  | 13.6 | 3.7  | 8.1  | 15.5 | 16.7 | 16.5 | 9.8  | 15.3 | 14.2 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 50       | 50   | 33   | 300  | 167  | 93   | 89   | 107  | 75   | 100  | 97   |
| Offspring<br>+off/kin      | 58.8     | 36.1 | 53.7 | 62.3 | 39.5 | 41.0 | 50.0 | 40.8 | 53.1 | 43.6 | 45.4 |
| MALE                       | 60.0     | 26.7 | 52.6 | 57.7 | 34.1 | 34.2 | 55.0 | 38.6 | 49.2 | 42.1 | 43.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 58.3     | 42.9 | 54.5 | 66.7 | 45.9 | 46.4 | 45.0 | 42.9 | 56.1 | 45.0 | 47.2 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 43       | 44   | 83   | 83   | 88   | 58   | 108  | 87   | 70   | 85   | 82   |
| Lodger only                | 0.0      | 8.3  | 7.3  | 7.5  | 6.2  | 8.1  | 10.3 | 6.1  | 6.8  | 8.0  | 7.8  |
| MALE                       | 0.0      | 6.7  | 5.3  | 11.5 | 4.5  | 11.8 | 13.5 | 6.8  | 7.7  | 9.9  | 9.5  |
| FEMALE                     | 0.0      | 9.5  | 9.1  | 3.7  | 8.1  | 5.2  | 7.4  | 5.5  | 6.1  | 6.3  | 6.3  |
| SEX RATIO                  | 0        | 50   | 50   | 300  | 67   | 180  | 163  | 120  | 100  | 143  | 135  |

Source: Digitised Census Enumerators' Books (CEBs).

Table 3B – Residential Patterns of Elderly by Parishes in the Hertfordshire sample and by Rural and Urban Collective Totals, 1891

