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Except for the highly unusual, women have been historically invisible. Based on the British Census of 1851, this exploratory and descriptive study uses a subsample of all heads of households drawn from a one-percent cluster sample of the population of Greater London. The theoretical model is stratification based on occupation, age, and sex. The occupational skill status of heads of households is examined and compared on the basis of age, sex, and marital status. Findings indicate that the major predictor of occupational skill is marital status, in complex interrelationships with age and sex. Women heads of households, supporting themselves in a mid-Victorian urban patriarchal society, occupied an anomalous position. In terms of occupational skills, married women heads of households had the lowest status; widows' occupational skill status varied by age, with the lowest held by the older subjects; single women consistently occupied the highest position, regardless of age and sex.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The status of women . . . is indeed a useful indicator of how society is doing in its historical enterprise of making humans more humane. When we look at the imbalances regarding women in the social record, we are getting clues about general social imbalance not just the status of women. (Boulding, 1976, p. 9)

The importance of the historical record in evaluating our own present circumstances cannot be underestimated. To ignore the totality of the experience of the past is to deny ourselves an understanding of how to nurture human potential in the future. Yet until recently the importance of the contribution of women in the past has been largely ignored. As we gradually increase our knowledge of what women were doing historically, it will give us a better understanding of the social opportunities available today and how to develop them in the future.

The historical invisibility of women makes the task of researching their contribution problem-ridden. Simone de Beauvoir (1949) postulated that women were onlookers in the historical drama, preferring to act in the service of patriarchy; they therefore have no history of their own. Other approaches attempt to show women's history as either moving away from or into further oppression. Standard histories (the few that do exist), such as Cora Castle's (1913) A Statistical Study of Eminent Women, stress individual achieve-
ment and that "queens and courtesans are the most likely female characters to survive the historian's sorting process" (Boulding, 1976, p. 5).

Women have, therefore, remained largely anonymous in history, yet what there is of women's history is the history of the majority of the human race (Lerner, 1976). Today we can no longer legitimately view women primarily as family members. Our perceptions are changing. Although family historians have asked many questions concerning women, family history is not women's history. Family history has largely ignored unmarried and widowed women. (See, for example, Greven, 1970; Gordon, 1973.) Unaddressed are the variations in family support patterns in which the work and wages of daughters have been used to pay for the education of brothers and to support the elderly members of the family, whereas those of the sons have not been so used (Lerner, 1976).

The status of a woman in her family is different from her status in society. However, the areas of functioning for women, together with their status in those areas, have been "officially" defined by men and largely accepted by both men and women. Any analysis that does not consider this complexity must be considered inadequate.

The study of large aggregates of people based upon public documents such as census records can yield new and illuminating information. Scholars such as Hareven (1971) and McLaughlin (1971) have used such data sources with gender as a factor to obtain historical and humanistic interpretations. These methods enable us to ask new questions concerning the experiences of both men and women in the past.
The acceptance of women as a social group whose lives were (and are) systematically restricted causes many researchers to think and write about them from the viewpoint of a subordinate class with less than equal life chances with men. The awareness of the effects of a patriarchal system should be included in any analysis of the status of women in any historical era.

This study examines the occupations of both men and women during the Industrial Revolution, an event which dominated the history of nineteenth-century Europe. Few events in human history have caused such a change in people's lives, from place of residence to fundamental beliefs and attitudes. Yet the people most involved in industrialization left unsystematic and inconvenient records of their activities. The result is that we have only a vague notion of what happened to the millions of men and women who crowded into the cities, drawn by the lure of new employment opportunities in shops, offices, and factories.

In Britain during the nineteenth century, many young women left their rural families of origin and became servants to the emergent middle class and the aristocracy, while yet others sought employment in the textile and other industries. These working-class women, fleeing the increasing poverty in their rustic backgrounds wherein the necessity to work was crucial for all in the economic unit, were operating on long-held work values and taking advantage of the increased opportunities offered within an urban setting. Their sisters in the rapidly expanding middle class, however, faced problems of a different nature. Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, their
lifestyles had become fairly clearly defined in an ideal way. Young
girls were taught from childhood that marriage was the appropriate
role for them to assume, and therefore their education and sociali-
zation contained little experience outside the family context.
Indeed, in a highly stratified middle class, a daughter who was
docile, ornamental, and cultivated (rather than educated) was seen as
a means of upward mobility for the family. Nonetheless, many women
in both groups may well have had to take full responsibility for
themselves and their families both at specific times or throughout
their entire adult lives.

The setting is London in the year 1851, the year of the decennial
census of Great Britain. This study is based upon data obtained from
the original census documents. The women in our sample are those
who, for whatever reason, did not have a male provider living with
them and who had, therefore, indicated to the census enumerators that
their status was that of head of household. As heads of households,
the women in this study are therefore directly comparable to the male
heads of households. However, our population of interest is confined
to heads of households living in specified areas of London in 1851.
We will examine the occupational situation of these women, apparently
supporting themselves and often their families in a patriarchal,
mid-Victorian, urban society. We will consider not only the problem
of stratification by sex, but also the impact of age upon the occupa-
tional status of female heads of households.
CHAPTER II

THE SETTING

In this chapter we will describe the socio-economic status of London in 1851, together with a discussion of the occupations of both men and women. We will suggest that London in 1851 was unique and atypical of the other large cities of the land, and that it offered opportunities that were generally unavailable in the industrial cities of the North. We will also describe the poverty and overcrowding that existed in mid-nineteenth century London. The legal status of married women in 1851 is noted, and a discussion of the social meanings of old age in 1851 is offered. It is intended, therefore, that this chapter will provide the reader with a knowledge of the social environment in which the subjects of our study lived and worked.

London

For centuries London had been the capital of the British Isles, and in the nineteenth century it was also the capital of the British Empire. Here was the seat of government and royalty, the home of the Queen and Empress of India, Victoria. The first two-thirds of the nineteenth century was a period of relative indifference to the acquisition of colonies. Indeed, America continued to trade with England, therefore the compelling need to secure and then maintain
colonies did not prevail. The scramble for possessions revived in the 1870s and 1880s, and modern imperialism emerged. The British Empire of 1851 indeed contained most of India, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, but the prevailing policy of 'laissez-faire' precluded intensive development of these domains, except perhaps in the case of India. Nevertheless, it was in London that all the major policy decisions were made for the Empire, such as the abolition of slavery in India in 1843.

London was the major port of the land in 1851, from where exports to and imports from the far-flung Empire both arrived and left. Her population was the largest in the country, if not the entire world, and she was the largest consumer market anywhere, with conspicuous consumption in evidence as in no other British city. The newly emerged middle class molded themselves upon the aristocracy and demanded luxuries unknown to their forebears, while Cobbett railed at the newfound effeminacy of the British farmer, who now preferred to go to concerts rather than to hunt (Perkin, 1969). In 1851 London was a unique combination of administrative, commercial, residential, and tourist characteristics. Here extreme wealth was fed by trade with the East and West Indies and most of the known world. It was the London of the Great Exhibition that demonstrated the affluence and skills of the British to the nation and to the world. It was also the London of abject poverty and misery, often unseen by middle-class Londoners, so eloquently described by Henry Mayhew, so vehemently denounced by Karl Marx.
Population Increase

Before the Industrial Revolution, the ready access to the needed raw materials, the availability of a skilled labor force, and a market with few transportation problems due to the access by river into the heart of the city, gave London a distinct advantage as an industrial city. However, the nineteenth century saw a great change in the economic power of London. In 1801 London was the only city in the kingdom with a population of over 100,000. By 1871 sixteen such cities were in existence, largely in England. This is not to say that the population of London did not increase throughout the nineteenth century, but relative to the other large towns the expansion was slower. From the first Census in 1801 until the Census of 1851, cities such as Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Sheffield had an annual rate of increase of 2.3 percent, whereas the population of London grew by only 1.8 percent in the same time period. In 1851 the population of London was 2,362,236 persons, which was an increase of 146 percent since 1801. Indeed, it was the largest city in the world at that time. However, the other larger cities expanded by over 217 percent in the same fifty years (Census Report 1851, Pt. 1).

Industrial Status

The emerging industries were mainly in the north, northwest, and the midlands, where the coal needed to power the new steam-driven machines and the clay for the potteries were available. Moreover, it was too costly to transport the raw materials to London. Factories required
space, and land in overcrowded London was at a premium. It was not until the 1860s that the intercity system of railroads really expanded and became operative. "The factory with its large demands upon space, its voracious appetite for fuel, and its semi-skilled labor force was quite inappropriate to London conditions" (Jones, 1971, p. 20). In fact, the Industrial Revolution threatened many of London's old established industries. In finished consumer goods, such as clothing and furniture, or the luxury trades of jewelry and carriage building, for example, the proximity of the market was still an advantage. However, this was no longer true of the production of raw materials and heavy capital goods. In the first quarter of the century, London had been famous for its shipbuilding and engineering as well as its silk production. By 1870 it had become deficient in all these industries as well as semi-finished goods. As industrialization increased, economic power became diffused throughout the country, the center of gravity moved northwards, and London, formerly the center of the nation's attention, became increasingly isolated in the still predominantly agricultural south (Sheppard, 1971). Thus the Industrial Revolution had less of a direct impact on London than the other major cities of Great Britain. Those trades remaining after 1850 tended to produce quality goods of high value and low bulk, requiring much specialized work and storage, and, in general, they were products that could be sold directly to consumers. Only those industries survived that demanded little space and relatively low capital investment. Conversely, trades that moved away from London tended to produce goods of low value, high bulk, and requiring little specialized labor, much power, space, and indirect
consumption. Although there were exceptions to this model, they did not invalidate the overall trends. London industries remained small with few employees. Jones (1971) concluded that 86 percent of London employers employed fewer than ten persons, based upon data provided in the Census of 1851. In a real sense, the occupations described in the Census resembled pre-Industrial Revolution trades and businesses.

Housing

Between the years 1821 and 1851, the population of London almost doubled, but this increase was not accompanied by a commensurate increase in housing. The main industrial and commercial businesses remained in the center of the city, and in the 1830s and 1840s two events precipitated the expansion of commerce in London. The first was the repeal of the Corn Laws, which substantially aided the import trade into the Port of London by the removal of import duties, and the second was the expansion of the railway system into London. Both these events changed London's situation in both national and international trade, but they also changed the use of land within central London. Many thousands of acres of residential land were cleared for the railway lines, stations, large warehouses, and docks, with their accompanying offices. Many residents, therefore, were robbed of their homes. The consequence was a great increase in land values. Landlords who hitherto had received modest rents from their tenants could now derive far larger profits by leasing to the burgeoning commercial interests. These incursions prompted many London residents to move to the suburbs, most notably the middle classes, who could
afford to travel some distance to their daily work. But there were thousands of working-class persons who could not afford to do so. Many were employed on a daily or even hourly basis, and often drawing the attention of the foreman could make the difference between hunger or subsistence for their families (Sheppard, 1971). Typically, workers in 1851 lived within walking distance of their work. This was due not only to economic necessity, but also to the lack of adequate and cheap suburban transportation facilities. Thus, until the 1880s, when mass travel to and from the suburbs became more feasible, London suffered a contradiction between its commercial growth and the necessity to house workers near the places of their employment. The poor clung to the immediate neighborhoods, living in increasingly unsanitary and overcrowded conditions. The Medical Officer of Health for the Strand district of London comments in his report of 1868:

Experience shows that great metropolitan improvements, whereby houses in poorer neighborhoods are demolished, by no means disperse the resident population in the manner which might be anticipated; . . . the families so displaced, merely migrate to the nearest courts and streets, and then provide themselves with homes, by converting the house, up to this time occupied by a single family, into one tenanted by nearly as many families as the rooms which it contains. (8th Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, 1865, XXXIII, Appendix II, quoted in Jones, 1971, p. 170)

The lack of an adequate and safe water supply in these overcrowded conditions caused several outbreaks of cholera in London, starting in 1832 and again in 1848-9 and 1871. Despite their igno-
of the causes of cholera, the Public Health authorities in the first half of the nineteenth century were aware of the need for cleanliness and noted that cholera occurred primarily in filthy and overcrowded conditions. A day of national fasting and penance in 1832 did little to improve the conditions that caused the incidence of cholera, even though the relationship between dirt and disease had been noted.

The national data from the Census do not reflect the overcrowded conditions of London. The mean number of families per inhabited house in England and Wales was 1.13, and the mean family size in 1851 was 4.83, and additionally the mean number of persons per inhabited house was 5.36 (Anderson, 1972). The larger cities of the nation did not experience over crowding to the degree that existed in London since they grew in response to industrial development, and thus industrialization and housing tended, in these cities, to have a symbiotic relationship rather than the contradictory relationship that existed in London as we have already described. Best (1972) notes that many examples of capitalistic philanthropy first came from the northern towns, where it was not uncommon for mill-owners to build and then rent houses at low cost to their workers.

**Occupations**

London held a unique place in the Industrial Revolution. She owed nothing to the exploitation of coal and retained from earlier times a heritage of more self-sufficient industries, which were small
in scale compared to the dark, satanic mills and factories of the north. Work dominated people's lives in mid-Victorian Britain to an extent that can hardly be imagined today (Best, 1972). Contemporary visitors to the businesses, mills, workhouses, and prisons commented upon the dedication to work seen in these places. Offices displayed notices reading: "You are requested to speak of business only." Visitors were not encouraged, since they upset the routine of the workers, who toiled long hours, often in appalling conditions by any standards.

The occupations of Londoners were so numerous and varied that only a few of the more important ones can be considered within the scope of this chapter. The importance of these industries is relative to two factors, namely, the number of workers employed and the concentration of the particular industry in London. The clothing industry was important because of its size, but it was not confined entirely to London, whereas the total number of persons employed in the manufacture of paint in England and Wales was 2,700, of which 2,200 worked in London. Both the rubber and tobacco industries were very largely centered in London. Sheppard (1971) divides mid-nineteenth century London occupations into two main groups: light industries and engineering. The former were, in general, old established crafts using light materials, with little transportation problems and often demanding a high degree of skill on the part of the workers. As the nineteenth century advanced, this tradition was slowly but steadily eroded because of the introduction of inexpensive machines.
and the use of cheap labor of foreign immigrants and women. Small businesses flourished based on "sweated labor."

During the first half of the nineteenth century, engineering steadily developed new techniques, which gradually eroded the old skills of hand and eye. Although many engineers were from Scotland or the North, they spent time in London learning basic skills before returning to their home towns. The watch, clock, and mathematical instrument makers were congregated in London, together with the silversmiths, goldsmiths, and printers, all of whom provided skilled training in engineering to the young apprentices from the North. Thus during the first half of the nineteenth century London enjoyed a prestige in the field of engineering—which was, however, short-lived. The machines for the great mills of the North were never made in London, and gradually old and established engineering companies left their premises and migrated northwards (Sheppard, 1971).

Almost one-quarter of all workers in London in 1851 were engaged in the service industry. These services were highly varied and included military, hairdressers, grooms, ostlers, livery stable keepers, and many thousands of servants, shopworkers, and laborers. Numerous retailers and middlemen supplied London with food through a complicated system of supply. With the exception of the suburban cowkeepers, the distribution of food was dependent upon a cumbersome chain of intermediaries. As the railroads and steam shipping increased, many of these systems were shortened. For example, cattle no longer had to be driven on foot from all over the country to London, and the nation gradually began to be able to draw its food from greater
distances. Londoners became consumers of grain from Canada, fruit from South Africa, and beef from America.

**Seasonality of Employment**

London was particularly vulnerable to the dictates of seasonal demand. The ambitious middle class copied upper-class norms, and the London "season" became a way of life for thousands of families. From April to July, the Queen was in London, fashionable society was preoccupied with its social life; daughters "came out," and if they were particularly fortunate, they would be presented at court, thus enhancing their prospects for a good marriage. The following industries were affected by the London season as well as by the normal dictates of seasonal demand: tailors, shoemakers, milliners, dressmakers, cabinetmakers, saddlers, harnessmakers, coachbuilders, farriers, cooks, confectioners, and cabmen as well as coachmen, servants (who were only employed from April to July and then dismissed), printers, painters, plumbers, plasterers, upholsterers, dyers, laundresses, and bakers (Mayhew, 1863, II). The natural variations in demand were "... grotesquely accentuated by London's position as a centre of conspicuous consumption" (Jones, 1971, p. 34-35).

The weather was another factor in the seasonality of employment in Victorian London. For example, gas and coal workers were generally unemployed during the summer. Since London was lacking in steam-powered factory production, the coal brought down the East coast from Newcastle largely served the needs of private consumers to heat their homes in the winter. Even undertakers experienced a seasonal trade,
with business becoming brisk when the London fogs descended in November. The distress caused by lack of employment became so severe that bread rioting broke out for the first time in 1854. Riots continued intermittently in London throughout the remainder of the century. The number of paupers increased from 96,752 in 1851 to 135,389 in 1860 (Jones, 1971). A London Medical Officer of Health, noting the increase in deaths in 1858, attributed a large part of this to starvation "caused by the prevalence of the easterly wind" (Jones, 1971, p. 47). The well-known commentator Alistair Cooke estimated that one in three Londoners suffered from serious malnutrition in the mid-nineteenth century.

