Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.
DOMESTIC SERVANTS
IN DUBLIN, 1880-1920
This thesis is an investigation of the number and characteristics of servants working in Dublin, 1880 - 1920, their training, conditions of work, career pattern and their fate in sickness and old age. The cost of employing servants, the reasons for their employment, and how these might have been affected by the social class and occupation of the employer is also investigated.

The main sources used were the censuses of Ireland, 1871 - 1926, enumerators' returns for the censuses of 1911 and 1901, government reports, diaries and account books kept by mistresses and reminiscences of former servants and employers. Other sources used included advertisements in newspapers, articles in journals and magazines, biographies, autobiographies, books about domestic service and novels.

The main conclusions were:

1. Servants were employed by virtually all the upper and the majority of the middle classes. The lower middle class generally did not employ servants - those who did usually needed them to look after children, help the housewife, etc.

2. Domestic service was a major employment for women throughout the period, due mainly to the lack of alternative employment. Domestic service was important to all classes in society - the home of the upper classes was the workplace of the servant. For this reason the employing classes resisted efforts to investigate service or to legislate in favour of servants.

3. As a result, there was no recognised system of training, recruitment, conditions of work or standardised wage rates.

4. Allowing for vast variations in standards, and that some servants were undoubtedly exploited, domestic servants were better off than workers in many comparable occupations.

5. The majority of servants were women - 93 per cent in 1911 - who did not look on service as a career; they usually retired on marriage. Life for the older servant could be difficult: it was hard to find a new 'situation' after the age of 40. Providing for old age was not easy and very few employers gave pensions, bequests or made other provision for retired servants.

6. The status of domestic service was low: this and the lack of freedom which service entailed were probably the main reasons for the decline in service - certainly the availability of alternative work was not an important cause of the decline which occurred in Ireland.
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INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the period covered there was a decline in employment for men and women. This was due, in part, to the closing of certain factories, a decrease in the number of new employees, and the economic recession by the single most important factor—replacement for sickness. Of the total number of employees in the country, nearly 75 per cent of employed men in the country in the period 1851 and 1861, those for which comparable statistics are available, there was a steady decrease in the number of workers in the cooperative unions. From 20,000 in 1851 to 11,000 in 1861. The same trend in the service was observed by special advisors in the country, who noted the larger number of women with the 120,000 total being an estimate The movement towards a more equal representation of women in the service, for the first time, was observed by special advisors in the country. The first women to have special advisors were probably those who had knowledge about women's activities and responsibilities in the country. The women were those who were more closely associated with the country, and the more so because of a more equal representation of women in the country.
INTRODUCTION

One hundred years ago the domestic servant was a familiar part of everyday life in Ireland; today the servant has virtually disappeared. The prospect of 'managing' without a servant was unthinkable to middle class householders in the early 1900s; the disappearance of their main source of employment would have been equally upsetting to the servants of that time. Yet, within a couple of generations that change occurred, a change which had profound effect on the social life of the country. In this thesis, domestic service in Dublin - from 1880, when it was still strong, to 1920, when it was in decline - will be examined.

At the beginning of the period domestic service was a major employment for men and women. There had been, over the previous decades, a decrease in the number of men employed, but in 1881 it was by far the single most important source of employment for women; 48 per cent of employed women in Ireland were in the domestic class. Between 1881 and 1911, years for which comparable statistics are available, there was a steady decrease in the number of indoor servants in each successive census, 39,000 less in 1891 then ten years previously, 35,500 less in 1901 and 40,000 fewer in 1911. In that year domestic service was surpassed by manufacturing industry, but it was still the second largest employer of women with 125,788 female indoor servants. The numerical significance of domestic servants is reflected in the fact that a separate occupational class in the census was devoted to them.

The importance of domestic service as an occupation which not only affected the whole life of those engaged in it, but also impinged, in an intimate and special way, on the lives of those employing servants, has never been adequately reflected in literature, legislation, labour or social history in this country. The main reason for this neglect was probably lack of knowledge about domestic service and certainly an absence of a comprehensive view of the industry. The work place of the servant was the middle or upper class home, and the home in
Ireland and Great Britain was a private haven into which no outside interference was tolerated or indeed contemplated. In her book about women in the coalmining industry, *By the sweat of their brow*, Angela Johns stated that 'female domestic service was one form of employment which significantly was not to be probed, subjected to investigation or controlled'.

Significantly also, a bill 'to regulate the hours of work, meal times and accommodation of domestic servants and to provide for the periodical inspection of their kitchen and sleeping quarters' which was presented to parliament in 1911, never became law. In 1918, when there was widespread disquiet about the scarcity of domestic servants, the Ministry of Reconstruction in England set up a Women's Advisory Committee on the Domestic Service Problem. The committee made certain recommendations on the organisation of domestic service which were unacceptable to the Marchioness of Londonderry who found herself unable to sign the report. She said: 'I regard any possibility of the introduction into the conditions of domestic service of the type of relations now obtaining between employers and workers in industrial life as extremely undesirable and liable to react in a disastrous manner on the whole foundation of home life'.

Any account of the employment of women in the nineteenth or early twentieth centuries must afford a prominent place to domestic service. It was, in the period under review, an inevitable part of life for many thousands of girls. Leonore Davidoff has pointed out that the expected pattern of existence for middle and upper class girls was life in their father's home followed by life in their husband's home; for working class girls it was life in father's home followed by employer's home and finally husband's home. Girls went into domestic service because it was very often the only thing for them to do. It appealed to parents, especially as a career for daughters, because it offered board and lodgings as well as money wages. Domestic service was also acceptable to the ideology of the time which considered the home, albeit someone else's home, the natural place for a girl or woman: the work was what any woman would do in her own home; also, it was considered the obvious destiny for those without families of their own - those from orphanages, industrial schools and reformatories.
Taking up a 'situation' as it was called for an indoor servant was a more fundamental step than taking up a position in most other industries. It involved a complete break with home, friends and a familiar way of life; it entailed living in a dependent and subordinate position in the home of people who were not only strangers, but who were also of a different social class with different habits, values and lifestyle. Many humorous stories are told to illustrate the difficulties experienced by mistresses when untrained girls were exposed to a way of life of which they were totally ignorant. Apart from a few rare instances in literature and passing references in servants' reminiscences or mistresses' diaries, there are few accounts which highlight how harrowing and bewildering an experience this must have been for young girls. The matter was mentioned in the 1919 report already referred to. The committee and witnesses were unanimous that girls should not enter service under sixteen years of age because 'it is unsuitable for a girl to live in other people's houses, as she has not reached the age at which she is capable of readily adapting herself to new conditions'.

The employer's household embraced the servants' whole life. Total loyalty to master and mistress was expected. Apart from some limited free time, the servant was always available to see to the wants and comfort of his employer. The total control of servant by master, which was in fact reinforced by legislation, meant that the domestic servant had little discretion over the day-to-day conduct of his life. To what extent domestic servants may have adopted the outlook and values of their employers and may have become estranged from those of their own social class is a fascinating question but one which is extremely difficult to answer. It is one of the reasons sometimes advanced to explain why trade unionism failed in its efforts to attract domestic servants. The usefulness of the experience gained by domestic servants in helping them afterwards to run their own homes is often given as an advantage of domestic service. The contrary view is also expressed, namely that the style and standard of living in the employer's house made it difficult for the domestic servant to adjust to the harsh reality of a working class home and a subsistence wage.
In investigating this industry, the total number of domestic servants employed at different times, the composition of the work force and the characteristics of the workers were examined. Other factors which were investigated included: the birthplace of servants, recruitment, training, duties, wages and conditions of work, attempts to recruit servants into trade unions, and the fate of servants in illness and old age. An effort was made to assess the extent and nature of criminality among servants. Difficulties which were experienced, especially towards the end of the period, in obtaining servants and reasons for the decline of domestic service are discussed.

Census returns for the years 1881 to 1926 give the total numbers of servants employed in Ireland, in the different counties and urban areas; they give information on the sex, age group, literacy and religious persuasion of servants. They give no information, however, on the employer or his family, the number of servants employed in different households, their duties, marital status, whether they were local or working a distance from home. To answer these and other questions the enumerators' returns for the 1911 census were used. These offer a unique opportunity to study household composition in Ireland and to relate servants and their known characteristics to the status, occupation and religious affiliations of employers and the possible needs of their households. Enumerators' returns for Dublin were used; in addition to the main sample of approximately 800 houses, a sample of 50 houses, whose owners were prominent in the professional and political life of the city, was selected. Also, a sample of 60 enumerators' returns for country houses throughout Ireland was chosen as a basis of comparison between the life of a general servant in a middle class Dublin home and that of a member of a large staff in a 'big house'. Only a minority of servants in Ireland worked in country houses, yet this world has shaped our image of life 'downstairs'. The reality for the vast majority of servants was very different. Country houses, however, provided the model for the staffing of much more humble homes. The dress, duties, conditions of service and treatment of servants in these houses were adapted by
the middle classes to suit their own more modest households, and elements were clearly discernible even in the one-servant home. Country houses provided an opportunity to study the division of household labour and, of course, the domestic hierarchical system was seen at its most elaborate in these houses. They also provided an opportunity to study male servants, who were employed, almost exclusively, in this type of household.

In selecting the 1911 households an effort was made to get a representative sample of households of different socio-economic classes, so that differences, if any, between social classes regarding the employment of servants, or any of the factors already mentioned could be detected. The number of servants employed in households of different rateable valuation, in households of prominent citizens and in country houses in 1911 was obtained; the number of servants employed by people in different social classes and occupations was examined. The minimum salary required before a servant could be afforded was investigated. An effort was made to determine if the number of servants kept was related to the needs of the household in terms of number of children, number in household, keeping of boarders, and if this varied according to socio-economic class. Religious affiliation of servants was compared to that of their employers to see if religion was an important factor when selecting a servant.

Even though domestic service was a relatively neglected employment, there were a number of royal commissions on the subject during the period in question. For reasons already mentioned, there was a reluctance to legislate in this area; however, there were a number of bills which affected domestic servants either directly or indirectly. In literature servants are usually portrayed as anonymous, and shadowy figures, adjuncts to comfortable and gracious living. This is probably how they were seen by many, and how employers would have had them seen. Some novels have been written about servants, and some books written by servants themselves, and these give an insight into the lives of servants, their hopes, their fears and their problems.
Diaries, usually written by the mistresses of large houses, and household accounts, give valuable information on wages, length of service and conditions of service. Articles in journals and newspapers highlight the important issues regarding servants during the period, though they were usually written by the employing class. In order to get the servants' perspective a number of people who were in service towards the end of the period or during the following ten years were interviewed or wrote an account of their experiences. A number of former employers were also in communication with the author. In order to preserve confidentiality, names of servants and employers have not been divulged. Only their general location, and the date of the communication are given. An interest in domestic service has been shown recently by social historians, and a number of books on the subject have been written by writers in England, the United States and France. Domestic service was no less important in Ireland at that time and therefore deserves investigation.
CHAPTER 1

THE EMPLOYERS

The vast majority of employment in Ireland, however, was very different from the kind with their lower status and limited standard of living. Just over half the people in the rural areas from the large landlord's estates lived with the family in two rooms. In 1870, a man of 42 years old and a woman of 34 years old and their five children would not earn enough money to live. Their income was £3 a year. They were dependent on the fact that their two sons and three daughters all went to work. They were also the breadwinners of the family. The children were employed by the employer was very common. In 1870, a man named McConnell, the seventh Earl of Gower, owned 500 tenants in Dublin, and they were employed by the landlord to live and work on the land. On the other hand, many of the tenants of the large landlord were servants. There were no servants in Coole's castle in 1870 as there are today. It is said that there were none in Ireland.

The vast majority of employment in Ireland, however, was very different from the kind with their lower status and limited standard of living. Just over half the people in the rural areas from the large landlord's estates lived with the family in two rooms. In 1870, a man of 42 years old and a woman of 34 years old and their five children would not earn enough money to live. Their income was £3 a year. They were dependent on the fact that their two sons and three daughters all went to work. They were also the breadwinners of the family. The children were employed by the employer was very common. In 1870, a man named McConnell, the seventh Earl of Gower, owned 500 tenants in Dublin, and they were employed by the landlord to live and work on the land. On the other hand, many of the tenants of the large landlord were servants. There were no servants in Coole's castle in 1870 as there are today. It is said that there were none in Ireland.
CHAPTER 1

THE EMPLOYERS

The largest number of domestic servants in the country was employed by Lord Aberdeen, the lord lieutenant of Ireland. In 1911 he had fifty, not all of whom lived in the Viceregal Lodge. The staff consisted of a butler, under-butler, seven footmen, two platemaid, a hall porter, house porter and hallboy, two housekeepers, eight housemaids, a chef and five kitchen maids, two stillroom maids, three laundrymaids, two coachmen, one chauffeur and seven grooms. There were also five personal servants - two ladies' maids and three valets. The staff was organised into different departments with a senior servant, such as the butler, housekeeper, chef, head coachman in charge of each. Compared to this, the number of servants employed by the gentry was very modest. In 1911, William Randal McDonnell, the seventh Earl of Antrim, employed fourteen servants in Glenarm, and this was average for the larger country houses in Ireland. As the family was adult, the two or three servants usually employed in such houses to look after the children were missing. On the other hand, many of the homes of the gentry had much fewer servants. There were six servants in Castle Leslie in 1911 to look after Sir Shane and his two adult sons.

The vast majority of employers in Ireland, however, were very different from the gentry with their large staffs and lavish standard of living. Just over three miles, as the crow flies, from the lord lieutenant's stately residence, there was a small house, 157 St. Helen's Terrace, Clonliffe Road, in which a G.P.O. sorting clerk lived with his wife and two sons. In 1911, C.L. Doyle was 48 years old and earned approximately £146 a year. He and his wife kept a boarder and employed one young girl aged 18 from Co. Meath as a general servant. Mr Doyle was lucky as most of his neighbours could not afford a servant and probably it was the income from the boarder which allowed the Doyles to keep a servant. Ten doors away, at number 167, James Blake, who was also a sorting clerk earning a
similar salary, had no servant. He had a family of eight children and obviously could not afford to employ a servant. The majority of servants worked in homes where only one servant was kept; about 80 per cent (9,800) of the 12,322 servants in Dublin city were probably employed as general servants (p. 20). C.L. Doyle was typical of thousands of employers in Ireland in 1911.

Most employers were protestants. While only a quarter of the general population was protestant, almost two thirds of those who employed servants in the Dublin houses in 1911 were protestants. Most heads of household were, of course, male, but the sex of the head did not seem to affect the employment of servants.

A minimum salary of about £150 a year was required to afford a servant (see below, p. 93). In 1912 a select committee of the house of commons investigated the wages and conditions of employment of post office clerks in Ireland. The clerks earned £104 - £114 a year and were presumed, by the committee, to have 'a moderate standard of living'. The annual cost for rent, food and fuel for a clerk's family in an Irish provincial town was reckoned to be £103.10.0 - £108.10.0. This did not allow, as was pointed out, for the education of children. The employment of a servant was not even mentioned by those advocating higher wages. It was apparently taken for granted that this was not an expense incurred by those earning £100 - £120 a year. When it is considered that keeping a servant cost at least £25 a year (see below, p. 94), it is evident that an income of £140 - £150 a year was necessary before a family could afford a servant. This remained sufficient at least up to 1914.

The income of only six of the lower middle class employers in Dublin in 1911 was known. Five (two carpenters, a retired Dublin Metropolitan Police inspector and two post office clerks) had annual incomes of £100 to £146. The carpenters had other wage earners in the household and the clerks kept boarders. The police inspector had a pension of only £106 but his salary had been £160 and his
standard of living established at that stage of his career. The sixth employer described himself as a butler/valet and it is difficult to see how he could have afforded a servant. Sixteen other lower class householders with known incomes of between £100 - £250 and similar opportunities of financial help from other members of the family or earnings from boarders did not have a servant. Only 11 per cent of skilled men had a servant. The basic wage of a skilled man, of about £100, was not sufficient to employ a servant but many probably had opportunities of earning extra money or getting help from the family. Thus while £140 - £150 per annum was required before a servant could be employed, many with that income and indeed higher incomes, did not keep a servant. Less than a quarter of the lower class had servants though probably a much higher percentage could have afforded one (see below, p. 10). On the other hand, some of the middle classes did not keep servants because they could not afford them. In 1914 male secondary teachers earned £140 a year and female teachers £90. National teachers earned much less. Only five of the sixteen teachers in the Dublin houses of 1911 had a servant. A certain income was necessary before a servant could be employed but, if this income was available, the middle class was more likely to have a servant than the lower middle class. Of course some people with very low incomes hired a young girl at a small wage, and made savings by reducing the quantity and quality of the food supplied. Violet M. Firth in The psychology of the servant problem suggested that a prime cause of servant trouble was the less well-off keeping servants who were underpaid and badly housed and fed.

The keeping of servants was determined, to a large extent, by social class. Upper class and most middle class families had servants: the style of living of these classes in this period was such that the employment of servants was seen as a necessary requirement. An article in The Irish Homestead in 1915 discussed the responsibilities of a middle class man earning £400 a year. These were seen as:

- obligation to live in a better house, provide domestic help, clothe wife and children, as well as the wage earner himself according to the standard of his social
Wives and daughters of the better off members of society were not expected to do their own housekeeping, and one of the skills a young wife was expected to acquire was the ability to 'manage' servants.

In the Dublin houses in 1911, 98 per cent of the upper class had servants, most of the middle class (71 per cent) and 23 per cent of the lower middle class. The two lowest classes, the semi-skilled and the unskilled, did not generally keep servants.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>number of servants employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower middle</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected the higher the social class the more servants employed (Table 1). Some of the higher professional class, living for example in Merrion and Fitzwilliam Squares, had large staffs of six or seven servants. Mr Justice John Ross, then a high court judge, who lived with his wife and grown-up daughter at 66 Fitzwilliam Square in 1911, had six servants: a butler, footman, cook, two housemaids and a chauffeur. Sir Charles Cameron, who in 1911 was medical superintendent officer of health and held other public health positions for which he was paid £1000 a year, lived at 51 Pembroke Road, and employed four servants.

The position and salary of the head of household - which determined social class and style of living - influenced the employment
of servants much more than total family income.\(^{15}\) The middle and upper classes lived in larger houses and this of course increased their need for servants. Houses in 1911 were often poorly planned and were usually devoid of labour-saving appliances. The style of living of the upper classes was elaborate and friends were entertained lavishly: this standard of living depended on the availability of servants.

It was found that lower and middle class households with large families in Dublin in 1911 were less likely to have servants than those with small families. This was consistent with the findings of a government report in 1899 on the wages of domestic servants: 'the larger the family, the less can the head afford to pay until some of the younger members become self-supporting'.\(^{16}\) Charles Booth also found that less affluent homes with few members were more likely to have servants than larger households.\(^{17}\) In upper class homes the number in the family did not, of course, affect either the employment of servants or the number of servants employed.\(^{18}\)

There was evidence that earnings from boarders may have enabled some of the lower middle class to employ a servant. On the other hand, those who lived in medium-sized houses, generally the middle class, and had boarders, were less likely to have servants.\(^{19}\) This seems to indicate that the middle class people who kept boarders were the less well off who were also less able to afford servants. Where a large number of boarders were kept, 5 - 8, a servant or another adult female relative was normally present; these householders, invariably women, usually described themselves as 'boarding house keepers' and obviously depended for their living on boarders.

There was a large number of dependent women, other than wives - those over fifteen years of age who were not in school or employment - in the Dublin houses in 1911. The number of houses with dependent women increased, as the size of house increased, from 22 per cent of small houses to 38 per cent of medium and 50 per cent of large houses. The more prosperous households were
better able to support dependent women, and, of course, were better able to accommodate them. Lower and middle class families with dependent women were less likely to employ servants than those in which the wife had to do all the housework. The presence of dependent women in upper class homes did not affect the employment of servants at all. Bachelors and widowers belonging to the lower and middle classes who had a woman relative living with them did not generally employ a servant. Those belonging to the upper class were more likely than married men or women to employ a servant, even though they had female relatives who could, presumably, have done the housekeeping.

The presence of children influenced the keeping of servants by all social classes. Members of the lower class were more likely to have a servant if they had a young family - the number having a servant at all was, of course, low. The difference was more noticeable for the middle class. Upper class homes with children had a slightly higher average number of servants than those without, and a high proportion - over one third - of specialist servants, nurses and nursemaids. The needs of the less wealthy were met by the employment of a general servant who was expected to help with the children or free mothers to mind the children. The important influence which children obviously had on the employment of servants was reflected in the high proportion of advertisements for servants or by servants specialising in caring for children or required or willing to help in their care.

While the upper and most of the middle class may have employed servants because this was considered a requirement of their station in life, the employment of a servant by the lower and some of the middle classes was in response to a specific need - such as help with children. The findings also show that upper class women were not expected to play an important part in the work of the house, whereas women were expected to have a much more active role in less prosperous households. Indeed all the family was expected to help if the household was large.
As with any other possession, servants were often used for the ostentatious display of wealth and standing: more servants than were needed were employed, men were engaged rather than women, foreign servants were hired: in earlier times, male servants were dressed in elaborate and colourful liveries. Elizabeth Smith, who lived in Wicklow in the middle of the nineteenth century, when deciding which luxuries she could do without, said: 'upper servants, fancied wants, indolent habits, can all be dispensed with and no great happiness sacrificed'. Most employers, however, regarded servants not as a luxury or a status symbol, but as essential for their comfort and the proper organisation of their homes. Even when servants posed problems for employers, or when they became difficult to obtain, the possibility of doing without servants was rarely entertained.

When servants in Dublin houses were compared with those working in country houses, it was found that the former were older and included more male and female married servants. This was a surprising finding (see below, p. 33) and one which was worth further investigation. The gentry in Ireland spent a lot of time out of the country, as Anita Leslie said when she mentioned that the Leslies went away three times a year - after the union they, 'like the rest of the country gentry took their social life in London'. Household account books kept by Lady Clonbrock record the frequent visits to London by that family. Lady Charlotte Elizabeth Stopford of Courtown, Co. Wexford, mentioned numerous visits to Windsor in her diary. Lady Fingall tells us that many owners never saw their country houses at their loveliest time, the spring. They were, of course, in London for 'the season'. This social event was recalled by former servants who described their annual sojourn in the capital and also visits to other parts of England during the summer. The amount of time that the gentry appeared to spend away from home was a striking feature of life in country houses in Ireland. David Thompson first saw Woodbrook when he arrived from London with Mrs Kirkwood and her two children to act as tutor. He remarked that the hall was dark and unlived-in, as indeed it was, because the family, with the exception of Major Kirkwood, had been away for six months.
Many of the great houses of Ireland must have had this unlived-in air for long periods each year. This pattern of living of many of the gentry would appear to have affected the employment of servants. It probably contributed to the recruitment of a large number of British servants in these houses (see below, p. 28). The constant travelling back and forth, while undoubtedly enjoyed by some servants, would appear to have had an unsettling effect on others; this is shown by the comparatively high turnover of servants in Irish country houses (see below, pp 124-5). Life for servants left behind must have been dull and lonely.

