

2

Characteristics of households in the eastern part of North Brabant, 1810-1920

Gerard Trienekens

Data

The Integral History Project in the Netherlands, which was begun in 1987, was a joint project of the Universities of Groningen and Utrecht. Utrecht carried out the research in the sand area in the southern province of North Brabant, with 's-Hertogenbosch as the main city. In this area 95% or more of the inhabitants were Roman Catholic. Collection of data for ten sample municipalities was carried out by local volunteers. Cohort analysis and analysis of municipal records was carried out within each structure analysis based on the Population Registers.¹ The volunteers were supervised by University assistants who provided them with the necessary instructions concerning the use of the relevant archives and computer programs. Altogether, more than 150 volunteers were involved for one day a week over a two-year period. Most of the data collected has now been processed or transformed into several thousand pages of statistics. These are registered as 'PIGU, Results of cohort (structure) analyses' and, consequently, the source material will be referred to as such below the tables. This large quantity of data is currently being converted into readable history.

As the material is worked with, its value begins to become apparent. At the level of the local municipality, the analyses carried out were seldom completed as far as was originally intended. Often, part of an analysis is missing due to a lack of the basic data in the archives, or because the volunteers did not have the time to finish it all. The perseverance and the power of endurance of most groups was high, but the task they accepted was bigger than had been anticipated either by themselves or the research team, who had too little insight into the amount of time it would take to accomplish the intended analyses. On the other hand, enough material has been collected for a book to be written about the history of households in eastern North Brabant in the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth

¹ See P. Kooij, 'Introduction. The Integral History project', in: P. Kooij (ed.), *Where the twain meet. Dutch and Russian regional development perspective 1800-1917* (Groningen/Wageningen) 2-3.

centuries. However, the historian writing that book must always remain aware of the way in which this data was obtained.

Households

The best way of converting the data into written history seemed to be to write a book about households and families. The size and composition of the households and families becomes apparent from the structure analyses for the benchmark years. It is also possible to supplement this picture by using data from the cohort analyses, which provides some extra information about the kind of households people had to live in during the course of their lives and, in some cases, also about differences related to their financial situation. All the data collected in the cohort analyses concerning births, marriage, childbearing, death and migration are required to give a demographic explanation of the size and composition of the households. This is illustrated in figure 1. Naturally, other general data referring to these points can also be of use but this does not help in distinguishing the social classes.

Figure 1 Demographic factors (1 to 9) and their backgrounds determining the size and composition of the households

		Demographic factor*	Backgrounds
SIZE of the HOUSE	Size of the nucleus	1. number of singles	- economy
		2. marriage participation	- housing
		3. (marriage) fertility	- religion
		4. infant mortality	- culture
		5. mortality (general)	- biological fecundity
		6. children leaving home	- birth control techniques
	Number of live-in	Presence of: 7. relatives 8. servants 9. boarders	- general hygienic and medical situation
			- social structures
			- politics

* divorce was negligible

Some of the demographic factors in the figure are interdependent and most of them are influenced by the same backgrounds. These backgrounds can turn this kind of history into Integral History but it is very difficult to relate the demographic factors to their backgrounds significantly. Hopefully this may be achieved by using the other data collected in sample municipalities, such as those concerning economics and community policies on public health. The focus here will exclusively be on the average size and composition of the households, seen as units of communal life of nuclear families, servants, relatives and boarders. Methodologically two kinds of sizes and compositions

must be worked with, those from the structure analyses and those from the cohort analyses.

Note that the average sizes given by the cohort analyses are always greater than those from the structure analyses because the cohort members were nearly always born in an existing family and lived there for many years. Singles are absent or rare for the benchmark years for which their households were analyzed. The number of households with only one or two people has a large influence on the average size in the structure analyses. Questions to be answered include what kind (small or large, nuclear or extended) of households were people in North Brabant living in? Did the means of subsistence influence the situation? Were there differences between the municipalities and for what reasons? How did the situations develop during the course of a person's life? This paper will not include a more extensive discussion of these themes.

Average size of households

The simple survey of the average size of households, as shown in Table 1, could make a researcher very depressed. It seems that there was very little development during a century of family history. The average size of the households in all the municipalities is always about 4.75. Peter Laslett found exactly the same result for England for the period 1574–1821!² In the context of the Netherlands, this is an average value when compared with the figures found for other regions researched.³ Only in 1869 were there rather more municipalities with household sizes of less than 4.5. Moreover, further analysis shows that a considerable part of the difference in size results simply from the number of singles. The absence of change makes the history very static and uninteresting. Fortunately there are some changes at the local level, as in 's-Hertogenbosch, Aarle-Rixtel and Wanroij, and there is also the possibility that although the size remained nearly the same the composition of the households may have changed.

There is a large difference between the impression the average size gives us and the actual size of the households people were living in. Table 2 shows that at any particular moment in Bladel, two thirds or more of the people lived in households larger than the average size and, in this respect, Bladel is fairly representative for the rest of the sample municipalities. More than 30% of the people lived in a household of seven or more persons. In a West

² P. Laslett, 'Mean household size in England since the sixteenth century', in: P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.), *Household and family in past time* (Cambridge 1972) 139. See also P. Laslett, 'Size and structure of the household in England over three centuries', *Population studies*, 23 (1969) 199–223.