Women's Occupations

In 1851 women were primarily employed in the clothing industry and domestic service. Women in the clothing industry labored in conditions known as "sweating." This was really an attempt to reduce London overheads to a minimum. It was a radical solution to the problem of factory competition from the North and also solved the employer's problem of offsetting high rents, expensive fuel, and high wages (Jones, 1971). "Sweatshops" became a term to describe a workplace where conditions were oppressive and where there was unbridled exploitation of the workers, most notably women and children. Thus a mass of unskilled labor was pressed into monotonous work as a response to competition, with total disregard to the human element. It involved a rate of wages inadequate in terms of work done or a basic standard of living, excessive hours of labor, and unsanitary conditions. The
handloom weavers of London serve as an example. They worked and lived in a single room from six in the morning until ten at night. Those who worked with cotton often had to labor in a damp cellar because that particular fiber is woven when damp. The silk handloom weavers could not open their windows because the noxious air from the street would affect the delicate colors of the silk. The position of the loom required the feet to be free, and thus all the strain of weaving was largely taken by the back muscles. Additionally, the stomach was constantly pressed against the beam of the loom. The weaver often suffered from serious diseases due to his or her position at the loom and the unhygienic conditions. Weavers gradually lost their physical strength as they aged and lacked all ability to resist infection (Pinchbeck, 1930).

Approximately 13 percent of the labor force in 1851 was in some form of domestic service. Of these 96,000 were men, and 784,000 were women (Pinchbeck, 1930). It is hardly possible to describe the life of the female servant, since it was largely dependent on the humanity of the employer. Wages were consistently low, yet domestic service offered a chance to those women who had to work in order to be self-supporting. The inducement to go into service for a girl from the rural parts of England was considerable. It offered her an income which, had she stayed at home she never would have received. Her employers, however, had strong bargaining power. Older female servants became dependent upon their employers as their physical strength waned, and younger ones would often accept what they were given because of the dire consequences of being fired without a reference.
Married women whose husbands were seasonally employed would take in laundry when their husbands were out of work. Thus, for example, the gas workers' wives would do laundry work in the summer, and builders' wives would be similarly employed during the winter (Mayhew, 1863, III). However, in general wives did not work unless pressure was put upon them by necessity and they were thus in no position to bargain.

The Census Report itself eloquently describes the duties expected of married women, reminding us that the husband has the responsibility for providing all the necessaries:

Without overlooking the high duties which women, as well as men, perform in England, it must be admitted that St. Paul . . . lays down for women their substantial business: which cannot be neglected without imminent peril to their children . . . and the nation . . . A good mother . . . is in the eyes of all European nations (sic) surrounded by a sanctity . . . The fatal effects of leaving her children to the care of strangers -- are well known. Under such circumstances monogamic nations inevitably fall in arrear. . .

The importance in the duties of a wife are seen in the clean house, the dry floor, the healthy children and their neat clothes, the husband's comfortable meal, and the enjoyment which, under all difficulties she manages to shed around her. The duties of a wife . . . can only be efficiently performed by unremitting attention. Accordingly . . . in the districts where the women are much employed away from home, the children and husbands perish in great numbers. (Census Report 1851, Pt. II, lxxxviii)

Who but the lion-hearted could resist?

The Occupational Abstracts of the Census Returns for both 1841 and 1851 indicate that women were employed in many jobs, but in
lesser numbers, other than domestic service and the clothing trade. The following is an example of some of the occupations pursued by women in 1841 when all others related to the two above-mentioned sources of employment have been abstracted.

Actor, artist, auctioneer, author, baker, banker, blacksmith, boat builder, bobbin maker, bookseller, binder, publisher, brass founder, brewer, builder, carpenter, carver and gilder, chair maker, chemist and druggist, chimney sweep, china and glass dealer, coal labourer or heaver, clock maker, cooper, fishmonger, French polisher, gardener, gunsmith, ironmonger, lunatic asylum keeper, locksmith and bell hanger, match maker and seller, midwife, cow keeper, miller, miner, musical instrument maker, nail manufacturer, plumber, pipe maker, pin manufacturer, plater, messenger, pen maker, poulterer, printer, pump maker, rope and cord spinner, saddle maker, sand merchant, Sawyer, scissors maker, shroud maker, smelter, snuffer maker, tanner, smack owner, steel worker, beershop keeper, teacher, thimble maker, tool collector, turner, umbrella maker, undertaker, whitesmith, wire merchant, yeast dealer. (Pinchbeck, 1930, pp. 317-321)

Even from this selection we can note that women in mid-nineteenth century England were working with a wide variety of skills in many different trades.

In London more women were educated into a trade than were their rural sisters; however unemployment, as noted above, and especially the conditions of their work, were both factors that pervaded their employment. Unemployment among women was seen at its worst in London, where crime, prostitution, suicide, and, not infrequently, starvation, followed upon the wake of unemployment. A magistrate commented in 1852 at an inquest upon a woman who had drowned herself:
For hardly a week passes without one or more instances of [this] kind, and few or no men have been for some time known to have committed the crime. Perhaps the distress to which some females have been lately reduced may in some measure account for it. (Perkin, 1969, p. 153)

Although some mid-Victorian women were undoubtedly working in skilled and therefore higher-status occupations, the relative absence of properly remunerated employment and adequate working conditions stamped women's work with the taint of poverty and loss of status.

The Legal Position of Women in 1851

As we have already noted, social customs put women at a severe disadvantage, and the law, nominally written for the protection of individuals, also provided little in the way of safeguards for women. A married woman had no responsibility under the law and was classified with minors and idiots.

She was, in the legal phrase, a "femme covert—my wife and I are one and I am he." She was, in fact, civilly dead. (Crow, 1972, p. 147)

Upon marriage a woman gave up her legal right to her property, her earnings, and her ability to sign a contract and make a will. Her husband had sole and exclusive custody of any children that she might bear. She could be imprisoned for denying him his marital rights, and he had the legal right to prevent her from leaving him by force. Divorce in 1851 was obtained by Act of Parliament; therefore it was only granted to the wealthy and aristocratic families. Furthermore, it was only granted to the husband's petition. In practical terms,
separated but not divorced women were in a very perilous position. They could not legally hold property or control their earnings since those belonged to their husbands, and yet they had to support themselves. Single women and widows were in a more tenable legal position, in that they could keep their own earnings, make contracts, own property, and dictate their own wills.

Old Age in 1851

England, together with many Western countries, has today a growing proportion of old people in her population. This situation inevitably generates new problems and raises social issues which require national responses. If these responses are to be adequate, there must be an understanding of the basic questions that are involved. One of these questions is: When does old age begin? Indeed, in reviewing the literature and in the context of our data, which reveals that in 1851 2.84 percent of the population of Great Britain were over the age of 70, we may perhaps ask: Was the concept of old age as a distinct period of life common to all classes in the nineteenth century?

Chronological and Perceived Old Age

In the early stages of human development, physical change can be used as a basis for developing age categories—for example, the onset of puberty. There are no such distinct phenomena that point toward a transition into old age. Aries (1962) found a distinction only between childhood and adulthood. Gillis (1974) and Kett (1977) both
show that "youth" was invented as a third stage of life in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, coming between childhood, which ended at eight years of age, and adulthood, which was delayed until the age of twenty-nine. They also suggest that "adolescence" too was invented as a fourth stage, coming between youth and adulthood, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Fischer (1977) and Achenbaum (1978) both argue that old age is a universal phenomenon but that its onset is, at the least, ill defined.

Lacking a common physical definition of old age, sociologists and others have tended to accept the government's "retirement age" as a convenient indicator of the onset of old age. (See, for example, Rowntree, 1947; Townsend, 1957). The now-arbitrary use of the age of 65 may have originated with Otto von Bismarck in the 1880s. He was reputed to be the first statesman in Europe to devise a comprehensive scheme of social security, offering the worker insurance against sickness and a pension in old age. Bismarck's ascribed motive was less humanitarian than it was political. Orbach (1981) suggests that this is a myth, that in fact Germany had a retirement program before the days of Bismarck. However, this myth has been used to great effect by numerous leading policy-makers both in the United States and Europe. While the policy appeared to be paternalistic, its application was not widespread, since only a small percentage of the population was at that time over the age of 65.

Before retirement age became the more commonly accepted definition of old age, people used loose and varied descriptions. The Elizabethan Poor Law required that aid should be given to the aged
and impotent poor, but no indication as to a specific age was offered to parish authorities. Indeed, Roebuck cites numerous examples of the arbitrary nature of parish relief in nineteenth-century England:

[A] survey of Hesket in Cumberland, for example, indicates that even people who might be expected to have enjoyed modestly prosperous lives . . . sought parish relief in their 70s and 80s. Private organizations, too, varied in their definition of old age. For example, one . . . gave old age allowances to members over 70 . . . while [another] gave 4 shillings a week to members over 60 whether they could work or not. It was generally accepted that individuals aged in the sense of increasing functional incapacity combined with advancing years, at different times and rates (Roebuck, 1979, p. 418).

It appears that old age had no accepted chronological onset but rather was a function of physical incapacity correlated with advancing years. The Census Report of 1851 confirms this concept but also adds the idea of honor in old age:

The fourth vicenniad (60-80) . . . may be considered the laureate age of a complete life . . . but as civilization advances men are not now cast aside but enter upon the legitimate rewards and honours of their accumulated services . . . Integrity and wisdom in counsel are sealed by experience, and receive the recognition which envy can no longer gainsay . . . As a good life in old age becomes something almost divind, so a bad life is then transformed into a "wrinkled eld" of almost supernatural malignity (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, xiii).

Indeed it is not until over the age of 80 that the Report reluctantly concedes that old age and decreased strength or health may indeed be connected:
If [emphasis added] the vitality rapidly decreases in the ... fifth vicenniad (80-100)... then the colours of the world fade away; the forms of men are indistinctly seen in the dim twilight; the voices of men are heard, but like the inarticulate murmurs of the sea... the sense of being, and the memories themselves of well-spent years, are at last obliterated. The lamp of life is not broken but is softly burned out. (Census 1851 Report, Pt. I., xiv).

While it is tempting to accept the idealism of the Census Report, the literature on the history of aging suggested that it is a complicated subject, culture-bound and open to varying interpretations. At present there are three major studies on the history of old age extant, two on old age in the United States (Fischer, 1977; Achenbaum, 1978) and one concerned with France (Stearns, 1976). Fischer posits that from the early 1600s to the early 1800s the elderly were venerated but not loved. During the nineteenth century their status declined as the cult of youth increased, although, ironically, their filial bonds strengthened. He suggests that this decline was extremely rapid between 1780 and 1820, leading to their long-term loss of status until a more positive stage emerged in the mid-twentieth century when the increasing numbers of elderly forced legislation to alleviate some of their problems. While Achenbaum agrees with this overall scheme, he disagrees with several parts of it. He finds a gradual and steady change in status from 1790 and warns against subdividing American history in the twentieth century. Stearns chose France to study because of the historically high proportion of elderly in the French population. Theoretically this would put a strain on institutions and families and, in terms of Fischer's thesis, enhance social concern. Stearns concludes, however, that France did not
possess a benign attitude toward her elderly population—in fact, quite the contrary. Today Stearns suggests that France is a bellwether in this regard but that the most striking modern development is a national sense of guilt. The case of England is surely different from that of the United States and France. A country that had suffered so grievously in World War II and immediately created a National Health Service after it must contain an idealism in her culture that differs from both France and America. At least this suggests something of a metahistorical possibility.

Social Class and Age

Roebuck (1979) indicates that working-class people in the nineteenth century tended to age sooner than did the higher ranks of society. The following discussion is based upon Aaron Antonovsky's 1967 study of the literature on this subject for nineteenth-century England. Since relatively little research has been done in this area, Antonovsky warns that the literature should be treated with caution.

Writing in 1839, Gavin investigated the average age of death in Bethnal Green, a borough of London, by social strata and concluded that there were considerable differences:

Gentlemen, professional men and their families died, on the average, at the age of 45; tradesmen and their families at age 26; and mechanics, servants, labourers and their families at age 16. (Cited in Antonovsky, 1967, p. 34)
Titmuss (1943) cites similar data for the city of York for the years 1839 to 1841. He found that for corresponding social groups, the average ages of death were 48.6, 30.8, and 23.8, respectively. He also reports that a "gentleman" in London lived twice as long as a "labourer." His figures for Leeds were 44 and 19 years, and for Liverpool 35 and 15, respectively. Thus an inverse relationship between social class and mortality in nineteenth-century England is suggested.

As a caveat to these data, Antonovsky cites separate studies by Milne (1815) and Farren (1832), who both claim that the mortality rate is greater among the higher classes of British society. Antonovsky concludes that in general during the nineteenth century there appeared to be a "substantial widening in class differences." However, he warns that "...no report is available comparing the life expectancy of social strata of the population prior to the nineteenth century" (Antonovsky, 1967, p. 33)

Age-Specific Death Rates

While the data on social class and mortality may be ambiguous, nineteenth-century age- and sex-specific death rates are more reliable. Johansson (1977) assures us that:

The data gathered and published by the Registrar General of England and Wales are generally regarded as very accurate. Perhaps only three to five percent of all deaths escaped the registration process between 1837 and the late 1860s, when registration became compulsory. (Johansson, 1977, p. 301)
In 1840, although England was the world's first rapidly developing industrial country, the age- and sex-specific death rates showed clearly that its mortality pattern was as yet more traditional than modern (Johansson, 1977). Between the ages of 10 and 34 the death rate for women was higher than that of men, though their overall life expectancy at birth was 1.9 years higher than that of males. The Second Annual Report of the Registrar General of 1840 noted these differences and attempted to explain them. It was suggested that the longer life span of women was caused because wars, intemperance, and "excessive fatigue" extracted a heavy toll on men. Musing on the fact that when men were between the ages of 10 and 34 they did most of their fighting, drinking, and hard work, the Registrar General concluded that it was some mysterious element in the "very blood and brains" of individuals that caused those differences by sex. Johansson comments that the biological mystery appeared to give strength to the weaker sex during the most vulnerable years, namely extreme youth and old age—surely an embarrassing finding for Victorian doctors, who were convinced that the weaker sex was in fact weaker and more physically delicate. Why then did more women die between the ages of 10 and 34? Tuberculosis, or consumption, was the single leading cause of death in the nineteenth century for both men and women; however, in the 1840s and 1850s eight percent more women died of it than did men, and it was not until the 1880s that the trend was reversed. In mid-Victorian Britain, of all the women who died in this age category, approximately fifty percent died of some form of tuberculosis, whereas only one percent died of complications related to pregnancy of childbirth (Johansson, 1977).
Older Women

As we have seen, nineteenth-century women lived slightly longer than did their male counterparts, thus they were more likely to be widows and also, as Stearns points out, were "... far less well provided for materially..." (Stearns, 1976, p. 121). Additionally, they were "treated horribly in the popular culture of traditional society," which was long enhanced by doctors (Stearns, 1976, p. 119). When women reached menopause they clearly entered a debased status. Stearns describes the attitudes toward menopausal women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in France and how doctors correlated life force with sexual function. A medical journal published in 1785 described menopause as "an old woman is for nature only a degraded being, because she is useless to it" (Stearns, 1976, p. 132). Not only were old women functionless, but they were also ugly:

The theme of ugliness was extremely pervasive, for the menopausal woman was held likely to be obese, wrinkled, with deteriorated skin and hair. (Cited in Stearns, 1976, p. 132)

We may conclude that even in the nineteenth century women outlived men, and thus there were more widows than widowers, that their material condition was insecure generally, and that old age brought for them a lowered status in the eyes of society.

The Census Report notes that there were many more women than men in London than in any other part of the country, due to a need for a "... large number of female servants and of women employed in London preparing articles of dress" (Census Report 1851, Pt. II.,
London in 1851 contained 113 women for every 100 men. Between the ages of 40 and 60 this increased to 116, and at ages 60 to 80 there were 137 women for every 100 men. Over the age of 80 the ratio increased to 197:100. London in 1851, therefore, contained more older women than any other part of Great Britain, indeed, perhaps more than any other city in the world.

How then may we view old age in 1851? While we cannot be specific to London except in terms of demographic data, following this discussion we may draw some conclusions. First, the meaning of old age was socially and culturally determined. In general there was no demarcation point at which old age officially began. It was, rather, correlated with individual health and ability and perhaps, as the Census Report claimed, honor, wisdom, and integrity. Secondly, aging in men and women was viewed differently. Menopause was considered the event that placed women in the category of old age and furthermore demeaned them by attributing lack of function and ugliness to this status. Finally, we suggest that, since the elderly as a group were relatively small in numbers, 2.84 percent of the total population of Great Britain, as has already been noted, they did not constitute a particularly significant group and furthermore, as Hareven (1976) proposes, the elderly received comparatively little public concern in the nineteenth century since they were not perceived to be dangerous to the social order:

The physical weaknesses and inevitable end associated with old age did not present an imminent danger to society and did not, therefore, evoke the anxiety produced by
problems among the youth ... young people
were compared to the "proletaire" of Paris
and were regarded as the "dangerous classes."
(Hareven, 1976, p. 15)

Thus we may tentatively conclude that old age in 1851 was not seen as
a distinct social problem, although clearly there were many old
persons living in poverty and dire straits.

Summary

London in 1851 was a city of contrasts and contradictions. Although its capitalism had its roots in the Industrial Revolution, the economic growth of London did not accelerate as rapidly as that of other large cities of the nation. It was a city where the worst poverty and the wealthiest magnificence in the world could be observed existing side by side, where the labor of men, women, and children was exploited often in appalling conditions, where working people lived in overcrowded slums beside the homes of the wealthy, and where starvation and malnutrition were common spectacles. It was a city of diverse occupations for men and women, many of which resembled pre-Industrial Revolution trades. It was the city to which young women from rural areas came in search of independence and perhaps upward social mobility through an advantageous marriage, which work in a factory town made much less likely. It was the city where old age came sooner to the workers than to the upper classes. But it was also a city of immense pride and hope for the future. In 1851 Londoners congratulated themselves upon their achievements and proudly displayed them to the world at the Crystal Palace Great Exhibition.
It was a year of reflection on past and present attainments and a year to prepare themselves for the second half of the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER III

THEORY

Introduction

In this chapter we will discuss those theoretical positions that appear to have relevance to our problem and organize them under the umbrella of social stratification. Three aspects of social stratification will be discussed, namely: stratification by sex, occupation, and age.