The nobility and gentry, unlike the middle classes, normally had very little personal contact with the majority of their servants. Young servants were responsible to upper servants, whom they regarded as their real masters, and often they were very hard task masters. Communication with employers was usually through an upper servant. The layout and organisation of castles and country houses were designed to separate, as far as possible, the employers from their servants. The baize door, which separated the front or main part of the house from the servants' quarters, was symbolic of this division. Most staff only used the back staircase and back entrance so that they would not encounter the family or their friends. Main rooms were cleaned in the early morning, bedrooms later in the day. Kitchen staff very often never saw the drawing room, dining room, other formal rooms or family bedrooms. Employers rarely visited the kitchen or other servant quarters. A former servant in Dunsany Castle, Co. Meath, remembered Lord Dunsany's only appearance in the kitchen, which was almost as momentous as the event he came to announce - the outbreak of war between Germany and Britain on 3 September, 1939. 31

In Rockingham, Co. Roscommon, the home of the King-Harman family, the servants lived in what David Thompson described in Woodbrook as 'a dungeon specially made for them'. He went on to say that it was not any worse than the attics and basements occupied by London servants. 32 However it was literally underground, and it meant that all the usual out- offices were out of sight: goods were delivered by means of an underground passage and servants came and went through another dark tunnel. According to Thompson 'it shows how the landowners
wished to keep apart from the people who served them'. At Baronscourt, the Duke of Abercorn provided quite comfortable quarters for his servants but he had them specially built so that they were not in view from the main house.

The Aberdeens made an effort to break down the barriers which existed between employees and employers. They founded a club to provide recreational and educational facilities for servants. This and other philanthropic actions led to rumours that servants in the Aberdeens' homes were behaving in most unconventional ways. One such rumour stated that visitors at the Viceregal Lodge in Dublin were liable to be escorted into dinner by the butler or housekeeper, rather than by members of their own social class. These stories, which persisted over a number of years, were investigated by Queen Victoria and later by King Edward VII, and proved unfounded. The royal curiosity shows the importance attached to the manner in which the household of the sovereign's representative was run. The story also shows that the attempts made by the Aberdeens to take a more personal interest in their servants must have been quite unusual, obviously misunderstood and possibly considered dangerous.

In the homes of the majority of the people, employers and servants were of course in close contact with one another. This proximity generally did little to break down barriers between the two classes. Whilst a good friendly relationship existed between many mistresses and their servants, employers regarded servants as a class with a certain amount of suspicion and distrust. When seeking servants they tended to stress desirable personal qualities rather than ability to do the job efficiently. They sought 'respectable', 'trustworthy' or 'superior' persons. An advertisement in the Irish Times in 1908 required a 'superior Protestant boy with a widowed mother' and offered wages of 10/- a week, a house and milk. This shows the extent to which an employer specified the type of person required and the desired family background. 'Smart', 'clean', 'good' and 'steady' were other adjectives frequently used. Employers also looked for
'sober' and 'abstemious' persons. An advertisement in the Irish Times in 1907 specified a 'clean respectful' girl. Employers often sought 'humble' servants: 'a strong humble girl' was required by two mistresses in the Daily Nation on 3 July 1892. A general servant was sought in the Freeman's Journal in 1892 who was 'strong, middle aged, humble and civil'. A preference was often expressed for country girls - possibly because they were considered easier to manage. In regarding servants as inferiors and in seeking ways to maintain the distance between the two social classes, employers were merely reflecting the views and attitudes of society. When it became known in 1910, on the publication of his will, that A.J. Munby, a barrister, had married his servant in 1873, it 'caused a sensation in England and was reported in every newspaper'. Derek Hudson, Munby's biographer described Munby as a man 'ahead of his time in crossing the barriers of sex discrimination and class distinction'. Yet it is clear from Munby's diaries that this 'enlightened' man was painfully conscious of the social gap which existed between employer and servant. He felt that Hannah, his servant, and himself should not be seen together; he described returning home with her: 'she would not take my arm for it was still daylight and many people were about - but walked apart till we got down into the empty streets ... When visiting the Haymarket Theatre with Hannah he looked over the rails of the gallery at 'my equals in the stalls and boxes', and described his discomfiture sitting 'among the "roughs" by the side of a maid of all work'. He decided: 'I love her, then, because she is not like her own class after all, but like mine'. In her journal Elizabeth Smith makes no secret of the contempt she had for her servants; their indolence, carelessness and disorderliness are recurrent themes throughout the book. She said: 'one can't expect better from creatures so badly brought up'.

In the 1870s a lady in Wales called Rose Mary Crawshay started an experiment in which she trained higher class women as upper servants. The idea of ladies becoming servants appalled many people. They said they could not bear to employ these ladies because it would hurt their own feelings to see them in such positions, a view which was
commended by Mrs Crawshay. It is quite clear that this plan was not motivated by democratic ideals. Mrs Crawshay simply felt that ladies were so superior to servants that they could do the job much more efficiently: 'owing to their superior intelligence, ladies "get through" work much faster than ordinary servants: and, owing to the delicacy and refinement of ladies, they make none of the "dirt" servants are so famed for producing. There is much less wear and tear of carpets and floorcloths by the feet of young ladies, as compared with those of ordinary housemaids'. She also made it quite clear that her gentlewomen were to be employed only as upper servants, and all the dirtier and rougher work must be done by an 'ordinary servant'. Mrs Crawshay's and other similar experiments sought to emphasise the nobleness of certain household tasks, they did nothing to raise the status of those who normally performed the household chores.

In 1920, an Irish magazine, The Lady of the House, discussed the desirability of having a more democratic relationship between mistress and maid. There were many letters from readers objecting to the idea: 'even the most advanced Republican believes in the monarchy of home and firmly grasps her throne as reigning queen'; and again: 'but the good old title, "mistress of the home" with all that it stands for and has stood for for generations, must be left with us'.

A number of former servants complained about the attitude of employers; one said: 'generally we were looked down on'. This opinion was substantiated by former mistresses who agreed that people held servants in low esteem. A servant said that her master would never let 'the likes of her' into his car, in later life he became crippled and was glad to have her to help him in and out of the car and travel with him. A servant who enjoyed her work said she was employed by an American whose son asked her one day to make up a foursome at tennis. She was very impressed by 'the likes of her playing tennis'. On the other hand, many former servants enjoyed their work and did not mention their lowly status, because they accepted it as normal.
The way in which employers treated their servants and the lowly status of service certainly contributed to what became known as the 'servant problem'. Employers considered servants as inferiors and by various means made this difference clear. Servants were expected to be as unobtrusive as possible, to speak when spoken to, to remain standing in the presence of their employers. They walked behind their mistress when out, they ate in a different room, used a back stairs and entered and left the house by the tradesmen's entrance. Servants wore uniform, not just as a protection when working, but also as a means of distinguishing them and their particular positions on the staff. In later times, much of the servants' resentment about the way in which they were treated by employers was symbolised by the wearing of uniform.
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The majority of servants were young single women working in houses where only one servant was employed. They were usually called general servants - during the 1880s the name 'thorough servants' was used. These young women were responsible, with the help of the housewife, for all the work of the house. Kate Ivory was a general servant in 1911 working at 89 Grosvenor Square, Rathmines for Mr Henry Kelly and his wife. Kelly was a commercial clerk working in a brass foundry, and in 1911 he had one six-year-old child; he and his wife kept a boarder. Kate was twenty nine years old, single, and born in Co. Wexford. She was a catholic working in a protestant household. No. 89 was a two-storey red brick house, with the usual hall, sitting room, dining room and, extending away to the back, a gloomy kitchen, scullery and pantry where Kate spent most of her working life and indeed nearly all her evenings. Across the square, Ellen McQuillan, a twenty-five-year-old single catholic from Co. Fermanagh, worked for an older couple, Mr and Mrs. Robert Daly, who lived with their three teenage children at 54 Grosvenor Square. Robert Daly, a member of the Church of Ireland, was a civil servant in the telegraph department of the G.P.O. No. 54 was larger than 89, with twelve granite steps leading to the front door. There was a door under these steps into the kitchen premises. This was the entrance used by Ellen, and the one to which the delivery men came. Ellen had to climb the stairs each time the front door bell rang, and she had to carry all the meals up the stairs to the dining room on the first floor. These two young women, with, no doubt, some help from their mistresses, had to clean the houses including scrubbing the twelve steps, flagged or tiled kitchen floors and back passages. They had to light ranges and fires, carry hot water upstairs, empty slops, mind children, cook and serve meals. Kate had to attend to the needs of a boarder as well as the family. Kate and Ellen had much in common and probably were typical of many other young women who worked alone in similar houses, in similar squares and streets in the city.
Probably about 80 per cent of the 12,322 indoor servants employed in Dublin in 1911 were working in one-servant households. In the Dublin survey, in which the suburbs and the servant-keeping classes were over-represented and very low rateable valuation houses, which might have had a maid, were omitted, 63 per cent of employers had only one servant. It is not unreasonable to expect that the percentage for the whole city was considerably higher.

The general servant was the only one for whom Mrs Beeton had any sympathy, describing her life as 'solitary', and her work as 'never done'. She had to do all the work which in larger establishments was undertaken by a number of servants. 'Her mistress's commands are the measure of the maid-of-all-work's duties'. Patricia Branca blamed the hard household work required at that time for much of the tension in middle class homes: '. . . the amount of daily menial labour involved in keeping the middle class home was overwhelming, and physically exhausting for only two women, especially a home that had the care of at least three children which was the norm by the end of the century'. Many Irish homes had more than three children; for example, Mr and Mrs John Kenny, who lived at 3 Triery's Terrace, St Patrick's Road, Drumcondra, in 1911, had four young children aged from 6 years to 3 weeks, and one 17 year old girl to mind them and tend to the household chores.

When only one servant was employed she was expected to do all the work of the household no matter what her title - thus cooks, nurses or housekeepers, a title often given to the servant in a widower's or bachelor's home, had to help with the general work. Advertisements from mistresses show that they required servants who were flexible and willing to undertake duties not directly related to the job title. In the 1911 Dublin households, 60 per cent of women in one-servant households were called 'general servants', 30 per cent were given no specific title and 10 per cent were cooks, nurses, etc.

In two-servant households the most common servant employed was a cook; the second servant, whose function it was to look after the
cleaning of the house, was usually called a general servant, housemaid, house/parlour, parlourmaid or was given no specific title. This was the beginning of specialisation in the service hierarchy. In the 1911 Dublin houses there was a large number of cooks but only enough to supply about two thirds of the two-servant households. Presumably many housewives did the cooking themselves. A number of houses had a general servant and a nurse for the children. In this type of household the employment of a second servant was only temporary and as soon as the children became older only one servant was employed.

'With three servants - cook, parlourmaid and housemaid - a household is complete in all its functions. All else is only a development of this theme'. This was said by Charles Booth. He added that in larger households, the cook had an assistant, a kitchen maid or perhaps a second assistant, a scullery maid; the parlourmaid's duties were taken over by the butler, and the housemaid had the assistance of other housemaids who might be called upper and lower housemaids. A nurse for the children might have got help from an under-nurse and nursemaids. Valets and ladies' maids were only found in wealthy households. The staff structure in houses with three or more servants in Dublin seemed to have followed this pattern. As the number of servants increased there was a reduction in general servants and 'non-specific' servants. The usual three servants employed were a cook, parlourmaid and housemaid. In almost one third of three-servant houses one servant was a children's nurse.

Mrs Beeton thought that three- and four-servant households usually had a man or boy on the staff. This was definitely not true of the Dublin households. Even though the number of male indoor servants dropped from 13,193 in 1891 to 9,542 in 1911 - on a national basis this was not a large number - it does not seem likely to have been correct in Ireland even when Mrs Beeton was writing in 1892. The four servants who worked for Mr Francis Longworth Darnes, a stockbroker, at 41 Upper Mount Street in 1911 were a typical staff in an upper class household, consisting of a forty-year-old female cook, parlourmaid and housemaid, both in their mid-twenties, and a thirty-four-year-old nurse to look after two young children.
There were only 66 male servants out of the total of 1040 servants in the Dublin houses. This was close to the percentage for the whole country in the 1911 census - 93 per cent of servants were women and only 7 per cent men. Five of the male servants were grooms, 4 were gardeners and 22 were coachmen and chauffeurs. There were only 35 indoor servants, 18 of whom were butlers and 9 footmen; a footman was sometimes employed instead of a butler. There was only one valet and he worked in a ten-servant household. Butlers and footmen sometimes assumed the duties of a valet. A 'general man' was employed in two houses where a small staff was kept. Men were more likely to be employed in households with a comparatively large staff of six or more servants.

There was of course a vast amount of work involved in the running of a country house in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Lady Fingall described the lighting and heating of Killeen, in Co. Meath: 'The house was difficult of course to light and heat in those days, when we had only oil lamps and candles. There were two boys to do the lamps and keep the fires of wood and turf going, and carry enormous cans of hot water for baths. I believe it took nearly a hundred lamps to light the house, and even then there were many dim corners'. She added that it took fourteen candles to light a large bedroom, six on the dressing table alone. Someone had a special duty of going around to put out all the candles when the family and guests had gone down to dinner. In addition to the numerous and essential tasks that had to be done in the country houses, chores were devised which today seem quite ridiculous: newspapers were ironed before they were presented to the master. Frank E. Huggett told of a footman who had to scrub small silver coins to make sure they 'were unaffected by any previous handling of tradesmen'.

Most of the gentry led an active social life and their servants, compared with servants in middle and lower class houses, had an interesting and varied existence. The gentry visited one another frequently and organised shooting parties and week-end parties on their own estates. Lady Fingall mentioned visiting many famous houses such
as Carton, Mount Stewart, Adare and Rockingham. Some of these visits lasted a week and Lady Fingall recalled changing her dress as often as five times in the day, for riding, playing croquet and tennis, for shooting, tea and dinner. 'Our frocks were voluminous and our luggage, of course, absurd'. It was not surprising that ladies' maids always accompanied their mistresses on these occasions. Male guests sometimes brought their valets, and for shooting parties they brought a loader. Life 'downstairs' was enlivened by these visiting servants.

The gentry went to Dublin for the main Irish social events of the year. The Dublin season lasted from after Christmas until St. Patrick's Day. Lady Fingall described the grandeur of a state dinner in Dublin Castle during the vice royalty of Lord Spencer with the footmen wearing powdered wigs and scarlet and gold livery. The 'season' in Dublin aped the London season with its balls, parties, entertainments and hunts. At the centre of this social activity was the castle where Lady Fingall said: 'we were almost as magnificent as Buckingham Palace with our toy Court'. Sir John Ross, the last Lord Chancellor of Ireland, also spoke of the social life in Ireland: 'There was always plenty of social intercourse and lavish entertaining. Dublin, down to the time of the Great War was famous for its dinners. In private houses as many as eighteen courses would be served and the wine was abundant and excellent in quality. The public banquets were simply portentous and the courses were still more numerous'. He also mentioned the 'boundless hospitality at the Castle' during the season, and the large house parties in the neighbourhood of Punchestown during the races.

As has already been seen, owners of country houses in Ireland spent much of their time away from home, usually in London. Ladies' maids, children's servants and valets, accompanied the family on their frequent travels and stayed with them in their London homes. Many other members of staff, especially the more senior members, usually moved to London also and a skeleton staff was left in Ireland. It was very quiet for the servants left behind; the time was usually
utilised in spring cleaning. The servants may have enjoyed the freedom from the regular routine; meals were cooked by one of the staff using board wages to buy the food required.

The staff in country houses was divided into the three main departments: kitchen, hall and dining room and house; the number employed in each varied considerably. In 1911 the Hon. Robert Edward Dillon of Clonbrock, who was unmarried, had ten servants: three in the kitchen, cook, kitchen maid, scullerymaid; three in the hall, butler, footman and hallboy; a head housemaid and two assistant housemaids; he also had a valet. The earl of Antrim had 14 servants: butler, 2 footmen, housekeeper and 3 housemaids, cook, kitchen maid, scullerymaid, 2 laundriymaid, dairymaid, and one personal servant - a lady's maid. Apart from the larger staffs found in most country houses in 1911, the main difference between them and the homes of the middle classes was the much higher proportion of male servants employed in the country houses. This varied from 24 per cent in those having 3 - 10 servants to 28 per cent in houses having 11 - 19 staff. There were few coachmen, chauffeurs, grooms or gardeners listed in enumerators' returns. These servants usually lived in houses on the estate and were not included in the household returns of the employer. If they had been included the proportion of men employed in country houses would have been greater.

Details of servants employed in these houses are given in appendix A, table 33. Where members of the family were away, some senior members of staff were also missing. This may help to explain a shortage in some key members of staff.

Male servants were few in number and were employed almost entirely in upper class homes. In 1911 there were only 711 indoor men servants in Dublin city and 618 in the county - approximately 5½ per cent of all servants. It was more expensive to employ men, for their wages were generally higher and they ate more. When Elizabeth Smith decided to economise she declared: 'we have resolved to do without a man servant'. The cost of male servants was increased by a tax on them which was introduced by Lord North in 1777 to help to pay for the American War. It was
one guinea a year for each servant at the beginning but it was gradually increased, and a sliding scale used whereby a higher tax was paid on a second or subsequent male servant. In 1799 the tax on 21 male servants in Castletown House was £23.17.9. In 1786 a duty on hair powder affected those whose servants wore powdered wigs. An attempt was made to tax female servants but this caused such an outcry that it was abolished. The tax on male servants was reduced substantially during the nineteenth century but it was still a disincentive to the employment of men. It was only finally abolished in Great Britain in 1937.

Men servants were not as adaptable as women. As they were usually employed in houses where a number of staff was kept, they tended to have specialised functions. They may also have been less amenable than women to standing in for fellow servants or doing chores which they considered not part of their normal duties. Charles Booth certainly thought so; he maintained that it was want of adaptability on the part of men rather than high wages which led to the gradual disappearance of male servants from all but the most wealthy households.

Many of the positions held by men were at the top of the domestic hierarchy - house steward, butler, valet. Lady Fingall said of house stewards: 'kings of their own kingdom. The affairs and management of a great house lay on their shoulders - a world, a little State of its own'. Charles Booth considered that: 'as a class, male servants are not overworked', and thought that as a result of this they often turned to drink and gambling. Some servants, especially butlers, who had responsibility for the control of spirits, wine and beer, often did drink too much. Men also created problems for employers by flirting with the female servants; they were also more difficult to discipline.

Of course the reduction in male servants was not due only to employers' decisions to hire women rather than men. When domestic service began to lose its attraction men were the first to move into other employment. It was easier for them as men always had a greater choice of work than women. The specialised functions that male servants
usually performed prepared them for other occupations; a groom could become a public coachman, a butler or footman could become a barman, or run his own public house. The fact that they were used to taking responsibility made the transition from one occupation to another easier. Many men took jobs as outdoor servants - gardeners, grooms and coachmen. The residential indoor and non-residential outdoor service followed an almost complete female/male split. 38

Margaret Powell maintained that a man who spent his whole life in domestic service was quite different from other men: 'I wouldn't like to say they were effeminate but they have a much quieter, gentler way of talking and they're nicer in their appearance and the way they do things. And I'm not using the word nice as a compliment here'. 39 Elizabeth, countess of Fingall, also suggested that service had a profound effect on a servant: 'he was a perfect butler, courteous and interested in everyone, but so perfect that he had ceased to have any identity or mind of his own'. 40 It is likely that service made individuals, men and women, more polite, more docile, more subservient; many might argue that these were necessary qualities for the good servant. It is interesting that in the case of female servants these traits were not considered remarkable.

It is obvious that disputes about servants' duties were common. Employers' efforts to list chores when advertising for servants is an indication of this difficulty. Washing was frequently mentioned as part of a servant's responsibilities; 'managing servants', minding children, sewing, waiting at table, helping in the dairy or with fowl were all duties which it was often considered necessary to mention specifically. The frequency with which 'working housekeepers' were sought shows that employers and servants had very different ideas about that position. The difficulties usually arose because the contract between mistress and servant was a verbal one and details about duties and free time were not always made sufficiently clear. Mrs Beeton warned:

We would here point out an error and a grave one it is - into which some mistresses fall. They do not when engaging a servant, expressly tell her all the duties
which she will be expected to perform. . . Every portion of work which the maid will have to do should be plainly stated by the mistress, and understood by the servant. If this plan is not carefully adhered to, an unseemly contention is almost certain to ensue, and this may not be easily settled.  

Ellen W. Darwin in an article in The Nineteenth Century, spoke of servants undertaking 'to do a certain amount of badly-defined work'. It was not only in two- and three-servant households that difficulties arose, there were also problems among staff in country houses. Frank E. Huggett maintained that: 'Demarcation disputes were so common downstairs that, in comparison, a modern manufacturing plant appears to be a haven of industrial peace'.  

Newspaper advertisements for servants give some indication of characteristics and attributes considered important by employers. A study of the enumerators' returns for the 1911 census gave additional valuable information. This showed that servants' religion was important to many employers. It was found that catholic employers tended to recruit only catholic servants. One third of the servants employed by protestants were members of their own church. It must be remembered that whereas the recruitment of catholic staff was easy - after all, 80 per cent of the general population in Dublin city were catholics - the recruitment of protestant staff was consequently much more difficult.  

In the selection of personal servants - nurses, nursemaids, ladies' maids and companions - employers showed a definite preference for members of their own church. As a protestant employer said, she was happy to employ catholic servants but liked a protestant nurse who could tell bible stories to the children when putting them to bed. It would seem that the employment of protestant servants was not related only to a preference for a particular religion but also to the number of servants and the employment of specialist servants. Approximately 66 per cent of prominent citizens and employers in large and medium houses were protestants, but those in the larger houses with the bigger staff, had a significantly higher proportion of protestant
servants. This is reinforced by the fact that a much higher proportion of male servants - who were employed almost exclusively as specialist servants - than female were protestants.

The gentry in the 1911 households, 93 per cent of whom were protestant and 7 per cent catholic, also showed a preference for their co-religionists. Protestants accounted for 68 per cent of servants in country houses. A very high proportion of them, 44 per cent, were born in Great Britain. It was found that British-born employers, one third of the gentry in these houses, tended to employ British servants, who were, of course, usually protestants. British-born employers had an average of seven British servants as compared with 2.5 for Irish-born employers.

When the specific positions and religion of servants were compared it was found, as in the Dublin houses, that employers favoured their co-religionists as personal servants. Protestants were favoured for the more responsible positions, stewards, housekeepers and almost 90 per cent of butlers and footmen were protestants. Three quarters of all cooks, housemaids, parlourmaids and hall boys were protestants. Catholic employees only equalled, or almost equalled, protestant servants in the lower status positions as kitchen, scullery, laundry and dairy maids and as grooms. Thus, in country houses also, the recruitment of protestant servants may not have been simply on religious grounds but may have been connected with a preference for British, or what was considered better, servants.

While the religious affiliation of their servants was important to many employers, former servants did not appear to have suffered from religious discrimination. They did not feel that they had been excluded from situations on account of their religion. None had experienced difficulty in practising her religion.

Domestic servants had a higher level of literacy than the general population. In 1911, 92 per cent of indoor servants were literate, as against 88 per cent of the general population. The literacy rate for the Dublin houses was even higher, it was 98 per cent.
literacy rate for indoor servants for the whole country included farm servants and young people from city tenements who worked in one-servant households - the former were not included in this sample while the latter were under-represented. This would explain the difference in literacy rate. Evidence from people interviewed and a worker in an agency, suggested that servants did not come from the poorest of the agricultural population but were often the daughters of small farmers and workers on estates. It is clear that most employers took great care when choosing a servant, therefore it is reasonable to expect that they looked for literate people. The literacy rate of servants rose from 94 per cent in small houses to 98 per cent in large houses and almost 100 per cent in the homes of the gentry. This showed that households where a large number of staff were employed, and specialised staff had, as would be expected, more literate servants. It was also found in other countries that domestic servants were more literate than other 'lower class groups'. Of course the literacy of servants improved greatly over the forty years between 1881 and 1911, from 61 per cent in 1881 to 92 per cent in 1911.