³ Compare A. van der Woude, 'De omvang en samenstelling van de huishoudingen in Nederland in het verleden', *A.A.G. Bijdragen* 15 (1970) 202–241 and J.A. Verduin, 'Het gezin in demografisch perspectief', in: G.A. Kooy (ed.), *Gezinsgeschiedenis. Vier eeuwen gezin in Nederland* (Assen/Maastricht 1985) 77–84.

European context, households of seven and more are usually termed ‘big’, so that the term ‘big’ will also be applied to such households here. At the same time it must be realized that in a Russian context, seven or more would be nothing out of the ordinary.⁴

Table 1 Average size of households (excl. institutions) in the sample municipalities in benchmark years

benchmark years						
		<4.5	Between 4.5 and 5.0	5.0 and >		
1811			Bladel	4.8	Den Bosch	5.3
			Oirschot	4.6		
			Schijndel	4.5		
			Veghel	4.5		
1829			Bladel	4.5	Berlicum	5.4
			Oirschot	4.8	Deurne	5.0
			Schijndel	4.5		
1849			Deurne	4.9	Aarle-Rix.	5.1
			Oirschot	4.6	Berlicum	5.3
			Schijndel	4.8	Bladel	5.2
			Veghel	4.5		
			Den Bosch	4.5		
1869	Oirschot	4.3	Aarle-Rix.	4.7	Gestel	5.0
	Veghel	4.1	Berlicum	4.9		
	Wanroij	4.2	Bladel	4.8		
	Den Bosch	4.1	Deurne	4.8		
			Schijndel	4.8		
1889	Den Bosch	4.4	Aarle-Rix.	4.6	Schijndel	5.2
			Berlicum	4.8	Wanroij	5.0
			Bladel	4.8		
			Gestel	4.5		
			Veghel	4.6		
1909	Aarle-Rix.	4.4	Berlicum	4.9	Schijndel	5.0
			Bladel	4.9	Wanroij	5.0
			Gestel	4.9		
			Oirschot	4.7		
			Veghel	4.6		

Source: PIGU, Results of the structure analyses.

Table 1 also provides an overview of the municipalities and years in which structure analyses of the population registers were made. A total of 44 intersections of a community population took place.

The percentage of cohort members living in a big household (7 and >) gives a more accurate impression of the households people lived in than the

⁴ Compare T. Trokhina, ‘A typology of the Russian peasant family of the Upper Volga Region’, in: Kooij (ed.), *Where the twain meet*, 181 ff.

average size does. In addition, this indicator magnifies the variation in average size by a factor of between 5 and 9 rather than by a constant value.

Table 2 The distribution of households (hh) and members of households among size-classes as percentages of the total number of households and members of households and the average size in Bladel, 1829/1869/1909

Size	1829		1869		1909	
	hh	members	hh	members	hh	members
1	3.5	0.8	6.0	1.2	3.9	0.8
2	18.5	8.3	10.3	4.2	13.0	5.3
3 and 4	31.5	24.9	29.3	21.8	34.9	25.1
5 and 6	29.2	35.1	31.8	35.8	24.1	27.4
7-9	15.8	27.2	20.5	32.5	18.6	29.3
10-14	1.5	3.8	2.1	4.5	5.5	12.1
7 and >	17.3	31.0	22.6	37.0	24.1	41.4
n =	260	1,181	283	1,368	307	1,502
Average size	4.5		4.8		4.9	

Source: PIGU, Results of the structure analyses.

Households and the life cycle

Historiography of the household has already introduced the idea that people lived in various types and sizes of households at different points in their life cycle.⁵ In the cohort analyses this variation was followed methodically by tracing the situation of the cohort members at the ages of 0, 10, 20, 40, 60 and 80. Table 3 shows that at the age of ten a majority of all the cohort members lived in a big household. On average households and families were always at their largest around that age. The values calculated are minimums, because some of the servants registered in the separate 'Servants Registers' of 1869 and later could not be individually linked to certain households in the general Population Registers. There was a second high chance of living in a big household around the age of forty, but because some cohort members did not found a family, the average size is lower. However, at the ages of 0 and 20 households were, on average, only slightly smaller. The idea that living in a big household only occurred at particular times in the life cycle must be rejected. It is only possible to say that the chances of living in a big household for a shorter or longer period was very high and was at its highest around the age of ten.

⁵ E. Kloek mentions L.K. Berkner as the historian who first drew attention to the life cycle (1972). See *Gezinshistorici over vrouwen* (Amsterdam 1981) 25-26.