George Simmel's (1902) theory of a male-dominated culture is an all-encompassing concept with which to begin. That culture, he says, has been a powerful obstacle to women's ability to make contributions to a common culture. Simmel's analysis of the social position of men relative to women parallels Marx's analysis of capitalistic labor in that the relationship between employers and employees is ostensibly free but is in fact to the advantage of the employers since they control the means of production. Within this broad theory, the formulations of Frederick Engels (1884) and Randall Collins (1972) will be contained since they have more exact reference to the problem under consideration. Developing Marx's broad theory, Engels applied it to the status of women and analyzed it as a system of male exploitation of women, based upon the control of private property and maintained by a degree of false consciousness on the part of women. Randall Collins supports Engels' theory, his thesis being that, while
sexual stratification is indeed conditioned by particular economic circumstances, the initial situation of coercion by males of females is a crucial underlying condition.

In the literature of the sociology of occupations, the occupational status of women has generally been ignored. Following Acker, we will argue that the position of women is indeed of importance to the larger social structure.

Finally, stratification by age will be discussed and further developed as it may combine with sexual stratification, a theory known as "double jeopardy."

Stratification by Sex

Although the term "politics" is often understood in the narrow sense of meetings, chairpersons, parties, and vested interests, in this study we will expand our understanding to the Weberian meaning of "Herrschaft," or a relationship of dominance and subordinance—in essence, a social relationship based upon the amorphous concept of power. Domination, according to Weber, "... can only mean the probability that a command will be obeyed," but discipline enhances that probability by its application to a group of persons because of their practiced orientation toward a command, thus producing an "... uncritical and unresisting ... obedience" (Weber, 1925/1972, p. 117). Although Weber applied these concepts broadly to members of a corporate group, he carefully points out that such domination is not the exclusive prerogative of bureaucratic systems, but that a head of a household can also, as an individual, dominate without an adminis-
trative staff. Thus domination will be called "political" as long as its existence and the validity of its laws "are guaranteed by . . . continuous application and the threat of force" (Weber, 1925/1972, p. 119). Patriarchy is indeed such a system, consisting of the control through domination by men over women. The main institution of patriarchy is the family. The family mediates between the individual and the larger societal structure, thus effecting control and conformity where governmental and other authorities are inadequate (Goode, 1964). The family "... not only encourages its own members to adjust and conform, but acts as a unit in the government of the patriarchal state which rules its citizens through its family heads" (Millett, 1970, p. 33).

Historically, patriarchy granted the father or husband practically complete ownership of the women and children in his household, which included the right to physical abuse and even sale. As an ideal type, patriarchy may be viewed as a social constant that may be observed in all social structures. It pervades class and caste and also all major religions; however, it demonstrates enormous variation both in time and place. The concept of romantic love in the Western countries dulls the consciousness as to the reality of the patriarchal system since it is a means of emotional manipulation. It ascribes practically impossible virtues to women, thus restricting them to a narrow range of behavior.

It was a Victorian habit . . . to insist that the female assume the function of serving as the male's conscience and living the life of goodness he found tedious but felt someone ought to do anyway. (Millett, 1970, p. 37)
Patriarchy is at its most efficient level of functioning in its economic domination over women. In traditional patriarchal societies, women had no independent economic existence that they could earn or own in their own right. The difference in the division of labor was roughly proportional to the difference in physical strength (Boserup, 1970). Women were an essential part of these agricultural systems which needed the contribution of every able-bodied person in order to ensure the well-being of the whole. The advent of the Industrial Revolution initially appeared to be a means of overcoming the problem of the difference in strength between the sexes, in that the new machinery would aid women in performing tasks that they were hitherto unable physically to perform.

Insofar as machinery dispenses with muscular power, it becomes a means of employing laborers of slight muscular strength . . . the labor of women and children was, therefore, the first thing sought for by capitalists who had machinery. (Marx, 1867/1961, p. 394)

Furthermore, Marx saw capitalism, even in its most depressing aspects, as a step forward toward the economic emancipation of women because of the opportunities now offered to women outside their homes:

However terrible and disgusting, therefore, the dissolution under the capitalist system, of the old family ties may appear, nevertheless modern industry, by assigning as it does an important part in the process of production outside the domestic sphere to women . . . creates a new economic foundation . . . the relations between the sexes. (Marx, 1867/1961, p. 489.

Alas poor Marx! Esther Boserup, in her scholarly study Women's Role in
Economic Development, documents in detail from a precise analysis of agricultural practices how the advent of industrialization in actuality led to reduction in the status of women:

As agriculture became less dependent upon human muscular power, the differences between the two sexes might be expected to narrow. In actual fact, however, this was far from being so. It is usually the men who learn how to operate the new types of equipment, while women continue with the old hand tools. With the gradual introduction of mechanization there is less need for male muscular strength; nevertheless, the productivity gap tends to widen because men monopolize the use of the new equipment and modern methods of production. (Boserup, 1970, p. 101)

Industrial labor and automated technology may well be the preconditions for women's integration into the market place, but they are no more than preconditions. According to Millett, in today's "reformed" patriarchal systems women indeed have greater economic independence, yet domestic work remains unpaid for, even though it occupies two-thirds of the female population of undeveloped countries. She concludes that, since status and prestige in a money economy depend upon currency, since the position of women in a patriarchy is a function of their economic dependence, since their social position is vicarious and achieved through males, therefore their relation to the economy is also vicarious and tangential.

Georg Simmel

Patriarchy's most powerful weapon is not only its historical longevity but also its broad acceptance by both men and women as a
normative system. In 1902 Georg Simmel courted the objections of Edwardian patriarchal society by drawing its attention to this male-dominated culture which, over the ages, has been a powerful obstacle to women's ability to make contributions to a common culture. His gauntlet remained ignored upon the ground until 1935 when it was once more cast down, this time by Karen Horney (1926)\(^1\).

While it is necessary to describe gender roles and how they exist, it is also important to determine why these phenomena exist at all and why they are maintained in societies. The work of Georg Simmel (1902) describes the cultural and social conditions that make it very difficult for women to participate fully in a culture that is guided by male standards and criteria. He argues that although the relationship between the sexes is apparently free, it is the male who exercises the ultimate power:

We measure the achievements . . . of males and females in terms of specific norms and values: but these norms are not neutral, standing above the contrasts of the sexes; they have themselves a male character . . . The standards of art and the demands of patriotism, the general mores and the specific social ideas, the equity of practical judgements and the objectivity of practical knowledge . . . --all these categories are formally generically human, but are in fact masculine in terms of their actual historical formation. If we call ideas that claim absolute validity objectively binding, then it is a fact that in the historical life of our species there operates the equation: objective = male. (Cited in Coser, 1977a, p. 872)

Simmel continues to explain how this happened:
Man's position of power does not only assure his relative superiority over the woman, but it assures his standards become generalized as generically human standards that are to govern the behavior of men and women alike. (Emphasis in the original.) If one sees the relations between the sexes in a somewhat crass manner as that between masters and slaves, then it will be realized that it is the master's privilege not to have to think continuously about the fact that he is the master. In contrast, the position of the slave is such that it never allows the latter to forget it. There is no doubt that women more rarely lose their sense of being women than men lose their sense of being men. Very frequently it seems as if men think in terms of purely factual categories without their sense of maleness coming into play; by contrast it seems as if women never lose the sense, be it clearly felt or only subjacent, that they are in fact women. . .(Cited in Coser, 1977a, p. 872)

Simmel, therefore, believes that women have adapted themselves to the requirements of men, internalizing that this adaptation is their true nature. Male forms of behavior achieve normative value, thus "...claiming a transsexual validity as the yardstick of truth and justice for both men and women." Simmel argues that "under these conditions the autonomy of the female cannot be perceived." If it is simply a question of the brutalization of females by males, the norms of justice that govern both the sexes can be appealed to. "But when the higher court of appeal is again male dominated, then one cannot even imagine how female nature can ever be judged in terms of norms attuned to its requirements" (Simmel, cited in Coser, 1977a, p. 872).
Frederick Engels and Randall Collins

Frederick Engels and Randall Collins, writing in different centuries, have examined the same problem in more pragmatic terms than Simmel, both using an evolutionary framework in an effort to explain the differences between the sexes. As will be seen, Collins improves upon Engels' evolutionary scheme, but Engels was the originator of the theory that stressed the causal influence of economic systems on gender roles and stratification by sex.

Frederick Engels.

In 1884 Frederick Engels published The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State. In this work he constructed a theory of the subjugation of women, based upon the Marxian notion that control of the mode of production is of primary importance in determining the nature of basic aspects of society (such as the family, class and family structure, ideology, and child rearing). He placed this materialistic theory within an evolutionary scheme which consisted of three basic stages, savagery, barbarism, and civilization, postulating that family relationships mirrored these stages. Savagery is a period when people subsisted by foraging for wild plants and animal food. In this stage Engels maintained that "group marriage" was the norm, with all males and females of the same cohort (including brothers and sisters) having legitimate sexual access to one another. During this stage of development he believed that matrilineal descent prevailed. Barbarism is a stage in which "...man learns to breed
domestic animals and to practice agriculture, and acquires methods of increasing the supply of natural products by human activity" (Engels, 1884/1942, p. 22). Group marriage continued into this period, but a "pairing family" developed because, Engels argued, the incest taboo was gradually extended to more and more relatives.

In this stage, one man lives with one woman, but the relationship is such that polygamy and occasional infidelity remain the right of the men, even though for economic reasons polygamy is rare, while from the woman the strictest fidelity is generally demanded throughout the time she lives with the man and adultery on her part is cruelly punished. (Engels, 1884/1942, p. 110)

Nevertheless, matrilineal descent still was maintained in this system and for this reason Engels believed that women had a relatively high status in these societies. They also had control, because there was no private property and they were recognized as important contributors to the well-being of the whole community. In Engels' view, however, in this emerging monogamous system the dual standard of fidelity was first practiced. At this time production was for use value and not for exchange. Men began to accumulate large herds of cattle, not just for the sustenance of the family, but as valuable objects of exchange and profit, and thus a new economic order was born which eventually overthrew the dominance of the matrilineal system and reduced women's status to a menial level:

Thus on the one hand, in proportion as wealth increased it made the man's position in the family more important than the woman's and on the other hand created an impulse to exploit
this strengthened position in order to overthrow, in favor of his children, the traditional order of inheritance. This, however, was impossible as long as descent was reckoned according to mother right. Mother right, therefore, had to be overthrown, and overthrown it was ... the male line of descent and the paternal law of inheritance were substituted for them.

The overthrow of mother right was the world historical defeat of the female sex. The man took command in the home also; the woman was degraded and reduced to servitude; she became the slave of his lust and a mere instrument for the production of children. This degraded position of the woman ... has gradually been palliated and glossed over, and sometimes clothed in a milder form; in no sense has it been abolished. (Engels, 1884/1942, pp. 119-120)

Because of the new importance attached to property and inheritance, the paternity of children was of the utmost importance to men, and thus, claims Engels, the patriarchal family emerges. This, together with monogamy, reduced women to a subordinate position.

Randall Collins.

Within his broad, sweeping theoretical framework, Simmel did not articulate the specific means employed by men to maintain their "position of power." His reference to "brutalization of females by males" was the closest he came to it, but he never expanded upon this subject as an explanation of sexual stratification. Randall Collins (1975) has taken this concept of aggression, basing it upon the theories of Engels, Max Weber, and Freud, and advances an explanatory conflict theory of sexual stratification.
Collins begins by suggesting that Freud's theory can be fruitful to historical sociology. He argues that Freud's "discovery" of biological universal drives of sexuality and aggression, together with the historically specific repression of these drives through an idealized moralism, become the keys to unlocking the history of sexual stratification. Collins interprets his position within Max Weber's theory of stratification, namely: that persons struggle for as much dominance as their resources permit; changes in resources lead to changes in the structure of domination. Moreover, ideals are used as weapons in these struggle, both to unify status communities and to justify power interests.

Like Engels, Collins devises an evolutionary scheme of gender roles and sexual stratification. He argues that there is a minimum of stratification in low-technology tribal societies. These societies produce little or no surplus beyond subsistence, and therefore males and females have fairly equal bargaining resources. Male force is superior to female force, however, and gives males the advantage. Thus low productivity is the causal variable in producing a low level of sexual stratification within such societies.

The second type of society that Collins considers is a pre-industrial agricultural system which he calls fortified households in stratified society. These are established societies with class variations, but the state has not yet acquired strong power, and the legitimate use of force remains with the feudal overlords who own the estates and fortified households. There is marked sexual stratification in this society, according to Collins, and male sexual property rights
are strongly enforced. For example, virginity is strongly guarded in unmarried women by their fathers and brothers, and since the purpose of marriage is to forge alliances between great households, chastity is strongly enforced upon wives by their husbands in order to preserve their honor. Collins sees women as having a very low status in such societies and often viewed as being innately immoral and inferior. Women have few or no bargaining resources in this type of society.

With the growth of the centralized state, the legitimate use of force is gradually removed from the heads of households and becomes the prerogative of the centralized state. The great household declines in power, and capitalist business flourishes in small shops and craft enterprises and later in large factories separate from the household. Individual males relinquish direct control over the instruments of force, but retain control over economic resources. Family wealth and power is still often important in making alliances, though women have more freedom to negotiate their own marriages. Collins calls this type of society private households in market economy and maintains that this type of marriage market gives rise to the ideology of romantic love and to strong sexual repression. But he suggests that both these developments tend to strengthen the female bargaining position in the marriage market.

The most favorable female strategy (now) . . . is to maximize her bargaining power by appearing both as attractive and as inaccessible as possible. Thus develops the idea of femininity, in which sexuality is idealized and only indirectly hinted at as an ultimate source of attraction; since sexuality must be reserved as a bargaining resource for the male wealth and
income...an element of sexual repression is thus built into the situation in which men and women bargain with unequal goods. (Collins, 1975, p. 243)

Since sexual repression serves to strengthen women's bargaining position, it is now more strongly defended by women than by men. Collins suggests that a remnant of male honor remains, but women now condemn women who trade their sexual favors for immediate rewards instead of holding out for the long-term economic support of the male in marriage. He also argues that women now extend their bargaining powers to extend chastity to their husbands and reduce the sexual double standard. Collins points out, however, that this strategy for improving the female's position in society has inherent limitations. It can never result in equality for women because it requires the idealization of women and a view of women as the weaker sex in need of protection from men. Therefore, since such women can never be permitted into the harsh world of politics or economics, male domination in these areas remains unchallenged.

In advanced market economy, Collins maintains that large numbers of women are needed in the labor force. A woman has increased ability to support herself, thus freeing her from control both by her parents and a potential husband. She may reject marriage if she chooses, and the "playing hard-to-get" strategy is no longer necessary. No longer do women have to accept the limits imposed by the idealization of feminine weakness and dependency. Men are still physically stronger, and the increased use of violence in the form of rape and battered wives may well represent masculine attempts to maintain dominance in a society that is removing that very dominance.
Summary

If we were to make an ideological assumption that the relations between men and women consist of dominance and subordination, and that discipline imposed within this relationship produces uncritical obedience on the part of women, we have therefore a normative system known as patriarchy, so eloquently described by Georg Simmel. Both Engels and Collins developed explanatory evolutionary theories which were lacking in Simmel's reasoning. They then disagreed as to the status of women in traditional, nonindustrialized societies. If we consider women in the mid-nineteenth century in relation to these two theories, we can state broadly that Engels saw these women as degraded and in servitude. In a materialistic theory based solely upon economic considerations, this conclusion is logical since the relationship of women to the means of production in the nineteenth century was tangential and highly restricted by law. (See Chapter II.) Collins, on the other hand, is somewhat more optimistic. We may expect that women in 1851 lived in a system described by him as private households in a market economy. Here they had some power derived from the ideology of romantic love, and they could, therefore, initiate the strategy of bargaining in order to achieve status.

Both theories derive from Simmel's concept of a male-dominated culture. Collins agreed that economic factors have a place in this system, but he does not give them the prominence accorded by Engels. He stresses biological factors and the role of ideology in the relations between the sexes.
Each of the positions outlined above, when considered separately, leaves a sense of inadequacy to address the total problem. Together they bring a semblance of completeness as we consider the combination of the materialistic and the social psychological points of view.

Obviously the cross-sectional nature of our data prohibits our testing the evolutionary nature of these theories, nor can we attribute any inequalities in status found among the subjects in our data to the causes outlined above, because we simply do not have that information. We do, however, offer these theories as being highly relevant to our problem, despite the fact that a direct linking cannot be made.

Stratification by Occupation

Occupations have fundamental importance in society. They are the way that people keep themselves alive. They are either the direct means of obtaining subsistence, as in hunting and gathering, or they are the indirect means of obtaining subsistence, through the exchange of money which has been earned by the occupation. However, they also shape differences between people not just because they are essential, but because people relate to each other differently based upon their occupations. Indeed, not only the occupation, but also how that occupation is performed, is a basis for social evaluation. Thus occupational prestige has two dimensions: the subjective evaluation of the occupation by a given society at a particular time, and the ranking of the individual within that occupational hierarchy.
In a sense, Karl Marx invented the social scientific concept of class. He claimed that social class was a universal concept, both historically and in his temporal context, the nineteenth century. Class, according to Marx, is based upon the relations of production, that is, "... the relations men establish with each other when they utilize existing raw materials and technologies in the pursuit of their productive goals." (Coser, 1977b, p. 45). Thus Marx did not mean just technology, but also the social relations that people engage in as they participate in economic life. In other words, the individual's position in the social system is determined by economic forces which also determine the political and spiritual processes of life. Occupation, therefore, is a basic link between the individual and the economy.