Domestic service was an occupation for young people and the old family retainer was probably a rarer phenomenon than her appearance in literature suggests. In 1911, 48 per cent of indoor servants in Ireland were under 25 years of age and only 18 per cent were over 45.

TABLE 2

Percentages of indoor servants in different age groups in 1911 compared with the general population [in square brackets].

Source: Cen. Ire. 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The age structure of servants in the four censuses from 1881 to 1911 show that servants were predominantly young.
The ages of 1,600 servants were available in the study of Dublin houses and Irish country houses in 1911. The largest number of these was aged 20 - 24, the next largest was 25 - 29 and the third 15 - 19 years. Sixty two per cent of servants were under 30, and 81 per cent were under 40. The large number of servants under thirty was probably due to the fact that most female and possibly some male servants left service on marriage. Also, employers preferred to engage young servants. This was reflected in advertisements for servants and also from evidence given by former servants. Young servants could usually be paid less, were presumed to be more amenable to new routines and new surroundings, to be stronger and have more energy and far removed from the problems that an ageing servant could create for an employer. It was found, as might be expected, that the smaller homes, normally employing one servant, had the highest proportion of young servants. Homes where more than one servant was usually employed, had a much higher percentage in the older age groups. People living in these houses were better able to afford servants and had older, more experienced servants. There was a very noticeable drop in the number of servants over 30 and over 40 years of age.

When the ages of servants in Ireland were compared to the ages of servants in England and Wales in 1911, it was found that Ireland had more older and fewer young servants (Table 3).

TABLE 3

Percentage of female servants in Ireland and in England and Wales in different age groups in 1911.

Source: Cen. Ire. 1911, Cen. Eng. & Wales 1911*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>age group</th>
<th>under 15</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that Ireland had more older servants than England was pointed out by Miss Collet in her report in 1899; she said that according

to the census of 1891, Ireland had 21 per cent of female servants aged 45 and over whereas the figure for England was only 9 per cent. She concluded that the unfit and infirm were not eliminated to the same extent in Ireland as in England. By 1911 the percentage aged 45 and over had dropped in Ireland to 18 per cent while it remained the same in England.

An interesting difference in the ages of servants in Dublin houses and country houses was that the latter had more young servants, 38 per cent of servants in houses were aged between 15 and 24 years compared with 48 per cent in country houses. This is surprising when it is considered that urban houses included many employers who could just afford to employ one young inexperienced girl. Again 10 per cent of servants in Dublin houses were aged 50 or over, and only 5 per cent of servants in country houses were in this age group. There was no servant aged 65 or over working in the latter, there were 19 or 2 per cent in the former. This is a surprising finding for a number of reasons. Servants in country houses were recruited in a more formal way, usually from an agency, and were presumed to be older. Certainly it was more difficult to get a job in a country house than a middle class home. Working in a big house was generally considered more desirable than working in a small one. The comparatively low age structure in Irish country houses shows that the staff was not as stable as might be expected considering that working conditions in these houses were generally good, many had facilities for married staff, and there was usually the possibility of promotion. Records which are available from some country houses show that turnover of staff was rapid (see below, pp 124-5). This substantiates the evidence of staff dissatisfaction which the age structure suggests. Many British servants probably found working in an alien country both lonely and uncongenial. The constant movement by most families between Ireland and England was probably unsettling for all servants, Irish and British, whether they travelled with the family or stayed at home. Employers often recruited servants from agencies while in London, whether this was to replace disaffected servants who had just left is, of course, not clear. David Thompson talked of the absolute ignorance of each
others' ways which existed between Anglo Irish employers and their servants. This did not seem to affect the amicable relationship which existed between the Kirkwoods and their servants in 'Woodbrook'. Former servants who worked in country houses showed no evidence whatsoever of antagonism towards their masters; rather, subsequent employers suffered by comparison with what was termed the 'real gentry'. Irish servants may, however, have found life in country houses lonely; they were usually in the minority, and in the more lowly positions in these households. The companionship and empathy which might have been expected to exist among the staff may have been lacking.

The majority of servants were single, they either married, generally comparatively late, and left service, or they did not marry at all. That employers preferred unmarried servants is clear from newspaper advertisements which often either stipulated that an applicant must be single or asked for a declaration of marital status. It is also clear from the apologetic tone of advertisements from married applicants who hastened to assure employers of the usefulness of their spouses to look after the garden or help with the housekeeping; childlessness was seen as an advantage. In Dublin in 1911 92 per cent of female servants were single, 6 per cent were widowed and only 2 per cent were married. The percentage of married male servants, 22 per cent, was high compared to the percentage for females. It must be remembered, however, that the number of male servants was small. Most male servants worked in large houses where there was more likely to be accommodation for married servants. Also, male servants usually held positions of authority or ones for which employers would prefer mature men; 39 or 57 per cent of men in these houses were butlers, coachmen or chauffeurs. Many would not take jobs unless married quarters were available. The type of accommodation, gate lodges, and living quarters over stables and garages was more suitable for men than women.

When the marital status of female servants is compared to that of women in the general population it is clear that at any age female
servants were less likely to be married than their peers. Approximately half of the female population between the ages of 25 and 34 were married, compared with only 3 per cent of servants. At the higher age levels, the percentage of servants was made up mainly of widows; married servants only accounted for approximately 4 per cent (Table 4).

TABLE 4

Percentage of women, in different age groups, married and widowed, in the general population and in service in Dublin in 1911.

Source: Cen. Ire. 1911; Appendix A, Chart 3, p. 175A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>population</th>
<th>servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the country houses surveyed 95.5 per cent of female servants were single, 3 per cent were widows and only 1.5 per cent were married. For male servants the percentages were, 86 per cent single, 1 per cent widowers and 13 per cent married. There were more single male and female servants in country houses than in Dublin houses. This is the opposite to what might be expected until it is remembered that there were more young servants in the country houses in Ireland than in the Dublin homes. A number of male servants employed in country houses might have lived in houses on the estate and not appeared in enumerators' returns. There were not many indoor servants, however, missing from the returns.

Conditions of service and the attitude of employers did not facilitate the meeting of the sexes in circumstances conducive to courtship and marriage. Servants worked long hours and had very little freedom; they therefore had limited opportunities to meet each other.
This was especially true of those working in one- or two-servant households, which included the majority of servants. Those working in the 'big houses' had a better opportunity of marrying a fellow servant, or a visiting servant. Servants working in smaller households tended to marry milkmen, breadmen, butchers' roundsmen, or small shopkeepers, probably the only men they met regularly. Margaret Powell remembered the excitement when the chauffeurs who brought guests to dinner waited in the kitchen: 'You never saw such fluttering in the dovecote as there used to be on those occasions. There we were, six or seven of us women who hardly ever spoke to a man . . .'. Marriage was looked on by many servants as a way of escaping from service.

The process of acquiring a spouse was actively discouraged by many masters and mistresses. Merlin Waterson in The servants' hall said that employers did not like their servants mixing with the opposite sex: 'such meetings were likely to end in trouble; at best the loss of a good servant, at worst an unwanted pregnancy and all the unpleasantness of instant dismissal'. Margaret Powell railed against the inconsistency of employers who arranged parties and balls for their debutante daughters but who dubbed their servants' suitors 'followers'. 'The business of getting a young man was not respectable and one's employers tended to degrade any relationship'. The disparaging term 'follower' was widely used; it was the subject of jokes and cartoons. A 'no followers' rule pertained in many households. It was even mentioned by some employers in advertisements for servants. This rule isolated servants further from their own social class. Munby described how he got a new perspective on the relationship between a servant and her boy friend: 'in the capacity too of a servant's "follower", I begin to take a new view of the question of kitchen courtships - the hardship, both to the servant and her sweetheart, of compelling an honourable love into deceit and darkness'. The low status of their occupation also made it more difficult for them to acquire an eligible young man. A number of former servants said that they pretended to boyfriends that they worked in factories.
Employers and conditions of service probably delayed marriage and made it more difficult. On the other hand servants may have postponed marrying until they had accumulated a nest egg which gave them greater independence and security when setting up home. Certainly many Irish servants were in a position to save and they may have acquired some of their employers' middle class values of thrift and prudence. Later marriages may also have improved servants' prospects of making better marriages. The tendency of Irish servants to delay marriage extended to Irish women immigrants who became servants in the United States. Many of them never married. 'To work a lifetime in an employer's family without marrying was an accepted custom on the Emerald Isle'.

The question might be asked whether single women found a livelihood in domestic service or whether servants tended not to marry. The latter seems more likely. Servants had fewer opportunities for marriage than most women in other jobs or living at home. Pressure, which might have been exerted on single girls living at home on farms or indeed in towns, to marry and start a home of their own was, of course, lacking. There was no evidence that marriages were arranged for servants by their families. Some women may have entered service when they were older and not likely to marry, but the number was probably small. The difficulties of older women entering service are obvious; apart from the preference of employers for young servants, older women would have found it harder to accept training and the lack of freedom and subservient role that service imposed. There was an influx of older women into service but they were widows. They were probably domestic servants before marriage and merely returned to the job for which they were trained.

Domestic service was the cause of considerable migration especially of young girls. Of the servants working in Dublin houses in 1911, 28 per cent were born in Dublin city or county - half were born in the city - 21 per cent were from the adjoining counties of Meath, Wicklow and Kildare, and 21 per cent were from the rest of Leinster. Thirty per cent came from further afield, 22 per cent from the other three
provinces, 7 per cent from Britain, and 1 per cent from abroad. While the number of servants working near home was small, the majority of servants had not come from too far afield. In 1911, working even in the next county could mean infrequent visits home. When the birthplaces of these servants was compared with that of the general population in Dublin city and county the difference was striking (Table 5) and the contribution of service to migration obvious. Mary Daly mentioned this contribution in Dublin the deposed capital when she pointed out that servants tended to come from rural areas and added significantly to the number of migrants in the Dublin suburbs.

The percentage of servants born in Great Britain was very similar to that for the general population of Dublin county and city. There were ten foreign-born servants in the Dublin houses; the census for that year showed that there were 72 foreign-born servants in Dublin city and 77 in the county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of servants in Dublin houses and of people in Dublin city and county in 1911 born in different locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Cen. Ire. 1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Dublin city &amp; county</th>
<th>rest of Leinster</th>
<th>Munster</th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Connaught</th>
<th>G.B.</th>
<th>abroad</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>servants in Dublin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population in Dublin city</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population in Dublin county</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason why most domestic servants worked a distance from their birthplace was the unavailability of work at home and the great demand for servants in cities and large towns. This also occurred in Britain and France. The smaller houses had the higher percentages of local servants, 57 - 39 per cent. Employers living in larger houses employed
only about 24 per cent servants from Dublin. This supports the contention that people employing only one or two young servants tended to recruit them locally through friends, neighbours and tradesmen (see below, pp 46, 86).

The large number of British servants working in country houses has already been discussed. Only one sixth of servants in these houses were from the locality - these were probably daughters and sons of estate workers - and only one quarter were from the county in which they worked or an adjoining county (Table 6). Three quarters of the servants came from a distance: most were recruited through agencies or perhaps newspaper advertisements.

TABLE 6
Percentage of servants in country houses born in different locations (number in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>local (same county)</th>
<th>adjoining county</th>
<th>rest of Ireland</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
<th>abroad</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The majority of servants in Dublin houses in 1911 were young, female and single. They had a higher level of literacy than the general population. Most worked in one-servant households. They were catholics but many worked for protestant employers. Most were employed away from home, but in the province in which they were born. The majority of servants in country houses were also young and single, but a much higher percentage were male. Servants in country houses differed from those in Dublin houses by being predominantly protestant - over two thirds - and in coming from places distant from where they worked. The vast majority of the owners of country houses were protestant and many had been born in England. These facts, as well as the propensity of employers with large staffs to recruit specialist servants in England, were probably the reasons why such a high percentage of staff were British-born and protestant. This in turn may have led to dissatisfactions among staff in country houses in Ireland which were shown by the comparatively rapid turnover of staff and the higher proportion of young and single servants than might have been expected.
CHAPTER 3

SOURCES OF SERVANTS

In the early Victorian period, there were substantial changes in the social structure of domestic service. The demand for servants was driven by the rapidly growing middle class, which sought to emulate the生活方式 and comfort of the upper classes. In many households, domestic service was not only a means of providing labor but also a symbol of social status.

As a result of these changes, there was a need for new methods of training and recruitment of servants. In response, many new establishments were created to provide systematic training for domestic work. These institutions were often run by religious organizations or charitable foundations.

One of the most significant of these institutions was St. Anne’s House, founded by Miss Anne Boulton in 1864. St. Anne’s offered a comprehensive course of study in domestic science, including topics such as cooking, sewing, and housekeeping. The curriculum was designed to prepare young women for a life of service, teaching them the skills necessary to run a well-ordered household.

The training at St. Anne’s was based on the belief that good service was not just about performing tasks but also about establishing a bond of trust and care between the servant and the household. As Miss Boulton stated in her report, "The education of such girls is looking important, not only to the comfort and happiness of the household, but to their own dignity and contentment."
CHAPTER 3

SOURCES OF SERVANTS

A widely recognised source of domestic servants was workhouses, industrial schools and reformatories. Many farmers and local employers came to these establishments when seeking servant girls and general servants. Domestic service was by far the most important occupation for girls leaving the institutions; it was also one requiring little or no training. The extent to which some training was provided varied over time, from one type of institution to another and between individual institutions of the same kind. Wherever industrial training for girls was given, however, it was directed mainly towards service.

There was a lot of criticism of the training given in workhouses. In the early 1850s there were unsatisfactory reports from New South Wales and South Australia on the suitability of girls from Irish workhouses as domestic servants; they were described as 'generally well conducted, but ignorant of the domestic work for which they were principally required'. As a result of this it was suggested, by Mrs Hannah Archer, that pauper orphan girls could be boarded out 'under the care of cottagers' where they would be taught how to run a house and would be overseen by 'an association of ladies'. In this way girls would receive a more suitable training for domestic work than could be given in a large impersonal institution. This point was also stressed by Florence Davenport-Hill in her book Children of the state. She said that even when girls helped with the household tasks in workhouses it did not teach them anything of the arrangements of a well-ordered household. The girls were often a hindrance rather than a help, appearing stupid because they were unacquainted with the names and uses of kitchen articles: 'the intricacies of such arts as cooking, needlework, bread-making, etc., are not instinctively perceived'. She quoted the report of the local government board for 1880-81 that:

though praiseworthy efforts are made in the large unions to develop this side of education, there is a certain absence of system in many cases,
which renders the instruction desultory, and therefore almost worthless. The haphazard and irregular way in which, in small unions, the so-called industrial training is conducted, imparts a degree of slovenliness to their work which operates very prejudicially when the children are first sent out to service.\(^5\)

Florence Davenport-Hill stated that one of the reasons why the system, especially as it applied to girls, was so unsatisfactory was that it was almost entirely in the hands of one sex, she urged placing the girls 'under a discreet but firm matron'.\(^6\) It was pointed out that, while eternally proclaiming 'home' to be the only sphere of a woman, state-educated female children were given no idea of what a home was. They did not get affection, care or responsibility for household duties.\(^7\) The author stressed that the provision of industrial training in workhouses was made more difficult due to what she described as 'communication with and contamination from the adults'. Girls might be trained as nursemaids but this would constitute a danger by bringing them into close contact with numerous unmarried mothers.\(^8\) Florence Davenport-Hill thought that there had been a general improvement in the care being taken to choose the girl's first place and to supervise her work; she was critical that the law only required that a girl should be visited in her first place, after that the girl was entirely on her own.\(^9\)

The report of the poor law and lunacy inquiry commission in 1879 gave interesting information on the industrial training of children in workhouses. Information was obtained from the clerk of each poor law union. A study of the replies from forty unions showed that the industrial training of the girls generally consisted of learning to sew and knit, mend their own clothes and do washing. Occasionally housework was mentioned, which seemed to consist of scrubbing floors, cleaning dormitories etc. The industrial work was supervised generally by the school mistress, occasionally by the matron. In Clonmel Union girls got some experience in the infirmary kitchen and in the masters' and matron's kitchens. In the South Dublin Union girls were employed by the female and
married officers and were trained as domestic servants. In Cork it was reported that special superintendents had been employed to train girls and that proper appliances for the purpose had been purchased. However, the number of girls of a suitable age fell and the superintendent had to be dismissed. Since then the school mistress taught the girls sewing, knitting, washing, scouring and cooking.

It would seem, from these accounts, that criticism of the training for domestic service given in workhouses was well-founded. In most institutions the only training given was sewing, knitting and the rougher types of institutional cleaning. Only in a very few instances was an effort made to provide training under circumstances which might approximate to conditions in a private house, and, of course, there was no way of judging the adequacy of that training. The Cork Union was the only one in the sample examined which employed special people to train the girls as domestic servants, and which used household-type appliances for the purpose. The fact that Cork, which was one of the largest, had to abandon this plan as there were not sufficient girls of suitable age to justify it, highlights a difficulty which smaller unions would have had in providing proper training in domestic service.

In their replies the clerks of the unions stated that the guardians had no difficulty placing children in service, and that the demand far exceeded the supply. An exception was Macroom where it was said that: 'there was difficulty in putting them out to service as a very few of them gave satisfaction'. In Mallow there were fewer applicants as the guardians had made a rule than an employer must have a valuation of £30 or more.

Wages given to children when they started work were usually approximately £2 per year, though one union mentioned £1 - £2 and another £2.10.0 to £4. Rathdown union stated that children did not get a wage, they gave their services in exchange for food and
clothing. The clerks of the Clones, Monaghan and North Dublin unions inferred that children were simply clothed or at most given a wage sufficient to clothe them. Sometimes the guardians provided an outfit of clothes to the children when they were leaving the workhouse. The ages at which children were placed varied from ten to fifteen years, the usual age being twelve to fourteen. About half of the clerks said that children generally retained their first place; five stated that children do not usually retain their first place and many did not answer the question. Possibly clerks did not know the answer. The reply from Cork was: 'From the general imperfection of their training and habits as servants, they do not in most cases retain the situations they first obtain. They are re-engaged, however, from time to time, the intervals being principally spent in the Workhouse'. The Ballymoney report said that, while the boys retained their first places, the girls did not give as much satisfaction 'in fact as servants they are a failure'. In its appraisal of industrial training and placements the same report stated: 'The defect of workhouse education appears to be the want of systematic, well-organised industrial training. Too much is sacrificed to merely literary advancement. As there are some unions in which industrial training is carefully attended to, and with the best results, why should it not be insisted upon in all?'

In 1880 a general circular was sent to inspectors of workhouses from the local government board of Ireland regarding the education and training of children. In this it was stated that girls should be taught to knit and sew and be involved in the ordinary work of the household, scouring, cleaning, washing and ironing, to prepare them for becoming good servants. Cookery was not specifically mentioned, or methods which might have overcome some of the unsuitability of institutional-type experiences which had been criticised.

The fifteenth annual report of the local government board also expressed dissatisfaction with the industrial training of
girls. It stated that: 'of 2,363 girls, 1,879 are taught sewing and knitting and only 104 employed in laundry or other work which might fit them for domestic service'. The board said that if industrial training was not satisfactorily provided in future the board of guardians and the union officers would have to explain their omission. In 1892, the local government board's annual report gave favourable mention to the district school in Trim that catered for workhouses in Drogheda, Dunshaughlin, Kells, Navan and Trim. Forty-nine girls were receiving instruction in sewing, knitting, washing, cooking and general housework. There was a dressmaker and a cook-cum-laundress employed in the school in addition to a matron and three school mistresses. A royal commission on the poor laws in 1909 recommended that all children from workhouses who were hired out to service should be supervised for some time afterwards and that guardians should be empowered to retain the supervision of children up to the age of twenty-one.

With the introduction of industrial schools in 1858 there were fewer children found in workhouses: the number of children under fifteen in workhouses fell from 18,099 in February 1864 to 9,184 in 1884 and to 5,988 on 31 December 1899. Training for girls in industrial schools was always much more satisfactory than in workhouses. This is not surprising when it is considered that industrial schools were set up for a limited group of people, children between the age of six and sixteen, usually girls or boys who were committed for specific reasons, and were not, like the unions, catering for the destitute poor of all ages and both sexes. Children who were found begging or homeless, orphans, children whose parents were in prison or were drunkards and could no longer control them, or those who frequented the company of thieves or prostitutes could be committed to industrial schools. These schools were smaller, less forbidding institutions than workhouses, and were usually run by religious who had a deep interest in the children.

The report of the inspector of reformatories and industrial schools in 1884 pointed out that many managers spared no expense
in employing experts to instruct the children; cookery was taught by women trained in South Kensington. Thus training was much better than in workhouses. In his report in 1880, the inspector said that training in girls' schools had been particularly successful. He added: 'farmers, even with large farms, complain that industrial school children receive a training and instruction in trades which their sons and daughters cannot hope to obtain'.

These schools were inspected regularly and the reports included information on the dates on which they were visited, the state of general education and industrial training, together with details about the girls discharged during the year.

The rules and regulations for certified industrial schools in Ireland stated that not less than six hours daily must be devoted to industrial training and not less than three to scholastic training. Industrial training for girls was to consist of 'needlework, machine work, washing, ironing, cooking and housework'. Where practicable they were to get training in dairying, poultry and gardening. The 1880 report showed that schools provided the needlework and household work stipulated; many said that girls were taught the duties of housemaids or of parlour and housemaids. The report on Booterstown Industrial School for Roman Catholic Girls, which was visited on the 23 September 1879, said that some girls were transferred to the House of Mercy, Baggot Street, for training as household servants. A number of schools prepared girls for other occupations such as glove-making, shirt-making, lace and crochet work, millinery and dressmaking; some of the more able girls were prepared for teaching or to act as governesses in private families.

The inspector's report in 1884 said that the teaching for girls had always been very practical, the results obtained most satisfactory, and the children obtained employment easily when they left the schools. In 1899 the inspector again commented
on the satisfactory nature of industrial training: 'in all the
girls' schools, with very few exceptions, there has been a marked
improvement in every branch of industrial training this year'.
Two schools got special praise, Hampton House Industrial School
for Protestant Girls in Belfast and St. Michael's School for
Roman Catholic Girls in Wexford. A method used in one of them,
whereby six senior girls were allowed a tradesman's wage and each
in turn had to act as housekeeper and cook for her 'family' of
six for a month and keep an account of all expenditure, was
described. 'These girls when they leave give the greatest
satisfaction to their employers,'.

The inspector in his report in 1905 said that he had issued
a syllabus to the schools' managers 'to show what is aimed at in
the training of girls'. He said that in the best of these schools
there were very few subjects mentioned in his syllabus which were
not already efficiently taught. For John Fagan, industrial
training for girls meant training in domestic science, which he
defined as 'the knowledge to make the home and its inmates healthy
and happy'. 'This', declared Fagan, 'is woman's work', and 'if
managers succeed in placing their girls in the world capable of
doing this, they will accomplish a great and good work for the
poorer classes in the country'. John Fagan then identified
'four essential kinds of industry' in which every child should
get a good practical training - housework, needlework, laundry
work and cookery, and kitchen work and housekeeping. He maintained
that girls should start industrial training at thirteen when they
enter first standard. At sixteen, when they left, they should
have received a sound practical education which would enable them
to make a respectable livelihood. The detailed syllabuses for the
four areas which John Fagan issued had been drawn up with the help
of managers of wide experience and good records in the training
of children. His aim was to establish a uniform and systematic
method of industrial training for all industrial schools.