Table 3 Minimum percentages of cohort members in all sample municipalities living in a household of seven and more persons at six calculated ages

cohort:	1811		1829		1849		1869		1889		1811/1889	
	%	n★	%	n★	%	n★	%	n★	%	n★	%	n★
0 year	39.0	208	41.7	84	46.3	837	33.1	493	51.9	535	43.8	2,157
10 year	56.8	104	62.8	94	54.9	590	52.7	321	69.8	378	58.9	1,487
20 year	53.4	237	46.0	148	47.8	439	36.6	341	45.4	304	45.6	1,469
40 year	36.0	189	33.3	66	38.3	337	33.8	169	49.7	241	39.5	1,002
60 year	25.2	130	12.6	16	19.8	172	29.6	54		★★	22.8	327
80 year	23.5	17		3	19.2	26		★★		★★	19.6	46
0/80 year	41.9	885	45.3	411	45.4	2,401	38.1	1,378	54.9	1,458	45.6	6,533

★ n = the total number of households of cohort members traced for the relevant age.

★★ no data because of the inaccessibility of the public registers.

Source: FIGU, Results of the cohort analyses.

Households and social classification

Some commonly used classification systems are available for dividing the population into subsistence classes.⁶ For the sake of comparability it is necessary to apply a standard method, but the value of any classification method is determined by the answers it provides for the essential questions. Here the main question to be answered is whether the means of subsistence influenced the size and composition of the households. In the region studied the subsistence structure was rather complex. For most of the sample, farming communities were the dominant structure. The farms were usually small and based on a system of mixed farming with butter, rye, veal and later also pork and eggs as the most important goods marketed. The size of the farms was generally less than 10 hectares and farmers owned between 1 and 8 dairy cows.⁷ It is clear that the majority of them were not at all well off, but also that there were large differences in income. Nevertheless, farmers will all be grouped in one class.

A large number of working-class craftsmen such as weavers, spinners and spinsters, shoemakers, clog makers and cigar makers worked for the local market or were active in the proto-industry. In the second half of the nineteenth century most of the weavers and other labourers became absorbed by various types of urban industry. In the literature it is assumed that there is a big difference between the households of each group. Households in proto-industrial production would have been bigger because of the need for labour in the family economy. In addition most members of the first category had a cottage with some land and some animals with a goat being the most important. They had a double subsistence base the financial income from industrial activity and the supply of natural products from activities in and around the cottage.

The group of day-labourers who only worked in agriculture around harvest time and otherwise were employed in the public sector (roads, canals, cleaning ditches, earthworks, etc.) and building also belonged to the group of cottagers. Regular farm workers were usually the sons and daughters of farmers. They were seldom married, were waiting for their own plot and lived as part of the farmer's family. Most craftsmen such as carpenters, bricklayers/contractors, blacksmiths, tanners, blue-dyers and bakers had their own businesses, just as shopkeepers and publicans did. Tailors were often illiterate and as much proletarian as the men working in the proto-industry. Many of the tradesmen did not have much more than a dog-cart to transport their wares. Some visited the farmers on the fields with no more than a gin-

⁶ See note 8.

⁷ Compare M. Duijvendak and G. Trienekens, 'Towards a comparison between the regions in Groningen and North Brabant', in: Kooij (ed.), *Where the twain meet*, 60-64.

bottle and a glass to sell a drink. It will be clear that it is very difficult to choose occupational categories which fit all these situations and the changes that took place over time.

In order to solve the classification problem, the 'sector classification' introduced in the Netherlands during the census of 1889 and a home-made classification, more suited to the needs of this research and the existing subsistence structure of the region, will be used.⁸ The first system of classification, generally used by historians and other scientists, distinguishes between people working in the six classes of industry, agriculture, commercial services, casual labourers and day-labourers, social services and pensioners.⁹ The categories used for the second classification can be found in Table 4. This classification is based on the recorded professions that have been brought together in groups according to their position in the capital and labour market. This position was to a large extent responsible for the kind of work and the income of the families and is, therefore, related to their production and consumption. In order to prepare these categories and apply them to the known professions, the information gathered by those carrying out the census and what has been learnt in the research has had to be used. The 1889 census distinguished four positions in the six above-mentioned classes. These were A, B, C, and D. The men or women who were owners of a business belonged to class A, the paid heads of a business or institution to B, the paid employees with some responsibility for the course of the process such as foremen, overseers, controllers, clerks, and schoolmasters to C, and all ordinary labourers and servants to D.

The classification system of the Project Integral History in Utrecht (PIGU) distinguishes independent entrepreneurs who used their own capital and labour and possibly also relied on borrowed capital and hired labour as the first group. Besides manufacturers, this list also includes all craftsmen and shopkeepers who needed some substantial capital for doing their job. Farmers are grouped separately as class 2 because of their special way of life and their large number. Pensioners and all people living on one's private means are also included in the first group.

⁸ See F. Bergman and M. Prak, 's-Hertogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc) as a regional capital in the nineteenth century', in: Kooij (ed.), *Where the twain meet*, 98. In the first instance this classification system does not take account of the differences in social positions. If the positions A-D in the separated classes, as used in the census, are taken into account the number of possible categories will be too large for a working classification system. A more socially orientated system, the classification of Giele and Van Oenen, is also often used. See, for example, F. van Poppel, *Trouwen in Nederland* (Wageningen 1992) 138-140. The problem with the last classification is that there is too little differentiation in some of the classes, in the same way that the method used here is not able to distinguish between rich and poor farmers. All more or less proletarian professionals such as weavers, spinners and clog-makers, for example, would belong to the middle classes.