| LIVING WITH                | PARISHES |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                            | Lilley   | Gad  | Barl | Ther | Ald  | Bus  | Hert | War  | RUR  | URB  | TOT  |
| Offspring                  | 21.4     | 18.2 | 28.0 | 24.6 | 16.5 | 21.0 | 21.3 | 28.2 | 23.0 | 22.7 | 22.8 |
| MALE                       | 25.0     | 17.6 | 34.5 | 25.8 | 18.8 | 24.0 | 23.9 | 29.2 | 25.5 | 25.0 | 25.1 |
| FEMALE                     | 18.8     | 18.8 | 19.0 | 23.5 | 14.5 | 18.5 | 26.1 | 27.3 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 20.8 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 100      | 100  | 250  | 100  | 113  | 107  | 92   | 95   | 129  | 98   | 103  |
| Wider Kin                  | 35.7     | 10.6 | 10.0 | 13.8 | 13.6 | 15.4 | 12.3 | 10.3 | 14.8 | 12.7 | 13.1 |
| MALE                       | 25.0     | 8.8  | 6.9  | 9.7  | 12.5 | 12.4 | 8.0  | 8.8  | 10.4 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| FEMALE                     | 43.8     | 12.5 | 14.3 | 17.6 | 14.5 | 17.8 | 21.0 | 11.7 | 19.4 | 15.0 | 15.7 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 43       | 75   | 67   | 50   | 75   | 57   | 38   | 67   | 55   | 54   | 54   |
| Off/Kin                    | 17.9     | 22.7 | 14.0 | 21.5 | 10.7 | 20.3 | 19.4 | 22.7 | 19.6 | 19.7 | 19.7 |
| MALE                       | 25.0     | 20.6 | 10.3 | 22.6 | 10.4 | 21.7 | 16.7 | 23.4 | 18.9 | 19.5 | 19.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 12.5     | 25.0 | 19.0 | 20.6 | 10.9 | 19.1 | 29.0 | 22.1 | 20.4 | 19.9 | 20.0 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 150      | 88   | 75   | 100  | 83   | 93   | 58   | 94   | 95   | 80   | 82   |
| No off/kin<br>(+spouse)    | 21.4     | 45.5 | 42.0 | 36.9 | 50.5 | 32.9 | 31.8 | 32.0 | 38.8 | 34.1 | 34.9 |
| MALE                       | 25.0     | 50.0 | 44.8 | 38.7 | 43.8 | 35.7 | 33.3 | 31.4 | 42.5 | 34.5 | 36.0 |
| FEMALE                     | 18.8     | 40.6 | 38.1 | 35.3 | 56.4 | 30.6 | 41.3 | 32.5 | 35.0 | 33.7 | 33.9 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 100      | 131  | 163  | 100  | 68   | 96   | 81   | 86   | 125  | 84   | 91   |
| As lodger/vis<br>/serv etc | 3.6      | 3.0  | 6.0  | 3.1  | 8.7  | 10.5 | 15.1 | 6.9  | 3.8  | 10.8 | 9.6  |
| MALE                       | 0.0      | 2.9  | 3.4  | 3.2  | 14.6 | 6.2  | 18.1 | 7.3  | 2.8  | 11.1 | 9.5  |
| FEMALE                     | 6.3      | 3.1  | 9.5  | 2.9  | 3.6  | 14.0 | 17.4 | 6.5  | 4.5  | 10.5 | 9.6  |
| SEX RATIO                  | 0        | 100  | 50   | 100  | 350  | 36   | 104  | 100  | 60   | 86   | 84   |
| Offspring<br>+off/kin      | 39.3     | 40.9 | 42.0 | 46.2 | 27.2 | 41.3 | 41.0 | 50.9 | 42.6 | 42.4 | 42.5 |
| MALE                       | 50.0     | 38.2 | 44.8 | 48.4 | 29.2 | 45.7 | 41.0 | 52.6 | 44.3 | 44.5 | 44.4 |
| FEMALE                     | 31.3     | 43.8 | 38.1 | 44.1 | 25.5 | 37.6 | 41.0 | 49.4 | 40.8 | 40.8 | 40.8 |
| SEX RATIO                  | 120      | 93   | 163  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 74   | 95   | 112  | 89   | 93   |
| Lodger only                | 3.6      | 0.0  | 2.0  | 3.1  | 6.8  | 7.3  | 12.7 | 5.5  | 1.9  | 8.5  | 7.3  |
| MALE                       | 0.0      | 0.0  | 3.4  | 3.2  | 12.5 | 5.4  | 16.7 | 5.8  | 1.9  | 9.7  | 8.2  |
| FEMALE                     | 6.3      | 0.0  | 0.0  | 2.9  | 1.8  | 8.9  | 9.7  | 5.2  | 1.9  | 7.4  | 6.6  |
| SEX RATIO                  | 0        | 0    | 0    | 100  | 600  | 50   | 128  | 100  | 100  | 107  | 107  |

Source: Digitised Census Enumerators' Books (CEBs).

Table 3C – Residential Patterns of Elderly Recorded as Poor by Region in Hertfordshire, 1851

| REGION          | LIVING WITH OFFSPRING ONLY |      |        |       | LIVING WITH WIDER KIN ONLY |      |        |       |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------|--------|-------|----------------------------|------|--------|-------|
|                 | TOTAL                      | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   | TOTAL                      | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   |
|                 |                            |      |        | RATIO |                            |      |        | RATIO |
| Baldock         | 21.5                       | 27.5 | 17.0   | 122   | 14.0                       | 7.5  | 18.9   | 30    |
| Barnet & Edm.   | 21.3                       | 19.0 | 22.5   | 44    | 11.5                       | 9.5  | 12.5   | 40    |
| Berkhamsted     | 21.1                       | 25.0 | 19.0   | 73    | 11.1                       | 6.3  | 13.8   | 25    |
| Bishop's Stort. | 12.8                       | 16.4 | 10.0   | 125   | 14.2                       | 18.0 | 11.3   | 122   |
| Buntingford     | 9.6                        | 4.8  | 13.5   | 29    | 4.3                        | 2.4  | 5.8    | 33    |
| Hatfield & Wel. | 26.7                       | 26.3 | 26.9   | 71    | 11.1                       | 5.3  | 15.4   | 25    |
| Hemel Hemp.     | 18.7                       | 25.9 | 14.6   | 100   | 6.7                        | 3.7  | 8.3    | 25    |
| Hertford        | 16.3                       | 12.5 | 18.0   | 31    | 14.0                       | 15.0 | 13.5   | 50    |
| Hitchin         | 14.8                       | 28.6 | 7.5    | 200   | 16.0                       | 17.9 | 15.1   | 63    |
| Royston         | 26.5                       | 20.0 | 30.6   | 42    | 3.9                        | 0.0  | 6.5    | 0     |
| St. Albans      | 14.8                       | 0.0  | 19.5   | 0     | 11.1                       | 0.0  | 14.6   | 0     |
| Ware            | 16.6                       | 11.8 | 18.5   | 26    | 12.6                       | 5.9  | 15.3   | 16    |
| Watford         | 16.3                       | 17.6 | 15.7   | 56    | 11.8                       | 3.9  | 15.7   | 13    |
| TOTAL           | 17.6                       | 17.8 | 17.4   | 58    | 11.2                       | 8.0  | 13.0   | 34    |