Two years later Fagan expressed satisfaction with the way in
which the syllabus was implemented.
Praiseworthy efforts are being made by managers of all girls' schools to work through the courses of domestic science. The course of training in this subject which all the children have now to pass through is well adapted to qualify them for positions as intelligent, capable servants, or would enable them to manage small households on their own on sound economic and sanitary lines. The good effect of the training which the children now receive is already showing itself by the increased demand on the schools for good servants...

The same report stated that industrial training for girls in two reformatories, in High Park, Dublin and in Limerick was very satisfactory and that there was steady demand for girls trained in these schools for domestic servants.

In 1914 the inspector pointed out that there were still a few girls' schools where the requirements of the domestic science syllabus were not fully carried out. In reports on various schools it is seen that the industrial training of girls was judged, to a large extent, on the implementation of the domestic science syllabus. These reports included information on the staff which showed that experts such as dressmakers, cooks and laundresses were employed to train the girls. The inspector's report in 1920 stated that the industrial training given in the schools was on the whole satisfactory.

This special training of the girls in domestic science enables them to fill good situations in private families. Numerous applications are received by managers every other day for such servants. The reports received from ladies who have employed these girls either as cooks, laundry maids, nurses or housemaids are generally of a satisfactory nature.

Reports on the inspection of schools gave details of the specific jobs of those who were placed in service; a large number were general servants, some were laundrymaids, kitchen maids, housemaids, cooks etc. Records kept by the schools also gave that type of information; again most girls were placed as general servants. This shows that in these schools girls were prepared for different positions within domestic service. In workhouses, on the other hand, only the most basic general training was given.
To ascertain the contribution that industrial schools and reformatories might have made to domestic service in terms of the number of girls entering the occupation annually from these sources, every tenth report was examined from 1879 to 1920. Taking 1879, 1889, 1899, 1909 and 1918 as examples, the average number placed in employment or service from industrial schools was 382. The number from reformatories was smaller, an average of 18. The numbers dropped from 33 in 1879 to an average of 12 after 1900, probably due to more girls being referred to industrial schools rather than reformatories (see below, Table 7, p. 47). It must be pointed out that this number included all employments that girls entered, not just domestic service: the statistics do not distinguish between service and other industries. There is no doubt, however, that the majority went into domestic service. The inspector's report for 1918, which does give that type of information, shows that of the 400 girls placed in employment from industrial schools in 1918, 329 (or 82%) went into service and only 71 into other occupations. The former included 49 housemaids, 15 cooks, 9 parlourmaids, 38 nursemaids, 11 kitchen maids, 167 general servants, 30 laund्रymaids (some of whom may have gone into public laundries), 5 dairymaids, 1 between maid, 3 scullerymaids and 1 gardener. It should be noted that over half the girls became general servants; this meant that most girls from institutions found employment in one-servant households. They usually found employment also in the same locality as the schools; most 'situations' were arranged as a result of applications by employers to managers.

Even if all those who went into employment from institutions became domestic servants, the impact on the industry as a whole could not have been great. Less than 400 new recruits from industrial schools and reformatories was not a significant number to an industry which employed 125,783 women in 1911. Turnover in service was rapid and two years was probably - at most - the average time spent in a 'situation'. Most of the activity therefore in seeking servants and situations was generated by people changing jobs, and it is very difficult to know how many new employees
entered domestic service each year. If it is considered that in 1911 16% of women between the ages of 20 and 25 were servants and only 7% of those between the much longer span of 25 - 45 years, this will give some idea of the number leaving service each year, most probably to marry. From the data obtained on almost 1,000 female servants in the study of Dublin houses and country houses in 1911, there was on average a loss of 34, or 3.5%, servants between the age of 29 and 30 and 39 and 40, ages at which the biggest losses occurred. When the servants who left to marry earlier, or to go to other employment, who lost their jobs, or died are taken into consideration an annual loss of 7% is a conservative estimate. On the number of servants employed in 1911, this would mean approximately 8,800 new 'situations' annually.

Industrial schools and reformatories were therefore not an important source of labour; however, service was of paramount

Table 7

Number and percentage of girls discharged from industrial schools and reformatories going into 'employment or service' in certain years between 1879 and 1918.

Source: Reports of the inspector appointed to visit reformatory and industrial schools of Ireland - see bibliography, pp 252-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Industrial schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Reformatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. to 'employment or service'</td>
<td>% of No. discharged</td>
<td>No. to 'employment or service'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

importance to the schools as the occupation most likely to employ girls when they reached sixteen years of age.
At that age government grants for them to schools ceased, and managers had to arrange to return the girls to the care of relatives or friends or to find employment for them. When this was done the girls were officially discharged from the institution. Most went to what was described by the institutions as 'employment or service'. Why service was differentiated from other employment is not clear, perhaps it was because it also provided girls with a home or perhaps the money wages offered were too low. Most of the girls went to employment or service, this varied from more than half to two-thirds (Table 7). The next largest number returned to relatives or friends; probably most of these eventually found employment in domestic service. This point was made by one of the nuns in a school visited during the inquiry, and indeed some records mentioned that girls who had been returned to parents found suitable situations later. A small number of girls emigrated and again many of these found positions as domestic servants.

Managers of industrial schools and reformatories had to report to the inspector on the conduct of the children for three years after they left the schools. The reports on the girls were usually good, with approximately 90 per cent doing very well. The number who had been 'lost sight of' was comparatively small. Of those discharged from reformatories in 1876-1878 (135 girls) it was reported in 1880 that 86.4 per cent were 'doing well', 3 per cent 'doubtful', 6 per cent reconvicted and 4.5 per cent 'lost sight of'. As might be expected, the proportion 'doing well' from industrial schools was higher; for the same years 1876-78, of the 1,374 girls discharged 92.8 per cent were making satisfactory progress.

Table 8

Progress of girls discharged from industrial schools 1906 - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>years</th>
<th>'discharged'</th>
<th>'doing well'</th>
<th>'doubtful'</th>
<th>convicted</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906-8</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,643 (94%)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-11</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>1,686 (98%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The book of discharges for one of the reformatories for girls, Saint Joseph's Reformatory, High Park, Dublin for the years 1880 to 1920 was examined. Of the 357 girls who left in that period, just over 50 per cent went into domestic service. Many of these were described simply as going to service. In some cases the job was specified: 10 per cent became childrens' maids or nurses, a few cooks, housemaids or parlourmaids, but most were described as general servants. The records show that when girls were unsatisfactory or did not improve the nuns were reluctant to place them as servants and preferred to send them home. In one instance in 1880 a girl who was described as 'most troublesome, unsatisfactory, with a light and giddy mind, and hard to control' was placed as a child's maid because she had no proper guardian; however the sister who was worried about her kept in touch with her employer. Another girl was described as 'troublesome and not satisfactory throughout the whole time of her detention. We declined placing her in a situation and returned her to her brother'. Of another it was said that 'her conduct during her detention was not satisfactory, fearing to place her in a situation in Dublin, we have returned her to her parents'. Yet another unsatisfactory girl was returned to her parents in Kildare. Most girls, however, were described as 'good and well suited for household duties' or 'fully competent to earn a livelihood as a servant'. Some were held in high esteem, 'we could not say too much in praise of this girl'. Another was employed in the convent 'at her own earnest desire we have engaged her as a servant here'. The nuns kept in touch with the girls and their employers. One girl was described as 'not getting on as well as expected in her situation'. A 'well-reformed girl' was placed in service with a Mrs McDonnell in Highfield Road, Rathgar in 1919. She was subsequently reported as 'getting on well' and that her wages would be raised next year if she continued to give satisfaction. On the whole girls were deemed suitable to work as servants and most were satisfactory at their job. Girls from reformatories might have been expected to give more trouble than girls from industrial schools. St. Joseph's became an industrial school in 1927 and until the 1940s most of the girls from there continued to go into service.
The discharge books for Golden Bridge Industrial School for the same years were also examined. This was a large school which had 150 pupils during much of the period and an average of 130 over the whole period. From 1880 to 1919, 877 girls were discharged, 301 of whom were placed in domestic service. Most were employed as general servants, some as housemaids, laundrymaids and childrens' maids with one or two as parlour-maids.

The nuns kept in touch with girls for up to three years after they left and for longer in many cases. Details, not only of the first situation, but also of a second or subsequent one were sometimes kept. A girl who was discharged in 1886 to become a general servant in Rathmines left that job in 1887 because lodgers were kept, and went to a situation in North King Street. In 1888 she was once again looking for a job; an entry in the discharge book said that as she had always been somewhat deaf it was not easy to find a place for her. A girl who went into service in 1887 is reported to be still in the same situation in 1890. Maggie Hatch who was discharged on 1 July 1886 and went to a house in Maynooth as a 'thoro servant' had to leave after six or eight months due to deafness. It was reported that 'she has changed to a humbler place where she has no bells to answer'. Mary O'Connell who was sent home to her mother in November 1900 is reported in 1902 as doing well in a situation and her temper is described as 'greatly improved'. About a girl discharged in 1901 it was said, 'as Mary is too small and young for any kind of service, a good lady living in Dundrum has taken her to help her servant, an excellent girl who was also in this school'. Bridget McPartland who was placed as a general servant in a 'small family' in 1899 was still 'giving satisfaction' to the same employers in 1903.

The girls seemed to remain in their positions as long, if not longer, than servants generally. This is borne out by the high 'doing well' rate reported nationally. Out of a sample of 58 girls in Golden Bridge only six received poor reports. Many of the entries show the interest and concern of the nuns for the welfare of the girls.
Frank O'Connor in *An only child* tells how his mother who was brought up in the Good Shepherd Orphanage in Cork was placed by the nuns. One evening when she was fourteen or fifteen, the mistress of studies came to her in the workroom and told her she had found 'a nice home for her with two ladies who had called to inquire for a maid'; she was then given the regular convent outfit for girls leaving the school - 'a black straw hat and black coat, a pair of gloves, and a parcel of clean aprons'. The next mistress of studies had a different approach, she would say: 'there is a situation free in the Xs. I think you might try it and see what you think of it'. The general rule was that any girl who left one of the homes provided by the nuns without permission was not allowed to return to the orphanage which was the only home most of the girls had. However, after a particularly bad experience in service Minnie O'Connor went back to the convent where she was welcomed by a compassionate reverend mother who kept her until she got a good situation.

The House of Mercy, Lower Baggot Street, was started in 1831 'for the training and employment of poor girls of good character as laundresses and domestic servants'. The school could accommodate 40 girls, all of whom were over fourteen and many between sixteen and twenty when they were admitted. The girls stayed until they were ready to take up a job and this varied from a few months to up to three years. Some came from orphanages and industrial schools where managers failed to place them at sixteen and were unable to keep them any longer; others were country girls who wished to train as domestic servants. All had to be recommended to the nuns as being of good character; many were vouched for by religious. The nuns did not obtain any government grants, but depended on bequests and donations. There was a public laundry attached but when the Factory and Workshop Act of 1901 was extended, by the act of 1907, to include laundries, the nuns decided to close it as a public laundry but continue to use it for themselves and for the other houses belonging to the order. The Factory and Workshop Act of 1907 which came into force on
1 January 1908, sought to regulate hours of work and improve conditions in washing and ironing rooms and provide for the inspection of the laundries. If charitable institutions did work for profit, the factory act applied; if the laundries were used only for the use of the institution itself, the act was modified. Of course the laundry continued to be used for training of the girls. There were two kitchens in the house, one for the nuns and one for the girls. The girls received training in cookery in these kitchens. They were also trained in housework and needlework. The nuns, in their own free time, gave lessons in reading and writing.

The register for the House of Mercy gave details of the number of girls in the house each year, their ages, relatives, if any, the names of those who recommended them, how they were provided for when they left, employers' name, and the length of time they spent in the home. The first entry was made in 1866. From then until 1880 the actual positions taken up by the girls were named, many became housemaids, thorough servants, childrens' maids, general servants, laundresses, wards maids, a few became kitchen maids, two were cooks and two parlourmaids. After that time fewer details were given and many are reported simply as gone to a 'situation' or to service. Where positions are named, however, general servants and housemaids seemed to predominate. Between 1880 and 1920 the average number of girls in the school each year was 26. During that period of forty one years, 358 went into service, an average of nine per year. This is a very small number when the total number in service in Dublin throughout the period is considered.

In addition to its function as a training school, the House of Mercy ran a registry office from 1914. Girls were interviewed in the school by prospective mistresses. A retired nun held needlework classes for the girls while they waited to be hired. The placement book, which was started in 1914, records that 122 girls were placed that year and 126 in 1915. During the following three years approximately 100 girls found situations annually. In 1919 the number dropped to 65 and by 1921 only 35 girls were placed. This reflects the decrease in popularity of domestic service which was quite evident at that time.
Girls, and to a much lesser extent boys, from industrial schools and reformatories were directed into domestic service. The vast majority of Irish servants were children of small farmers, estate workers, the semi-skilled and unskilled who freely chose service as their career. On further consideration, however, it becomes clear that the element of choice was probably illusory and that the reason why domestic service was selected was the lack of opportunity for other work. The usual choice facing girls with little education and no training in Ireland was domestic service or emigration. Those who emigrated very often entered service in their adopted country. In America — where from 1880 to 1917 the majority of Irish emigrants went, few went to Great Britain. 'Irish-born servants comprised 44 per cent of all servants in 1880 in New York City and the then independent Brooklyn, 34 per cent in Philadelphia, and 19 per cent in Chicago. In Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Hartford, Jersey City, New Haven, Providence and Troy, Irish-born servants exceeded 40 per cent of all servants'. Writing of the 1920s, Robert E. Kennedy in The Irish showed that 81% of Irish female immigrants in employment in six American states were domestic servants. In other countries also service was often chosen because of lack of other opportunities. Factors such as prejudice against factory work for women and a fear from working men of competition for jobs from women were mentioned in England as reasons for women opting for domestic service.

In Ireland the lack of alternative employment was crucial. A government committee which reported on the cost of living of the working classes in Ireland in 1908, drawing on the 1901 census, stated: 'the number of domestic servants to which attention is called in this and other reports is a characteristic of Irish life which has come into prominence since the decay of Irish industry'. This report also pointed out the absence of any industry employing women in large numbers: 'the greatest number of women are engaged in occupations found in every town and regarded as the special sphere of women, viz. domestic service and the making of articles of clothing'. The ratio of servants was high in towns and cities
in which there were only these traditional occupations available to women; Dublin had 50 servants for every 1000 of the population, Cork had 49 per 1000, Limerick 45 and Waterford 53. On the other hand Belfast had only 22 per 1000 and Derry 32. The report continued: 'this comparatively small number of domestic servants is characteristic of towns which flourish by manufacturers, especially those in which women are principally employed, such manufacturers affording plentiful employment of a nature often more popular than domestic service'.

Because service was usually the only choice available it became the traditional haven for women from rural Ireland and from many towns and cities. This in its turn added its own momentum, so that positions as servants were sought automatically without consideration of alternatives which might in some cases, particularly towards the end of the period, have in fact existed. Many former servants told the author that they entered service immediately on leaving school, sometimes the day after. There was obviously no discussion about their career: it was accepted that they would go into service.

A study done in Buffalo in 1850 by Lawrence Glasco said that the propensity of Irish girls to work in service was so high that 'virtually every Irish girl during adolescence spent several years as a live-in domestic'.

Wages of domestic servants compared very favourably with wages in other industries (see below, p. 103). The servant had very few expenses and could save, or send money home to help relations. Elizabeth Smith in The Irish journals complained that her servants were not able to dress themselves properly because they sent so much money home. Rowntree in his study of York said that it was well known that Irish and Welsh children not living at home and working as domestic servants sent considerable sums home to their parents. In addition to wages, domestic servants had free board and lodgings and many appreciated this advantage. Other reasons which might have attracted people to domestic service were a desire to improve their social position, and the fact that service provided a relatively simple way for boys and girls to enter urban life and be initiated into the mores of the
cities. Certainly the attractions of town or city life and the desire to escape from the poverty and hardship of subsistence farming and crowded tenements would have played a part. Parents welcomed the control and security which they felt service offered for their children, especially their daughters. 62

The advantages of service were frequently stressed. In 1908, 'Roving Rebecca' writing in the Lady of the House said: 'Servants have fewer cares and more pay than any other class of women in return for the service they give. They are made friends of, looked after in sickness, and befriended in sorrow. Good servants always find good homes and vice versa; they are better off in every way than any other women in the same position in life'. 70 Evidence given by social workers in a study of young working girls carried out in Boston in 1913 stated: 'The girl who chooses housework is likely to be better housed, better clothed, and better fed than she would be at home; secures training in a vocation natural to woman; in proportion to her capacity is relatively more highly paid than in any other kind of work; and almost universally establishes a better type of home life when she marries than is possible for the factory or shop girl'. 71

It must be pointed out that domestic service was usually extolled by employers or those who considered it an ideal occupation for others. However, these opinions reflected the perceptions of society at the time and would inevitably have had an effect on the thinking of the working class. Domestic service may not always have been chosen for the advantages which seemed significant to the employer-class, but the general suitability of service for girls and single women would have been accepted. Compared to other industries it offered good wages; unlike other jobs it offered board and accommodation. It could provide an entree into urban living and a middle class way of life.
CHAPTER 4

TRAINING OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS

In the past, domestic servants were trained through apprenticeships. However, during World War I, there was an emphasis on formal training. The Scottish Employers' Association, for instance, established a scheme to train domestic servants. This was followed by similar initiatives in other countries. By 1918, the Women's Advisory Committee on Domestic Service noted that formal training programs had become more widespread. The United Kingdom also took significant steps, with the government establishing a training scheme in 1914 to address the shortage of domestic workers.

This was seen as a necessity not only to meet wartime demands but also to improve the quality of domestic service. The government's intervention was part of a broader effort to modernize and professionalize domestic service. The wartime context provided a catalyst for these changes, and the legacy of these initiatives continued into peace-time, influencing the standards and expectations for domestic workers.
CHAPTER 4

TRAINING OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS

When, in 1880, farmers complained that industrial school children received a training which their daughters could not hope to have - if they were talking, as seems likely about domestic service - they were perfectly correct (see above, p. 43). At that stage there was probably no formal training course available outside the institutions already discussed. Forty years later the situation had not changed greatly. More training facilities may have existed but the impact on the occupation was slight.

In 1919 when the Women's Advisory Committee on the Domestic Service Problem investigated methods of training for domestic service, they considered facilities under three categories:

1. local education authorities aided by state grants
2. other public authorities such as poor law schools and institutions and reformatories
3. philanthropic agencies.

It is quite a useful framework for the purpose. In Ireland, as has been seen, many of the institutions and reformatories were run by religious orders.

The vast majority of servants, however, were not trained before beginning work; the only instruction they received before they sought their first place was that gained at home. Servants were trained by their mistresses or, in large houses, by upper servants. Former servants and employers all agreed that servants were trained on the job; moreover, these servants stated that the domestics with whom they came in contact had also been trained in this way. They were totally unaware of any formal courses that might have existed. As late as 1940 the Report on vocational organisation stated that domestic service 'was still a matter of apprenticeship'.

This was true also in Britain and other countries. The Women's Advisory Committee in 1919 said: 'in 1911 there were in the country some 1,362,706 domestic servants including 63,368 who were
employed in hotels and restaurants. The figures for those trained in institutions (meaning educational institutions) forms only a small fraction of this number ... the bulk of domestic servants no doubt obtain such training as may be from the mistress, or in large households, from the upper servants under whom they work'.

The committee pointed out that full use was not made of the limited educational facilities that did exist. An earlier government report, in 1899, said that: 'The absence of any system of training for general servants is a serious defect in our social organisation. At present the good general servant, like the good mistress, is unfortunately born not made, and is consequently rare'. The same report stated that: 'at the top, the want of "professional" training alone disqualifies the most efficient general servants for promotion to the households employing many servants and paying higher wages'. Employers in England and France had to educate their own servants; the lag in the educational system was blamed for this. Formal training for domestic service was not a success in the United States, and it was considered by many there that the only successful training was done on the job.

This method of training had a number of disadvantages. Many people felt that mistresses could not teach their servants something about which they were ignorant themselves. Mrs. Beeton's book, Household management, and similar manuals were designed to help mistresses in the task of training and organising domestic staff. Even if mistresses had the necessary knowledge and skills, the likelihood of the servant receiving a systematic training was not high. The Irish Homestead in 1902 gave 'Practical hints on the training of servants as cooks' in which it was pointed out that not every mistress had the leisure or strength to train servants and spoke of 'the utter absence of any system or method in the training of the average domestic servant'. Any training which a mistress gave a servant was designed to expedite the performance of the domestic chores in her household according to her wishes, as one servant put it: 'most mistresses trained girls in their way of doing things'. This was not necessarily the best way, neither
was the household organisation necessarily such that it provided a representative model for the teaching of good practice which would be useful in other situations.

The training given by upper servants was probably more satisfactory. Firstly, the upper servant at least knew how to do the job herself; secondly, on account of the specialisation in these households, the content of the job could be more easily defined and presumably, taught. Also, the training was usually more systematic and extended over a number of years. Finally, households in which a large staff was employed were usually organised in a manner that was widely accepted, and servants trained in one house could move easily to another similar house. The Report of domestic service sub-committee on training of 1919 said that the training given to young servants in large households was considered by some of the committee and some of the witnesses to be the best kind for domestic servants. While conceding the value of this training, the committee pointed out that it is probably limited to: 'technical instruction in the branch of domestic service selected, since for the most part, the upper servant herself is not possessed of more than technical knowledge, and is quite unable to explain the reasons for the various processes which have been adopted as a result of experience. Hence the intellect is not trained and the domestic servant tends to become mechanical in her work and her intelligence suffers in consequence'.

The importance of a mother's training as a preparation for domestic service was stressed by some. The sub-committee on training in 1919 said the number of servants who obtained sufficient instruction on domestic matters at home to allow them to take paid domestic work was probably insignificant. Sometimes young girls did part-time work or took jobs minding children or doing some light housework with a local family for a very low wage. In this way they obtained some experience and a minimum amount of training. In England these were called 'petty places'. They are mentioned by Flora Thompson in Lark Rise to Candleford. When the girls in the
hamlet left school they went to a petty place where they spent a year; they got low wages - often 1/- a week - but they were treated as one of the family, provided with uniform, if worn, and given presents. At 13 they were ready for 'gentlemen's places'.

The formal education system in Ireland provided very little of what could be considered training for domestic service before the first decade of the twentieth century. It could be argued that it offered little before the 1930s. The development of technical education in Ireland really only started with the passing of the 1899 technical instruction act. A similar act of ten years earlier had not been a success, for six years after its introduction only nine local authorities were availing of their power to levy a rate for technical education. Even under the 1899 act progress was slow. The technical education system was a decentralised one in which the onus was put on local authorities - county councils and county boroughs - which were very new. Ireland had no experience of a decentralised system; both national and intermediate education as well as the police and poor law systems were centrally controlled. There was a marked lack of informed public opinion on educational matters. Also, in many parts of Ireland, agricultural interests overshadowed industrial interests, so effective local involvement in technical education was slow. There was also difficulty in the early years in obtaining technical teachers.