According to Collins (1975), occupations are the major basis of class cultures, and therefore they become organized into hierarchical status groups. The crucial difference between these groups, however, is for Collins the power relationships involved. He identifies three main classes: those who take orders from few or none but give orders to many; those who must defer to some people but can command others; and those who are order-takers only. Thus the continuum of upper to lower classes corresponds with this dimension of occupational stratification.

Williams (1951) sees the basis of class cultures as being much more diverse. Occupation alone will not identify class position, yet because of the availability of the data it is widely used as an indicator of status. The stratification within a society can be
analyzed by means of a variety of indicators that are both objective and subjective. The distribution of objective privileges would include: income, wealth, safety (health and crime rates), and authority. Subjective privileges would include personal ranking by other members of society, such as the acknowledgement of prestige and the granting of esteem. Williams continues to list many other criteria that indicate status: achievements, possessions, style of life, clothing, housing, beliefs, values, and attitudes. He indicates that many of the controversies that exist today in the literature on social stratification would be clarified if these basic elements were examined collectively. Thus he chastises Marx and Engels for distinguishing classes based only on the distribution of one single objective privilege, namely the possession of rights over the means of production. Since it is difficult to gather information on many of these indicators, "... a great many investigators have utilized occupation as the defining mark of class" (Williams, 1951, p. 83).

Treated with care, occupation can shed a great deal of light on social stratification systems. For example, it can indicate the relationship of individuals to the means of production and the correlation between this and their social and political attitudes. Both Collins and Williams see Marxist theory as a monocausal explanation for a multicausal world.

Dahrendorf (1968) claims universality for stratification (as did Marx) but denies that its origins lie in an historically dubious conception of private property. The division of labor may also be a universal feature of all societies, but it lacks the elements of evaluation that are necessary to explain stratification.
Pitirim Sorokin (1959) has a distinct vision of social stratification and social mobility. His concern is with groups in the social hierarchy and not the placement of individuals in the various strata. From his perspective, stratification is a permanent feature of any organized social group, and indeed individuals are stratified according to three separate sets of criteria: economic, political, and occupational. However, our main concern must be with the size and shape of the overall stratification pyramid of a particular society. How many strata does it have? What is the size, width, and height of this pyramid? Contrary to evolutionary thought, Sorokin sees no consistent trend in the changing shape of the stratification pyramid, neither on the exterior nor in the interior; rather, all is in a state of ceaseless fluctuation. Thus his concern is with the exchange of groups in social space and not the placement of individual persons in a system of stratification.

If stratification is based upon economic criteria, then one concentrates on differences between the rich and the poor. If it is based upon political criteria, then the question becomes: How are the authority and power distributed? If members of a society are divided into differentiated occupations, if those occupations are ranked according to some criteria such as prestige and/or skill, or if the occupations are divided between those who give orders and those who receive orders, then we have occupational stratification (Coser, 1977b).
Sexual Stratification: An Addendum

In the sociology of occupations and work, women's "... sociological visibility has been far below their social presence" (O'Kelly, 1980, p. 16). They have either been completely ignored or their work has been seen as being deviant from the "normal" roles of wife and mother. For example, Blau and Duncan (1967), in their book The American Occupational Structure, did not include women's work in their analysis. Nor did Glen and Weiner (1969) include any female sociologists in their study of sociologists. Ann Oakey, in The Sociology of Housework (1974), notes that when women are included in occupational research they are usually asked "Why are you working?" whereas men are asked "Why are you not working?" Oakey also charges that sociologists have accepted the fiction that women are more capable than men at tolerating boring and repetitive work and also that they are not seriously committed workers. As Collins notes, this is a self-fulfilling prophecy:

If women are given opportunities only for menial jobs, they might well view home and children as preferable employment. . . . If women are given the opportunity for satisfying careers, they appear to pursue them no less consistently than men. (Collins, 1972, p. 56)

Women's subordinate position, both in their occupational stratification and in their status at work, is seen as an extension of their position in the home.

Although social inequality is the content of stratification studies, Acker (1973) suggests that little work has been done on the
position of women. She has extracted from the general stratification literature the following assumptions, both explicit and implicit, which appear to be the justification for ignoring sex as a salient dimension of stratification:

(1) The family is the unit of analysis in the stratification system.

(2) The social position of the family is determined by the status of the male head of the family.

(3) Females live in families, therefore their status is determined by the status of the males to whom they are attached.

(4) The female's status is equal to that of her man at least in terms of her position in the class structure, because the family is the unit of analysis.

(5) Women are unequal to men in many ways, are differentially evaluated on the basis of sex, but this is irrelevant to the structure of the stratification system. (Acker, 1975, p. 937)

Acker suggests that these assumptions are without foundation. Women are not without status-enhancing attributes and skills independent of their husbands or fathers, and furthermore, it cannot be assumed that a woman's resources are identical to those of her husband.

More importantly, by choosing the family as the unit of analysis in the stratification system, we are ignoring a significant segment of any population that is unattached. Acker argues that the assumption that the social position of the family is determined by the status of the male head of the household is a researchable question which has been little researched. Empirical researchers often imply an answer to this by their choice of indicators. Acker challenges the third assumption above by indicating that all females do not live in fami-
lies. It is obviously not true that women have no basis for determining their own status. Why are these resources rendered inoperative if a woman should marry? Furthermore, if we accept that women have the ability to achieve status independent of their husbands, then we must logically question the assumption that the wife's status is equal to that of her husband. Equivalent evaluation can no longer be assumed. The position of women is not irrelevant to the larger social structure. In 1970, for example, in the United States, forty percent of households below the poverty level were female-headed (Ferriss, 1970).

Thus, if we use the individual as the unit of analysis rather than the family, we can then use sex as a basis for evaluating the placement of persons in particular strata within a system. We may also examine this dimension of stratification as it cuts across class lines, and finally we have a foundation for speculating on the theory that women constitute castelike groups within social classes or (following Collins) are a subordinate class in a system of sexual stratification.

Stratification by Age

As we have already seen, there is a growing body of literature describing the many and various forms of discrimination and inequality between men and women. (See also de Beauvoir, 1949; Ellis, 1970; Morgan, 1972; Bullough, 1973.) In addition, a number of studies have described the discrimination and equality that exist between age groups. (See Tuckman & Lorge, 1953; Palmore & Manton, 1973; Ward,
This inequality was first called "ageism" by Robert Butler in 1969 (Robert Butler, 1969). These two sets of literature make it clear that the ascribed statuses of sex and age are of fundamental importance in our society and that they are closely related to the differential distribution of the classic stratification variables: income, occupation, and education.

Regardless of previous practice, there is no logical reason to conceptualize stratification systems as distinct and separate phenomena (Dowd, 1978). The disparities existing in an occupational stratification system are all basically manifestations of the same phenomenon, that phenomenon being inequality. We do not imply that these systems either have similar origins or are maintained for the same reasons; however, they can be conceptualized in terms of differential possession of and different access to scarce resources. Rather than attempting to unravel this relationship, we will agree with Neugarten and Hagestad that we "... know very little about the way in which age criteria actually operate alongside other criteria in determining social rank" (Neugarten & Hagestad, 1976, p. 37).

The age stratification theory is mainly associated with the work of Matilda White Riley and her associates (1972). It conceives of society as being divided into cohorts that are differentiated by age. Any definition of stratification will contain certain basic values that are related to the existent ideologies of a given society at a given point in time. Therefore, stratification may be viewed in two dimensions: longitudinally and cross-sectionally. Age stratification also has two dimensions: an historical dimension and a life course dimension.
The historical dimension sees an age group as a distinct cohort that has lived together through a particular period of history at approximately the same time. Moreover, they have experienced certain events at roughly the same age. The life course can be seen as a common experience that people hold together in terms of various roles that they share. Age groups, therefore, are not mere statistical aggregates, but because of age grading, persons born in the same period of history tend to be cohortcentric (Atchley, 1980). That is, they tend to interpret the various stages of life from the standpoint of the historical era in which they experienced them. It is also assumed within the literature that various chronological age cohorts are differentially valued by individuals and society in general (Streib, 1976). Tuckman and Lorge (1953) found shared stereotypes (both positive and negative) between the young and old formed a basis for mutual understanding as well as a popular base for differential evaluation between generations. In general, old age is not the most favored period of life (Kogan & Wallach, 1961). There are, however, socio-economic differences in the perception of old age. Middle classes see old age as a time for relaxation, leisure, and security, while lower classes perceive old age as a time of retirement and physical decline (Neugarten & Peterson, 1957).

The age stratification theory can form the basis for describing the particular characteristics of the various generations within a society. It should also be noted that unequal access to status positions is viewed as a function of biological attributes rather than the differential distribution of resources to dominant and subordinate age strata (Dowd, 1978).
So far in this discussion we have described stratification by occupation, sex, and age as separate systems, although we have noted that there is no logical reason for doing so. Further, we have indicated how little is known as to the means by which social rank is determined by these characteristics. However, what if certain categories were combined? What if we examine only women, together with those categories of age that are considered to be old?

As one reviews the burgeoning literature on the history of women, it is rare to find the combination of both "female" and "old" being of major concern.

In view of the disproportionate numbers of older women in the population little attention has been paid to the older woman in research and the literature. A quick review of the literature on aging indicates to the observer that... aged women are seldom the focal point. ...[the] literature on women is equally indicative that few researchers and writers concerned with women carry that concern beyond middle age of women. (Bell, 1978, pp. 45-46)

Being both old and female is a situation which is today referred to as "double jeopardy" (Jackson, 1972; Palmore & Manton, 1973; Dowd & Bengston, 1978). The argument is based upon the assumption that being female and being old are are both stigmatized statuses, and occupying both at the same time brings more negative consequences than by occupying either status alone.

A possible consequence of being old is that increasing age brings with it (a) declining health (Shanas & Maddox, 1976; Hendricks & Hendricks, 1977); (b) decreased financial resources (Larson, 1978);
(c) increased likelihood of institutionalization and social isolation (Kastenbaum & Candy, 1973); and (d) decreased mental functioning (Havens & Thompson, 1975). Therefore, as individuals age, the negative consequences of their situation increase (Chappell & Havens, 1980). However, the literature is far from unanimous in its conclusions as to the effect of adding sex as a variable to this situation. Dowd and Bengston suggest that age acts as a leveller, so that as men age, their status deteriorates to that of elderly women. Larson concludes that there are no significant differences by sex on subjective well-being. Payne and Whittington (1976) argue that there are differences by sex in the status of the elderly and that older women experience more prejudice than do older men.

A double jeopardy study would examine the combined effects of two negatively perceived statuses upon a general indicator of the quality of life, such as income. Thus a double jeopardy hypothesis would be supported if it could be demonstrated that being old and female involved more disadvantage than being old and male.

Summary

The problem of examining stratification by occupation, sex, and age in secondary data over one hundred years old is considerable. In many ways it is easier to discuss what cannot be done rather than what can be done. The information is quite limited, and the question of reliability raises some unique questions. (See Chapter IV.)

Although we agree with Williams (1951) that social stratification has many basic elements that should all be examined in combination,
we are limited by our data and therefore can only join those many investigators who have also used occupation as an indicator of status, noting Williams' advice to treat it with care. Little can be deduced about the power relations involved among lower strata, nor can we discuss ranking within categories, however information as to the perceived prestige of occupations is available, and we take heart in the fact that theorists in general agree that occupation is a basic dimension of social stratification.

From our discussion of sexual stratification, we note the historic avoidance of this issue and agree with Acker that women do indeed have status-enhancing qualities of their own. Thus we will examine the status of men and women in our sample, treating each one as an individual in his or her own right.

Congruent with our discussion of stratification by occupation, in this study we can only examine inequality between age strata, not among individuals within them. Neither can we discuss the possible cohortcentricity of the age strata in our sample, other than to make reference to notable historic events that the different cohorts will have experienced collectively. By using occupation as our measure of status, we may examine differences in age cohorts in response to the theory that increasing age tends to produce negative consequences. In particular, with reference both to age and sex stratification, we can examine the occupational status of older women compared to their male counterparts.
Summary and Conclusions

Placed as they are in an indeterminate stage of evolution, our data, due to limited information, can only be investigated from a restricted theoretical framework.

Within Marxian theory we can examine the stratification of those persons in our sample by a single economic criterion, namely occupation. Thus the choice of occupation forges a link between the individual and the economy and also determines his or her place in the stratification system, with all its inherent privileges or lack of same. This then is the theoretical basis for our study.

Further refinements can now be added. Simmel, Engels, and Collins all posit inequality between the sexes; therefore we can ask whether the stratification system contains systematic differences for men and women. If such differences are indeed found, we may only speculate as to the mediating causes. Were they, as Engels suggested, due to the absolute rule of patriarchy due to male control of property, or would the status of the women in 1851 be, in fact, lower than that observed had they not gained the manipulative power of femininity and an overall acceptance of the patriarchal system?

Following Acker, we will focus on heads of households, regardless of the household size, since we support the concept that women have also a basis for determining their status which is independent of men. We will be looking at comparisons between men and women, not the general household status.
We will examine differences among age cohorts based upon the concept of their differential evaluation by individuals and society. By combining sex with age we may, agreeing with Collins, be able to refine the concept of all women being a subordinate class in a system of stratification to the notion of only certain categories of persons being so defined.

It seems likely that the subordinate position of women in 1851 did not derive solely from property relations, but from something else that denied them full social status. Marx's materialist theory leaves much unexplained. Economic factors cannot account completely for male supremacy in class society. By the nature of our data, however, this study is confined to a Marxist theoretical basis, and thus our analysis must follow from this position.

From the above we therefore derive four research questions. For heads of households in specified districts of London in 1851:

1) What is the relationship between sex and occupational status?

2) What is the relationship between age and occupational status?

3) What is the relationship between marital status and occupational status?

4) What are the relationships among sex, age, and marital status and occupational status?
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

In this chapter we first describe the British Census of 1851 from which the data for this study were drawn and assess its validity. The conceptualization and operationalization of the dependent variable are also described, along with the specification of the independent variables. Finally, we describe the analysis and discuss the statistics employed.

The Census

The Census of 1851 was administered on March 30th to the entire population of Great Britain and the Islands of the British Seas. It was the sixth decennial census and "... was considered a great improvement on its predecessor(s) on several counts" (Armstrong, 1968, p. 76). Among other things, the actual age of every respondent was recorded for the first time, together with detailed occupations and the relationship of every individual to the head of the household. (See Appendix A for a listing of information available on the Enumeration Schedules.)

In order to facilitate the census-taking process, the country was first divided into registration districts, based upon definitions contained in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Subdistricts were, in turn, derived from these (Tillott, 1972). Moreover, since the Census was administered on a single day, it obviously involved a
major organizational effort. Enumerators had to be hired, and the public had to be made aware of the event (which in those days of limited media was no mean feat). The newspapers were, of course, the main source of information for the public, but not everybody could read them or, indeed, could read. In order, therefore, to inform this section of British society, the Census Commissioners ordered a special psalm to be sung in the churches for the three Sundays prior to the administration of the Census, exhorting people to stand up and be counted. Nevertheless, despite their efforts, rumors still persisted, and in the County of Westmeath in Ireland all the poultry was slaughtered prior to the Census because the rumor had persisted that "... a tax or rate was to be levied upon them" (The Times, 16 June 1851). In the week before census night, the enumerators delivered forms to every householder in their particular district. These, on the morning after census night, were collected once again. The people were, of course, required by law to fill in and return their schedules. Those with no response were checked on the spot, taken home, and "... copied ... into books or forms which were very similar in design to the householders' schedules" (Tilott, 1972, p. 83). It is these documents that are now available for use and therefore form the basis for this study.

Sources of Error

The official responsible for the Census of 1851, George Graham, the Registrar General of Great Britain, reported to the Prime Minister not only his pride in the efficient manner in which the Census was administered, but also his confidence in its accuracy:
To the 4,342,226 occupiers of houses or parts of houses, certain duties were allotted; they had to fill up schedules, or to answer circumstantial questions respecting themselves and their families, subject to penalties which the Legislature had imposed for refusal or false information. It was not found necessary to enforce the penalty in a single instance. The information was cheerfully furnished and, on the whole, we believe with a nearer approach to accuracy than has before been obtained, here or elsewhere. (Census Report 1851, Pt. 1., cxix)

While Mr. Graham's confidence in the accuracy of the Census may be well-founded, some comments on potential sources of inaccuracy, perhaps not noted by him or his assistants, are appropriate at this juncture. One serious source of error lies in the level of literacy of many of the respondents. As Tillott notes,

... in an unknown but probably large number of cases neither the householder, nor any member of his family will have been able to read or complete the schedule. Even where a literate person was available, his understanding of the instructions and treatment of the facts must have been subject to a variation wider even than reported by enumerators today. (Tillott, 1972, p. 83)

Although we cannot obtain a reliable account of the rate of literacy in mid-Victorian England, we can get an impression of it by examining the information available on school attendance (bearing in mind that middle-class children, especially girls, were often educated at home by governesses). The 1851 Census of Schools reported that attendance in day schools as a proportion of the population under the age of 20 was 20 percent for males and 16.9 percent for females. It should also be remembered that the Census of Schools was a voluntary enumeration.
Since each enumerator had to copy the returns onto another form, errors in copying and problems of illegibility were sure to arise. Moreover, after the enumerator had laboriously copied the household schedules onto his form, two other persons subsequently amended the returns. First, the district registrars revised the forms; then they were sent to the Census Office, where clerks were instructed to revise them once again "... but to content themselves with surveying the inherent consistency of the enumerators' books..." (Tillott, 1972, p. 84).