⁹ *Uitkomsten der Beroepstelling in het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden op den één en dertigsten december 1889*, part 14, ('s-Gravenhage 1894) Bijlage, 1-15.

Those whose incomes were based on typical human capital such as special talents, intellectual ability or higher education, (doctors, solicitors, mayors, artists, etc.) are placed in class 3. All professionals with a C-position are grouped together in the next class. The labour force is divided into a more urban/industrial part and a rural part. Urban casual labourers, such as carriers and barrowmen and industrial workers, are included in the first group. In principle, their source of income was either their own labour or poor relief. They can be termed normal wage-earners. The day-labourers and agricultural labourers, who usually possessed a cottage and therefore had a double basis for their income, are included in the second group.

All possible self-employed working-class tradesmen and women both in industry and commerce, such as the proto-industrial weavers, spinners, bleachers, knitters, slaughterers, basket-makers, hawkers (street-traders), cheap-jacks, fishermen, carters, liquor-traders and others are classified together in the class of AD professionals. They all possessed some small form of capital such as a loom or a spinning wheel or some other tools, a pony and cart or a dogcart, a small stock and so on. It is not known who amongst them had more substantial capital, such as more than two looms or two horses and carts, but the tax registers show that most of them did not. Those from the countryside in this category could also be included with the cottagers. People without a profession or whose profession is unknown are placed in group 8.

This paper will only use the results of the PIGU classification system. The most significant differences between the subsistence classes are found for the cohort members when they were 0 years old. The largest households are found then among the independent entrepreneurs and farmers. The few households of groups 3 and 4 (not shown in Table 4) are larger than the average size but still smaller than those of groups 1 and 2. The households in which the AD professionals and normal wage earners were born were in between the average size and that of the rural day-labourers, who were born into the smallest sized households. There seems to be a connection between being born in a big household and the fact that the economic base of the household consisted of a certain amount of capital goods. Contrary to expectations, the size of the households of the AD professionals was similar to that of the labourers living in an urban situation, but the households of the day-labourers at the time of the birth of their children were much smaller until 1889. The situation in this respect did not change fundamentally as the cohort members became older. This leads to the conclusion that the difference between rural (proto-industry) and urban (industry) labour was less important for the extension of the young households than exactly what kind of occupation the labourers had in the countryside. A great deal more research on demographic factors is needed to explain this.

Table 4 Minimum percentages of cohort members living in a household of seven or more people, at six calculated ages, ordered according to the PIGU subsistence classes for the head of the household

Class**	1		2		5		6		7		8		Total
	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	n*	%	n*
1811													
0 year	70.6	17	36.8	128		5	36.7	30	11.8	17	11	39.0	208
10 year		2	72.6	62		0	30.0	20	29.4	17	12	56.8	104
20 year	94.1	17	54.5	123	62.0	29	38.9	36		12	20	53.2	237
40 year	43.8	16	47.1	87		12	19.6	34	13.0	23	17	36.0	189
60 year		12	35.5	48		1	18.1	22	4.5	22	24	25.4	130
80 year		0		6		0		5		0	6	23.5	17
0/80 year	64.1	64	58.0	454	53.1	47	29.9	147	17.6	91	82	41.9	885
1829													
0 year		5	53.3	45		0		13	13.3	15	4	41.7	84
10 year		10	73.6	53		1		12	29.4	17	1	62.8	94
20 year	53.3	15	61.1	72	26.6	15	43.8	16	20.0	25	5	46.0	148
40 year		4	32.2	28		4	35.7	14	14.3	14	2	33.3	66
60 year		2		3		0		5		4		12.6	16
80 year		0		1		0		2		0	0		3
0/80 year	63.9	36	57.4	202	35.0	20	35.5	62	19.2	73	18	45.3	411
1849													
0 year	51.9	81	56.8	396	33.4	15	39.6	169	21.2	136	44	46.3	837
10 year	74.6	63	59.2	267	58.8	17	52.2	117	29.9	77	49	54.9	590
20 year	46.7	45	58.5	188	40.7	27	43.8	96	27.2	33	50	47.8	439
40 year	37.5	48	45.2	135	34.5	29	31.5	73	39.1	23	29	38.3	37
60 year	15.3	26	32.0	72	27.3	22	0.0	19		0	27	19.8	172
80 year		2	28.6	14		4		1		0	5	19.2	26
0/80 year	49.9	265	54.2	1,072	37.7	114	40.6	475	25.4	271	204	45.4	2,401