The national schools in Ireland did not contribute to training for domestic work, at least not before 1902. Reports to a commission of enquiry into technical education which was set up in 1881 said that primary education was too literary and suffered from a total lack of technical instruction; it did not prepare pupils for any trade or occupation. The Report of the commissioners on manual and practical instruction in primary schools in 1898 reaffirmed the one-sided nature of primary education. In 1902 changes were made in the curricula in both primary and intermediate schools in an effort to improve the imbalance between academic and practical subjects. Elementary science, manual instruction and domestic
26 In 1927 the commission on technical education reported that the teaching of domestic economy to primary pupils was not a success. Even if it had been successful, it is doubtful if the domestic economy learned by national school children could be considered as training for domestic service. Violet M. Firth in *The psychology of the servant problem*, certainly did not think that primary schools were capable of giving this training.

In 1887 Kevin Street Technical School was opened. As a result of interest generated by the Artisans’ Exhibition held in Dublin in 1885, the corporation agreed to subsidise science and art instruction under the Public Libraries Act. The curriculum in the school included, besides mathematics, many trade subjects, shorthand, typing, bookkeeping, French and German, cookery and dressmaking. An article in *The Lady of the House* in 1903 said that of the 398 girls and women who attended the various evening classes in the previous year, eleven were domestic servants. This is a very small number and many may not have been attending cookery classes; on the other hand 218 had no avowed business or profession and some of these may have been acquiring knowledge of cookery or sewing with the intention of seeking work as servants. In 1913 a technical school was opened in Ringsend, on a site donated by the earl of Pembroke who also gave £5000 and an annual grant to the school. The Pembroke township commissioners also levied a rate of one penny in the pound under the 1889 act to support the school. Cookery, dressmaking and hygiene were also taught here. Of course attendance at a series of cookery or other classes cannot be expected to fit a person for a career in service. A writer to *The Irish Homestead* in 1898 said: ‘thirty lessons in the year in either cooking or laundry work cannot be called training’. However such courses could give a limited foundation or enhance already acquired skills. A much more complete training was given at full-time courses in technical schools. In Britain full-time courses at these schools were intended primarily to prepare girls to run their own homes. There were schools specially for servants provided by local authorities in England and Wales - ten in 1914. The total number these schools could cater for was 350. By
1918, one had closed and the number receiving training in the other nine was about 220. When full-time courses in technical schools became available in Ireland they also were intended to train girls to run their own homes.

In Ireland from 1899 to 1924, the main work in both urban and rural centres was done at evening classes. In the county schemes instruction was usually given by 'itinerant teachers' on short courses of five evenings a week for approximately six weeks. The Irish Homestead in 1902 and 1903 reported that four month courses in cookery, laundry and sick nursing were held in places like Glencar, Creevela and Killorglin. These were intended for farmers' daughters and were primarily meant to help them to run their own homes. In the early years, many country districts were untouched by these courses. In urban areas, some of the principal courses for women were in domestic economy subjects. Introductory courses in schools gradually developed into continuation classes, but even by 1924, day schools formed only a small part of the work of technical education. The Report of the commission on technical education in 1927 stated that there were only 65 technical schools in the Free State in 1925. The main work of the schools was carried on in evening classes. Therefore the number of girls who had access to full-time courses in technical schools was limited. Many of those who could avail of them did not do so. The Report on vocational organisation stated that: 'in recent years facilities are afforded in continuation and technical schools for learning the rudiments of housewifery, but until technical certificates command a reasonable minimum wage there is not sufficient inducement for girls to spend time and energy obtaining them'.

Comparatively few girls took these courses and there is no evidence to suggest that they were ever considered adequate training for service. All those advocating formal training had something more specialised in mind. The 1919 Report of the domestic service sub-committee advocated that training should commence on leaving school at 14 years of age, should last for two years and take place
in junior technical schools. The programme for the first year was
very similar to that followed in technical schools in England and
Ireland, two thirds of the time devoted to domestic subjects and
one third to general education. In the second year a more specialised
course of training was suggested depending on the branch of work
selected by the student - cook, nurserymaid or laundremaid. It was
thought desirable that in this year some practical experience should
be gained in a household under the teacher's supervision; for this
purpose a boarding house for teachers connected to the school was
suggested; those wishing to train as nursery-maids would have three
months' experience in play centres, nursery schools and day
nurseries. This programme was very similar to that in the schools
for domestic servants run by local authorities in England, which
have already been mentioned. A member of the Irish Women Workers'
Union, in evidence to the commission on vocational organisation in
1940, suggested that residential hostels should be set up in every
town for training indoor domestic servants. When asked if this was
not being done by the vocational schools, the witness said that those
schools could teach cookery and laundry work but only in a residential
hostel could girls learn the full work of a house. Obviously it was
felt that a school for training domestic servants should be residential
or at least have access to residential facilities.

A number of philanthropic and private agencies provided training
for domestic service. There were six residential domestic economy
schools in Ireland run by religious in places such as Carrick-on-Suir
and Drishane. They were intended to teach household skills, poultry
and dairy work to farmers' daughters. The training would, of course,
have been suitable for domestic servants and, no doubt, some did take
up that occupation. The Third annual general report of the department
of agriculture and technical instruction, however, insisted that the
primary object of residential schools for girls was to train house-
wives and not domestic servants nor future teachers of domestic
economy. The Kildare Street Dublin School of Cookery, Laundrywork &
Dressmaking was established in the early 1890s by the Royal Irish
Association for Promoting the Training and Employment of Women. The
Girls' Friendly Society's report for 1894 said that it was easier for a girl to get special training in housewifery since that school opened. It became the school for training domestic economy teachers and on 1 August 1903 the Department of Agriculture & Technical Instruction took over complete control of the school for this purpose. The Killarney School of Housewifery was founded in the last century by Lady Kenmare to train servants and it continued well into the present century. The aim was to give a general training and to prepare girls for positions such as cook, housemaid or parlourmaid. It was a one year course and twenty girls were trained each year. There was no formal examination at the end of the course. Employers wrote to the school looking for servants and the girls got positions all over the country.

In 1905 a school of housewifery was started in Saint Kevin's Park, Kilmacud, in conjunction with a holiday home for catholic women workers of limited means. An instructress was appointed by the benefactor to train the girls either to run their own homes or to work as domestic servants. They obtained practical experience catering for the women on holidays in the home. The girls received a certificate in housewifery at the end of the course. However, this school was taken over by the D.A.T.I. in 1909 when teacher training in domestic economy was moved from Kildare Street to Kilmacud. (See also the House of Mercy, p. 51, above).

The Protestant churches and communities also made some provision for the training of domestic servants. The Girls' Friendly Society was established in Dublin in 1877. It was modelled on the G.F.S. in England which had been working successfully for two years. The society was started originally to help young girls leaving home and going out into a difficult world fraught with temptations. From the beginning it had close ties with the Church of England and its organisation reflected that of the church; it was based on the diocese and the parish. The girls were members of the society and the ladies who helped them were called associates. The associates were expected to seek out these young girls leaving national schools,
befriend them, help them to find employment, put them in touch with the local clergyman and keep in contact with them. Service was the main outlet for the girls and the G.F.S. was interested in training their members for this occupation. This interest took different forms. Associates were advised to place the girls in training schools 'to fit them for service', and to induce members to join suitable classes where these existed. The G.F.S. organised classes themselves though the council was careful to point out that this should not be done where classes were already provided by other organisations.

The G.F.S. had a section known as the industrial department, which had special responsibility for training. It reported that it had a very successful year in 1893. During the winter and spring three qualified teachers from the Liverpool Technical College were engaged by the G.F.S. and they gave courses in Dublin, Armagh and Cashel in cookery and laundry work. It was pointed out that in the dioceses within reach of cities, where teachers could easily be obtained, classes in many of these subjects had been already held. The G.F.S. made it possible to extend these advantages to country places. The department was then in its infancy, but it was hoped to develop classes in dressmaking, dairywork, sanitary matters and domestic economy and to hold examinations. Reports in 1896 and 1898 show that developments within the industrial department had been slow but there was optimism that technical education was becoming more widespread and would fulfil the needs that existed. Subsequent reports, however, show that this optimism had not been justified. A report from Tuam in 1905 stated that their members had no opportunity to avail of technical education as the county council classes were held in convents. In 1907 the report of the industrial department said: 'it is disappointing to find that only comparatively few of our members make use of the technical schools'.

The industrial department commended a country branch in 1895 for sending a member to do a complete course of training in the Kildare Street School, and hoped that more branches would do this
in future. The G.F.S. also used their hostel for training purposes, but only one or two girls at a time could receive training there. In 1892 a girl was given six months' training in house and parlourmaid work in La Touche Lodge, South Frederick Street. She got no wages but was provided with clothes. The girl of course helped with the work of the lodge; at a later stage two girls were trained in this way. By 1912 the lady superintendent said she had great difficulty in getting and keeping training-girls and it was agreed to pay them £6 a year. This reflects the general difficulty in obtaining servants at that time and the growing independence of young girls.

In 1905 plans were made by the Church of Ireland to provide a central home for training domestic servants and the G.F.S. was represented on the planning sub-committee. In the autumn of 1906 the Domestic Training Institute for Protestant Girls was opened in Charlemont Street, Dublin. It was under the board of education of the general synod and was recognised by the Department of Agriculture & Technical Instruction. It was primarily intended for girls holding county council scholarships but was also open to others for whom a fee of £15 was charged for the year's training. The G.F.S. offered a scholarship to the institute - however very few protestant girls applied for the scholarships. In 1908 50 scholarships were available but only three were awarded to protestants, not because they were refused to them but rather because they did not apply. By 1912 the Domestic Training Institute was in difficulties caused by heavy costs, rent, taxes and salaries and the falling off of public support.

Formal training played a comparatively small part in the preparation of domestic servants for work. Yet, in spite of this, it was a subject about which much was written throughout the years. It was a constant theme of reformers in the nineteenth century. It was even more common in the present century when the number of servants declined and it was seen as a method of enhancing the status of service and increasing its ability to compete with other occupations. This was stressed in the Report of domestic service
sub-committee on training of 1919. The increased interest in education, especially technical education, in the early twentieth century also had its effect. There were demands for certificates for servants, standardisation of training and a fixed rate for the job as in other occupations. Methods of training were suggested such as using ladies with large establishments and a well-trained staff of servants who would take young girls in and train them as scullery-maid, under-housemaid etc; mistresses in smaller homes, 'refined gentlewomen with small means who are well suited to become trainers of domestic workers', were considered for general servants. Boarding houses attached to orphanages, where girls could get practical experience in all branches of a domestic servant's work, were also mooted. As has been seen, as late as the 1940s, the I.W.W.U. was urging that the government should set up hostels in every town in Ireland where servants could be trained.

However a satisfactory system of formal education for domestic servants never materialised, and the problem was solved by the disappearance of the domestic from most homes. In the U.S.A. 'the rumour that courses in home economics were training students for domestic service could kill a program', and only schools for institutional housekeepers and teachers of domestic science did well. The same thing happened in Ireland and probably in most other developed countries. Instead of training enhancing the status of domestic servants, the low esteem in which servants were held seems to have frustrated whatever efforts were made to provide a proper system of training.
CHAPTER 5

SEEKING 'SITUATIONS' AND SERVANTS

There were a number of places in which servants and employers were brought into contact with each other. The middle and upper classes of society frequently used their influence to secure positions for their children as well as for neices and nephews. The Laurentian sisters also ran their own employment agency, which was run on a more businesslike form. The maids of the 'big' houses and servants and their employers were all acquainted with people who ran agencies and servants in general. In the 19th century, employment agencies were set up in which people were no longer involved in either party, and, more importantly, the situation of servant was known as a recognized third person.

This method was also used widely in Great Britain, France and America. Mrs. Beaton recommended the use of employment agencies as confidential registry offices. An agent on service often suggested that employers recruit among their friends or local tradesmen when seeking domestic servants. This internal process offered the servants and employers the best control and retained the most reasonable system for both.

In the Dublin households in 1920, 10% of those with four or more servants and the servants from the same county or family. However, it is difficult to ascertain how many of these were servants were living in the same houses. In many other cases, servants from different places or counties were also employed. This was especially true in the larger cities, where a large proportion came from other areas and could have been recruited in many different ways. However, it is difficult to ascertain how many of these servants might have recommended where they had worked with them or were not from the same locality.
CHAPTER 5

SEEKING 'SITUATIONS' AND SERVANTS

There were a number of different ways in which servants and employers were brought into contact with each other. The simplest and most commonly used method was by word of mouth. Of 29 servants and employers who discussed this matter with the author, 22 had at least obtained one position or one servant in this way. Members of families in service recommended their brothers, sisters or children; nuns and teachers in schools, shopkeepers, van drivers, clergy, the mistress of the 'big' house, friends and neighbours were all mentioned as people who put employers and servants in contact. It was generally regarded as a most satisfactory arrangement in which there was no cost involved to either party, and, more importantly, the situation or servant was known to a trusted third person.

This method was also used widely, in Great Britain, France and America. Mrs Beeton recommended the use of tradespeople as unofficial registry offices. Manuals on service often suggested that employers enquire among friends or local tradesmen when seeking domestic servants. This informal process offered the servant and mistress the most control and remained the most desirable system for both.

In the Dublin households in 1911, 15% of those with from two to seven servants had two servants from the same county (one had three). Some of these could have occurred by coincidence, though one quarter were cases where sisters were working in the same house. Incidences of two or more servants from Dublin city or county were not counted as a high proportion came from Dublin and could have been recruited in many different ways; some, however, would have been by servant recommendation. The extent to which this method was used is difficult to ascertain; servants might have recommended others who had worked with them but were not from the same locality.
Clustering of servants from the same locality in apartment houses and city blocks which was found in Paris and London suggests that servants often recommended each other.  

Sons and daughters of employees and tenants living on large estates may have hoped to get a job in the 'big' house but, while some landlords recruited local labour, others preferred servants who were strangers. An examination of the birth places of servants working in the country houses in Ireland in 1911 showed that the latter policy was much more common. There was no local person employed in 39 per cent of the houses in the study. A further 35 per cent had only one person from the locality on the staff, even though, in some cases, there were 10 - 14 servants employed. The smaller households were, on the whole, more likely to employ local labour. There were 17 indoor servants in Powerscourt, none of whom was from the locality. Similarly the Marquis of Downshire, who had 16 servants, had no local person on the staff. Castletown House had a staff of 19, but no servant from the county. There were many other similar examples.

A former servant who was born on Lord Dunsany's estate in Co. Meath, where her father was employed, became a housemaid in the castle in 1933. It was the policy there to employ the children of estate workers and she and her sister and brother worked for Lord Dunsany. This is substantiated by the census return for 1911 which showed that seven out of twelve servants were locals, three were sisters. The servant from Dunsany then got a job as housekeeper in Major McCalmont's home in Thomastown, Co. Kilkenny. The policy in that household was not to employ local labour, and staff were told not to fraternise with the local people. The small number of local people employed on Irish estates was due, in part, to the large number of British born servants in these households, though that, in turn, may have resulted from a reluctance to employ, not just local, but also Irish people.

It is difficult to discover to what extent newspaper advertisements were used in other countries to obtain situations and recruit
servants. It was used in England in the eighteenth century but was omitted as a method of recruitment in Mrs Beeton's Book of household management published in 1861. However, it was proclaimed 'one of the commonest modes of procuring servants' in a new edition which appeared at the end of the 1860s. On the 10 January 1870 The Times had 177 advertisements for situations or servants and this was not considered untypical. This does not seem a large number for the major London daily newspaper. Theresa McBride in The domestic revolution said that in England the second most common means of securing a servant, after personal contact, was by advertising. She also inferred that advertising was not as important at all in France as in England. Employers in the U.S.A. were reluctant to answer situation-wanted advertisements and 'had mixed reactions about advertising themselves'. The extent to which they used newspapers to advertise themselves varied according to local custom; in New York the practice was favoured by employers, in Chicago employers preferred to use registries.

In Ireland, newspaper advertising was quite important at the end of the nineteenth century and into the 1920s. There were 133 advertisements in the Irish Times on 21 January 1880; this is high when compared to the 177 in The Times in January 1870 - though, of course, ten years later. The Irish Times was the most important paper for domestic service advertising. The paper also ran an agency for servants and this probably strengthened its reputation. In 1880 newspaper advertising was used much more by servants than by employers. On the 21 January 1880, 119 of the advertisements were placed by servants and only 14 by employers. On 8 July 1880, the Freeman's Journal had 38 advertisements from servants and only five from employers. During the next decade the use of newspaper advertising increased: on 3 May 1892, the Irish Times had 218 advertisements, 134 from servants and 84 from employers; within a year this had increased to 271. After that the number declined to approximately 250 daily.

Even though the annual intake of servants in Ireland at the time must have been at least 100,000, and this is a conservative
estimate, 250 advertisements on one day in one paper - undoubtedly the most important national paper - shows that newspaper advertising was of major importance when seeking situations and servants. After 1914 advertising declined to about 200 daily in 1916 and more rapidly after that. On 14 January 1919 there were only 104 advertisements, 20 from servants and 84 from employers. Advertising in the Freeman's Journal showed a similar decline from 81 on 20 January 1885 to 50-60 daily between 1890 - 1905, and 30-40 in 1909; on 18 February 1919 there were only 18 advertisements, 17 from employers and one from a servant. Another national newspaper, the Daily Nation, had 62 and 70 advertisements on two days in June 1897, 60 and 69 respectively from servants and only 1 and 2 from employers. This was at a time when advertising seemed to be at its height. It will be noticed that as time went on and servants became more difficult to obtain, the number of employers placing advertisements increased. It was only in 1913 that advertisements from employers outnumbered those from servants in the Irish Times.

The fact that servants more than employers used the Irish Times shows that upper class employers generally did not advertise for servants, but answered servants' advertisements. Employers who did advertise usually wanted general servants, cooks, childrens' maids, housekeepers, usually described as 'working'; housemaids and sometimes parlourmaids were next in importance. The male servants required were usually general men, hall or pantry boys, grooms and coachmen. On the other hand, those looking for situations included a much wider range of specialisations, up to 25 different categories. On the 13 January 1880, ten butlers offered their services in the Irish Times. It was only about 1913 that an advertisement for a butler or footman was noticed in the Irish Times, showing the difficulty which was being experienced in obtaining servants at that time. Upper servants used the Irish Times almost exclusively. Servants using the Freeman's Journal, the Daily Nation and the weekly papers were mainly general servants with some cooks or cook-generals, childrens' maids, laundresses and housekeepers.
Most people confined themselves to a brief statement about the situation sought or offered. Occasionally an employer stipulated that the applicant must belong to a particular church, be unmarried, or a certain age - young, experienced, and not over forty. On the whole religion was not often mentioned (of course this information could be obtained later). Non-catholic servants and those seeking them used the Irish Times almost exclusively; it was, of course, also used by catholics. Out of 1,219 advertisements appearing in the Freeman's Journal between 1880 and 1913 only 31 mentioned religion, and only one of them was Church of Ireland. The Freeman's Journal catered mainly for catholics and also for servants working in one- or two-servant households, lower servants and very young and inexperienced servants. It was used for general servants, cook generals, childrens' maids and nurses who were usually 'smart, tidy little girls', 'useful little girls' - who were also expected to help with housework - priests' housekeepers and staff for business houses. It was not used at all by upper servants or male servants. Employers sometimes said that a servant must be hard-working, strong, an early riser, have 'good discharges'; they often indicated that a servant must be flexible in his or her approach to work. Some managed to give a lot of information about the situation in a short advertisement. 'A maid to wait on elderly lady, useful in house, abstainer, I.C., needlewoman - £12 - 2 other servants' and 'Wanted superior Working Help, Protestant, all cooking, housework, small family, no children; charwoman; seaside; £14'. An advertisement, by no means typical, appeared in the Irish Times on 19 March 1901: 'Lady wants respectable trustworthy woman about 50, light housekeeping - no salary'. Servants sometimes stated that they were experienced, honest, had 'long discharges', no encumbrances, were hard-working, willing or unwilling to do washing. Cooks sometimes gave their repertoire of dishes. Many advertisements were inserted on behalf of servants, especially young servants, by middle or upper class ladies. Some employers addressed their advertisements to other employers, 'will any lady recommend' was a not uncommon preamble when seeking a childrens' nurse, a cook or general servant. 'Can gentleman recommend active young fellow as indoor servant. Must attend well, wages £14. State age, height and religion'. 
The weekly papers in Ireland do not appear to have been used to a great extent by employers and were used very little by servants. A random selection of weekly papers from different parts of Ireland and spanning the years 1882 - 1920 confirmed this. The Drogheda Independent in 1889 had only four advertisements for servants in the 52 issues of the paper. Eleven employers used the paper in 1890 and 1891; in the latter year one servant advertised. In 1902 the number of employers advertising was 47 and the number of servants five, an average of one advertisement a week. Many advertisements in weekly papers, and indeed in daily papers, were inserted on a number of occasions; so the total number of advertisements was greater than the number of positions and servants.

Newspaper advertisements provided servants who were thinking of changing their job with an opportunity of considering other openings without committing themselves or paying fees to agencies. They could then make direct contact with employers in their homes. Of course they could also spend a lot of time travelling and then discover that the position was unsuitable or no longer available. On the whole more servants than employers inserted advertisements in the papers, probably because servants were prejudiced against registry offices. The country weekly papers were used, almost exclusively, by employers. These may have been people who had not ready access to registry offices. Newspaper advertising was also used fairly extensively by registry offices to inform servants and employers of the range of openings and personnel on their books. Newspapers had, of course, the advantage of bringing information to a very wide public.

One of the most controversial methods of obtaining situations or servants was registry offices. They developed from small shops which kept lists of local girls requiring situations and mistresses maids, and charged a small fee for introducing one to the other. Registry offices were controversial because some were suspected of being used for fraudulent and immoral purposes. In England, many, especially in the larger towns, had earned a doubtful reputation.
as resorts for prostitutes and lower grade servants. Registry offices often cheated servants by charging fees which employers had already paid, demanding bribes to furnish employment, obtaining servants at lower rates to please mistresses, and misrepresenting working conditions. Many writers mention the fraudulent and immoral activities of registry offices. Evidence was given to a royal commission on labour in 1893 that registry offices were dishonest, that they allowed servants to put down their names and pay a fee when they could not find employment for those already on their books. A select committee of the house of lords, which in 1881 examined the law relating to the protection of young girls, found that registry offices, even if not directly involved in prostitution, could cause a lot of trouble by enticing girls to London by pretending that they had jobs to offer. The disappointed and penniless girls then often turned to prostitution. The select committee was told that a proprietor of a registry office in the Paddington area was convicted of this offence. Witnesses were asked if any Irish girls had been brought over and become prostitutes; the answer was that there was no case known to the witness.

Registry offices in Great Britain and Ireland were not licensed or controlled in any way until the twentieth century. In France, in 1852, Louis Napoleon licensed agencies and by 1909 there were 203 authorised agencies in Paris. In April 1909 the French Consul in Dublin enquired if a licence was necessary for a foreigner to set up a registry for servants in Dublin. The Dublin Metropolitan Police replied that, as far as they were aware, there were no legal formalities to be complied with by foreigners and no licence was necessary. The registry was opened in May 1909.