It is likely that some ages were falsified, although the Report comments:

The mean age of the females ... exceeds the mean age of the males by ten months; so that the tendency in women to understate their ages has only operated on comparatively small numbers; there is no doubt of their general truthfulness. (Census Report 1851, Pt. I., xxiv)

However, the remaining information, namely name, sex, occupation, and birthplace, is less likely to contain error.

Errors in describing occupations appeared to have occurred not from an intention to deceive, but rather from confusion due to the ambiguity of the instructions. Tillott notes that these instructions were detailed and precise with reference to peers of the realm and others of high status, yet "... laconic when it came to distinguishing the multifarious occupations of the laboring poor" (Tillott, 1972, p. 84). Furthermore, there were no instructions whatsoever as to whether the occupations were pursued full-time, part-time, or not at all. The last is particu-
larly important in the case of widows, who may have inherited their husband's business and were merely employing others to continue it for them. Retired persons were not described as such; instead, the occupation that they had originally pursued was listed. We have, therefore, no concrete knowledge as to the actual number of retirees in the sample.

Definition of Household

The Census Report declared that "the possession of an entire house is . . . strongly desired by every Englishman" (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, xxxvi). Yet for many in 1851 this was an unrealized ambition. Many houses were occupied by two or more households. While it was relatively easy to define a house, as a "... distinct building . . . separated by a party wall. . . " (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, cxlv), the definition and operationalization of what constituted a household in 1851 led to considerable confusion. The occupier is defined as a "... resident owner or any person who pays rent, whether (as a tenant) for the whole of the house or (as a lodger) for any distinct floor or apartment. . . " (Anderson, 1972, p. 136). The occupier thus was the person to whom the schedule was to be distributed. Then, when returning to a house, the enumerator was instructed to ascertain whether it was inhabited by one or more occupiers. In those cases where there were multiple occupiers, each was instructed to fill out a separate schedule. Finally, on his return to his own home, the enumerator entered the schedules in his book according to the following instructions:
Under the last name of any house (i.e. a separate and distinct building, and not a mere story or flat) he should draw a line across the page as far as the fifth column. Where there is more than one occupier in the same house, he should draw a similar line under the last name of the family of each occupier; making the line, however, in this case, commence a little on the left side of the third column, as in the example of page vi. of his book. . . . (Anderson, 1972, p. 137)

Unfortunately, enumerators did not always record multiple-family households in the manner set out in their instructions. Indeed, Tilott lists numerous examples of the confusion and lack of consistency among enumerators. (Tilott, 1972).

Other difficulties occurred. Lodgers were, on occasion, recorded as being heads of households, which were divided from the preceding household by a long line. In such a circumstance Tilott comments, "... it can only be assumed that the head of the lodger's household is absent, and he therefore stands as head equivalent" (Tilott, 1972, p. 98). Whatever the explanation, we must recognize this element as a source of error.

The Sample

Our population of interest is confined to heads of households who lived in London at the time of the Census of 1851. The specific social and geographic characteristics have already been described in Chapter II. A one percent cluster sample had been drawn earlier by David Chaplin from the total population of enumeration schedules for the Greater London Metropolitan Area. From this earlier sample, the
subset of all "heads of households" was drawn as the sample for the present study. This resulted in subjects being drawn from 10 registration districts, which contained 26 parishes. (See Appendix A for a listing of the Registration Districts contained within this sample.) These were the same persons who were designated as "occupiers" in the Census instructions. More specifically, they were "... the occupier of the house, the householder, master, husband, or father ... The Head of the family supports and rules the family" (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, xxxiv). Female heads of households, furthermore, were to be recorded in the same manner as males, and their occupations were to be distinctly recorded if they were regularly employed at home or away from home, in any pursuit other than domestic duties.

One group deserves comment. There were a number of female heads of households for whom there is no information as to their occupations. Tillott suggests that by examining the schedules it is possible to deduce their possible source of support by noting the presence of another wage-earning adult in the household; however, even with this strategy, there are many for whom there is no information of either type, and thus an occupational classification cannot be given.

The Population: A Note

Due to the specific status of the subjects in our sample (i.e., heads of households), our population of interest is confined to persons of equivalent status. Moreover, generalizations can only be made to heads of households living in particular registration districts of London in 1851 drawn from Chaplin's original sample (see Appendix B).
We do not know the residential impact upon occupations in these districts but are confident that this effect is random.

The Variables

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable for this study is occupational status. In general, studies of stratification include three main variables: education, income, and occupation. Unfortunately, however, the Census of 1851 contained no information as to education and income; therefore, we are left with occupation as the primary indicator of status. Thernstrom (1973), facing the same problem with American data, wrote:

... historical study ... requires the use of objective criteria of social status. The most convenient of these is occupation. Occupation may be only one variable in a comprehensive theory of class, but it is the variable that includes more than any other criterion of status. (Thernstrom, 1973, p. 84)

Similarly, Rosser and Harris also support the relative importance of occupation as a measurement of socio-economic status:

Though there may appear to be as many views of social class and as many ingenious methods of classification as there are sociologists, it does appear to be generally agreed among sociologists that the most useful piece of information to have about a man to place him in a social context, is to know what sort of job he does. (Rosser & Harris, 1965, pp. 89-90)
If we agree that occupation is the best guide to status (or at least a reasonable one), we are then in a position of either having to determine a hierarchy for ourselves or using an already existing format with or without modification. Armstrong presents a clear position with respect to this problem: "... no general scheme of classification (with published lists of attributions of individual occupations to social classes) exists for the nineteenth century..." (Armstrong, 1972, p. 202).

Chaplin (1976) points out that to date there is no method of classifying occupations upon which consensus has been reached.

Much of the literature on British census analysis focuses on the issue of how occupations should be classified. Most analyses are interested in either an economic or a sociological classification, but neither discipline could possibly prescribe a single correct system. (Chaplin, 1976, p. 1)

Rather than adopt a twentieth-century classificatory scheme with highly refined categories and attempt to insert the descriptions of occupations from 1851 into it, we decided to develop a system unique to this study and these particular occupations—in other words, a grounded scheme of occupational classification.

Since at this distance in time we cannot expect to classify occupations in 1851 in terms of prestige or esteem with any degree of reliability, we conceptualized occupational status only as the amount of skill required to perform the task involved. Although we placed persons into categories according to their work skills, we had some people, such as "titiled aristocrats" and "ladies" in our sample, who
did not appear clearly to have any skills and yet had a readily perceived status. These persons were included in the coding and part of the subsequent analysis.

Operationalization of Dependent Variable

By classifying the various work skills from "high" to "low," we constructed an ordinal scale for our dependent variable. The following schedule contains the instructions for the coders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SKILLED A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SKILLED B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SEMI-SKILLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNSKILLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE A
This category may include persons of independent means, pensioners, and persons who, although not apparently in the labor force, appear to be adequately provided for from non-public sources.

2 PROFESSIONAL
Persons with degrees, certification, etc. Manual labor is not involved. The work is highly skilled and has involved at least three years' study prior to practice. There is generally a readily perceived status.

3 SKILLED A
Persons with skills that do not necessarily involve certification. Manual labor is not involved; however, it takes time to acquire the skill which is often learned on the job.

4 SKILLED B
Persons with skills that do not necessarily involve certification. Manual labor is involved; however, it takes time to acquire the skill which is often learned on the job.

5 SEMI-SKILLED
Persons who acquire skills on the job. The skills involved are not complicated or demanding, and can often be acquired in a short time. There is little or no creativity involved.

6 UNSKILLED
Jobs that can be performed without training. Manual labor is involved. The task may be repetitive, or it may be of the "watchdog" type.

7 NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE B
This category may include persons of no means and those who are apparently dependent upon public sources of support.

CANNOT DETERMINE
The original schedule consisted of the following classifications: professional, skilled, semi-skilled, not in the labor force A, and not in the labor force B. It became clear, however, that the "skilled" category covered an extremely broad range of occupations and needed to be further refined. Therefore we divided the skilled occupations according to the presence or absence of manual labor. Two scholars of nineteenth-century occupations coded the various occupations into these categories. The researcher acted as the ultimate arbiter in order to resolve disagreements.

Out of a total of 552 occupations considered, the coders disagreed on 115, or 20 percent. Some major problems encountered in the coding were as follows: a tendency to rate some of the apparently female jobs (e.g., bonnet maker) higher than perhaps was justified since they were probably not paid as well as men nor had an equivalent social standing to men within the category, and yet the skill involved required that these women be ranked accordingly. It should be noted that the number of these occupations was relatively small, as was the number of persons performing them. There were terms over which there was a lack of consensus. One of these was "merchant," but in general it was felt that the merchandise itself was a clue to status, since no information was available as to the volume of the business or the degree to which the merchant actually performed the tasks involved in the trade. Since a jeweler, for example, often both made and sold jewelry, should he or she be placed in category 2 because selling involves no manual labor, or in category 3 because the manufacturer of jewelry does require some manual labor? In this case the resolu-
tion was obtained by relying on the skill involved, which was high. It was felt that the term "manufacturer" could mean both the lower-level worker or the owner of a business, thus implying higher status, and once again this question was resolved by considering the amount of skill involved in producing the goods. Since the apprenticeship system was common at that time, it was felt that many of the owners of businesses may have learned their trade actually on the job and worked their way up. On the other hand, they may have inherited the businesses and never learned the needed skill preferring to employ others to do the actual work. Because the necessary information to resolve this question is unavailable, it must be recognized as a confounding influence on the analysis, since we cannot ascertain whether the subjects were titular or actual workers. However, out of 3175 heads of households, there were only 30 manufacturers. Thus the problem is reduced, in the context of this study at least. One coder was concerned that individual abilities were unknown to him, that he did not know how well the persons in the sample were actually performing the different jobs. In an historical context this should be of concern, but in a sociological perspective the fact that these occupations existed in 1851 is a sufficient condition.

Taking the skill of the coders into consideration, and the inter-coder reliability or degree or agreement between them, we decided that the dependent variable had been coded into a reasonably valid scale.

The Census of 1851 provided more information than had previously been collected. However, as is often the case, the only historical
data available to scholars of social stratification is very limited. The Census of 1851 was no exception, and the broadest measure of status available was based upon the occupations of the people. Thus, for this study, we are confined to a single measure of social status, that of occupation. Occupational status was based upon different levels of skills. These skill levels were rank-ordered from low to high, from occupations requiring little or no skill to those demanding a high level of training. By so defining occupational status by level of skill, it was hoped that our operationalization of status could avoid some of the problems implicit in historical research on socio-economic status.

**Independent Variables**

Our three independent variables are marital status, age, and sex. Once again, we must stress that the availability of predictor variables was limited due to the nature of the historical data. These three structural variables were chosen as being the most directly related to occupational status.

**Marital Status**

The subjects in our sample were either single, married, or widowed. Since separation was relatively rare and divorce even more uncommon, they were not issues of concern to British Registrars General until the twentieth century. Thus it is likely that the "single" category contained some separated and divorced persons. Unfortunately, we have no clues as to how many there might be.
(See Chapter II for a discussion of separation and divorce in England prior to 1860.) In contrast, the married men and women whose spouses were absent is a matter which did indeed concern the census takers, since the results revealed that 1 in 13 couples were temporarily separated on the Census night (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, xxix). The use of the term "temporarily separated" indicates the lack of concern by the authorities about separation of a more permanent character; however, a total of 188,297 wives were either temporarily or permanently separated from their husbands at that time. Additionally, the Report notes that some persons under the age of 20 who were described as wives were probably not married.

What then may we conclude about these women? Assuredly, many were indeed married, in all probability the majority. Some of the rest were probably separated, a few were divorced, and perhaps a very few were unmarried mothers who declared themselves to be married in order to keep up appearances.

Age and Sex

The Census of 1851 required all respondents to record their age and sex. As has been discussed above, the authorities declared their confidence in the veracity of the public, and in particular the female respondents. Tillott (1972) confirmed this in a longitudinal study of two small communities between the 1851 and 1861 enumerations, where he found "... errors of one or occasionally two years, but rarely more" (Tillott, 1972, p. 107). However, some "age stacking" (i.e., an increase in numbers at every decade) was noted.
Occasional errors with regard to the sex of respondents was noted by Tillott. These he attributes to have been made by the enumerators when entering the information in their books. In the householders' schedules, sex was indicated by writing M or F in one column, whereas the enumerators indicated the sex of a subject by writing the age in one or the other of two columns. Some errors may have been made by a name at first being misread and then changed without the corresponding change in the sex/age column. In general, however, the errors related to sex do not appear to be significant.

Summary

Age and sex, errors notwithstanding, are not ambiguous variables. For the purpose of analysis, age was treated in an ordinal manner, in that it was collapsed into ten-year categories. Marital status contained no implication of rank order. We should note that the category for married women is somewhat ambiguous in that the meaning of this status is not exactly clear.

Analysis

Introduction

The analysis of the data is divided into two main parts. The first is primarily descriptive and will respond to the first three research questions, and the second part is multivariate and relates to the fourth research question. Though the dependent variable is defined as an ordinal scale, we assume an underlying implication of
interval scaling for the following reasons: In any scale of occupational status, there is a sense of process as we scan from low to high status. Each category inevitably must contain occupational rankings that can never be considered exactly equivalent to each other. We suspect that the variation within the categories may be as great as the variation between the categories in levels of skill required to perform the various jobs. As we have already noted, we cannot discuss the issue of individual ability in any manner. Finally, our sample size is large, and if we were to use purely ordinal-level statistics in our analysis, much information would be lost.

Of the three independent variables, both sex and marital status are nominal or categorical in nature. However, in the case of sex it is also considered as an effect. In the context of our theory, there is an implication of ranking, i.e., that men and women are not equal in status. Therefore, the social consequences of being born female are different from those who are born male. Age was collapsed into categories due to lack of very old and very young cases. The descriptive analysis contains all the categories of occupational status, since persons contained within our sample were an integral part of Victorian society; however, since the operationalization of our dependent variable is based upon levels of skill, it was decided to omit persons of independent means from the multivariate analysis since their skill levels cannot be determined.
Descriptive Analysis

For the first part of our analysis, frequency distributions and cross-tabulations of the variables and subcategories of the variables are used. We then use the chi-square statistic to investigate whether these findings can be generalized to our population, heads of households living in specified districts of London in 1851. This test of significance will be used at the .05 level; in other words, the researcher will accept only a probability of error of 5 percent in order to conclude that the observed relationships also existed among heads of households in specified districts of London in 1851. Should the error rate be greater than 5 percent, we will conclude that the observed relationships occurred only by chance and therefore we cannot generalize them.

Multivariate Analysis

The second part of the analysis will involve a classic Analysis of Variance, together with a Multiple Classification Analysis. The Analysis of Variance will test whether age, marital status, and sex have a significant effect upon occupational status, both singly and in combination. Moreover, since interaction among the three independent variables is suspected, we will examine the interaction tests of significance contained within the Analysis of Variance table. If the effect of all or any of the independent variables is significant, we may conclude that the mean of at least one category of the variable(s) is different from the grand mean after appropriate adjustments have been made.
Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) provides additional information concerning the pattern of the independent variable's relationship to the dependent variable (Kim & Kuhout, 1975). MCA analysis was chosen for the following reasons. It is a robust model, in that it can tolerate predictor variables with dichotomous scaling, and it handles both correlated predictor variables and nonlinear relationships which will obtain with nominal variables. It assumes that the dependent variable is predictable from an additive combination of the independent variables. In essence, it is a multiple regression with dummy variables (Andrews et al., 1973). The MCA coefficients are all expressed as adjustments to the grand mean and not deviations from a single class which must be excluded from each set when dummy variables are used. Thus the output is also more readily understandable. Finally, the MCA analysis is sympathetic to large numbers of cases and to six or fewer predictor variables. With this analysis we may examine the net effect of each variable when the differences in the other variables are controlled. Thus we may examine the pattern of changes in the effects of, for example, sex when controlling for age and marital status. Finally, the MCA analysis provides a measure of the overall relationship between occupational status and the combination of age, sex, and marital status. When this number is squared, we will obtain a measure of the amount of variance in occupational status that is explained by the three independent variables.

Thus our research questions will be answered as follows:
1. What is the relationship between sex and occupational status for heads of households in London in 1851?

We will utilize frequency distributions in order to examine the distribution of male and females as well as occupational status in our sample. We will then cross-tabulate these two variables in order to ascertain the form of the relationship. Additionally, we will cross-tabulate sex and marital status so that we may obtain a description of the marital status of both men and women in our sample. The chi square test of significance will enable us to decide whether our findings can be generalized from the sample to heads of households in specified districts of London in 1851 with a no more than five percent probability of error.

2. What is the relationship between age and occupational status for heads of households in London in 1851?

We will utilize frequency distributions in order to examine the distribution of age of persons in our sample. We will further divide this distribution by sex. We will cross-tabulate age with occupational skills in order to ascertain the form of the relationship. The chi square test of significance will enable us to decide whether we can generalize our findings from the sample to the population with no more than five percent probability of error. Additionally, we will cross-tabulate age with marital status in order to obtain a description of the relationships between the independent variables.

3. What is the relationship between marital status and occupational status for heads of households in London in 1851?

We will utilize a frequency table in order to examine the distribution of marital status within the sample. A cross-tabulation of
marital status and occupational skills will be made in order to ascertain the occupational status of single, married, and widowed persons, both men and women, in our sample. The chi square test of significance will enable us to decide whether our findings can be generalized from the sample to heads of households in specified districts of London in 1851 with no more than a five percent probability of error.