| REGION          | LIVING WITH OFFSPRING AND WIDER KIN ONLY |      |        |       | LIVING WITH NO OFFSPRING OR KIN (+ONLY SPOUSE) |      |        |       |
|-----------------|--|------|--------|-------|--|------|--------|-------|
|                 | TOTAL                                    | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   | TOTAL  | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   |
|                 |  |      |        | RATIO |  |      |        | RATIO |
| Baldock         | 19.4                                     | 20.0 | 18.9   | 80    | 30.1   | 27.5 | 32.1   | 65    |
| Barnet & Edm.   | 26.2                                     | 19.0 | 30.0   | 33    | 36.1   | 52.4 | 27.5   | 100   |
| Berkhamsted     | 32.2                                     | 34.4 | 31.0   | 61    | 17.8   | 18.8 | 17.2   | 60    |
| Bishop's Stort. | 25.5                                     | 23.0 | 27.5   | 64    | 36.9   | 34.4 | 38.8   | 68    |
| Buntingford     | 23.4                                     | 21.4 | 25.0   | 69    | 41.5   | 47.6 | 36.5   | 105   |
| Hatfield & Wel. | 31.1                                     | 31.6 | 30.8   | 75    | 22.2   | 26.3 | 19.2   | 100   |
| Hemel Hemp.     | 40.0                                     | 37.0 | 41.7   | 50    | 26.7   | 29.6 | 25.0   | 67    |
| Hertford        | 19.4                                     | 20.0 | 19.1   | 47    | 33.3   | 30.0 | 34.8   | 39    |
| Hitchin         | 30.9                                     | 14.3 | 39.6   | 19    | 25.9   | 35.7 | 20.8   | 91    |
| Royston         | 29.4                                     | 27.5 | 30.6   | 58    | 21.6   | 32.5 | 14.5   | 144   |
| St. Albans      | 40.7                                     | 53.8 | 36.6   | 47    | 27.8   | 38.5 | 24.4   | 50    |
| Ware            | 24.0                                     | 19.6 | 25.8   | 31    | 32.0   | 45.1 | 26.6   | 70    |
| Watford         | 24.8                                     | 19.6 | 27.5   | 36    | 35.9   | 41.2 | 33.3   | 62    |
| TOTAL           | 26.8                                     | 24.1 | 28.4   | 48    | 30.9   | 35.7 | 28.1   | 71    |