The act designed to bring registries within the ambit of the law was the Public Health Amendment Act, 1907. This allowed local authorities to make by-laws to control the registries. As the option to exercise regulative powers was left to the local authorities legislation was not introduced at all in many areas. Also, an agency which lost its licence in one part of the country could move to an area in which there was no control.
By-laws designed under the 1907 act to regulate and licence registry offices were introduced in Dublin on 8 May 1911. Proprietors of registries were obliged to keep two books, one for registration of employers and one for servants. The type of information which should be recorded for both was specified. There were also regulations about the premises, especially if it was used as a lodging by those seeking employment. This shows that the provision of this facility must have been fairly widespread. It is interesting that these by-laws applied specifically to female domestic servants, showing that women were generally those exploited by dishonest and immoral registries, and also that the work force was largely female.

The act does not appear to have been properly enforced in Dublin. The appointment of a full-time inspector of registry offices was opposed by the lord lieutenant on the grounds that there was not sufficient work to justify such an appointment, and that the work could be done by the existing sanitary staff. The public health committee did not agree with this and said that the staff was fully occupied in the inspection of shops. When the act came into force in 1911, a Miss Anna Kavanagh, who was a temporary sanitary officer, was given the responsibility for inspecting registry offices. Her services were terminated on 30 June 1912. In 1913 the public health committee stated that the registries had not been inspected since Miss Kavanagh left, and they appointed a Mrs Anna Scott as inspector of registry offices for female domestic workers. As the work was not considered as laborious as that of a sanitary sub-officer, she was offered a more modest salary of 18/- per week. This post was not sanctioned by the lord lieutenant and Mrs Scott was given two months' notice.

The only report on the inspection of registry offices in the minutes of meetings of Dublin Corporation up to 1922 was in 1912 when Miss Kavanagh was acting inspector. During the quarter of the year ending 31 March, 340 visits were made, 24 notices were served, there was one conviction, six offices were closed and 20
notices were complied with. Two new offices were registered. Considering that there were only 34 registered offices, the number of visits seems excessive. It appears, however, that after this short-lived burst of enthusiasm and zeal the 1907 act was not enforced in Dublin. In 1940, the Report on vocational organisation pointed out that the revision of the act was long overdue.

The fact that six registries out of 34 were closed should have been a cause for concern, especially when it is considered that those registries were possibly among the more reputable offices. Four of these were closed on sanitary grounds. The health committee admitted that: 'to a great extent the inspection of these offices is purely with sanitary objects'. This emphasis on the sanitary rather than the fraudulent or immoral was perhaps inevitable when a sanitary officer was appointed to this position.

The extent to which Irish registry offices may have been used for fraudulent and immoral purposes is difficult to ascertain. If they were used in this way in other countries it would be naive to think that registries in Ireland were not affected. No evidence of their use for immoral purposes was discovered and a letter from the Regular Hotel & Club Workers' International Union to Augustine Birrell, the chief secretary, stating that several cases of fraud, blackmail and withholding of original references had come to the notice of the union did not mention immoral activities. The union suggested amendments to the by-laws designed to protect the servant and employer against fraud. Commercial registries nonetheless seem to have been regarded with a certain amount of suspicion. The 1909 report of the G.F.S. said about young girls: 'it is wiser for them to avoid strange registry offices'.

There was, of course, a large number of well-run registry offices, not only in Dublin, but in all medium-sized and larger towns. Half of the servants and employers interviewed said that they had used registries. Registries were favoured by the upper class and a number of Dublin offices specialised in catering for
their needs. Two very famous agencies in Marylebone, London, Masseys and Mrs Hunt's, were much used by the Irish gentry.

Agencies became important in England and France in the nineteenth century and after 1850 most servants probably had access to a registry; however in London registry offices only dealt with a small percentage of job seekers. In France, agencies appear to have been more important; in 1896 the number of placements of servants by agencies was 38% of the total number of servants. Even these agencies, however, do not appear to have been too efficient, the total number of placements was only approximately 35% of the requests for work and less than half the number of places offered. Although few servants or mistresses in the United States expressed satisfaction with registry offices, they became the primary 'market place for urban domestic jobs'.

Employers and servants paid fees to the registry offices. Sometimes a fee of perhaps 2/6 was paid to put one's name on the books and an additional set fee or a proportion of the first month's wage was paid when the client was 'suited'. Sometimes a higher fee, perhaps 5/-, was paid by mistress and servant and this covered the placement charge. If a situation or servant was not obtained the fee was forfeited. This was one of the practices to which the Regular Hotel & Club Workers' International Union objected. The union suggested that a booking or registration fee should not be paid until suitable employment was obtained and that it should not exceed 1/-. Employers sometimes paid more than servants. Upper servants usually cost more than lower servants; a butler might cost 7/6, a kitchen maid 2/6.

Registry offices provided facilities where clients could wait, and had separate waiting rooms for ladies and servants. Many provided cubicles or rooms where employers could interview servants, though employers often preferred to interview servants in the employers' homes. Registry offices often had accommodation where servants could stay while seeking a job. Former servants mentioned using this type of accommodation in Dublin and agencies sometimes stated in their advertisements that lodgings were available.
Philanthropic and religious bodies also played a part in placing girls in service. The role of the religious in reformatories, industrial and other schools has already been discussed (see above, pp 38-52). As part of their work in helping girls leaving national schools and going into the world, the G.F.S. founded registry offices and also homes where girls could stay while waiting for situations. These offices were free for the girls but employers paid a fee. In 1883, when the G.F.S. had 785 members, 63 girls were placed by the Dublin registry and there were registries in four other centres. The work of the registry offices, however, did not keep pace with the growth in membership. In 1894 the G.F.S. had 10,000 members but the number placed in service did not increase greatly. In 1895, there were 206 members on the books of the central registry, 525 applications for servants were received but only 98 placements were made. This was clearly worrying the central committee and in 1899 there was an appeal to associates to take a greater interest in the registries, to urge girls to use them and to stress that they were free. It was also reported that associates were placing the good girls themselves, and only putting those difficult to place on the registries' books. It was pointed out that all members had to be accepted, but that as they were inexperienced and untrained they were difficult to place. The rules for registry offices stated that members should be warned that those who were placed in good service through G.F.S. offices should not depend on repeated assistance. A member who declined a place or left without good reason was to have her name removed from the registry office's book or not put on again. It was decided in 1899 to charge members seeking other than the first place a fee of 1/-.

In 1897 non-members were allowed to use the registries, and had to pay a fee. In that year there were 231 members registered, 117 of whom were placed; 30 of 33 non-members were also placed. From then on there was a steady increase in the number of non-members using the registries, the number of members placed increased but not significantly. There was a big increase in the number of applicants for servants; employers, no doubt, trusted agencies run by church and charitable bodies. In 1909 the G.F.S.
received 1,466 applications for servants, 175 servants were placed and 84 of these were members - only 12% of applicants were 'suited'. In that year the G.F.S. reckoned that there were 1,139 members in domestic service. In 1911 the G.F.S. took over a long established institution called The Protestant Servants' Home at 20 Upper Merrion Street. The G.F.S. central registry moved from Molesworth Street to here and amalgamated with the registry office connected to the home. In that year there were 1,661 applicants for servants and 230 (96 members) were placed. In the context of the total number of servants in Ireland, the activities of the G.F.S. in promoting and placing servants was not very important. As a means of placing protestant girls in service and supplying protestant servants it was probably much more significant. A report in 1898 stated that 'the great difficulty in organising this department throughout the country seems to be that in some parts there are so few protestant servants'. The membership of G.F.S. was open to all religions but was used mainly by members of the protestant churches.

One of the best known of the philanthropic agencies running registry offices in England was the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants which was founded in 1875. Its function at first was to carry out the work of the poor laws in placing poor women and girls in domestic positions. Later, it widened its scope and during the 1880s placed about 5,000 yearly. In 1883 the G.F.S. in England had 48 registries and found positions for nearly 4,000 members a year. After the 1914 war started, the state-run employment exchanges in England began to act as agencies for domestic servants. It was not a success. Employers and servants alike felt they would not produce either the better class of servants or situations. The report of the Women's Advisory Committee in 1919 recommended that the practice should continue. The committee said: 'the outstanding advantages that the Employment Department would appear to offer in this connection are a wider field of selection, greater mobility and the opportunity of employing for domestic service the same methods of engagement as are used in connection with industrial and commercial work'.
They recommended that the facilities of the employment exchanges should be made more widely known to the public, and that experienced officers with knowledge of the wants of mistresses and servants as well as proper rooms for interviews - both of which had been criticised - should be made available.\textsuperscript{78}

In addition to the major disadvantages of registry offices which have already been discussed, there were other aspects which were disliked by mistresses and maids. They could be quite costly especially if one registered in a number of agencies or if one was not 'suited' and lost the registration fee. Even if a situation or servant was obtained there was no guarantee that they would be suitable. The choice of servant or job was limited to those available at a particular registry; this could be a very big handicap especially if the registry was small. For this reason the Report of the sub-committee on the machinery of distribution in 1919 favoured larger offices.\textsuperscript{79} In spite of these shortcomings registry offices were probably second in importance, after 'word of mouth', in bringing employer and servant together.

Another method which merits brief mention was hiring fairs. These persisted in Ireland well into the present century and were used mainly for farm servants and, towards the end, mainly for farm workers.\textsuperscript{30} Of course the distinction between a domestic servant and farm worker was often blurred and girls were expected to help in the house and also to look after the cows and the poultry. The report of the department of agriculture for 1906, when discussing agricultural labourers, pointed out that women were generally hired as domestic servants for 3, 6 and 12 months.\textsuperscript{81} In 1955, a 79 year old man recalled: 'there used be servant girls at the Hiring Days too and many a farmer would prefer to get a girl than a boy, and sure they used to have to do the milking and everything too'.\textsuperscript{82}

Many people found the idea of hiring fairs distasteful and indeed they did resemble cattle fairs and slave markets in a number of ways. Paddy the Cope described how he was hired at a
fair in Strabane. He was made to walk up and down so that the
farmer could judge him. Paddy heard the farmer say to a friend:
'he is wee, but the neck is good'. 33 Patrick MacGill in Children
of the dead end told how, at a fair in the north of Ireland,
farmers examined them 'after the manner of men who seek out the
good and bad points of horses which they intend to buy. Sometimes
they would speak to each other, saying that they never saw such a
lousy and ragged crowd of servants in the market place in all their
life before, and they did not seem to care even if we overheard
them say these things'. 34 In 'Open-Air Labour Exchanges' which
was published in the Times Pictorial in 1944, Michael Murphy wrote:
'some day a mature social consciousness will starve the Hiring Fair
into a memory'. This happened, but, of course, it had started to
happen long before 1944. Hiring fairs in other countries were also
used mainly for farm servants, 35 and were discontinued for the same
reason and because of the drunkenness which often accompanied them. 36

Before a domestic servant could hope to obtain a good situation
she had to get a reference from her previous employer testifying
that she was of upright character and a diligent worker. Without
a good reference a servant's career was seriously threatened.
Unfortunately there was no legal obligation on an employer to give
his servant a 'character'. Several attempts were made in the early
years of the twentieth century to bring in a bill making it compulsory
upon employers to give a reference to workers leaving their employ-
ment, but without success. 37 A vindictive employer could thus
deprive a servant of her means of livelihood. French servants
were better protected because the servant had the legal right to
obtain a certificate stating the length of service and the date on
which the servant left without further comment on his ability
unless requested by the servant. 38

The absolute necessity for a good reference was stressed by
former servants and mistresses alike. Margaret Powell pointed out
in Below stairs that to get another job one had to have, not only
a good reference, but one from the last place in which one worked.
The G.F.S. reports contain a note from the council urging working associates to: 'lose no opportunity of impressing upon girls going into service the importance of keeping their places, remember that a character for good service is the best and surest guarantee of future employment'.

Mrs Beeton said: 'In giving a Character, it is scarcely necessary to say that the mistress should be guided by a sense of strict justice. It is not fair for one lady to recommend to another a servant she would not keep herself'. In spite of Mrs Beeton's strictures, this was a common practice and had necessitated, as early as 1792, the introduction of an act which decreed that anyone giving a false character to a servant, knowing it to be false, could be fined £20 with 10/- costs. A similar penalty was imposed on a servant who presented a counterfeited character. Servants did forge references, which is not surprising when it is considered how vital they were to a servant's career. In 1902, 1903 and 1904 attempts were made to introduce a false character bill, but it never got beyond the first reading.

The practice of giving misleading references continued. Barbara Charlton in her memoirs recalls that 'indulgent as my husband could be in giving bad servants good characters and, in general, overlooking their shortcomings, Inkley got no character from him'. (The said Inkley had seduced several servants and was referred to by Mrs Charlton as the 'infamous', 'wicked' and 'atrocious' Inkley). Again, Molly Keane in Good behaviour said that the nannie was sacked 'but given quite a good reference with no mention of her drinking; that would have been too unkind and unnecessary, since she promised to reform'.

Whilst employers sometimes erred on the side of leniency when writing references for charitable, if misguided, reasons, servants could unjustly be given poor references. An unjust reference was only actionable if a servant could prove that the employer had acted with malice, a very difficult thing to do. Employers
generally checked servants' references by getting in touch with former mistresses.  

Servants had another grievance: references were held by employers and servants had to ask for them when they were leaving. Employers were, of course, obliged to return references. Registries could also retain original written references belonging to servants; the trade union wanted this practice banned in the by-laws for registries introduced in 1911. Servants felt very vulnerable when documents essential to the furtherance of their careers were in the hands of others.

It is quite understandable that employers should have insisted on good references before employing servants. They were not only hiring a worker, they were taking a stranger into their home and family. What was reprehensible was the lack of control and safeguards, especially for servants, which existed in an area which was crucial to the employment process.
CHAPTER 6

WAGES OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS

To obtain information about wages for the present study, wages
above and below domestic servants were used; they could only with
hesitation be assessed of the middle and upper class domestic servants,
compared with wages in some selected households in Dublin and Great
Britain, and for the data they supplied on wages of male servants.

Areas of wages quoted in newspapers were also used. Disadvantages
of these are that they vary in stating salaries, and, as such
CHAPTER 6

WAGES OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS

The wages of domestic servants were very difficult to ascertain for a number of reasons. Domestic service was neglected by royal commissions on wages. The special difficulties in obtaining exact information about servants' wages which caused them to be passed over in statistical inquiries was pointed out by Miss C. E. Collet's Report on the money wages of indoor domestic servants which was published in 1899 by the labour department of the Board of Trade. In addition money wages was only one aspect of servants' remuneration. Board and lodgings formed a considerable part of the real wages of servants. The value of board and lodgings is often calculated on the actual cost of their provision to employers. When determining the real wages of servants, and when comparing their wages to those of workers in other industries, an estimate should be made of the actual expenditure on food and lodgings by women of the same social class. This is stressed by W.T. Layton in his article 'Changes in the wages of domestic servants during fifty years'. Also, servants often got an allowance of tea, sugar and beer; they received presents, tips and other perquisites. Information on servants' wages in Ireland is particularly difficult to obtain. The literature is concerned with wages in Great Britain and other countries. Miss Collet's report in 1899 did include Ireland, but the number of Irish servants surveyed was not large, 359, and the returns from Ireland did not show the same consistency as those from Great Britain.

To obtain information about Ireland for the present study, wage books and other manuscript sources were used; they dealt only with households of the gentry and upper class and were interesting to compare with wages in more modest households in Dublin and Great Britain, and for the data they supplied on wages of male servants. Rates of wages quoted in newspapers were also used. Disadvantages of these are that they refer to starting salaries, and, as many
servants got rises, they are not representative of those in service, however, changes in the former reflect changes in the latter; secondly, they probably do not reflect the lowest paid and the highest paid adequately, because newspapers were not the usual method of recruitment for those at the extreme ends of the scale. Information was also obtained from reminiscences of former servants; these referred only to the twentieth century and most of them to the period after 1920. Miss Collet's report was, of course, used as well as English wage rates. From Miss Collet's statistics and a general comparison of wages in Great Britain and Ireland, it would seem that wages were lower in Ireland than in England.

There were great variations in wages from one household to another and from one servant to another. This is stressed by many writers. The wage was affected by the income level of the employer, the age and experience of the servant, the number of staff employed, the location, and supply and demand. The wage paid was finally a personal one - that agreed between employer and servant. Interviews with former servants and letters from them show that when they moved from one situation to another they invariably got higher wages. This can be attributed to their experience but it also highlights that each servant had a base line which she was not willing to go below. One servant, who was a cook in a guesthouse in Kensington and earning £40 a year in 1926, returned to Ireland in 1927 and got a situation as cook in a private house in Shankill at £48 a year. Her employers were Americans which may help to explain what was an exceptional wage for that position in Ireland at the time, but it also shows the reluctance of servants to, as they would see it, worsen their position by accepting a lower wage. This element of personal negotiation was also seen in the fact that former servants always got conditions - free time and holidays - which were at least as good as those in their former situation. Wages of servants in Dromoland Castle, Co. Clare, 1880 - 1886 and in Ashfield, Co. Cavan, 1885 - 1892 show differences in wages of subsequent holders of the same position that cannot be simply explained by experience or length of service - many were for positions for which previous
experience would have been essential; many remained in the position for only a short period. In the six years there were seven kitchen maids in Dromoland Castle and their wages were: £18, £20, £18, £28, £19, £20 and £22 per year.

In spite of these difficulties and the relative scarcity of data on Irish wage rates a certain uniformity is discernible. Wages for general servants and cooks are shown in Table 9. These wage rates were taken from the Irish Times and the Freeman's Journal in three different years of each decade. Twenty two issues of the former and 28 of the latter were examined. The wages of general servants and cooks were based on comparatively large numbers, 105 general servants in the Irish Times and 112 in the Freeman's Journal and 68 cooks in the Irish Times. The number of cooks for whom wages were given in the Freeman's Journal was so small, and most seemed to require a general servant who would do the cooking, that these were ignored. The wages for general servants given in the two papers were so different that they have been shown separately. The wages were consistently higher in the Irish Times showing that readers were usually seeking older, more experienced servants. This was only one of the differences discernible between the two papers. Most of the advertisements in the Freeman's Journal sought general servants who were expected to do plain cooking; cooks were usually expected to do general housework. Many servants looking for positions appreciated this fact and couched their advertisements accordingly. The provincial papers also showed that when people advertised for either a general servant or a cook they very often wanted a servant who would fulfil both functions. The next most common position sought or advertised was that of childrens' maid or nurse. Employers using the Freeman's Journal and the provincial papers often looked for 'a smart little girl to mind the children', or 'a young girl to look after children and help with housework'. The wages offered in these cases were usually low, as little as 52/- a year; £4 a year was usual in the 1880s and 1890s and not unknown much later. Advertisements for servants reflect the different social classes of the readers of the two papers. There
Table 9

Average wages of servants in Ireland 1880 - 1920 from advertisements in the Irish Times and Freeman's Journal. (Wage span in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dates</th>
<th>General I.T.</th>
<th>Servant F.J.</th>
<th>Cook 'ordinary'</th>
<th>Cook 'superior'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880 - 9</td>
<td>£8.3 (£6 - £10)</td>
<td>£5.6 (£3 - £8)</td>
<td>£13.8</td>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 - 9</td>
<td>£9 (£8 - £14)</td>
<td>£7.6 (£4 - £12)</td>
<td>£14.2</td>
<td>£30 - £35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 9</td>
<td>£12.5 (£10 - £18)</td>
<td>£9 (£5 - £15)</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£30 - £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 - 20</td>
<td>£14.3 (£12 - £22)</td>
<td>£14.8 (£9 - £20)</td>
<td>£18.7</td>
<td>£30 - £40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were very few advertisements for other than general servants, cooks and childrens' nurses in the Freeman's Journal; some housemaids, kitchenmaids, house/parlourmaids and housekeepers sought situations. Very few servants in any newspapers mentioned wages. A much wider variety of servants - butlers, footmen, coachmen, house and parlour maids, nurses, ladies' maids as well as cooks and general servants used the Irish Times. As very few employers of upper servants advertised there were few wages quoted for these servants in the newspapers.

The lowest rates offered for general servants, £4 - £8 in the 1880s, were also offered in the 1890s and into the twentieth century though in greatly decreasing numbers. Between 1910 - 1920 there were some advertisements for a general servant at £8 - £9 and an agency offered to supply general servants from £8 - £20 a year. Low rates of pay were usually offered for 'young', 'young country', 'to train' or 'never-out-before-girls'. It has already been seen that many young girls were recruited from orphanages, and by word of mouth through relatives, shop-keepers and roundsmen as general servants. The wages given to them right up to the 1920s were low,
Domestic servants on farms in Ireland were paid as little as 32/- a year in the 1870s, and 50/- in 1896; about 1906 - 1910 they were paid £8 - £12. Charles Booth found that lower grade servants in London, especially the younger ones, were paid consistently less than the average servant in middle and upper class houses.

There were two clearly discernible rates of pay for cooks, a rate of from £10 - £20 rising to £14 - £23 at the end of the period and a rate of £30 - £40 (see above, Table 9, p. 86). Cooks were the second most common type of servant employed in one to three servant households; this was seen from the 1911 study. In many of these houses cooks had duties other than cooking, and their wages, and indeed their job was more akin to those of a superior general servant. The higher rate was paid to cooks who had purely culinary duties; advertisements for cooks offering wages of £30 often mentioned that a kitchenmaid was or was not kept, showing that a larger staff was employed and a degree of specialisation obtained. Charles Booth points out that the rate for housemaids and house/parlourmaids was higher in four-servant than in two-servant households but not greatly so; however cooks in four-servant households earned much more than those in two-servant households, £30 a year in the former, £18.16.0 in the latter. The same was true of cooks in Ireland. Advertisements from an agency in the 1910 - 1920 period offered £50 - £60 to professional cooks. This was the rate paid to cooks in the homes of the nobility and gentry. Wages received or given by many of those who wrote to or were interviewed by the author fit into the general pattern suggested by newspaper advertisements.

The wages in Table 10 were taken from the Irish Times, the Freeman's Journal and the Wicklow People. The number on which they were based was very small and therefore the range offered rather than the average is given. Inconsistencies are due to the small number which was probably not always representative of the time. The table shows that wage rates which were common in the 1880s were
Table 10

Range of wages offered to other servants in newspaper advertisements 1880 - 1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dates</th>
<th>housemaid</th>
<th>parlourmaid</th>
<th>house/parlourmaid</th>
<th>childrens' nurse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880-9</td>
<td>£8 - £14</td>
<td>£10 - £12</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£12 - £16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-9</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td></td>
<td>£12 - £18</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-9</td>
<td>£12 - £18</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 - £16</td>
<td>£16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-20</td>
<td>£14 - £24</td>
<td>£16 - £28</td>
<td>£12 - £25</td>
<td>£14 - £20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also paid in the following 30 years; it also shows a gradual rise especially in the last ten years. In 1911, the Girls' Friendly Society paid £10 a year to a young housemaid in their Molesworth Street Home for Business Girls; in 1912 they paid £10 - £12 to parlourmaids. These were young girls who had just been trained by the G.F.S. and the rates were probably slightly lower than those usually paid to similar young servants. A working housekeeper was paid £18 - £20 in the same establishment in 1911.