4. What are the relationships among sex, age, marital status, and occupational status?

Each independent variable will be assessed in its effect upon occupational status singly by means of a one-way analysis of variance. The independent variables will also be assessed by an analysis of variance test, in combination and in interaction together with F tests of significance. The Multiple Classification Analysis will examine the variance within the categories of each independent variable as they deviate from the grand mean, together with a measure (R) of the strength of the overall relationship of the combined independent variables to occupational status. Finally, the MCA analysis will also provide us with a measure of the explained variance in occupational status by the combination of the independent variables.

Summary

Nineteenth-century censuses are the best single documents with which to start a study of stratification during the Industrial Revolution. As a measure of stratification we chose occupational status and operationalized the raw data from the Census by developing a
scale based upon level of skill. Three independent variables—age, sex, and marital status—were utilized in order to explain variance in occupational status. Cross-tabulations and multivariate analysis, including Analysis of Variance and Multiple Classification Analysis, were used in order to assess the predictor power of the independent variable separately and in combination.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

In this chapter we will describe the findings obtained from the analysis of the data. The first part of the chapter will contain a description of the sample, while the second part reports the findings that are directly related to each of the research questions.

Description of the Sample

The subsample of heads of households, purposively extracted from the original one percent sample (N = 18,910) of the population of London taken from the Census of 1851, yielded 3,974 cases (20% of the original sample). The sex of 34 persons could not be determined, and therefore any analyses employing categories of sex did not include these cases. Of the remaining 3,940 cases, 3,175 (80.6%) were men, and 765 (19.4%) were women. The marital status of four persons was not recorded; these cases were not included in analyses involving categories of marital status. One hundred and eighty-one persons had no record of their occupations; they were, therefore, excluded from analyses containing categories of occupational status.

In summary, with the elimination of those of unknown sex (N = 34), marital status (N = 4), and occupation (N = 181), the basic sample totalled 3,755 heads of households.
Occupation

The subsample included 552 different occupations. (See Appendix C for a listing of the occupations of male and female heads of households.) Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of occupational status for all heads of households. Less than six percent of our sample were persons of independent means. These included titled aristocrats, ladies, gentlemen, annuitants, pensioners, and independent householders. The sample yielded exactly one hundred professional subjects, representing two and one-half percent of the total. There were 17 professions in this category, the most common being clergymen or rector, and including bankers, physicians, surgeons, and barristers. Slightly over 15% of the sample were skilled persons in 76 non-manual labor trades. This category included flute makers, goldsmiths, lithographers, opticians, musicians, and time-glass makers, among others.

The modal category was "skilled with manual labor," with one-third of the persons in our sample so occupied. These skilled trades were extremely varied, and the category contained specialized occupations such as cabinet makers, gold and silver refiners, die-makers, wheelwrights, blacksmiths, and whitesmiths (tin workers). The second largest category was that of semi-skilled workers (23.5%). This classification contained 175 occupations which included: whip makers, trunk makers, undertakers, silk weavers, paper hangers, pipe layers, poulterers, pan makers, and certain categories of domestic servants such as butlers.
Table 1
Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Independent Means</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with No Manual Labor</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with Manual Labor</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers, etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3974</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unskilled workers represented under 15% of the sample. This category contained 58 different occupations and included persons who opened pews, mangled (ironed) clothes, sold newspapers, picked rags and bones, watched buildings at night, kept cows, and unloaded coal from boats (lightermen). Lastly, a very small percentage (0.2%) of our sample were persons who declared themselves to be paupers, beggars, recipients of alms, or dependent upon parish charity.

It is interesting to note that over half our sample (51.3%) were employed in either skilled or professional occupations, while a smaller proportion (38.1%) were semi-skilled or unskilled workers.
Marital Status

Tables 2 and 3 contain information on the marital status and age of the subjects in our sample. As we look first at Table 2, we see, as expected, the great majority were married (73.7%); fewer than 17% were widowed; while only nine and one-half percent were single.

Table 3 shows the age distribution of the heads of households in the sample. The modal category included all persons between 30 and 39 years of age (27.2%). Moreover, another 24.1% were in the 40-49 category. This results in just over half (51.3%) of all the subjects falling between the ages of 30 and 39, while the median age was 40 to 49 years. Slightly under 16% of the sample were persons over the age of 60, almost as many as there were under 30.

Relationship of Independent Variables

In order to explicate further the description of these data, we now examine the relationships among the independent variables. Table 4 shows the frequencies and percentages for the various age categories of heads of households by their marital status. The chi square test for Table 4 was highly significant. From this we may infer that the relationship between age and marital status as displayed in this table is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

The median age category for single persons was 30 to 39, whereas the median age of married subjects fell into the 40 to 49 category, and that of widowed men and women lay between the ages of 50 and 59. The age distributions for single and married persons were not dissimilar; however, widowed subjects were clustered in the older age categories, with 43.2% over the age of 60.
Table 2
Marital Status of Heads of Households in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3974</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Age Distribution of Heads of Households London 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 and under</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3974</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4
Age by Marital Status*
for Heads of Households
London 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 &amp; under</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>72**</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>755**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 3970

Chi Square = 290.036 df = 8 p = <0.0001

*Cases with missing data were excluded from this table.
**Indicates the category in which the median falls.

Table 5 presents the age distributions for both male and female heads of households in our sample. The modal category for men was 30 to 39, whereas for women it was fully 30 years older, at 60 to 69. In fact, the ages for men were rather normally distributed, while those of women were strongly skewed toward the elderly, with over one-third (33.5%) at least 60 years old. Indeed, the mean age for
### Table 5
**Age by Sex*  
**Heads of Households**  
**London 1851**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and under</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 3940

Chi Square = 290.036  
df = 8  
p = <0.0001

*Cases that were missing were excluded from this table.

Women in the sample was 51, in contrast to 42 for men. The last categories show more than three times the proportion of women to men among the elderly. The data show that female subjects were considerably older than their male counterparts.

Table 6 contains the distributions of marital status for the men and women in our sample. Obviously, the vast majority of men were married (87.9%), while most women were widowed (63.8%). Proportion-
Table 6
Marital Status by Sex*
Heads of Households
London 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2791</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 3936
Chi Square = 1729.763 df = 2 p = <0.0001
*Cases with missing data were excluded from this table.

Ately three times more women were single than were their male counterparts, and only 18.2% of women heads of households were married. Three women had no record of their marital status, as did one man.

The sample consists solely of heads of households, and therefore since it is likely that most women would achieve the status of head of household only upon widowhood, distributions for age and marital status tend to be skewed toward women who are both elderly and widowed. Thus this sample cannot be considered to be typical of the conjugal condition by age of the total population but only heads of households in specified districts of London in 1851.

Table 7 further explicates the information presented in the above tables. The chi square test between marital status and age for both men and women was highly significant. Thus we may infer that
Table 7  
Marital Status by Age and Sex  
Heads of Households, London 1851  
Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>Over 60</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2216.22  
$df = 18$  
$p = <0.001$
the relationships observed in this table are different from those expected solely by chance.

The proportions of single and widowed women at all ages are greater than those for men. For example, for those under the age of 29, most men were married (82.1%).

With a few minor exceptions, there are proportionately fewer single persons in the older age categories than the younger ones, and conversely, there are proportionately more widowed subjects in the older age categories than the younger ones.

The proportions of single and widowed women at all ages are greater than for men. In all the age categories, married men exceed married women, both numerically and proportionately.

The Research Questions

In this section, findings related to each research question will be examined individually. The tables that relate to each question will be analyzed, and finally a table of occupational means for each category of the independent variables will be interpreted.

What is the Relationship between Sex and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

In Table 8 we examine the relationship between sex and occupational status for household heads in our sample. Twenty-two percent of all women in the sample were of independent means, as compared to under three percent of all men; however, since we are confining our attention to the levels of skill in occupations, the reader should at
### Table 8
Occupational Status by Sex
Heads of Households
London 1851

Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Independent Means</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with No Manual Labor</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with Manual Labor</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 3055) (N = 502)

Chi square = 74.786  df = 5  p = <0.0001

r = +0.034  p = <0.001

*Adjusted % refers to proportion in each occupational category excluding those of independent means. Tests of significance do not include persons of independent means.

At this point examine and compare the adjusted percentages of the table. These refer only to the coded occupational skills, excluding those
persons whose skills cannot be ascertained. Relatively few persons were in professional occupations, but of those who were, men vastly outnumbered women by a ratio of three to one. Proportionately more women than men were working in skilled work that required no manual labor, yet approximately 10% more men than women were working at skilled occupations that did require some manual labor. In the category of semi-skilled occupations, practically equal proportions of men and women were so employed. Finally, amongst those performing unskilled work, and the paupers, there were more women than men.

To summarize, the greatest differential between men and women is within the occupational category of independent means. Here women outnumber men both actually and proportionately. We note, however, that the proportionate differences between men and women in the categories confined to occupational skill are not large.

The category of independent means was not included in the chi-square test which is highly significant, and thus we may infer that the relationships observed and described above are different from those expected by chance. The strength of the relationship between sex and occupational status, although significant, is extremely weak ($r = 0.034$).

What is the Relationship between Age and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

Table 9 presents the relationship between age and level of occupational status for persons in our sample. The reader should note that persons of independent means are not included in this table.
Table 9  
Occupational Distributions by Age for Heads of Households in London 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>13 (2.2%)</td>
<td>21 (2.0%)</td>
<td>33* (3.7%)</td>
<td>21 (3.6%)</td>
<td>12 (2.6%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/No Manual Work</td>
<td>78 (13.0%)</td>
<td>176 (17.0%)</td>
<td>140* (15.7%)</td>
<td>96 (16.6%)</td>
<td>118 (25.9%)</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with Manual Work</td>
<td>252 (42.1%)</td>
<td>423* (40.8%)</td>
<td>318 (35.7%)</td>
<td>209 (36.2%)</td>
<td>128 (28.1%)</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>171 (28.6%)</td>
<td>262 (25.3%)</td>
<td>242* (27.2%)</td>
<td>138 (23.9%)</td>
<td>120 (26.3%)</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>84 (14.0%)</td>
<td>154 (14.9%)</td>
<td>156* (17.5%)</td>
<td>113 (19.6%)</td>
<td>72 (15.8%)</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers, etc.</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>6 (1.3%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>598 (16.8%)</td>
<td>1036 (29.1%)</td>
<td>891 (25.0%)</td>
<td>578 (16.2%)</td>
<td>456 (12.8%)</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 3559   Chi sq = 88.55   df = 20   p = < 0.0001   r = -0.0008   p = < 0.306

*Indicates the median age category for each category of occupational status
The chi square test between age and occupational skills is highly significant, allowing us to conclude that the relationships observed here are different from those that we might obtain by chance. The strength of the negative relationship is extremely weak and not significant.

The row marginals reveal that more than two-thirds (70.9%) of the working persons in the sample were aged 49 or under, while the column marginals show us that over one-half (57.2%) of these workers were employed in skilled or professional occupations.

The model occupation for all ages is "skilled with manual work," and the median age for all categories of occupational status lies between 40 and 49 years, with the exception of the skilled subjects who had to utilize manual labor in applying their skills.

As we compare the professional and skilled workers to the less skilled persons in the sample, the proportionate differences across the age categories remain relatively stable. We observe that the largest proportion of skilled workers utilizing no manual labor are aged 60 or older (25.9%). Indeed, 82.9% of older workers in our sample were employed in either skilled or semi-skilled occupations. As we compare them to the younger cohorts, there is little difference in the distribution of their occupational skills.

Although there are differences in occupational status by age, age alone does not appear to explain much of the variation in occupational status due to the relatively stable distribution of work skills across all the age categories.
What is the Relationship between Marital Status and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

In Table 10 we may examine the relationship between occupational status and marital status for heads of households. The mode for all categories of marital status was skilled with manual labor. Proportionately more single persons (than married and widowed) were either professionals, skilled workers with no manual work, or semi-skilled workers. The majority of all single persons (77.6%) were employed in skilled or semi-skilled occupations. Proportionately more married people than either the single or widowed were employed in skilled work with manual labor, while proportionately fewer were in skilled labor with no manual work than their single or widowed counterparts. The widowed subjects in our sample had the lowest proportion of professional persons in their ranks (1.7%). The distribution of widowed persons throughout the other occupational skills is very even. Widowed persons had the highest proportion of unskilled workers among them as compared to their single and married counterparts; however, proportionately more widowed persons were working with skills that required no manual labor than were the married subjects. All the paupers in the sample were widowed.

The chi square test between marital status and occupational status was significant, thus we may infer that the relationships observed here are different to those obtained only by chance. The strength of this relationship is extremely weak though significant (r = 0.072).
Table 10
Occupational Distributions by Marital Status
Heads of Households
London 1851
Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/No Manual Work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.8%)</td>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled with Manual Work</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.0%)</td>
<td>(39.3%)</td>
<td>(28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.9%)</td>
<td>(26.0%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(16.3%)</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paupers, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 3555  Chi sq = 124.155  df = 10  p =< 0.0001
r = +0.072  p =< 0.0001

In summary, proportionately more single persons were in the higher skill categories than either the married or the widowed subjects. The comparison between married and widowed persons is more complex, with the latter having proportionately more cases in the skilled with no manual work category. In general, widowed persons
had a slightly lower occupational status than did their married counterparts, noting that they had the lowest proportion of professionals and a small proportion of paupers among them.

What are the Relationships among Sex, Age, Marital Status, and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

In Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 we may examine the multivariate relationships among all the independent variables and the dependent variable.

Table 11 is a composite of the three independent variables expressed in terms of mean occupational status for each category of the independent variables. Once again the analysis concentrates only upon occupational skill, and therefore persons of independent means are excluded. Before examining this table, the reader should note that the lower numerically, or nearer to zero, is the occupational mean score, the higher is the occupational status of the subjects within that particular category. For example, in the first two columns of Table 12, single males aged 29 or younger have a lower occupational status (x = 4.38) than do single females (x = 4.24). The reader should further note that the mean occupational scores in this table fall within two categories of our occupational status scale, namely: "three," which is skilled occupations involving no manual labor, and "four," which is skilled occupations involving manual labor. Moreover, the scale ranges from "two" to "seven," since persons of independent means were excluded, this category having been assigned "one" in the scale.
Table 11
Mean Occupational Scores for Categories of Age by Marital Status and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Single M</th>
<th>Single F</th>
<th>Married M</th>
<th>Married F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>Widowed F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 3553</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus for single persons, males aged 39 and younger have a slightly lower occupational status than single women of the same age. This difference is reversed at the age of 40 to 49, where single men have a slightly higher status. However, from the age of 50, the single women in the sample consistently have higher occupational status than do their male counterparts.
Table 12
Comparison of Occupational Scores (Differences of Means) for Single, Married, and Widowed Persons by Age and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single vs.</td>
<td>Single vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Married women have, in general, a lower status than married men except between the ages of 50-59. In the oldest age category the mean occupational score for married women is their lowest as well as being the lowest in the table. Married men at this age have their highest ranking.

Widowed men have a consistently higher status than widows, with the exception of young widows who have, until the age of 30, a higher occupational mean score than widowers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>26.581</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.797</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>24.199</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.099</td>
<td>11.295</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>3.003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX/MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>5.838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX/AGE</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS/AGE</td>
<td>12.008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX/MARITAL STATUS/AGE</td>
<td>4.826</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained Variance</td>
<td>78.303</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Variance</td>
<td>3773.906</td>
<td>3523</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variance</td>
<td>3852.209</td>
<td>3552</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 3553**
Table 14  
Occupational Status by Sex, Age, and Marital Status  
Heads of Households, London 1851  
Multiple Classification Analysis

Grand Mean = 4.37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Unadjusted Means</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 &amp; over</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.009$

$R = 0.094$
In summary, Table 11 shows us that single persons have, in general, the highest occupational mean scores. Indeed, single women are the only group that achieves mean scores below "four." Married persons of both sexes have, as a category, the lowest occupational mean scores in our sample, with the exception of widows. Widowers have a higher occupational status than do widows, with the exception of young widows, who have an advantage over the young widowers. However, the numbers of these persons are not large.

Table 12 is based upon the same information that is contained in Table 11; however, it is expressed in different terms. Here we are examining the differences of the mean scores within the sexes rather than between them, and additionally the actual differences are expressed in positive or negative terms. For example, if we examine the table we can see that as we compare single women aged 29 or younger to married women of the same age, there is a decline in status from the single to the married condition (0.31). Thus negative scores indicate a loss of occupational status as we compare single, married, and widowed persons in certain age categories, and conversely, a positive score indicates a higher status.

In Table 12 we see that single women have a higher occupational status than either married or widowed women, except in the case of young widows, who have an occupational advantage. As we compare married to widowed women, married female heads of households have a higher occupational mean score at all ages, except for the young and old widows, who both have a higher ranking.
Single men have a higher ranking than do married men, and single men over the age of 40 have an advantage over their widowed counterparts; the younger widowers have a slight edge over the single men. Widowers achieve a higher ranking than married men at all ages, with the exception of those aged 60 and older. Figure 1 is a graphic representation of the data that is contained in both Tables 11 and 12.

In summary, Table 12 shows that scores for men and women are not dissimilar. Single persons of both sexes have higher occupational status, particularly the older subjects, and single women have a higher status than all the other women in our sample with the exception of young widows. Married individuals have, in general, the lowest status. In old age, married women have the lowest occupational score as compared with elderly single women, but elderly married men do not demonstrate such a severe decline. Widowed persons of both sexes have their highest status in youth, but our analysis shows this advantage is not maintained in the older age categories. Widowed women do, however, have a slightly higher status in old age.