| REGION             | AS LODGERS, SERVANTS<br>AND VISITORS |      |        |       | AS LODGERS ONLY |      |        |       |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------|--------|-------|-----------------|------|--------|-------|
|                    | TOTAL                                | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   | TOTAL           | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   |
|                    |                                      |      |        | RATIO |                 |      |        | RATIO |
| Baldock            | 15.1                                 | 17.5 | 13.2   | 100   | 15.1            | 17.5 | 13.2   | 100   |
| Barnet &<br>Edm.   | 4.9                                  | 0.0  | 7.5    | 0     | 3.3             | 0.0  | 5.0    | 0     |
| Berkhamsted        | 17.8                                 | 15.6 | 19.0   | 45    | 16.7            | 15.6 | 17.2   | 50    |
| Bishop's<br>Stort. | 10.6                                 | 8.2  | 12.5   | 50    | 9.9             | 8.2  | 11.3   | 56    |
| Buntingford        | 21.3                                 | 23.8 | 19.2   | 100   | 19.1            | 21.4 | 17.3   | 100   |
| Hatfield &<br>Wel. | 8.9                                  | 10.5 | 7.7    | 100   | 8.9             | 10.5 | 7.7    | 100   |
| Hemel<br>Hemp.     | 8.0                                  | 3.7  | 10.4   | 20    | 6.7             | 3.7  | 8.3    | 25    |
| Hertford           | 17.1                                 | 22.5 | 14.6   | 69    | 14.0            | 20.0 | 11.2   | 80    |
| Hitchin            | 12.3                                 | 3.6  | 17.0   | 11    | 8.6             | 7.1  | 9.4    | 40    |
| Royston            | 18.6                                 | 20.0 | 17.7   | 73    | 15.7            | 20.0 | 12.9   | 100   |
| St. Albans         | 5.6                                  | 7.7  | 4.9    | 50    | 3.7             | 7.7  | 2.4    | 100   |
| Ware               | 14.9                                 | 17.6 | 13.7   | 53    | 11.4            | 13.7 | 10.5   | 54    |
| Watford            | 11.1                                 | 17.6 | 7.8    | 113   | 9.2             | 17.6 | 4.9    | 180   |
| TOTAL              | 13.5                                 | 14.4 | 13.0   | 62    | 11.5            | 13.8 | 10.3   | 75    |

| REGION             | LIVING WITH OFFSPRING / OFFSPRING<br>AND WIDER KIN |      |        |       |
|--------------------|--|------|--------|-------|
|                    | TOTAL  | MALE | FEMALE | SEX   |
|                    |  |      |        | RATIO |
| Baldock            | 40.9   | 47.5 | 35.8   | 100   |
| Barnet &<br>Edm.   | 47.5   | 38.0 | 52.5   | 38    |
| Berkhamsted        | 53.3   | 59.4 | 50.0   | 66    |
| Bishop's<br>Stort. | 38.3   | 39.3 | 37.5   | 80    |
| Buntingford        | 33.0   | 26.2 | 38.5   | 55    |
| Hatfield &<br>Wel. | 57.8   | 57.9 | 57.7   | 73    |
| Hemel<br>Hemp.     | 58.7   | 63.0 | 56.3   | 63    |
| Hertford           | 35.7   | 32.5 | 37.1   | 39    |
| Hitchin            | 45.7   | 42.9 | 47.2   | 48    |
| Royston            | 55.9   | 47.5 | 61.3   | 60    |
| St. Albans         | 55.6   | 53.8 | 56.1   | 30    |
| Ware               | 40.6   | 31.4 | 44.4   | 29    |
| Watford            | 41.2   | 37.3 | 43.1   | 43    |
| TOTAL              | 44.4   | 41.9 | 45.8   | 51    |

Notes: Tables 3A, 3B and 3C exclude the elderly in almshouses, hospitals and workhouses.  
Source: N. Goose (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-ROM* (Hatfield, 2005).

## Appendix Two:

### Social Status Scheme

- A.** All gentry, land and property owners, top professionals, e.g. magistrates, clergy, lawyers, accountants, farmers employing 20+ labourers or owning over 350 acres, people of independent means, any employer with over 25 employees.
- B.** Lower professions, e.g. teachers, local government officials, surveyors, police inspector, etc., annuitants, farmers, merchants with over 5 employees.
- C.** Dealers, skilled craftsmen, clerks.
- D.** Semi-skilled workers, agricultural labourers, straw plaiters, servants.
- E.** Unskilled workers, road labourers, hawkers, errand boys etc.
- F.** Unemployed, prisoners, paupers, etc.
- Z.** Unknown. Mainly pertaining to individuals who were listed as visitors or lodgers in both the 'Relation' and 'Occupation, Rank, Status' fields.

### Protocol

All people given the highest possible status. For instance, if someone listed as Brewer and Property Owner they would be given status A. Except in the case of anyone who was listed as a pauper, regardless of any other occupational information, they were coded as F.