Household account books for two families gave an indication of wages paid by upper class employers at the end of the nineteenth and the first twenty years of the present century. Unfortunately the actual position of many of the servants was not specified in either account. The wage book of Elizabeth, wife of John Dillon, who lived in North Great George's Street, showed that in 1896 she had four female servants, earning from £19 to £22 a year. The highest wage, £22, was paid to the cook. In August 1899 a housemaid was engaged at £16 a year and a house/parlourmaid at £18 a year; a replacement for the latter was paid £20 in 1902. The Robin Vere O'Brien family, who had six servants in 1911, paid two male servants £40 and £12 respectively; the former was probably the butler and the latter a general man or boy. The wages of four women varied from £26 to £12, the £26 was probably paid to the cook. Both these accounts also showed that rises were given to servants especially within the first year.
Detailed accounts of servants' wages for Lord Inchiquin of Dromoland Castle, 1880 - 1886, Lord Clonbrock, 1888 - 1894, and Henry T. Clements, of Ashfield, near Cootehill, 1885 - 1892, are available. Table II shows the average wages paid to servants in these households between 1880 - 1895.

Table II

Average wages paid to servants in three country houses in Ireland 1880 - 1895


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>women</th>
<th>wage</th>
<th>men</th>
<th>wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cook/housekeeper</td>
<td>£47.5</td>
<td>butler</td>
<td>£57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>coachman</td>
<td>£41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>£34</td>
<td>2nd coachman</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady's maid</td>
<td>£26.5</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>£22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>£15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head laundrymaid</td>
<td>£21</td>
<td>hallboy</td>
<td>£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head housemaid</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen maid</td>
<td>£18.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd housemaid</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairymaid</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd laundrymaid</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schoolroom maid</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st nurserymaid</td>
<td>£12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under housemaid</td>
<td>£11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd nurserymaid</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd laundrymaid</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stillroom maid</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An account for each household which shows the number of servants who held each position and the rises given to servants is in Appendix B (table 41 p. 187). It is interesting to see that a new servant was often paid considerably less than his predecessor even when the latter had held the position for a short period. This probably reflects differences in experience and bargaining power.

There is considerable consistency between wages paid in Dromoland Castle and in Clonbrock; the latter are somewhat lower than the former and this may be explained by the fact that the staff was much smaller, eleven in Clonbrock in 1888, and 26 in Dromoland in 1880. Wages paid by the Clements family tended to be lower, especially those paid to the housekeeper and cook. These were more in keeping with those paid to a good cook or housekeeper in an upper class family. The cook in Dromoland was considered a professional and was paid £50 a year in 1880. In Clonbrock the positions of cook and housekeeper were merged and that servant was paid more than the cook in Dromoland, £55 a year. A new cook/housekeeper appointed in 1894 was only paid £40. There was remarkable conformity in the amount paid to ladies' maids in the three households - £25 - £26 a year. Advertisements in the Irish Times for ladies' maids between 1890 - 1919, when they specified wages, which was rarely, mentioned figures between £18 - £30, usually £25.

Information from former butlers interviewed show that butlers' wages did not change very much between the 1880s and the 1930s. A butler who worked for the King-Harman family was paid £75 a year in 1934; £60 - £75 was still usual at that time. The first footman in Adare Manor in 1934 was paid £60; a valet/footman who worked in Co. Tipperary was paid £52 a year. A former kitchen maid who worked in a country house was paid £13 - £18 in 1906 - 1908. This was approximately the same as that paid in the three country houses in the 1880s and 1890s. Other kitchen maids interviewed earned much less at a later date but worked in smaller households. This shows that there were greater differences in wages between employers and different types and sizes of households than over time.
Miss Collet's report showed that wage levels of servants in Ireland increased with age until forty years of age approximately. It was also found that wages varied directly with the number of servants in the household, the greater the number of staff the higher the wages. The report showed that this also happened in England and Wales. Charles Booth, in his study of domestic service in London in the 1890s, also found that servants' wages increased with age up to middle age, and that wages increased as the number of staff rose.

Servants' wages in Ireland were lower than in England. Rates of pay suggested by Mrs Beeton for general servants, cooks, parlourmaids and housemaids in 1906 were higher than those quoted in Irish newspapers (see above, pp 86, 88). In Miss Collet's report a kitchenmaid's wage in Ireland was only two-thirds of the London rate. Indeed all Irish servants were shown to have earned less than their counterparts in Great Britain. The only exception was a lady's maid who earned the same in Ireland and England - approximately £25 a year.

This is consistent with the fact that wages in the homes of the nobility and gentry in Ireland, where ladies' maids were employed, seemed to be more like wages in similar establishments in England. Wages paid to servants at Englefield House, Berkshire between 1875 and 1891 are very similar to those paid in Dromoland Castle between 1880-1886. Likewise the wages suggested for upper servants by Mrs Beeton in 1906 are similar to those paid in 'big houses' in Ireland between 1880-1894. This similarity is not surprising when it is remembered that a large proportion, especially of upper servants, were recruited in England. The lower servants, scullery maids, stillroom maids, hall boys, were usually paid less than their English counterparts. These were the positions held by Irish servants and their wage rates were determined by Irish rather than English standards. General wage rates in Ireland were lower than in Great Britain. In 1912 it was...
reckoned that builders' labourers only earned 66 per cent of the 
amount paid to their English counterparts; compositors earned 90 per 
cent as much; skilled men in the building trade only 79 per cent of 
the wages of skilled men in England. 40

Servants in capital cities earned higher wages than those 
working in other parts of the country. In Paris servants earned 
much more than those working in the provinces. 41 Wages were higher 
in London than in the rest of England and Wales, according to figures 
collected by the Board of Trade in the 1890s. 42 Miss Collet's 
report showed not only that wages were higher in London but that 
the differences were greater for the older, more experienced servants 
and for servants in households with a large staff. 43 The same report 
showed that wages in Belfast were 10/- to £2 higher than in Dublin, 
which, in turn, was £1 to £2 higher than in Cork and Limerick. 44 
The high wages in the north can be explained by the greater availability 
of alternative employment. Capital cities generally offered a wider 
range of employment than the rest of the country and therefore had to 
rely on a supply of domestic servants from areas outside the city. In the 
Dublin houses in 1911, 72 per cent of the servants were from outside the 
county (see above, p. 35). Even though working in the capital had 
an attraction for many, wages had to be sufficiently high to ensure 
that an adequate work force was maintained. In addition, many wealthy 
people lived in the cities and these were the employers with large 
staffs; wages tended to be higher in such households. Charles Booth 
found that servants' wages in London were highest in the wealthy 
western side of the city. 45

Evidence from newspaper advertisements and from people inter-
viewed seem to confirm that, on the whole, wages were higher in 
Dublin. Advertisements in the Drogheda Independent in 1890 and 1902 
sought general servants at £7, £9, and £12 a year, and a good plain 
cook at £12 a year. 46 These rates were at the lower end of the 
scale for general servants and cooks quoted in the Irish Times.
Wages paid to eleven different servants in a business house in Gorey between 1891 and 1915 varied between £4 and £9 a year, an average of £6. The average rate offered for a general servant in the New Ross Standard in 1915 was £12, about £2 less a year than the average offered in the Irish Times and the Freeman's Journal (see above, p. 86). Wages already given for farm servants are much less than the average given in the Dublin daily newspapers.

So far only money wages of servants have been considered, however, a large proportion of a servant's total remuneration was in the form of board and lodgings. The value of this is usually calculated in terms of cost to employer. This is useful for establishing the total cost of employing a servant; it is also useful as an indication of the standard of living enjoyed by servants. While undoubtedly some servants had poor food and very bad living conditions, the majority of servants had a higher general standard of living than members of their social class who worked in other industries. Servants who were critical of their living conditions almost invariably compared them to those of their employers, not to those in their own homes.

Rowntree estimated that it cost £35 to keep a servant in York in 1902 - £15 for wages, £20 for board. The cost of a servant's board and lodging in Dublin at about the same time was approximately £15 a year. When board and lodgings was provided by farmers for agricultural workers, daily wages were reduced by approximately 1/- a day for men and 9d for women; this was equal to a charge of £18 and £13 annually. The higher ranking officers in the Dublin Metropolitan Police were allowed a servant's allowance of £45 a year in 1914. This was the same for the Inspector General, the Surgeon of the Force, the Veterinary Surgeon who earned £1,500, £400 and £200 respectively. It would have been more than adequate, to allow the lowest paid to employ a good general servant or cook general, and to subsidise the considerably larger staff that the highest paid employed.
The cost of board and lodgings for all servants was approximately the same - upper servants may have had better food and accommodation than lower servants; men may have eaten more than women - but differences were not great. The lower the wages the higher the proportion of a servant's compensation covered by board and lodgings. The total remuneration of a general servant in Ireland earning a money wage of £8 - £10, and there were many of these throughout the whole period from 1880 to 1920, was about £25 a year. In those cases, board and lodgings accounted for two thirds of the total wage. It accounted for half the wages of the better paid general servant, those earning a money wage of £15 a year.

To make a true comparison of servants' wages with those in other industries, the cost of living to women of the same social class as servants must be calculated. A Board of Trade inquiry into Expenditure of wage-earning women and girls in England in 1911 is useful for that purpose. Many of these girls were living at home and for that reason their expenses were often less than those of a girl living independently. At that time most girls working in shops, factories or offices lived at home. The girls included in the inquiry earned between 12/6 and 30/- a week. Girls at the lower end of the scale, those earning 12/6 to 14/10, had a mere subsistence standard of living and expenditure was equal to, or a few pence below, income. One girl, described as a camera maker and optical worker, who earned 13/11½ a week and spent 13/9½, is interesting. She lived alone in a top back room for which she paid 3/- per week rent; her food cost 5/7, fuel and light 8½d, sick club 7½d, washing 11½d, bath 2d, dress 2/5, miscellaneous 4d, holidays and fares nothing. With the exception of dress, all the other expenses would be included in the board and lodgings of servants.

In 1911, 12/6 a week or £32 a year, seemed to have been the minimum wage for a girl if she lived an independent life in England - the camera maker's expenditure on food was higher than that of others in the survey. Even if a girl in Ireland rented a room for 1/6 a
week, and spent less on dress and food, at least 8/- a week, or £21 a year, was necessary to live independently. In 1912 the Domestic Training Institute at 37 Charlemont Street reckoned that it cost £13 for the annual keep of a girl. An advertisement in the Freeman's Journal in 1916 offered 9/- a week to a cook if she lived out and 16/- a month if she lived in; her board and lodging was costed at 5/- a week. If a girl at home contributed 5/- a week towards household costs, 1/- for rent and 4/- for food, this would seem to be the minimum. Thus frugal living cost for a member of the lower social classes was £13 a year if living at home and £21 a year if living independently. However £13 a year was higher than the wages paid to the majority of young general servants. So even when the cost of board and lodgings is calculated on cost to the servant, money wages were at the most half the total remuneration of the servant and were probably much less than half.

Board wages were paid to servants when employers were away from home. Male servants in Powerscourt in 1906 were paid 11/- a week and female servants 9/-; the Robin Vere O'Briens seemed to pay 12/6 a week. In some cases board wages were paid all the time. Charles Booth in Life and labour in London said:

We understand that the plan of paying board wages throughout the year instead of providing food is increasing, and is usually at the rate of 16/- per week for upper men servants, 14/- for footmen, and 12/- to 14/- for women servants. For the "room" the ladies' maid usually undertakes the catering, while a housemaid or kitchen maid provides for the "hall". For both, one of the kitchen maids - a servants' servant so to speak - acts as cook. As the actual expenditure incurred in this way is said not to be more than 10/- per week per head, the difference makes a marked addition to their yearly wages, but even so, the cost to masters and mistresses is declared to be considerably less than under the older system.

In Miss Collet's report she mentioned the practice in many Irish households of paying 'breakfast' wages in some cases and 'full board' wages in others. She spoke as if this was more common in Ireland than in England. She said that although the servant was
supposed to provide her own food out of this allowance, there was little doubt – especially where breakfast wages were concerned – that the allowance went to supplement wages and that the servant managed to help herself from her employer's provisions. Advertisements in Irish newspapers show that 2/6 to 3/- a week was the usual sum allowed for 'breakfast' wages.

It seems probable that the usual yearly estimate of a £15 - £18 cost to employers for board and lodgings was indeed an under-estimation of the true cost. The amount of money usually paid as board wages and breakfast wages, 10/- to 12/- and 3/- respectively, the fact that servants could cater for themselves and save money, and the conviction of employers that it was more economical to pay full board wages than to supply food, all lead to this conclusion. This is reinforced by the fact that it cost a girl £13 a year to live frugally at home. Most employers probably did not know what the keep of servants cost them, and with many servants in a position to serve themselves to food, the cost, no doubt, was much higher than it should have been.

In addition to money wages, servants frequently obtained presents, tips and other perquisites. The practice of giving servants Christmas presents was widespread. The gifts were usually money, dress lengths or other items of uniform, cardigans, shawls or nightshirts, pipe and tobacco, books, bible or stationery boxes. The amount of money given usually varied from 10/- to 5/- depending on seniority; occasionally as much as £1 was given. A kitchen account book for T.C.D. 1861 - 1890 showed that the head cook, clerk and pastrycook got a Christmas allowance of £1.17.8 in 1880. Kitchen servants got presents of 5 lbs of meat each which cost 9½d per lb. Most presents were practical which was probably appropriate at a time when people found it hard to supply themselves with the necessities of life. Margaret Powell writing about the 1920s and '30s was very critical of this: 'at Christmas, we got presents of cloth to make things with, aprons, and horrible sensible presents', employers never gave us frivolous presents, she complained. Later she worked in a situation where the servants were given lovely presents, things they would never buy for themselves.
Servants also received tips for performing particular services or from guests staying in their employers' homes. In the eighteenth century this practice had grown to such an extent that visiting friends had become excessively expensive. Servants in some houses had a fixed schedule of rates for various services. There was a reaction to this in the second half of the century, employers maintained that when visiting one another they would not give tips to servants or allow their servants to accept money from their guests. This seems to have curtailed the worst excesses but the practice extended into the twentieth century. Account books and diaries of the Irish gentry record the tips given by members of the family to servants when visiting their friends or staying in hotels. Tipe of 2/6 and 3/- were given by members of the Vere O'Brien family to maids in the homes of their friends between 1880 and 1886. This was quite high when it is considered that a housemaid at that time might have earned 5/- to 8/- per week. In 1904 and 1905 the Clonbrock family gave tips of 1/-, 2/6, 3/- and 5/- to servants in houses and hotels. Servants working for the nobility and gentry where visitors were frequent and tips generous, could count on a not inconsiderable income from this source. Miss Collet in her report said that vails to servants in households where a large number of visitors were entertained must be an important item in the real earnings of servants. Servants in more modest households could also expect tips from visitors to recompense them for the extra work that guests created. The number of visits and the amount of the tip given was, however, probably considerably less and the total amount not significant. A letter in The Lady of the House in 1919 advocating eight hour home assistants said that she should not accept tips 'a killing business to both him who gives and her who takes'.

Another source of income was perquisites which were often considered the right of servants holding special positions, notably the cook and the butler. Tradesmen were only too willing to give discounts on orders placed by cooks, butlers, housekeepers or house stewards. The cook considered she had a right to sell dripping, rabbit skins and used tea leaves; the butler felt he had a claim
on candle ends and perhaps an occasional bottle of wine. These 'rights' could be, and often were abused. Margaret Powell said of the cook in a house in which she worked, 'she had no "arrangement" with the shops, but nevertheless when she paid the quarterly bills some little gift would often be given to her, and at the end of the year quite an appreciable discount, as they called it, was paid to her', and, she added, 'apart from her salary, any cook could count on a regular bonus from the shops at which she dealt'. It is impossible to put a money value on these other sources of income, but their prevalence has to be remembered as an added bonus for service.

Wages were examined to determine to what extent they changed between 1880 and 1920. Alterations in wages are usually related to the cost of living to see whether or not there has been an improvement in buying power or 'real' wages. To a large extent servants were cushioned against rises in the cost of living as most of their expenses were paid by their employers; when the cost of living rose the value of the board and lodgings element of their wages also rose. When it fell, other workers experienced a rise in 'real' wages which servants did not enjoy. It is important to remember these facts when examining changes in nominal wages, prices and 'real' wages.

An examination of wages of servants in Ireland between 1880 and 1920 shows a steady rise in the rates paid (see above, pp 86, 88). Great variations existed at all times, but the upper limit increased steadily. There was a sharp increase between the late 1890s and 1910. Letters in The Lady of the House in 1906 which were inspired by a debate in that paper on 'Has the life of a domestic servant improved?' mentioned that wages had increased considerably over the period. Wage rates of other workers were also rising at that time. Towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth there was also a reduction in the number of working hours a week. The introduction of the eight-hour day did not affect domestic servants and their conditions of work did not improve in this respect.
Wages of domestic servants in Great Britain also rose over the period 1880 - 1920. Those of female servants increased by one-third between 1871 - 1901; the cost of keeping servants rose at the end of the nineteenth century. In Woman at work, published in 1911, the universal and steady rise in wages for all grades of servants is noted. Mrs Beeton's suggested wages in 1861 and 1906 showed a considerable rise in minimum and maximum rates cited.

There was a rise in money wages generally of 11 per cent in the United Kingdom, including Ireland, between 1880 and 1889. At the same time the cost of living dropped by 15 per cent, giving a rise in real wages of almost 30 per cent. During the same decade money wages of servants rose more slowly, the wage of a general servant by about 8 per cent, and as the value of board and accommodation decreased, the real wages of servants dropped. Between the late 1890s and 1910 the money wages of general servants and lower paid servants rose by about 39 per cent (see above, pp 85, 88) at a time when the cost of living was rising slowly and the real wages of other workers were also rising slowly and fluctuating at about 5 - 8 per cent above wage levels in 1890. Money wages of higher paid servants, for example cooks, rose more slowly than those of lower paid servants (see above, p. 86). Between 1880 and 1920, wages of the better paid general servants rose by about 66 per cent and wages of cooks rose by about 36 per cent. The latter was similar to the general rise in wages in the United Kingdom between 1880 and 1914, which was 34 per cent. Most workers, however, got a rise of about 45 per cent in real wages, as the cost of living dropped after 1883 and only rose again with the outbreak of war in 1914, so upper servants were worse off than other workers. This is consistent with the evidence given by former upper servants that their wages in the 1920s and 1930s were not dissimilar to those in country houses in the 1880s (see above, p. 90). It must be remembered, however, that the cost of living rose sharply, by 75 per cent, between 1914 and 1924, so that while money wages generally rose by 94 per cent, real wages rose only by 11 per cent. So servants' wages in the post-war period were probably comparable to wages of other workers.
Wages were paid to servants at comparatively lengthy intervals and were often paid irregularly. Servants were paid quarterly in all the Irish household accounts examined. General servants employed in a business house in Gorey were also paid quarterly. Wages in Britain were paid every half year or every quarter; a demand of a trade union founded in Dundee in 1872, was that wages should be paid every quarter instead of every six months. Charles Booth pointed out that paying weekly wages was not at all usual except with lower class servants. Servants were unlike most other workers in this respect. The custom probably arose because servants were not dependent, like others, on wages to buy the daily necessities of life. L. Davidoff and R. Hawthorn maintained that the slow change from paying wages every quarter to paying them every month - when in other occupations they were paid weekly - was because wages were regarded as a small part of the reward for servants. They added that some employers left their servants without wages for weeks either because they forgot to pay them or were short of money. Former servants interviewed were usually paid weekly or monthly but most of these had worked in the 1920s and '30s when things had changed; a number, however, mentioned that they often had to ask for their wages.

An advantage which domestic servants had over other workers - and this was because they were not unionised - was that they did not lose money on account of strikes. They were not affected either by the work stoppages of others. They also probably had more control over their own employment and suffered less from the effects of minor illnesses as they did not lose their wages at those times.

The remuneration of servants increased with age up to the age of thirty five approximately; experience and, presumably, efficiency were rewarded by many employers. As with all aspects of domestic service, there was no uniformity about this, and indeed, one of the principal reasons given for the rapid turnover of domestic servants was the need to change jobs in order to get a rise in wages. Increase in wages did not necessarily occur in one employment situation.
Charles Booth found that returns to the labour department of the Board of Trade in 1894 showed that 63.5 per cent of servants in middle and upper middle class families received rises in wages. Miss Collet's report showed that of 723 general servants, cooks and housemaids in London, 500 or 69 per cent received rises in wages. The account books from Dromoland Castle, Clonbrock and Ashfield all show that when servants remained in the same situation, even for a couple of years, they received wage rises. In the Dillon household servants received steady wage rises. The stability of the staff was probably partly due to this factor. Some former servants interviewed mentioned that they got wage rises but they were in the minority; some had to ask for rises which were reluctantly given, or had to threaten to leave. Charles Booth found that in cases where servants remained in the same situation for any length of time without a rise they had commenced at an amount equal to or exceeding that which other girls of the same age were receiving. He concluded from this that there were two methods of payment in practice, one was to engage a servant at a relatively high but stationary wage, the other was to begin at a lower sum and give increases with length of service.

Advertisements in newspapers showed that it was fairly common to give servants a rise within the first year of service. The word 'rising' appeared after the wage, or 'if satisfactory' a higher figure was mentioned. Many employers appeared to regard the first few months or year as a probationary period and to promise a rise if the servant proved satisfactory. This is confirmed by evidence from former servants, household accounts, and the literature. Miss Collet's report also showed that rises were usually given in the early period of the servant's working life. After the age of 25 - 30 in the case of general servants and housemaids, and the age of 30 - 35 in the case of cooks, length of service was not usually accompanied by increases in wages. Most servants reached the height of their earning power at the age of 35 - 40; changing positions became difficult at this age and certainly servants' bargaining power diminished. This was clearly most unsatisfactory for the person who was destined to spend his whole life in service. It was also an important reason for male servants, especially, leaving service and taking up a new career.
The wages of servants have little meaning until they are compared to wages in other industries, at least those competing for their services. One of these was the retail trade. It was usual at that time for drapers' assistants, and indeed assistants in grocery and general stores, to live in, either over the shop or in rented rooms. They were subjected to the discipline of the employer for practically twenty-four hours a day and six days a week. Often accommodation was crowded and food poor. Assistants were expected to behave with respect to their employers, to dress well, the women usually wearing special outfits. Shop assistants worked for long hours. The Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Shop Hours Regulation Bill of 1888, reported that they were satisfied that the hours of shop assistants were often as high as 85 hours a week. Dermot Keogh, talking about Ireland in 1906 said: 'there was no half holidays, neither was there a uniform closing hour, a practice which often forced employees to work over 80 hours a week with only Sunday off'. The Draper's Assistant in September 1912 recorded that a draper was prosecuted for allowing one of his young female staff members work 97½ hours in the week.

Thus shop assistants and domestic servants had many things in common. If dismissed, and shop assistants could be dismissed instantly, both found themselves without a home. Marriage, if not actively discouraged, was difficult and the marriage rate for both was low. Servants who received the same food as the families for whom they worked, the majority, probably had better food than most live-in shop assistants. While some servants had to pay for breakages, they were not subjected, like shop assistants, to a fines system for the infringement of numerous petty rules.