Table 13 shows the results of a multivariate analysis of variance of the three independent variables together with the dependent variable. We will utilize the analysis of variance in order to ascertain which variables are significant explanators of occupational status in all possible combinations. The F test, indicates the statistical significance of the differences between the means of the variables. In Table 13 we see that the main effects (sex, marital status, and/or age) are significant. However, it is interesting to note that marital
Figure I. Mean occupational scores by marital status and age for men and women.
status is the only variable which can alone predict occupational status within the allowable margin of error. The two-way analysis shows that the combinations of sex and marital status, sex and age, and marital status and age are not significant. In addition, the three-way analysis is not significant. Finally, the three independent variables in combination explain little of the variation in occupational status.

In summary, marital status appears as a significant predictor of occupational status alone but its impact appears to be reduced when it is combined with the other two independent variables.

Table 14 reports a multiple classification analysis (MCA). As with the analysis of variance, this technique provides an examination of the difference of means, but whereas the analysis of variance provides only the statistics necessary for significance testing of one or more variables combined, MCA provides information regarding the differences of means within the categories of each variable.

Thus in Table 14, while there is a slight difference in the occupational means of men and women (4.36 and 4.46 respectively), with men having a slight advantage when the effects of marital status and age are controlled, there is, in effect, no change in the means. Single persons have a higher occupational mean score than do either married or widowed subjects. When the effects of age and sex are controlled, the means of both the single and the widowed subjects indicate a slight increase in status, but for married persons there is no change. There is little difference in the means within the categories of age. Persons aged 60 and older appear to have a slight
advantage over the younger cohorts; however, when the effects of marital status and age are controlled, there is a negligible amount of change.

The correlation ratio, or eta coefficient, determines the closeness of the relationship between occupational skills and the predictor variables should the relationship happen to be nonlinear. This is an important statistic, since Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (r) only expresses the linear relationship between variables; therefore, a substantial but curvilinear relationship may exist and yet the computed value of r may be low. However, the eta scores in Table 14 are extremely low, and so we may conclude that although we do have curvilinear relationships among our variables, as shown in Figure 1, we do not have any strong relationships among the variables.

The beta coefficient is an approximate measurement of the relationship between each predictor variable and occupational status while holding all others constant. Since there is little or no difference between the eta and beta scores, we may conclude that controlling for the effects of each dependent variable simultaneously makes no difference to the closeness of the relationship among the three independent variables and occupational status.

Summary

In order to relate all the findings detailed in this chapter to the research questions, we will apply them to each question so that we may summarize and clarify this chapter.
What is the Relationship between Sex and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

In the descriptive analysis, it appeared that the proportionate differences between men and women in occupational skills were not large. (See Table 9.) Further, in Table 13 it was found that sex is not significant as a predictor variable. Therefore, at the univariate level of analysis, we may conclude that sex is an extremely weak predictor of occupational status.

What is the Relationship between Age and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

The descriptive analysis showed that there are some differences by age in occupational status. Persons in manual work tended to be younger than those in skills not requiring physical work. (See Table 10.) However, the explained variance was negligible and not significant. Further, in Table 13 it was found that age was not significant as a predictor of occupational status. Thus at the univariate level of analysis, the conclusion is that age is a very poor predictor of occupational status.

What is the Relationship between Marital Status and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

In general, single persons had a higher occupational status than either their married or widowed counterparts. (See Table 10.) The strength of the relationship was, however, extremely weak though significant. Thus we conclude at the univariate level of analysis that marital status is a weak but significant predictor of occupational status.
What are the Relationships among Sex, Age, Marital Status, and Occupational Status for Heads of Households in London in 1851?

Sex, age, and marital status in combination neither explain nor predict occupational status. (See Table 13.) Regardless of age and sex, single persons differ in occupational status from those who are married or widowed. (See Tables 11 and 12 and also Figure 1.) Single women have the highest occupational statuses in the sample. The most common occupation for this subgroup was dressmaker, with milliner and governess being respectively the second and third most frequently cited occupations. Moreover, this higher status is maintained over all age categories, in contrast to widowed and married women whose occupational status tends to decline through the categories of age. Single men also have a higher occupational status than all other persons in the sample with the exception of single women. The modal occupation for single men was tailor. However, they worked in a broad range of occupations which included silversmiths, solicitors, opticians, and jewelers.

We find, therefore, that we have interaction effects among our variables and that the relationships of age to occupational status and sex to marital status vary within categories of marital status.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

In this final chapter we will review the findings of this research, discuss their relationship to the theoretical framework, consider the limitations of the study, and offer suggestions for further research.

The Sample

Differences by Sex

The sample consists only of male and female heads of households in London in 1851 and cannot, therefore, be considered to be representative of the total population of London in that year. Findings may, however, be generalized to all heads of households living in specified areas of London in 1851. (See Appendix B.)

Because of the purposive nature of the sample, it contains some unique features. Only 20% of the total sample were women. Clearly this is due to the fact that the women in the sample were heads of households, and, as such, constituted a numerical minority of the female population of London at that period. These women were working in a wide range of occupations, which is not totally unexpected since it is likely that many were economically dependent upon their earnings to meet their own needs and those of their children and other household members. This suggests that many of them may have
deliberately sought jobs outside the traditional and normative occupational opportunities at that time.

More women than men were working in skilled jobs that required no manual labor. (See Table 8.) This may have been due to the number of "female jobs" in that skilled category, such as milliner or embroidress. We found that fewer women than men were working in skilled occupations that required manual labor, which may perhaps be explained by the difference in physical strength between the sexes and the prevailing norms of socially acceptable work that could be performed by women. However, some women in the sample were working in some very physically demanding and atypical occupations, such as blacksmithing, brick laying, and lightering (unloading coal from ships from Newcastle in the River Thames).

In the categories of lower occupational skills, we found little difference by sex, which may be partially due to the fact that in those early days of industrialization, especially in London, there were many repetitive tasks that could not yet be performed by machines. Furthermore women in these economic levels could not afford to be "choosy," and it may be that "appropriate" sex roles in work did not extend to that economic level.

It is interesting to note that a small proportion of the total sample consisted of persons of independent means and therefore apparently not in the labor force. However, some twenty-two percent of all the women were in this category, as compared to only two percent of the men. As we have already noted, the proportions of single and widowed women were greater at all ages than those of the
men in the sample. These women may have had income from family and/or their deceased spouses, thus enabling them to remain apart from the labor market. Conversely, more than three-quarters of the women in the sample were apparently gainfully employed in various levels of skilled and unskilled work.

Age and Marital Status

The age distribution in the sample is not entirely unexpected due to the characteristics of the subjects. As we consider mid-Victorian English society, it is likely that most women would achieve the status of head of household only upon the death of their spouse. Thus we find that the majority of women in the sample were widowed. Conversely, fewer than 6 percent of the men were widowed, most being married. The mean age of women in the sample was higher than that of men, and there were three times as many elderly women than men. As we have already noted (see Chapter II), London in 1851 contained more older women than any other part of the country. Indeed, over the age of 60 there were seven women for every five men. In addition, the life expectancy at birth in 1851 was slightly higher for women than men (1.9 years). This differential would probably have been larger had it not been for the high incidence of deaths from tuberculosis among women of that period. Thus the high percentage of widows in the sample is generally due to the purposive nature of the sample, coupled with the biological tendency for women to survive their spouses.
The Research Questions

The Relationship Between Occupational Status and Sex

Our findings indicate that sex was a very poor indicator of occupational status in 1851. We will therefore offer some possible explanations for this.

All the subjects in the sample were presumably financially responsible for their households. Thus the women are directly comparable to the men with reference to their occupational status. We found that the proportionate differences in occupational skills between men and women were not large, and only in the category of independent means did women both proportionately and numerically exceed men. Following the analysis, we therefore concluded that sex proved an extremely weak indicator of occupational status for heads of households in 1851.

Nevertheless, we must not assume that women had equal access with men to the labor market at that time. Clearly there was a limitation upon the types of jobs they could or should perform, although we have already noted that some of the women were working in quite unusual occupations. (See Appendix C.) Similarly, there was (and still is) a social stigma placed upon men performing "feminine jobs" such as lace making, although there is no other reason why men should not acquire these skills. Within the sexual stratification system of 1851, men and women clearly had defined occupations, some constrained by the sex of the subject, and yet others that could be performed appropriately by persons of either sex, for example, cow
keeper, day school teacher, or weaver. However, within the categories of occupational status both men and women were working in a broad range of occupations. Indeed, over half the female job descriptions were of occupations unrelated to either the clothing industry or domestic service. (See Appendix C.) This is especially striking when we note the differential in the numbers of working men (N = 3144) and working women (N = 502), suggesting that even with six times more men than women, the female workers had a reasonably wide range of opportunities as compared to the men in the sample.

The Relationship Between Occupational Status and Age

Our findings indicate that statistically age was not a strong predictor of occupational status. We did, however, note variation in occupational status by age which requires discussion.

There was a reduction in the proportions of persons over the age of 60 working in occupations that required manual labor. This change may be partially explained by a decline in physical strength with age, and we may view this finding as consistent with Roebuck's (1979) thesis that working-class people tended to age earlier than did higher ranks of society in the nineteenth century. We also found proportionately larger numbers of older people working in skilled jobs with no manual labor than the other categories of occupational status. A possible explanation of this finding could be the lack of physical demands upon these workers, thus enabling them to continue to apply their work skills into old age. In this context, we also note that retirement from work was most uncommon in the mid-Victorian
era. The overall life expectancy at this period was 40.4 years (Ninth Annual Report of the Registrar General of England and Wales, 1851). It is unlikely, however, that this explains much of the age distribution in the sample, since this figure was mainly a factor of the high mortality rates of newborn infants and young children in the nineteenth century.

We cannot comment upon the working conditions of the subjects in the sample since our data source gives us no information on this matter. However, social historians have described vividly some of the appalling conditions in the nineteenth century (see Chapter II), and there is little doubt that many of the workers in this sample were employed in conditions that would be considered unacceptable, if not illegal, today. This factor must have contributed to the health and longevity of the population.

The Relationship Between Occupational Status and Marital Status

Our findings indicate that single persons had a higher occupational status than either the married or the widowed subjects. The interpretation of this finding is distinctly problematic. It may be due to the age-distribution of the sample. The single persons were generally younger than either married or widowed subjects. In a rapidly changing society, they may have had the opportunity to enter or train in occupations that were less available to the older cohorts. In the latter we may perhaps observe the effect of some of the social problems of the time. Seasonality of some employment (see Chapter II) may have restricted employment opportunities for married
persons with dependents and resulted in their taking lower-level positions. The problems of adequate transportation and housing could affect married persons more directly than either widowed or single people, due to their need for larger living quarters, the cost of supporting a family, and the problem of the unavailability and cost of transportation. The greater financial obligations and fewer housing options for married persons could also restrict their opportunities for employment.

That widowed persons had the lowest overall occupational status may be partially explained by the fact that they were the oldest group in the sample. Being older, they may have been denied the opportunity to enter many occupations, due perhaps to age discrimination and lack of training. Because of their age, they may not have been able to perform a physically demanding job and had to seek a more menial type of employment. Perhaps as the oldest cohort they had less opportunity to train for a skilled occupation. We should remember that a large proportion of the elderly in the sample were over the age of 60. They were, therefore, born in 1791 or earlier, a period when there were considerably fewer industrial skills required than in 1851.

The Relationships Among Occupational Status and Sex, Age, and Marital Status

We have demonstrated that the independent variables in combination neither explain nor predict occupational status in this sample of London household heads. The analysis of variance shows us
that marital status alone is the only predictor that has a statistically significant effect. Furthermore, the Multiple Classification Analysis yields no additional information when we examine and control for categories within the three independent variables. The major finding, therefore, of this study focuses on the interaction of the independent variables and the dependent variables. The interaction effect that we observe is caused by marital status, since neither sex nor age is statistically significant as an interaction effect.

We found that single persons were working in high-status occupations. Some of the reasons for this have been discussed above. However, the differential between single men and women, and also between single women and their married and widowed counterparts, has not been addressed.

As noted, there were greater proportions of single women in the older age brackets than single men. These women, as heads of households, were probably working from necessity and, being single, may well have done so most of their adult lives. Thus they may have spent many years acquiring a skill. For example, some may have started working as seamstresses or attaching trimming to garments. Given time, uninterrupted by marriage, these skills could have been applied and expanded to a higher level in perhaps millinery or tailoring. Moreover, as single women, they may have had some independent income in the form of annuities, thus assisting them to start and operate small businesses, such as those in the sample who were piano manufacturers or furriers. These annuities, typically
received by single women, could have subsidized their employment in higher-status occupations that did not necessarily command an adequate income, such as translators, artists, and authors. Additionally, single women enjoyed benefits from the legal system of the day that permitted them to sign contracts and receive inheritances in their own right, benefits that were denied to their married sisters.

The majority of single men in the sample were young, perhaps beginning a career and not yet established. Indeed, the young men had a lower occupational status than their married peers. This differential is reversed between the ages of 40 and 49. Here factors such as family responsibilities may enter in. The older single men presumably had fewer dependents to provide for. Thus, for example, single men who were small business owners could tolerate a lower rate of return and survive the seasonality of the London market since their personal expenses were perhaps lower than those of their married counterparts.

The married female heads of households in our sample occupy an anomalous position. The Census notes that 1 in 13 couples in England were not living together (Census Report 1851, Pt. I, xxix). We can only surmise some of the reasons for this. The husband may have been serving in the army or navy and would, therefore, have been enumerated separately, or he may have been permanently absent. Divorce was extremely rare in those days and only granted to the husband's petition. During the entire Victorian period (1837-1901), fewer than 3,000 divorce petitions were filed (Holcombe, 1973). As
we have already noted, married women in 1851 tended not to work unless forced to do so by necessity, and then the work was, in general, of a menial nature. The married women in our sample had no husband present in the home and, as our findings demonstrate, had a generally low occupational status, especially in old age. In practical terms these separated women were in a very perilous position. They could not legally hold property or control their own earnings since those were the legal property of the absent husband. Yet they had to support themselves. They may have had low occupational status because of lack of training. It is likely that when their husbands were present they did not work outside the home and therefore had less opportunity to develop and acquire particular skills.

Although the widows in the sample generally had a low occupational status, the younger widows enjoyed a higher status, possibly due to inheritance from a prematurely deceased spouse, or perhaps some had entered the classic alliance of a young woman married to an elderly, but rich, gentleman and were enjoying the consequences of his timely demise. Others were perhaps obliged to enter the labor force, possibly with family backing, enabling them to purchase or set up small businesses or enterprises. The older widows may have inherited businesses from their spouses. In general, however, widowhood suggests low-status occupations in 1851, which is supported by the finding that all the paupers in the sample were widowed.
The Relationship of Findings to Theory

The theoretical framework of this study consists of a selection of these positions considered to be relevant. It is based upon Weber's concept of power or "Herrschaft" and also upon the assumption that there were and still are status differentials between the sexes in a patriarchal system. While Acker (1973) does not disagree that there are such differentials, her thesis is that women have a basis that is independent of men for determining their status.

Simmel's (1902) theory of the invisible autonomy of women, together with Marx's (1867/1961) perception of the Industrial Revolution as a new economic foundation for the relations between men and women, were both utilized. Boserup (1970), Engels (1884/1942), and Collins (1975) broadly oppose Marx's thesis and lay out their own individual views of history and the process of sexual stratification. Engels and Collins disagree as to the nature of the autonomy of women in industrial societies. Engels concluded that women were degraded and reduced to servitude, while Collins considered the ideology of romantic love and sexual repression both increased the bargaining power of women to achieve status. However, the desired status is still in the masculine domain.

The subjects in our sample were living in a patriarchal Victorian society. Husbands had practically complete ownership over their wives and children with the support of the legal system of the day. (See Chapter II.) The women in this study were working within the system but without the "protection" of a male head being present in their homes.
As such, they could be said to represent Acker's thesis that women can achieve status independent of men.

Boserup has suggested that in nonindustrial societies the division of labor was based upon differences in physical strength between the sexes. In this study we have concluded that London in 1851 still contained many traditional handskills and that, in a sense, industrialization had passed it by. Our findings indicate that there was little difference in the skill levels of men and women, but proportionately fewer women were in occupations requiring manual work.

Simmel argues that in a patriarchy in which normative systems are both male-created and male-dominated, the autonomy of women cannot be observed. The women in our sample had no male heads of households upon whom to rely and, moreover, some of them were working in jobs that were usually performed by men; therefore, they had a degree of economic autonomy. However, the degree to which they were observed or observable during that time cannot be determined. Certainly the dearth of literature on autonomous women during the past 130 years may well support Simmel's contention.

Our findings cannot confirm the theories of either Engels or Collins. The evolutionary nature of these theories cannot be supported in a cross-sectional study. However, we can suggest that the subjects in this study broadly represent Collins' third stage of gender roles and sexual stratification, namely "households in a market economy."
The measurement of occupational status in this study necessitated placing the many occupations into hierarchical status groups according to hand skills. Here we can suggest the relationship of the individuals in the sample to the economic system in 1851. Clearly, within our hierarchy of skilled and unskilled persons we would, following Collins, have classes of power relations. We can infer that the categories in the occupational status scale would contain his three classes of power relations. In very broad terms, those in highly skilled occupations would have more autonomy in their lives than those persons possessing few if any skills. We support Dahrendorf's claim for the universality of stratification and the division of labor, and we also agree with him that the division of labor is inadequate alone as an explanation of stratification. We have, however, demonstrated occupational stratification according to Coser's criteria since we have rankings according to skill and from these rankings we can infer power relations between the subjects so ranked.