In the case of dependents they were given the status of their Husband, Head of Household or Parents, if not the children of the Head of Household, e.g. where Head of Household = C and Son = B, offspring of the son would be status B. The offspring of servants, lodgers and visitors also coded as for their parents.

Any lodgers (inc. child lodgers) where no occupation or rank was given were coded Z, signifying Unknown.

Children at Boarding School were given status B.

All workhouse and prison inmates were given status F, regardless of previous employment.

People who were retired were given the status of their former occupation.

*Source:* Distributed by Professor Nigel Goose through personal communication.

### Goose Coding Scheme

This scheme takes the raw material used in the process of production as the main criterion for classification.

01: Agriculture: As for Ag. code in Sector field minus farmers wives and daus.

02: Textiles: All those involved in textiles and clothing (excepting shoe and boot makers coded under Leather in this field)

03: Misc. Manu.

04: Leather

05: Building: (Not including carpenters who are included in Wood code in Goose field)

06: Metal

07: Wood: Includes manu. who may use wood in their manufacturing e.g. carriage makers, who are in manufacturing code in Sector field

08: Food & Drink

09: Transport

10: Domestic Service

11: Public Service / Professional

12: Independent Means: Includes Property Owners and Annuitants etc.

13: Special Industry (Straw)

14: Quarry / Mining

15: Retail / Distribution: (Excluding those who could be placed in other categories of textiles, food & drink etc.)

16: Misc: e.g. General Labourers

17: Dependent / No Occupation

*Source*: Distributed by Professor Nigel Goose through personal communication.

## Bibliography:

### PRIMARY SOURCES:

#### Unpublished Material:

The Centre for Regional and Local History, University of Hertfordshire

Digitised Census Enumerators' Books, with Social and Occupational Coding for Lilley, Great Gaddesden, Barley, Therfield, Aldenham, Bushey, Hertford St. Andrew, Hertford St. John, Hertford All Saints and Ware Urban, 1851 and 1891.

House of Commons Parliamentary Papers:

C.6894-II, (1893-4), *Royal Commission on Labour: The Agricultural Labour, Vol. 1, England, Part II.*

The National Archives, Kew:

1881 census manuscripts for the Hertford Union:

Hertford St. Andrew: RG 11/1425

Hertford St. John: RG 11/1423

Hertford All Saints: RG 11/1425

Little Berkhamstead: RG 11/1424

Hertingfordbury: RG 11/1424

Bengeo: RG 11/1424

Brickendon: RG 11/1424

Additional manuscript data was used to denote the social group of farmers, whose specified farm acres are unrecorded in the 1891 CEBs. Particular farmers in 1891 were cross-checked with the 1881 and 1871 CEBs, in order to determine their social status, Group A being those farmers owning over 350 acres; Group B being farmers owning under 350 acres:

Lilley, 1881: RG 11/1421



Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

|                        |                     |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Great Gaddesden, 1881: | RG 11/1445          |
| Barley, 1881:          | RG 11/1411          |
| Therfield, 1881:       | RG 11/1412          |
| Therfield, 1871:       | RG 10/1360          |
| Aldenham, 1881:        | RG 11/1434          |
| Ware Urban, 1881:      | RG 11/1401 and 1402 |

Post Office Directories:

Post Office Trade Directory of Essex, Herts, Kent, Middlesex, Surrey and Sussex (London, 1855); Kelly's Directory of Hertfordshire, 1890 (London, 1890).

Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies:

BG/HER/45, Hertford Union Out-relief Application Books, June-September 1876 and  
BG/HER/51, Hertford Union Out-relief Application Books, September 1880-March  
1881.

**Published Material:**

**Books:**

Gandy, Toni and Jones, Arthur (eds.), *Village Chronicles: Kelshell, Rushdon, Sandon, Therfield and Wallington - Part 3: Mostly About Events* (The North Hertfordshire Villages Research Group, 1987).

Knight, Judith and Flood, Susan (eds.), *Two Nineteenth-Century Hertfordshire Diaries, 1822-1849* (Hertfordshire Record Society, 2002).