1869													
0 year	39.9	56	40.8	159	27.3	22	38.5	109	17.3	121	26	33.1	493
10 year	65.9	44	58.9	107	35.3	17	44.2	68	54.1	61	24	52.7	321
20 year	60.0	50	35.7	98	21.0	38	35.3	85	40.7	32	38	36.9	341
40 year	36.6	41	26.0	23	33.3	24	37.1	54		6	21	33.8	169
60 year		8		6	35.7	14	41.1	17		0	8	29.6	54
0/60 year	47.3	199	43.5	393	28.7	115	38.7	333	32.1	221	117	38.1	1,378
1889													
0 year	68.4	57	61.4	228	36.2	47	37.4	139	53.1	49	15	51.9	535
10 year	68.9	45	69.7	167	70.6	51	67.0	88		8	19	69.8	378
20 year	38.9	36	41.9	124	59.1	44	47.7	65		8	27	45.4	304
40 year	58.3	24	53.1	96	60.5	38	39.6	53		3	27	49.7	241
0/40 year	61.1	162	58.7	615	56.7	180	47.5	345	55.8	68	88	54.9	1,458
1811/1889													
0 year	53.3	216	52.4	956	34.8	89	38.3	460	23.7	334	102	43.8	2,157
10 year	71.4	164	64.4	656	60.5	86	53.2	305	40.5	180	96	58.9	1,487
20 year	54.6	163	50.9	605	43.8	153	41.6	298	32.8	110	140	45.6	1,469
40 year	42.8	133	45.6	369	44.8	107	33.3	228	27.5	69	96	39.5	1,002
60 year	20.9	48	32.5	129	29.7	182	17.4	63	3.2	31	64	22.8	372
80 year		2	23.8	21	15.0	22		8		0	9	19.6	46
0/80 year	53.6	726	52.9	2,736	44.1	476	40.4	1,362	28.7	724	509	45.6	6,533

★ n= the total number of households of cohort members traced per class at the relevant age.

★★ PIGU subsistence classification: 1 = independent entrepreneurs, 2 = farmers, 3 = particular ability, 4 = 'C profession', 5 = normal or urban wage-earners, 6 = 'AD profession', 7 = day-labourers, 8 = without profession, unknown and rest. N.B. The small numbers in classes 3 and 4 are included with class 8. The percentages where n= < 14 and of 'class 8' where these are of no significance are omitted. Source: Results of the cohort analyses.

Once the cohort members reached ten years of age, the differences between the classes were relatively much smaller. In general, there was a tendency towards equalization with the big households not growing as fast as those that had been smaller at 0 years. There were clearly more big households, 71.4% over the century, among entrepreneurs with ten-year-old children. But on average 40.5% of this age group of the rural day-labourers also lived in a household of seven or more. This group experienced the most strikingly increasing percentages during the nineteenth century. The households the cohort members of 1869 were born into enlarged by 212% in 1879. Those of the cohort born in 1889 were the same size as was normal for entrepreneurs and farmers. After this the group no longer formed part of the community.

The size of the households of normal wage earners and AD professionals of the cohort of 1889 increased considerably between their birth and the age of ten, by 95 and 79% respectively. By the end of the nineteenth century the class differences at age ten had disappeared completely. At that time there was a significant growth in the Dutch population. The cause of this was not simply the decreasing death rate, in North Brabant combined with a still increasing birth rate. Some groups had relatively more benefit from the new hygienic and economic circumstances than others. Apart from the purely demographic transition there was also a social transition with the beginning of a move towards more equality between the rich and the poor.

Households and individual municipalities

The differences between households in the separate municipalities are greater than might be expected for such a homogeneous region (see Table 5). It must be noted here that the percentages in the table are averages of three (or two) cohorts. It appears that the cohort members in Oirschot lived in the largest households with a total of 64.4% of the three cohorts being born in a big household. This percentage was particularly high, namely 81.2% for the 1889 cohort.

The results in Table 5 are clearly influenced by the manner of application of cohort analysis in the separate sample municipalities. Table 6 contains an overview of the analyses of the households of the cohort members for the six chosen ages that were made by the volunteers in their municipalities. This table clearly shows that several analyses for the cohort ages chosen are either missing or incomplete. For example, if the cohort age of 10 years is not involved in the calculations for a particular community this will result in a reduction in the size of the households calculated and also influence the overall average. Those municipalities where a cohort born in 1869 was taken will also show a reduction because the households were relatively small in

Table 5 Minimum percentage of cohort members living in a household of seven or more people for the cohorts from 1811 to 1889, in the separate sample municipalities for different ages

	0 year		10 year		20 year		40 year		60 year		80 year		0/80 year	
	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*	%	n*
Oir.	64.4	191	64.6	192	50.6	174	48.5	136	22.7	22		2	56.6	717
Ber.	44.3	226	62.2	180	50.0	98	47.5	40	33.3	18		0	51.0	562
Bla.	41.8	342	63.0	154	55.1	196	46.7	137	20.8	53		7	47.8	889
Aar.	54.3	234	65.6	151	44.1	127	28.4	130	22.9	70	12.5	16	46.4	728
Deu.	45.7	317	63.7	146	43.0	170	43.8	128	20.8	53	29.4	17	46.1	831
Ges.	54.0	37	54.1	122	46.5	116	31.1	103	32.3	31		0	44.5	409
Sch.	36.1	244	52.4	187	43.9	148		0		0		0	43.4	579
Goi.	40.0	90	64.7	82	41.3	143	35.6	115	29.6	54		0	42.3	484
Veg.	37.4	227	54.2	142	36.4	110	35.0	123	8.7	46		3	38.3	651
D.B.	24.5	53	59.1	22	40.7	59	45.5	55	25.0	24		1	37.9	214
Wan.	33.2	196	39.4	109	41.5	128	37.1	35		1		0	37.0	469

n = the number of households of cohort members traced at the relevant calculated age.