In this study, following Acker, sex has been used as a basis for evaluating the placement of persons in particular occupational strata. By doing so we can also utilize Collins' thesis that all women are a subordinate class in a system of sexual stratification. We cannot entirely support this thesis; however, certain categories of persons in the sample can be so designated. Widows over the age of 40 might, based upon the findings, be described as a subordinate or underclass. This conclusion would also lend support to a double jeopardy theory, since the findings show that elderly widows have
lower occupational status than do widowers in the sample. Indeed, they had the lowest occupational status of all the subjects. Here this conclusion is supported by Dowd, who reminds us that the differential access to status positions is viewed as a function of biological attributes within age strata.

By conceptualizing occupational stratification by levels of skill, we have not been able to delve into many questions concerning stratification by sex in 1851, such as prestige and income as differentiated by sex. Yet we know from historical investigation and nineteenth-century theorists that a rigid system of sexual stratification existed at this period (see for example, Boulding, 1976; Pinchbeck, 1930). Thus the linkage between our conceptual framework and the operationalization of the variables has not been established and yet we can reasonably infer that this system was extant in the London of 1851.

We know that industrial societies in general differentially reward abilities, and moreover our theory suggests that these rewards vary according to the sex and age of the recipient, with little regard for the level of skill involved. Our theory leads us to infer that, for example, the male gold beaters in the sample were probably more highly paid than the women performing the same task. Due to the limited information available in the 1851 Census, the operationalization of occupational status by skill levels combined with the lack of information concerning income, these differences cannot be corroborated. Had we sampled from the total spread of adult working women, thus including working wives with husbands
present, we might have observed a greater differential in levels of skills, thus suggesting a linkage with our theory.

The very nature of the women in the sample has surely an influence upon our findings. These were working women who, despite the stratification system of their time, were working in order to support themselves and their families. It is likely that the levels of skills necessary for these women were perhaps higher than the larger female population of London in 1851. Indeed, we can also infer that these female heads of households had to achieve high skill levels in order to survive in a patriarchal society.

Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of this study is the amount of information available from the data source. The 1851 Census of Great Britain contained no information on the education or the incomes of the population. The researcher is limited to a brief description of occupations from which to investigate Victorian social stratification. Had the incomes of the heads of households been known, we could have made more direct inferences between our theory and our findings. The availability of such information would have created more choices in the operationalization of the dependent variable. As it stands, the operationalization of social stratification is greatly limited.

Any attempt to reclassify nineteenth-century occupational data into social groupings is a hazardous project. Indeed, from the viewpoint of the purist the whole enterprise might be judged foolhardy. No work on nineteenth-century census data can ever
approach the standards of precision attained by sociological enquiry using contemporary data; yet it can still be claimed as an approach that attempts to look into historical data in as objective a method as possible. The analysis presented here can only suggest a rough approximation of the truth which remains obscured behind the ambiguous terminology of Victorian Registrars General.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research is necessary in order to determine whether the results found in this study can be duplicated. This is especially important because of the operationalization of occupational skills. Even though the skills of the coders in this study were exemplary, there is always a subjective element in such an enterprise, which is enhanced by the historical nature of the data. Verifiability is particularly important for this present study since it would lead to greater confidence in the research design. Should further samples be drawn from the London Census, we would hope for similar findings.

This study should be expanded to include all the census tracts of London so that the findings can be generalized to all the heads of households in London in 1851 and not just those residing in certain districts. Many of the residential areas of Victorian London were segregated by occupations (related, of course, to many other variables), and such an expansion of this study would yield more information.

By the same token, we have suggested that London in 1851 was in a unique economic situation with regard to the rest of the country,
and therefore much could be done with comparative studies using different industrial areas of the country from the same census data.

This research could also be expanded into a longitudinal analysis, using data from previous and subsequent censuses. Furthermore, the data base could be extended to include supporting documentation from tax returns, rate records, mortgages, birth, death, and marriage certificates, to name but a few, cross-classified with census data in order to enrich and substantiate these findings. Moreover, census data are an excellent base from which to embark upon linkage studies.

Little work has been done on social mobility based upon Victorian British censuses. Baines (1972) devised a methodology that he applied to the County of Cornwall, based upon the 1861 and 1871 censuses of Great Britain. This same design could be used to examine migration in and out of London and to study the characteristics of population changes in various districts in London over time.

Summary and Conclusions

This study has three dimensions. The first is descriptive. We know the occupations of both male and female heads of households in London in 1851. They were working in a wide range of occupations, and we know that the women were working in jobs that were not totally confined to the clothing industry and domestic service. Much of this was due to the unique nature of London at the time. In a sense, industrialization had left many of the occupations of Londoners untouched. Many were still working in pre-industrial Revolution
occupations. Small businesses and enterprises abounded which supplied the needs of the highly stratified London society. Thus men and women in London had more varied work opportunities than did their fellow workers in the northern cities. We also know about the marital status of the heads of households and the distribution of their ages.

The second dimension is analytical. We have reconceptualized the descriptive data in order to examine the differences in occupational status, not only between the sexes, but also in order to compare and contrast differences in occupational status within certain categories of both men and women. Here we found unique differences, apparently related to marital status, especially for elderly single women.

The last dimension is speculative. What do these differences mean in actual quality of life? If we consider the issue of manual labor, then clearly, according to our coding criteria, single women were generally working in jobs that required less manual labor than those occupations of most of the other heads of households. In general, however, the actual link between occupational status and the quality of these people's lives can only be surmised. We cannot infer from these findings that higher occupational status would necessarily suggest better working conditions for most of the subjects in this study, and especially for the women. A higher income is probable, which would then suggest a better lifestyle and confer a higher social status.
The nineteenth century was not the first time that every person in Britain had his or her existence officially recorded. Elizabethan parish registers were the first systematic records of the population. However, it was the first period in the nation's history that every man, woman, and child had his or her existence regularly recorded together with details of ages, addresses, and occupations. In the Victorian age this volume of information mounted fast. It is hoped that this research endeavor will encourage others who are attracted to the study of the recent past to delve deeper into these vast amounts of data now available to them, challenging the historical and sociological imagination of present studies. As we meet this challenge we will know much more about the nature of industrialization, urbanization, and rapid social change, and in particular, the responses of men and women to them.
Horney (1926) questions the validity of the psychology of women as considered from the point of view of men and asks how far the evolution of women has been measured by subjective masculine standards and therefore the true nature of women is inaccurately presented. She demonstrates that the contemporary (1926) analytical picture of feminine development differs by only a "hair's breadth" from the typical ideas that the male has of the female and suggests that while this may be the correct assumption, "...it is surely calculated to make us think and take other possibilities into consideration" (Horney, 1926, p. 327). This leads her to the application of Simmel's (1902) position that "...female adaptation to the male structure takes place at so early a period and in so high a degree, that the specific nature of the little girl is overwhelmed by it" (Horney, 1926, p. 328). Yet she questions that everything that is natural in the female could possibly completely disappear without leaving a trace. This returns her to the question of whether indeed psychoanalytical observations have been made from the man's point of view.

Horney suggests that the concept of penis envy has only been explained biologically and never sociologically. Furthermore, the male psyche as expressed in the boy's intense envy of motherhood is capable of more successful sublimation than the penis envy of the girl. In other words, men can more often lose their awareness of being masculine, whereas, for women, loss of femininity is a rare event, since they are constantly being exposed to the notion of their inferiority and this phenomenon stimulates the masculinity complex, which Horney now sees as a symptom of an underlying sociological cause which has never been investigated. The social subordination of women is explained by a combination of social and psychic factors that are so grave and so important that they require a separate investigation.
Appendix A

Enumeration Schedule of the Census of Great Britain, England and Wales, Scotland, and the Islands of the British Seas
1851
1. Name of Street with Name or Number of the House.
2. Names and Surnames.
3. Relation to Head of Family.
5. Age and Sex.
6. Rank, Profession, or Occupation.
7. Where Born.
8. Whether Blind, Deaf, or Dumb.
Appendix B

Registration Districts Contained Within the Sample of Heads of Households
London 1851
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth (Camberwell)</td>
<td>1 parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>7 parishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Botolph's</td>
<td>1 parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George's Hanover Square</td>
<td>3 parishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Paddington</td>
<td>1 parish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Occupations of Heads of Households
London 1851
(Spelling is taken exactly from the enumerator's schedules.)

**Females**

| Accountant | Felt Maker |
| Agent | Fund Holder |
| Alms | Furrier |
| Annuitant | Gas Lighter |
| Architect | Gentlewoman |
| Army | Servant to Gentleman |
| Author | Gold Beater |
| Baker | Governess |
| Barister | Green Grocer |
| Beadmaker | Grocer |
| Beerseller | Haberdasher |
| Blacksmith | Hall Porter |
| Blindmaker | Hatter |
| Boarding House Proprietor | House and Land Owner |
| Boatbuilder | Household |
| Bonnetmaker | Houskeeper |
| Boot and Shoe Maker | Income from Interest |
| Bottle Washer | Independent Land Owner |
| Box Maker | Keeps Mangle |
| Bricklayer | Lacemaker |
| Brickmaker | Lady |
| Butcher | Lampmaker |
| Cabinetmaker | Laundress |
| Candlemaker | Laundry in Own Home |
| Canvas Weaver | Leather Merchant |
| Cap Maker | Letter Carrier |
| Carpenter | Lighterman |
| Casual Work | Lithographer |
| Charwoman | Lodge Keeper |
| Chimney Sweep | Mantlemaker |
| Clear Starcher | Mariner |
| Coachmaker | School Mistress |
| Coffee House Keeper | Church Matron |
| Lady's Collar Maker | Messenger |
| Commercial Traveler | Marine Merchant |
| Compositor | Retail Merchant |
| Confectioner | Merchant's Clerk |
| Contractor | Milliner |
| Cook | Minister |
| Cooper | Needlewoman |
| Costermonger | Nurse |
| Cow Keeper | Packer |
| Day School Teacher | Painter |
| Embroidress | Parish Relief |
| Engineer | Parasol Maker |
| Farmer | Pauper |
Pensioner
Pew Opener
Physician
Piano Manufacturer
Porter
Powder Puff Manufacturer
Rug Weaver
Sailor
Seamstress
Servant
Sexton
Shirtmaker
Shoemaker
Shopkeeper
Silk Worker
Slippermaker
Slopcoat Maker
Stained Glass Artist
Stationer
Stockholder
Stock Maker
Strawbonnet Maker
Surgeon
Tailor
Tambor Worker
Titled Aristocrat
Tobacconist
Tobacco Stripper
Toll Keeper
Translator of Languages
Traveler, Wholesale
Trimming Maker
Trouser Maker
Twine Spinner
Umbrella Maker
Upholsterer
Victualler
Watchman
Weaver
Wheelwright
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Brickmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertiser</td>
<td>Brick Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Bridle Cutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Worker</td>
<td>Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuitant</td>
<td>Brushmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser</td>
<td>Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Bullock Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Bushelman for Coal Wiper's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Florist</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial Flower Maker</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Butter Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attache</td>
<td>Cabman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cabin Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>Cabinetmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Calker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>Canal Lock Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Candlemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baler Maker</td>
<td>Cane Spreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Cannister Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargeman</td>
<td>Capmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>Card Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketmaker</td>
<td>Carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedstead Maker</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beadle</td>
<td>Carriage Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beerseller</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellhanger</td>
<td>Casual Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellows Maker</td>
<td>Cattle Drover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Broker</td>
<td>Cattle Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiard Table Keeper</td>
<td>Cellar Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Cage Maker</td>
<td>Chairmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacklead Maker</td>
<td>Chancery Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>Chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindmaker</td>
<td>Cheesemonger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board House Proprietor</td>
<td>Chemical Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatbuilder</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilmaker</td>
<td>Childbed Linen Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Gatherer</td>
<td>Chimney Sweep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnetmaker</td>
<td>China Glass Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinder</td>
<td>Chronometer Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>Cigar Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td>Claymaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot and Shoe Maker</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Dealer</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Maker</td>
<td>Clicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>Clipper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches Maker</td>
<td>Clockmaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clothesman
Clothier
Coachmaker
Coal Backer
Coal Boy
Coal Dealer
Coffee House Keeper
Collar Maker, Lady's
Collector of Bills
Color Maker
Comb Maker
Comedian
Commercial Traveler
Confectioner
Contractor
Cook
Cooper
Copper Brazier
Copper Plate Printer
Cordwainer
Cork Cutter
Corn Cutter
Costermonger
Cotton Worker
Cow Keeper
Crepe Finisher
Curate
Cutler
Dentist
Designer
Dismaker
Dockman
Dollmaker
Doorkeeper
Draper
Drawing Instrument Casemaker
Drilling Machine Maker
Druggist
Dry Salter
Dyer
Eating House Keeper
Engineer
Engine Driver
Engraver
Errand Boy
Excavator
Factory Molder
Farmer
Farrier
Feather Maker

Felt Maker
File Hardener
Fireman
Fishmonger
Flax Dresser
Floor Cloth Manufacturer
Florist
Flower Maker
Flute Maker
Footman
French Polisher
Fringe Maker
Fund Holder
Furrier
Furniture Manufacturer
Gardener
Gas Fitter
Gas Meter Repairman
Gas Worker
Gentleman
Gentleman's Servant
Ginger Beer Manufacturer
Glass Cutter
Glass Dealer
Glass Manufacturer's Labourer
Gold and Silver Refiner
Governor
Government Clerk
Grass Cutter
Grenadier Guards, Lieutenant in the
Green Grocer
Groom
Gunsmith
Gutta Percha Frame Maker
Gutta Percha Dealer Master Employer
Gutta Percha Worker
Haberdasher
Hackney Carriage Driver
Hairdresser
Hall Porter
Hand Loom Weaver
Hand Loom Weaver, Velvet
Harnessmaker
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Hat Dealer Importer
Hatter
Hat Presser
Hawker
Hay Salesman
Hemp Dresser
Hop Factor
Horse Keeper
Hosier/Glover
Hot Air Stove Manufacturer
Hotel Keeper/Proprietor
House Agent
House and Land Owner
House Decorator
Householder
Housekeeper
House Painter
Importer
Incumbent of Church
Independent Land Owner
India Merchant
Inkstand Maker
Inspector of Weights and Measures
Insurance Broker
Iron Dealer
Iron and Brass Founder
Ivory Turner
Jeweler
Job Master
Joiner
Keeper of Public Records
Labourer in Gas Works
Lacemaker
Lamp Manufacturer
Lampseller
Laundry in Own Home
Law Clerk
Leather Case Worker
Leather Cutter
Leather Merchant
Letter Carrier
Librarian
Lighterman
Linen Bleacher
Lithographer
Livery Stable Keeper
Lockman on Canal
Locksmith
Lodge Keeper
Lucifer Box Maker
Machinist
Magistrate
Malt Factor
Manservant
Manchester Agent
Mariner
Market Gardener
Mason
Masoner
Mechanic
Medical Botanist
Merchant Marine
Merchant, Coal
Merchant, Provision
Merchant, Retail
Merchant's Clerk
Messenger
Miller
Milliner
Millwright
Minister
Mirror Frame Maker
Mop Manufacturer
Musical Instrument Manufacturer
Musician
Nautical Brazier
Newspaper Office Clerk
News Vender
Notary Clerk
Nurse, Male
Office Keeper
Office Worker
Oil and Colour Man
Oil Presser
Omnibus Coachman
Omnibus Time Keeper
Omnibus Owner
Omnibus Porter
Optician
Ostler
Packer
Packing Box Maker
Painter
Painter, Artisan
Pan Maker
Paperhanger
Paper Maker Stainer
Parish Clerk
Parish Relief
Parliament, Member of
Parochial Collector
Pastry Cook
Patternmaker
Pawnbroker
Pensioner
Physician
Piano Manufacturer
Pin and Needle Maker
Pipe layer
Plasterer
Plumber
Pocketbook Maker
Policeman
Porter
Potter
Poulterer
Private House Porter
Private Steward
Public Housekeeper
Publisher
Pupil
Quadrant Frame Maker
Railway Worker
Railway Clerk
Railway Guard
Rector
Reporter
Rice Dresser
Rigger of Ships
Road Labourer
Rope Maker
Rug Weager
Sack Collector
Sack Maker
Saddlemaker
Sailmaker
Sailor
Salesman
Satin Dresser
Sawyer
Schoolmaster
Secretary
Servant
Sexton
Sharedealer
Shawl Cleaner and Dyer
Ship's Broker
Ship's Butcher
Ship's Carpenter
Ship's Caulker
Ship Owner
Ship's Steward
Shoemaker
Shopkeeper
Shorthand Writer
Sieve Manufacturer
Silk Manufacturer
Silk Worker
Silversmith
Slippermaker
Soap Boiler
Sofa Maker
Solicitor
Solicitor's Clerk
Stationer
Statuary Mason
Stay Maker
Stockholder
Stoker
Stone Mason
Strawbonnet Maker
Sugar Refiner
Surgeon
Surgeon Apothecary
Surveyor
Tailor
Tanner
Taxidermist
Tea Merchant
Time Glass Maker
Timekeeper
Tinsmith
Titled Aristocrat
Tobacco Stripper
Tobacconist
Tollkeeper
Translator of Languages
Traveler, Wholesale
Traveler, Retail
Traveler
Trimming Maker
Trunk Maker
Turncork Engine Keeper
Turpentine Distiller
Twine Spinner
Type Founder
Umbrella Maker
Undertaker
Upholsterer
Usher
Vestry Clerk
Veterinarian  
Vicualler  
Waiter  
Waiter, Public  
Wallpaper Manufacturer  
Warehouse Keeper  
Warehouseman  
Warehouse Porter  
Watchmaker  
Watchman  
Waterman  
Weaver  
Wheelwright  
Whip Maker  
White Lead Maker  
Whitesmith  
Window Blind Maker  
Wine Cooper  
Wood Turner  
Wool Merchant  
Writer and Grainer  
Writer in Oil Colours
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