Young, Arthur, *General View of the Agriculture of Hertfordshire* (London, 1804).

**Articles:**

Evershed, Henry, "Agriculture of Hertfordshire," *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society*, No. 25, (1864), pp. 269-302.

**Miscellaneous:**

Goose, Nigel (ed.), *The Hertfordshire Census 1851: Family History Edition CD-Rom* (Hatfield, 2005).

Hertfordshire Names Online, at

[https://www.hertsdirect.org/ufs/ufsmain?ebz=1\\_1396632723793&ebd=0](https://www.hertsdirect.org/ufs/ufsmain?ebz=1_1396632723793&ebd=0).

**SECONDARY SOURCES:**

**Books:**

Anderson, Michael, *Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1971).

Armstrong, Alan, *Stability and Change in an English County Town: A Social Study of York, 1801-1851* (Cambridge, 1974).

Armstrong, Alan, *The Population of Victorian and Edwardian Norfolk* (Norwich, 2000).

Barrett, Frank A., *Ernest Ibbetson: Military Artist and Adventure Story Illustrator* (Toronto, 2008).

Booth, Charles, *The Aged Poor in England and Wales* (London, 1894).

Bushey Museum Trust, *Bushey Then and Now: Introduction* (1986).

Constable, Derek, *Household Structure in Three English Market Towns*, Geographical Papers, No. 55, University of Reading, (1977).

Dolezel, Lubomir, *Possible Worlds of Fiction and History: The Postmodern Stage* (Maryland, 2010).

Dupree, Marguerite, *Family Structure in the Staffordshire Potteries, 1840-1880* (Oxford, 1995).

Gately, David Alan, *Hanley in 1851 Revisited: A Survey Based on the Census Returns* (Staffordshire University, 1996).

Goose, Nigel, *Population, Economy and Family Structure in Hertfordshire, Vol. 1: The Berkhamsted Region* (Hatfield, 1996).

Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

Goose, Nigel, *Population, Economy and Family Structure in Hertfordshire, Vol. 2: St. Albans and its Region* (Hatfield, 2000).

Gordon, Eleanor and Nair, Gwyneth, *Public Lives: Women, Family and Society in Victorian Britain* (London, 2003).

Hoppen, K. Theodore, *The Mid-Victorian Generation, 1846-1886* (Oxford, 1998).

Jackson, D.G. *The Population of Borden in 1851: A Study of a North Kent Village Based on the 1851 Census Enumerators' Books* (Congleton, 1997).

Jaraus, Konrad Hugo and Hardy, Kenneth A., *Quantitative Methods for Historians: A Guide to Research, Data and Statistics* (North Carolina, 1991).

Laslett, Peter, *A Fresh Map of Life: The Emergence of the Third Age* (London, 1991).

Lees, Lynn-Hollen, *The Solidarities of Strangers: The English Poor Laws and the People, 1700-1948* (Cambridge, 1998).

Macfarlane, Alan, *The Culture of Capitalism* (Oxford, 1987).

Marsh, David C., *The Changing Social Structure in England and Wales, 1871-1961* (London, 1965).

Mitchell, Sally, *Daily Life in Victorian England* (Greenwood Press, 1996).

Nair, Gwyneth, *Highley: The Development of a Community* (Oxford, 1988).

Page, F.M., *History of Hertford* (Hertford Town Council, 1959).

Page, William, *Victoria County History: A History of the County of Hertford, Vol. 2* (1908).

Quadagno, Jill, *Aging in Early Industrial Society: Work, Family and Social Policy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1982).

Reay, Barry, *Microhistories: Demography, Society and Culture in Rural England, 1800-1930* (Cambridge, 1996).

Reay, Barry, *Rural Englands*, (Hampshire, 2004).

Ruggles, Steven, *Prolonged Connections: The Rise of the Extended Family in Nineteenth-Century England and America* (Madison, 1987).

Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

Shepherd, Margaret E., *From Hellgill to Bridge End: Aspects of Economic and Social Change in the Upper Eden Valley, 1840-1895* (Hatfield, 2003).

Short, Brian (ed), *Scarpfoot Parish: Plumpton, 1830-1880*, University of Sussex Centre for Continuing Education, Occasional Paper, No. 16 (Brighton, 1981).