Oir. = Oirschot, Ber. = Berlicum, Bla. = Bladel, Aar. = Aarle-Rixtel, Deu. = Deurne, Ges. = Gestel, Sch. = Schijndel, Goi. = Goirle, Veg. = Veghel, D.B. = Den Bosch (= 's-Hertogenbosch), Wan. = Wanroij.

Source: PIGU, Results of the cohort analyses.

that year (see Table 1). It is therefore necessary to be circumspect when drawing conclusions, but even so the differences are still significant.

Table 6 Overview of the calculated ages per cohort and per sample municipality

cohort	1811	1829	1849	1869	1889
Aar.	(20)40,60,80		0,10,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40
Ber.	10,20,40,60		0,10,20,40	0,10,20	
Bla.	0,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40
D.B.	(20,40,60,80)		(0,10,20,40,60,80)	(0, 20, 40)	
Deu.	0,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40
Ges.			10,20,40,60	0,10,20,40	
Goi.				20,40,60	0,10,20,40
Oir.	(0)10,20,40,60,80		0,10,20,40		0,10,20,40
Sch.		0,10,20	0,10,20	0,10,20	
Veg.		(0,10,20,40 60,80)	0,10,20,40,60	0,10,20,40	
Wan.		20,40	0,10(20),(60)	0,10,20	

() : very incomplete

Aar. = Aarle-Rixtel, Ber. = Berlicum, Bla. = Bladel, D.B. = Den Bosch, Deu. = Deurne, Ges. = Gestel, Goi. = Goirle, Oir. = Oirschot, Sch. = Schijndel, Veg. = Veghel, Wan. = Wanroij.

The differences are largest at the age of 0. It is not surprising that 's-Hertogenbosch, the only real city, had the smallest households. The value corresponds with the average size shown in Table 1, except for the fact that the households were very big in 1811, probably a result of the way in which the administration was carried out. There is no ready explanation for the differences between the other municipalities. The tendency towards equalization at age ten and above also existed at the local level.

It is likely that the differences were caused by the economic subsistence structure of the municipalities during the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. The occupational structures are known from more than one source. The occupations of the heads of the households the cohort members lived in are used here (see Table 7).

There seems to be some relationship between subsistence classification and household size. For instance, the size of the households in municipalities such as Gestel and Goirle diminished when modern industrialization took place and the agrarian sector became much smaller. It is indeed clear that in these two places most of the groups of (textile) labourers are still classified as AD professionals. Where there was reagrarization – the phenomenon that some communities became much more dependent on agriculture than they had been before as a result of the concentration of industry – as happened in Oirschot and Wanroij, the size of the households grew. There were quite

large groups of day-labourers living in Schijndel, Veghel and Wanroij and the size of households at 0 years were rather small in these villages. But the same is not true for Berlicum, where a quarter of the heads of the households belonged to this class. In 1869, the group of farmers in all the municipalities studied was relatively small (28.5%), because of the presence of the town and two textile villages in the analysis.

Tabele 7 Subsistence base of the heads of the households of cohort members as a percentage of the total households traced per cohort and per sample municipality (all cohorts combined)

Cohort	1811	1829	1849	1869	1889	1811/'89
1. ind. entrepreneurs	7.2	8.8	11.0	14.4	11.1	11.1
2. farmers	51.3	49.1	44.6	28.5	42.2	41.9
3. particular ability	0.8	0.5	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.9
4. 'C profession	1.8	1.2	2.5	2.0	2.9	2.3
5. norm. wage-earners	5.3	4.9	4.7	8.3	12.3	7.3
6. 'AD profession'	16.6	15.1	19.8	24.2	23.7	20.8
7. day-labourers	10.3	17.8	11.3	16.0	4.7	11.1
8. without/unknown/rest	6.7	2.7	5.0	5.2	2.4	4.5
n =	885	411	2,401	1,378	1,458	6,533

Class★	1	2	5	6	7	8★★	n=
Aarle-Rixtel	10.6	45.9	5.9	24.5	6.0	7.1	728
Berlicum	8.9	51.6	1.1	10.0	24.4	4.1	562
Bladel	9.7	56.9	5.1	14.1	5.7	8.5	889
Den Bosch	30.4	0.0	19.6	24.3	6.5	19.2	214
Deurne	6.1	50.8	13.1	16.0	7.2	6.7	831
Gestel	17.4	13.0	9.8	37.9	9.5	12.5	409
Goirle	15.7	11.8	15.5	45.5	1.4	10.1	484
Oirschot	11.3	41.7	5.0	23.3	10.3	8.4	717
Schijndel	6.2	51.6	1.6	14.0	20.4	6.2	579
Veghel	15.4	39.6	3.4	18.4	14.6	8.6	651
Wanroij	7.0	46.5	10.4	16.0	18.1	1.9	469
Total	11.1	41.9	7.3	20.8	11.1	7.8	6,533

★ see the upper part of this table.