Snell, K.D.M., *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England, 1660-1900* (Cambridge, 1985).

Thane, Pat, *Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues* (Oxford, 2000).

Thompson, Flora, *Lark Rise to Candleford* (Oxford, 1954).

Tosh, John, *The Pursuit of History* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., Harlow, 2010).

Wilkerson, Jack, *Two Ears of Barley: Chronicle of an English Village* (Royston, 1969).

Woods, Robert, *The Demography of Victorian England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2000).

#### **Journal Articles:**

Anderson, Michael, "Households, Families and Individuals: Some Preliminary Results from the National Sample from the 1851 Census of Great Britain," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Dec., 1988), pp. 421-438.

Arkell, Tom and Whiteman, Anne, "Mean Household Size in Mid-Tudor England: Clackclose Hundred, Norfolk," *Local Population Studies*, No. 60 (Spring 1998), pp. 20-33.

Goose, Nigel, "Cottage Industry, Marriage and Migration in Nineteenth-Century England," *Economic History Review*, Vol. 61, No. 4, (2008) pp. 798-819.

Goose, Nigel, "Evaluating the 1881 Census Transcription: a Pilot Survey for Hertfordshire," *History and Computing*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (2001) (published 2004), pp. 181-198.

Goose, Nigel, "Farm Service, Seasonal Unemployment and Casual Labour in Mid Nineteenth-Century England," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2, (2006), pp. 275-303.

Goose, Nigel, "Household Size and Structure in Early Stuart Cambridge," *Social History*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Oct. 1980), pp. 347-385.

Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

Goose, Nigel, "How Saucy did it Make the Poor? The Straw Plait and Hat Trades, Illegitimate Fertility and the Family in Nineteenth-Century Hertfordshire," *History*, Vol. 91, No. 304, pp. 530-556.

Goose, Nigel and Galley, Chris, "*Local Population Studies: Forty Years On*," *Local Population Studies*, No. 81 (Spring 2008), pp. 11-17.

Goose, Nigel, "Poverty, Old Age and Gender in Nineteenth-Century England: The Case of Hertfordshire," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Dec., 2005), pp. 351-384.

Hunt, Enid, "Household Size and Structure in Bassingham, Lincolnshire, 1851-1901" *Local Population Studies*, No. 75 (Autumn, 2005), pp. 56-74.

Laslett, Peter, "Family, Kinship and Collectivity as Systems of Support in Pre-Industrial Europe: A Consideration of the 'Nuclear-Hardship' Analysis," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (August, 1988), pp. 153-175.

Moody, David, "Whiteparish 1841: Some Dynamics of a Rural Parish," *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, No. 104, (2011), pp. 237-250.

Plakans, Andrejs and Wetherell, Charles, "Households and Kinship Networks: The Cost and Benefits of Contextualisation," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (May, 2003), pp. 49-76.

Robin, Jean, "Family Care of the Elderly in a Nineteenth-Century Devonshire Parish," *Ageing and Society*, No. 4 (1984), pp. 505-516.

Rose, Sonya O., "The Varying Household Arrangements of the Elderly in Three English Villages: Nottinghamshire, 1851-1881," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (May, 1988), pp. 101-122.

Shaw-Taylor, Leigh, "Family Farms and Capitalist Farms in Mid Nineteenth Century England," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2, (2005), pp. 158-191.

Smith, Roger, "Early Victorian Household Structure: A Case Study of Nottinghamshire," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1970), pp. 69-84.

Thane, Pat, "Women and the Poor Law in Victorian and Edwardian England," *History Workshop*, Vol. 6 (1978), pp. 29-51.

Tranter, N.L., "The Social Structure of a Bedfordshire Parish in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1973), pp. 90-106.

Verney Caroline, with Few, Janet, "Is Blood Thicker Than Water? Farm Servants and the Family in Nineteenth-Century North Devon," *Local Population Studies* No. 91, (Autumn 2013), pp. 10-26.

Wall, Richard, "Elderly Widows and Widowers and their Coresidents in Late 19- and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century England and Wales," *History of the Family*, No. 7 (2002), pp. 139-155.

Zhao, Zhongwei, "The Demographic Transition in Victorian England and Changes in English Kinship Networks," *Continuity and Change*, Vol. 11, No. 2, (August, 1996), pp 243-272.

#### **Articles in Collected Editions:**

Anderson, Michael, "Household Structure and the Industrial Revolution: Mid Nineteenth-Century Preston in Comparative Perspective," in Peter Laslett and Richard Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 215-236.

Anderson, Michael, "Mis-specification of Servant Occupations in the 1851 Census: A Problem Revisited," Nigel Goose (ed.), *Women's Work in Industrial England: Regional and Local Perspectives* (Hatfield, 2007), pp. 260-268.

Anderson, Michael, "Standard Tabulation Procedures for the Census Enumerators' Books, 1851-1891," in E.A. Wrigley (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 134-145.

Brayshay, Michael, "Depopulation and Changing Household Structure in the Mining Communities of West Cornwall, 1851-1871," in Dennis Mills and Kevin Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), pp. 326-345.

Goose, Nigel, "Population, 1801-1901," in David Short (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Hertfordshire* (Hatfield, 2011), pp. 56-7.

Goose, Nigel, "Straw-Plaiting and Hat-Making," in David Short (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Hertfordshire* (Hatfield, 2011), pp. 90-3.

Higgs, Edward, "The Tabulation of Occupations in the Nineteenth-Century Census, with Special Reference to Domestic Servants," in Nigel Goose (ed.), *Women's Work in Industrial England: Regional and Local Perspectives* (Hatfield, 2007), pp. 250-259.

Howlett, Neil M., "Family and Household in a Nineteenth-Century Devonshire Village," in Dennis R. Mills, and Kevin Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), 298-305.

Kay, Wesley, "Ageing in Rural Communities: From Idyll to Exclusion?" in Gary Bosworth and Peter Somerville (eds.), *Interpreting Rurality: Multidisciplinary Approaches* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 251-266.

Laslett, Peter, "Introduction: The History of the Family," in Peter Laslett and Richard Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 1-90.

Laslett, Peter, "Mean Household Size in England since the Sixteenth-Century," in Peter Laslett and Richard Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 125-158.

Mills, Dennis R. and Schürer Kevin, "Communities in the Victorian Census: An Introduction," in Dennis R. Mills and Kevin Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), pp. 1-15.

Perkyns, Audrey, "Birthplace Accuracy in the Censuses of Six Kentish Parishes," in in Dennis R. Mills and Kevin Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), pp. 229-245.

Thane, Pat, "Old People and their Families in the English Past," in Martin Daunton (ed.), *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past: 1500 to the Present* (London, 1996), pp. 84-103.

Thomson, David, "Age Reporting by the Elderly and the Nineteenth-Century Census," in Dennis R. Mills and Kevin Schürer, (eds), *Local Communities in the Victorian Census Enumerators' Books* (Colchester, 1996), pp. 86-99.

Thomson, David, "Welfare and the Historians," in Lloyd Benfield *et al.*, *The World We Have Gained: Essays Presented to Peter Laslett* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 355-378.

Tom Heritage  
MA by Research

Tomkins, Allannah and King, Steven, "Introduction," in Steven King and Allannah Tomkins (eds.), *The Poor in England 1700-1850: An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester, 2003), pp. 1-38.

Wall, Richard, "Elderly Persons and Members of Their Households in England and Wales from Preindustrial Times to the Present," in David I. Kertzer and P. Laslett (eds.), *Ageing in the Past: Demography, Society and Old Age*, (London, 1995), pp. 81-106.

Wall, Richard, "The Household: Demographic and Economic Change in England 1650–1970", in Richard Wall ed., *Family Forms in Historic Europe* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 493-512.

### **Unpublished Dissertations:**

Ayto, Jennifer, "The Contribution by Women to the Social and Economic Development of the Victorian Town in Hertfordshire," (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hertfordshire, 2013).

Moore, Julie, "The Impact of Agricultural Depression and Land Ownership Change on the County of Hertfordshire, c. 1870-1914" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hertfordshire, 2010).