★★ including class 3 and 4.

n= the total number of households of cohort members traced.

Source: PIGU, Results of cohort analyses.

Table 4 shows that the percentage of cohort members for 1869 living in a big household was also lowest. However, there only can be a small correlation since the farmers also lived in small households and the overall average size of the households in 1869 (see Table 1) was relatively low. Oirschot had the highest percentage of members living in a big household in the cohort of

1889. It is notable here that 66.7% of the farmers lived in big households whereas the figures for the normal wage earners, the AD professionals and the day-labourers, were 76.6, 76.1 and 77.5% respectively. The conclusion from all such observations must be that the subsistence structure alone is not sufficient to explain all the differences. Other as yet unknown factors, such as changing local attitudes, must have been playing a role as well.

Composition of the households

The term extended families usually causes people to think of large families. However, the concept can also be used for households consisting of more than two generations.¹⁰ Extended in this study simply means a composite household formed by the living-in of relatives, servants or boarders. It is the opposite of a nuclear family (including singles) consisting of just one or two generations. The composite average household does not necessarily need to be larger than a nuclear family, but generally it will be. The question as to what kind of family, nuclear or extended, the cohort members lived in could therefore be changed to what kind of family, 'nuclear or composite'?

Although households in the eastern part of North Brabant were of a normal size by Western European and Dutch standards, before the middle of the nineteenth century living in a nuclear family was not the most common situation. In 1829 for example, 47.6% of the households had a composite character (see Table 8) but a majority, 56.3%, of the inhabitants of the five sample municipalities lived in such households.

After 1849 the composite household lost importance to the extent that in 1889 only 34.2% of households, accommodating 39.2% of the people, were of this type.

In a municipality like Wanroij, where reagrarization took place, the development towards a more nuclear structure was also different with 60.5% of the inhabitants still living in a composite household in 1889.

Until 1849, a quarter of the households included servants. They represented the most common form of living-in, although relatives became more important in the second half of the nineteenth century and exceeded the percentage of servants in 1889. In 1909, only 14.3% of the households still had live-in servants (see Table 8). The percentage of households with boarders also diminished although a small revival of the phenomenon can be seen.

Many of the households had live-in members of more than one kind. The percentage decreased from 14.9% in 1829 to 4.1% in 1909. The composite households had a rather high percentage of more than one kind of living-in member.

¹⁰ Compare Trokhina, 'A typology', 175; see also P. Laslett, 'Introduction: the history of the family', in: Laslett and Wall (eds.), *Household and family in past time*, 31.

Table 8 Categories of living-in (relatives, servants, boarders, relationship unknown and plural) as percentages of the total number of composite households (= A) and as percentages of all households (= B), 1811/1909

	1811*		1829		1849		1869		1889		1909	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
relatives	19.5	9.1	34.7	16.5	37.4	15.9	47.8	17.3	52.5	18.0	44.7	12.2
servants	54.7	25.5	62.8	29.9	57.2	24.4	59.7	21.7	50.2	17.2	52.3	14.3
boarders	25.2	11.8	20.3	9.7	18.3	7.8	6.2	2.3	11.1	3.8	14.6	4.0
unknown	12.1	5.6	13.6	6.5	13.9	5.9	4.5	1.6	4.3	1.5	3.3	0.9
comp. hh.	100	46.7	100	47.6	100	42.6	100	36.3	100	34.2	100	27.4
plural**	11.5	5.4	31.4	14.9	26.9	11.5	18.2	6.6	18.1	6.2	14.9	4.1
N	1,216	2,606	1,215	2,550	2,243	5,268	2,265	6,244	1,233	3,604	669	2,445

* the dividing lines between the households are not clear in the registers of 1811.

** calculated by subtraction of the number of households with living-in members from the sum of households with relatives, servants, boarders and relationship unknown.

Source: PIGU, Results of the structure analyses.

Table 9 Minimum average numbers of family members, living-in members and the size of the households at the calculated ages of the members of the cohorts 1811/1889, with a correction for missing servants

	heads	members	nucleus	relatives	servants	boarders*	total I	total II	n**
1811									
0 year	1.96	3.13	5.09	0.40	0.67	0.07	1.14	6.23	208
10 year	1.83	3.95	5.78	0.23	0.63	0.13	0.99	6.77	104
20 year	1.71	3.77	5.48	0.41	0.91	0.15	1.47	6.95	237
40 year	1.67	2.87	4.54	0.57	0.62	0.14	1.33	5.87	189
60 year	1.60	2.58	4.18	0.36	0.14	0.08	0.58	4.77	130
80 year	1.29	1.35	2.65	0.88	0.35	1.12	2.35	5.00	17
0/80 year	1.75	3.23	4.98	0.42	0.63	0.14	1.19	6.17	885
correction					0.64		1.20	6.18	
1829									
0 year	1.86	2.94	4.80	0.69	0.68	0.18	1.55	6.35	84
10 year	1.78	4.14	5.91	0.36	0.73	0.40	1.50	7.41	94
20 year	1.72	3.66	5.39	0.14	0.49	0.20	0.82	6.21	148
40 year	1.79	2.74	4.53	0.36	0.42	0.13	0.91	5.44	66
60 year	1.50	2.50	4.00	0.19		0.19	0.38	4.38	16
80 year	1.33	0.67	2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	2.00	3
0/80 year	1.76	3.41	5.17	0.34	0.55	0.23	1.12	6.29	411
correction					0.57		1.14	6.31	
1849									
0 year	1.92	3.28	5.20	0.53	0.64	0.15	1.31	6.51	837
10 year	1.81	4.56	6.37	0.37	0.20	0.05	0.61	6.98	590
20 year	1.67	3.98	5.65	0.49	0.17	0.06	0.71	6.36	439
40 year	1.74	3.43	5.17	0.53	0.21	0.11	0.85	6.02	337
60 year	1.66	2.50	4.16	0.28	0.12	0.02	0.42	4.58	172
80 year	1.42	2.12	3.54	0.88	0.12	0.04	1.04	4.58	26
0/80 year	1.80	3.68	5.47	0.47	0.34	0.09	0.90	6.37	2,401
correction					0.38		0.94	6.41	

	heads	members	nucleus	relatives	servants	boarders*	total I	total II	n**
1869									
0 year	1.91	2.90	4.81	0.65	0.14	0.15	0.94	5.74	493
10 year	1.83	4.50	6.33	0.33	0.17	0.02	0.53	6.86	321
20 year	1.65	3.74	5.40	0.20	0.20	0.07	0.47	5.87	341
40 year	1.80	3.70	5.50	0.18		0.01	0.19	5.69	169
60 year	1.80	3.19	4.98	0.09		0.00	0.09	5.07	54
0/60 year	1.81	3.59	5.40	0.38	0.14	0.07	0.60	6.00	1,378
correction					0.25		0.70	6.11	
1889									
0 year	1.94	4.11	6.05	0.55	0.18	0.03	0.76	6.81	535
10 year	1.86	5.30	7.16	0.47	0.12	0.03	0.62	7.78	378
20 year	1.72	4.40	6.13	0.27	0.16	0.03	0.46	6.59	304
40 year	1.83	4.31	6.15	0.54	0.08	0.02	0.63	6.78	241
0/40 year	1.86	4.51	6.37	0.47	0.14	0.03	0.64	7.01	1,458
correction					0.19		0.69	7.06	
1811/1889									
0 year	1.92	3.37	5.29	0.56	0.41	0.11	1.08	6.37	2,157
10 year	1.83	4.66	6.49	0.38	0.24	0.06	0.68	7.17	1,487
20 year	1.69	3.95	5.64	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.74	6.38	1,469
40 year	1.76	3.54	5.30	0.47	0.23	0.08	0.78	6.08	1,002
60 year	1.65	2.63	4.28	0.28	0.10	0.05	0.43	4.71	372
80 year	1.37	1.74	3.11	0.83	0.20	0.44	1.46	4.57	46
0/80 year	1.80	3.77	5.57	0.44	0.31	0.09	0.83	6.40	6,533
correction					0.36		0.89	6.46	

* boarders includes relationship with the head of the family unknown.

** n = the total number of households of cohort members traced at the relative calculated age.

Source: PIGU, Results of the cohort analyses.

Table 9 provides a clear idea of the type of households the cohort members lived in. The composite character of a large proportion of the households was not dominant. The living-in percentage was 18.4 for the members of the 1811 cohort and no more than 9.8% for those of 1889. There were, on average, 1.2 and 0.7 people respectively living-in in these households, and slightly more than two in the households which had people living-in for both of these cohorts. This last figure remained steady but the total number of these households decreased. The percentages used in Table 9 for the living-in of servants and boarders have been corrected by means of a rather complicated calculation which will be justified elsewhere. Living in a nuclear or a composite family had little connection with the life cycle although there was some age-connected influence. Most of the living-in took place at the beginning and at the end of a cohort member's life (0 and 80 years). At the age of eighty the majority of these people were clearly living-in boarders or relatives.

Three-generation households were not really rare but are not of great statistical importance. The nuclear family appears to have been dominant also before the middle of the nineteenth century although some living-in of relatives or servants was normal. Parents or married children with their offspring could also have been counted as living-in relatives, depending on how the registration was made. After 1850, living-in decreased even further. The important consequence of the change to a more nuclear character of the households was that their size became increasingly dependent only on the size of the nuclear family. For the average size of households to remain at 4.75, as was the case in the region studied, the size of the family had to grow. How and why that happened will be discussed elsewhere.