Wages of shop assistants varied greatly, small shopkeepers paying only a few shillings weekly and the proprietors of larger establishments higher wages. Women assistants earned considerably less than men, approximately one third less. It was estimated that women assistants earned from £10 to £25 a year with board and lodgings; these figures were based on information supplied by the secretary of
the National Union of Shop Assistants for the period prior to 1894. Dermot Keogh said that in Ireland in 1900 a draper's assistant was paid between £40 and £50 a year. The rate was paid after a seven year apprenticeship and was probably the top rate for men. Women would have been paid less and those working in small shops where appearance and speech were not considered as important, much less. Even though conditions in the two occupations might seem fairly evenly balanced there was no doubt that shop assistants were seen as having the more desirable job. The main reason was that it had a much higher status. One of the difficulties Michael O'Lehane found in starting a trade union for drapers' assistants was that the assistants felt socially superior to craft or general workers. Many boys and girls were prohibited from becoming shop assistants by the indenture fee. Parents who found it difficult or impossible to supply uniform for children entering service could not pay the £40 - £50 demanded by the larger shops.

Conditions in factories were much inferior, from the point of view of the environment and the type of work, to those in the average middle class home. Wages were low and workers had to pay all living expenses from their wages. However hours of work were controlled and workers had evenings and weekends free. Many writers considered that service had many advantages over the far less remunerative and less propitious conditions of the factory worker. The report of the Women's Advisory Committee on the Domestic Service Problem in 1919 mentioned that:

Except among the lowest class of domestic workers, wages (with which must be estimated cost of maintenance), have for many years been higher than those of workers in comparable occupations, such as clerks, shop assistants and factory employees and they continue to rise.

Yet despite this, domestic service was not able to withstand the competition posed by other occupations, and with the growth of alternative employment in the present century domestic service declined. Aspects of service which were particularly disliked by
the workers were the loss of freedom, lack of companionship of one's equals, lack of status and, above all, the mistress/servant relationship. This gives what is described in Woman at work as 'a sense of servitude'.\textsuperscript{112} Charles Booth said:

The ordinary relations between employers and employed in other walks of life cannot endure here. . . . It is, in fact, almost necessary to have an inherited aptitude for the relationship involved - a relationship very similar in some respects to that subsisting between sovereign and subject. From both servant and subject there is demanded an all-pervading attitude of watchful respect, accompanied by a readiness to respond at once to any gracious advance that may be made without ever presuming or for a moment 'forgetting themselves'.\textsuperscript{113}
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As important, if not more important, to the servant as wages were the other conditions of employment - accommodation, quality of food, free time, cost of uniform and general treatment by employers. Working conditions were of paramount importance in an occupation which encompassed the whole life of the servant. It is very difficult to generalise about conditions in domestic service. There were vast differences between working as one of a large staff in the homes of the gentry, or working as a general servant in the homes of the lower middle classes. Great differences could also exist between conditions in households of a similar kind. This is clear from reminiscences of servants and writings of employers.¹

One of the difficulties of assessing the standard of accommodation and food provided is that judgement is based on the subjective evaluation of members of two different social classes. Employers and writers drawn from the same social class stress repeatedly that accommodation and food provided for servants was infinitely better than they were used to in their own homes. Servants, on the other hand, tended to compare their bedrooms, dining hall and food to conditions enjoyed by employers and their families. There was no such thing as a set standard for food and accommodation which should be provided by employers and expected by servants. An attempt was made in 1911 to set standards when Mr Bottomly, M.P. introduced to parliament the Domestic Servants Bill 'to regulate the hours of work, meal times and accommodation of Domestic Servants, and to provide for the periodical inspection of their kitchens and sleeping quarters'. It was rejected on the second reading.²

Servants usually slept in attic or top floor bedrooms which they may have shared with one or sometimes two others. These rooms were usually sparsely furnished.³ Most of the former servants who wrote or spoke to the author were content with the accommodation provided
for them; the majority had a single room though some shared with another servant. These rooms were plainly furnished with an iron bed, chest of drawers, wardrobe and perhaps a wash-hand basin. Servants in small houses rarely had a sitting room, the kitchen was used by the servants, and, as Charles Booth pointed out in *Life and labour*, could be 'quite equal to the house-place of the cottages of their own mothers'.

Some servants undoubtedly had very poor sleeping accommodation. A writer in the *Irish Homestead* in 1905 drew attention to the number of times she had to speak about accommodation offered to domestic servants: 'the cupboards and black holes in which so many Irish domestics are expected to sleep are a disgrace to civilisation'. Charles Booth said: 'the sleeping accommodation for domestic servants is, in the poorer class of households, very indifferent'. A.J. Munby told something of the conditions in which Hannah and her fellow servant, Mary, worked: they slept together on a straw bed in the kitchen which was 'shut up in the day time': and again: 'I made her wash herself at the sink - her only toilet place'.

In 1905 *The Lancet* was extremely critical of the unhealthy living conditions of many domestic servants. Florence Nightingale also had attempted to make England aware of the dangers of unhealthy conditions in servants' rooms.

Servants working in households where a large staff was employed seemed, on the whole, to have had better accommodation. Hermann Muthesius, an architect attached to the German embassy in London, in *The English House* in 1904 stated: 'it is also remarkable how a kindly, considerate attitude towards servants is reflected everywhere even in the layout of the house, in the way that they are given every comfort - in particular complete privacy'. Muthesius was talking about the large English house. The country houses in Ireland were, of course, built on the English model. Muthesius compared conditions of English and continental servants: 'English servants are accustomed to expect much more in the way of a becoming standard of life than those on the continent'. Generally female servants slept on the
top floor and a back staircase led from the kitchen to these rooms. Male servants usually slept downstairs; the butler had a bedroom adjoining the pantry and plate room so that he could guard the silver. Coachmen, grooms and gardeners generally had accommodation outside the house over the stables or in a gate lodge. There was a servants' hall for all and in addition the housekeeper usually had her own room; if there was a steward he had an office. Nurses and governesses might sleep near the children for whom they cared; a lady's maid usually slept in a room near her mistress.

Even in large houses, however, servants could have poor accommodation. Charles Booth said that while women servants fared quite well, the comfort of men servants received little consideration. One of the difficulties of finding suitable accommodation for them was caused by the necessity of separating the sexes. Anita Leslie describing the servants' quarters in Castle Leslie, Co. Monaghan, said that maid servants always slept at the top of the house. 'From the children's floor the stairs getting meaner and narrower went up to the maids' bedrooms and their bathroom under the slate roof . . .' She added that it was unlikely that the servants felt like carrying scuttles of coal up to heat their rooms. Lady Fingall described the servants' quarters in her home, Killeen, as big and airy but with stone floors and added that in spite of fires and lamps and candles the house was always cold.

Obviously living accommodation varied greatly: 'in the best households, a servant would have a room fit for a daughter of the family. In the worst, servants had no room of their own'. Servants were probably, as employers maintained, at least as well housed as they would have been in their own homes, but that in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not necessarily justification for complacency.

Food supplied to servants varied very much, depending mainly, it would seem, on the generosity of the employer. On the whole the literature on domestic service indicates that food supplied
to servants was good; again there was the tendency of employers to compare their servants' food with the diet of the working class and of servants to compare their meals with those of the families they served. There is evidence that servants were often given different food from that of the family, but this did not necessarily mean that their diet was poor. Most former servants interviewed stated that the food in service was good or very good, and in many cases the same as that eaten by the family. It was in households which really could not afford servants that shortage of food was usually experienced. Food was rationed and supplies kept in a locked cupboard.

Servants' meals in the homes of the gentry were usually: breakfast at eight o'clock - eggs, bacon and fish were often served; tea at ten or eleven; lunch at one o'clock; tea at approximately 4.30 p.m.; and supper or dinner at nine o'clock. These meals were served in the servants' hall, the butler sitting at the top of the table and carving, the housekeeper sitting at the end and serving the vegetables. People were served in order of importance and the highest ranking servant said grace. In large households an upper servant was often put in charge of catering for staff, and according to Charles Booth they tended to be less liberal than the lady of the house. In Dromoland Castle, in 1877, 1 1/4 lbs. of meat per day, or approximately 9 lbs. per person per week, was allowed for everyone, family and staff; this was at a time when the weekly consumption of meat in the United Kingdom (including Ireland) was less than 2 lbs. The weekly consumption of meat per head for middle class families in the 1890s in England was 3.2 lbs. Meals were more modest in number in middle and lower-middle class houses, breakfast, lunch, high tea and supper.

In the earlier part of the nineteenth century tea and sugar were expensive and were rarely provided by employers, servants having to buy them from a special allowance. Beer was the beverage supplied and, even at the end of the century, men servants might be given only beer with their meals. Esther Waters was advised to
give her daily pint of beer to the cook 'to soften her'. Some mistresses gave servants a weekly allowance of tea, sugar and butter and this practice persisted into the present century. Likewise servants were given an allowance of beer in some of the larger Irish houses into the 'twenties and 'thirties. In 1908 and 1909 the Clonbrock family paid beer money allowance of 2/- a week to female servants and 2/6 to male servants; this was £5.4.0 to £6.10.0 a year, quite a significant addition to their wages.

The working hours of domestic servants is difficult to assess. If the time spent in an employer's home is considered as working hours - and many servants would have said that they were on duty from 6.30 a.m. until they retired at 10 or 11 p.m. - then the number is formidable indeed and well in excess of the working hours in any other occupation. The average French servant worked 15 - 18 hours per day and in 1906 a French association of servants attempted to have the servants' workday limited to 15 hours; this was at a time when the average for other workers was down to ten. Of course many people contended that servants were not working all the time, they went for messages and, depending on the type and organisation of the household, had free time in the afternoon or evening. Servants did not work at a steady pace throughout the day, there were busy times and times when there was little or nothing to do; they could also, to an extent, work at their own pace. Most servants, however, when in their employer's house, were considered available, if required, for any chore that might arise. Violet M. Firth pointed out: 'mistresses forget that to be at the disposal of an employer is the equivalent of being on duty, even if no muscular work is being performed.' In this sense servants worked from 15 to 18 hours a day, and free time, to them, was time spent, as they thought fit, outside the employer's house.

Servants' leisure varied greatly but the usual was a half day every week starting after lunch and a half day every second Sunday with a fortnight's holiday in the year. The servants and employers who supplied this information were talking about conditions in Ireland...
between the very early years of the twentieth century and the 1930s and 1940s. In England there was an improvement around 1900 in the free time allowed to servants. Letters to The Lady of the House in 1906 would seem to suggest that a similar improvement occurred in Ireland. The letters, all from employers, were not specific about the improvements. One writer while agreeing with the other correspondents said: 'servants have too few relaxations; their working hours and their duties are alike undefined and unlimited'. This would appear to have been true, especially for general servants, right up to the final days of domestic service.

Even servants' free time was not inviolable. Half-days only began when all the work after lunch was done and everything prepared for the evening meal; 'half-days' of only two and three hours were recorded. Servants mentioned having to wash up after dinner or supper when they returned from their evening out. A former servant said that her half-day could be any day which happened to suit the work of the household, so she could not make plans. A former kitchenmaid remembered taking the dog for a walk around Dublin on her half-days and paying the food bills. Mrs Layton in Life as we have known it, recalled one mistress who suggested that she should take the children for a walk on her free afternoon. Margaret Powell complained that in one place her half-day was on a Wednesday unless her employer happened to have a dinner party that night in which case she was expected to work.

Many servants had far less free time than that which has been described. Some had no half-day, others had no holidays. Flora Thompson said of servants: 'like the children of the family, they had no evenings out unless they had somewhere definite to go and obtained special leave'. Employers justified the lack of free time allowed by maintaining that servants would not know what to do with leisure or would use it badly.

There was genuine concern about how servants spent their free time and the lack of facilities for them. The G.F.S. provided
social settings where servants could meet in their free time. The Lodge which was opened in 12 Molesworth Street in 1880 was a hostel and recreation centre. This was moved to 13 South Frederick Street in 1882 and was known as La Touche Lodge. Tea was served at 4.30 on Sunday afternoons for all those present, and social evenings for members were held during the winter months. In 1884, recreation rooms for servants were opened in Rathmines. In addition, classes provided by the G.F.S. or other agencies gave servants something to do in their free time and provided opportunities for meeting people and making friends. The Y.W.C.A. in Baggot Street also had facilities for servants and ran a club where servants could spend Sunday afternoon and their half-day during the week. This provision was mainly for protestant servants. Some catholics may have been members of the G.F.S. but this is unlikely. (In Ireland at that time, the activities of the G.F.S. had proselytising overtones which would have made it unacceptable to the catholic clergy.) Attendances at services, church activities, membership of sodalities, all had social as well as religious significance in the life of many servants. There was a house at 35 Fitzwilliam Place where servants who were out of work could stay and dances were held there twice a week, Thursday and Sunday. Men were not allowed to attend these dances. Employers were also concerned about the lack of recreational facilities for servants. Lord and Lady Aberdeen's efforts to cater for their servants' leisure have already been mentioned. They founded a household club to which servants paid an annual subscription of 1/-; classes, social meetings and entertainments were organised for the staff.

In spite of the efforts of well-meaning individuals, churches and various organisations, the provision of leisure facilities for servants in Ireland was meagre indeed. The Report on vocational organisation in 1940 stated that there was a 'need for the provision of clubs where domestic servants can find shelter, entertainment and facilities for the useful employment of their leisure time and hostels where they can be housed during periods of unemployment'. The vast majority of domestic servants had to depend on their own
resources during their free time, Those who were lucky enough to live nearby probably spent their time at home. In the 'big houses' servants had facilities, a servants' hall or sitting room where they could spend their free time comfortably if they did not wish to go out, and as there was usually a large staff, the possibility of their being pressed into service was remote. Also, where there was a large staff, servants probably entertained themselves. A number of former servants who worked in one or two servant households said that they usually spent their half-days in their attic bedrooms which were freezing in winter and too hot in summer. Generally servants seemed to spend their free time either alone, or in the company of another servant, visiting, walking around the city looking at the shops or going to the cinema, music and dance halls. (It must be remembered that at the end of the last century and in country areas there were no cinemas.) Servants working in the country, who did not live nearby, had to spend their free time in their employers' house or taking country walks.

In 1919 the women's advisory committee on domestic service made recommendations regarding the hours of work of domestic servants. They said that a half hour should be allowed for breakfast, one hour for dinner and a half hour for tea. A half-day should be given every Sunday and an afternoon and evening should be free every week. In addition, they advocated that some free time should be allowed daily, not less than two hours, when the servant could go out or remain in the house and during which she would not be called on to answer bells or do any other work. Finally they recommended that servants should get a fortnight's holiday with board wages, and a half-day or more at holiday seasons.

However the dilemma of domestic service was that while parliamentary advisory committees and other bodies could recommend and advise, the organisation of the industry made it impossible to introduce and enforce uniformity of conditions. So variations continued right up to the demise of domestic service as a significant occupation. It must be remembered that at the end of the nineteenth
and beginning of the twentieth centuries holidays and leisure were restricted for the majority of the population; amusements and entertainments were few and reserved for special and rare occasions. Thus the lot of domestic servants was not any worse than that of most people; where the difference occurred was that servants were living in the homes of others and their isolation and loneliness were more keenly felt in their leisure time, separated, as they were, from family and friends.

Before entering service at all, girls generally had to provide themselves with a uniform. This was a considerable expense and was regarded as a barrier to service, or at least to the better opportunities in service. Mostyn Bird claimed that many mothers put their daughters into laundries, as 'slaveys' in comparatively poor households, or in daily work, because they could not afford the outfit that was required for servants in a 'big house'. Many girls on leaving school did daily work for the local teacher, tradesmen or clergy where they not only got some experience, but could also save for the uniform required for residential work. According to Frank E. Huggett it cost a girl £4 - £5 to dress herself for service in 1884; this included the cost of underwear and nightdresses as well as uniform. Margaret Powell estimated that the print dresses, aprons, caps, stockings and shoes which she had to buy in the 1920s cost £2. From the prices given by a woman who worked in a house in Merrion Square from 1913 - 1923, a complete uniform for a housemaid or parlourmaid would have cost at least £2. The £2 - £4 required to dress a girl who was entering service posed a problem for small tenant farmers, unskilled or semi-skilled workers. Some charities helped poor girls by providing them with a complete outfit. The G.F.S. report in 1899 stated that there had been difficulty for some time in providing the poorer members with the necessary clothes to enter service. It was decided to buy a press and collect well made and useful garments from members and associates. A very small sum of money was expected in part payment from the member supplied. The report for 1907 stated that the outfit press was much used that year. Girls from workhouses were provided with their first outfit by the guardians; it had to be returned if the girl left her position within six months.
While the majority of female servants had to buy their own uniform, male servants had their liveries supplied by their employers. The wearing of uniform by male servants predated its adoption by women. Footmen in richly embellished livery, sporting the colours of the families they served, were part of the ostentatious display of wealth and position used by the rich and powerful. Women servants wore their own clothes with cap and apron - which wives and daughters also wore in the house - until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Then it became usual for them to wear special cotton print dresses, usually in blue, pink or lilac with special caps and aprons showing the rank of the wearer - housemaid, cook, parlourmaid or nurse. In the afternoon housemaids and parlourmaids usually changed into a black dress, with a frilly apron and cap threaded with a black velvet band. Housekeepers usually wore black silk dresses.

Footmen in the nineteenth century wore eighteenth century dress, a knee length coat, a long waistcoat and knee breeches often made of plush, silk stockings, and for evening wear, buckled shoes or pumps and a wig. Servants’ uniform was often based on styles no longer fashionable, presumably to differentiate between servants and their masters and mistresses. Parlour maids about the turn of the century wore caps with streamers which had been worn by ladies 30 years previously. The wig remained in fashion well into the century and was replaced by powdered hair. After 1870, footmen wore black suits with brass buttons and waistcoats striped horizontally for indoor servants and vertically for outdoor servants. In the twentieth century, the chauffeur adopted the riding breeches and gaiters worn by his predecessor, the coachman. The butler wore morning suit, short jacket, until noon, he then changed into a tail coat, stiff shirt, butterfly collar and white tie. The butler was supplied with a suit and a pair of shoes a year.

While some servants liked the uniform, many looked on it as a badge of servitude; servants resented especially having to wear
after the First World War, when servants were difficult to recruit, uniform, one of the aspects of service which had been criticised, came under scrutiny. The sub-committee on organisation and conditions in 1919, recommended that employers should provide the uniform, if one were required: 'Doubtless in some cases the dress would consist simply of an overall. We think that in many instances employers will agree to dispense with caps'. In the same year, a writer to *The Lady of the House* advocated that home assistants should not wear a badge of servitude - cap or apron, but perhaps a neat uniform such as nurses wore.

Uniform, which might seem a minor and unimportant aspect of service, had in fact a much more significant role. It was a formidable obstacle to entry into the better situations for poor girls; it was a burden borne by females in service, not by males. Livery was used by the upper classes to flaunt their wealth and importance; uniform was used by the new middle classes to indicate the distance between mistress and maid. It is not surprising that servants associated uniform with their lowly status and, as they became more independent, rebelled against it.

The all-important factor which influenced conditions of work was the relationship between employer and servant. This depended primarily on the character and personality of the former, and, to a certain extent, on the attitude of the latter. The philosophy underlying the relationship provided the basis on which interpersonal communication, attitudes, and concepts of rights and duties developed. The problem during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was that the relationship was built on two distinct systems, the paternalistic and the commercial, and the ambiguities which resulted affected both employers and servants. Under the former system, servants were paid low wages but were supplied with all the necessities of life, the employer's home was their home, and their welfare, in sickness as well as health, was seen as the responsibility of their masters. In the latter case, the relationship was governed by a contract which could be terminated on either side by a short notice, what
A. Egmont Hake in *Suffering London* described a harsh business transaction in which one has paid as little as possible, and the other has only rendered strictly prescribed services, the master has come to regard his responsibility at an end when the wages are paid.

This change was caused by a number of factors. With the growth of industrialisation the work relationship in factory and office affected domestic service. The paternalistic attitude was weaker in England than in France, which probably reflected the greater industrialisation in England. In America service was affected by the growth in professional management and the emphasis on efficiency. Theoretically, the work relationships of the factory and shop should be introduced into the home. Another cause of change was the rapid growth of the middle classes, and consequently the servant-keeping classes, in the nineteenth century. These people had no experience of master-servant relationships other than their own, and were becoming employers at a time when masters and servants were beginning to think in terms of a merely commercial exchange of services for money. Gradually the influence of the middle classes was eroding the remnants of paternalism and transforming the master-servant relationship into an employer-employee relationship. Servants welcomed the change as a way of improving their wages, conditions and status.

There is evidence of a nostalgic regret for the 'paternal' relationship. Violet Firth advocated that the home help should become a member of the family and give the service that is only given for love: 'this is really what the real old-fashioned servant used to do in those households where she was seen in all her glory'. Hake said that servants lost privileges which, under the new scheme, masters could no longer afford and added 'few housewives have any idea what the servants have lost by the modern system'. In the past a certain consideration was necessary in the treatment of servants 'in order to secure, through their fidelity, affection and esteem - what we now expect from them in return for
money'. Of course the existence of paternalism did not rule out the exploitation of servants. Whenever change occurs people tend to regret the advantages of the old system while ignoring the gains acquired under the new. Writers tended to attribute many of the difficulties in the master-servant relationship to the advent of the commercial system. The fault was not in the commercial system itself - though rights and duties of employers and employees under this system, or indeed any system, were never clearly defined - it was rather in the slow transition from one system to another which was never entirely effected and resulted in the co-existence of the two, with their very different underlying philosophies. This was recognised by Hake in the 1890s when he said: 'while this slow transition lasts, the relations between masters and servants are framed on a hybrid principle and for this reason give satisfaction to neither the one nor the other'.

Both systems, the paternalistic and the commercial, were in evidence up to the first world war in England and France, and, no doubt, were there much later. Elements of paternalism existed in the employer-servant relationship in Ireland up to the 1940s.

The treatment of servants when they were ill reflected the different philosophies held by employers. The domestic economy manuals, adhering to the paternalistic system, said that masters had a responsibility to look after their servants when they were ill. In spite of this, however, many employers dismissed sick servants if they felt they could replace them. Many sent staff back to their families for nursing if they fell seriously ill, or alternatively, gave them notice in the knowledge that they could, if necessary, go to the workhouse. Mr William Gibson Martley, organising secretary of the charity organisation society for Poplar and Westham, in evidence to the Royal commission on poor law and relief of distress in 1910 said that domestic servants were only out of work for short periods or for illness: 'if illness creeps in the Poor Law would creep in to meet it - or charity'. Elizabeth Smith of Baltiboys treated her servants harshly when they were ill. Referring to a servant who had been dismissed, she said:
'so she has left us to her extreme sorrow, but I could not put up with her health and her impertinence'. Her health, or presumably ill-health, was mentioned before her impertinence. The same lady, on another occasion said: 'these sick servants in a small household don't do'. Miss Gilchrist, cook for over thirty years to the Bradshaws, the upper class family in James Plunkett's Strumpet city, considered that she was living in the height of comfort, was highly thought of and had employers who would not 'pack you off to the Union the minute you showed a sign of feebleness'. Unfortunately she became ill, and partially paralysed and Mr Bradshaw sent her to the workhouse. He explained to the priest: 'It's not that I mind her growing old, . . . provided she can potter around and get her work done. But what if she is incapable? We can't employ a servant to dance attendance on a servant. The thing would be absurd'.

Sick servants were also sent to hospital. Hake said: 'to send off to the hospital any servant who falls ill or meets with an accident is, nowadays, a custom so firmly established, that house- holders have come to look upon it as a natural right'. He was critical of this and saw it as a result of contractual arrangements which allowed employers to act in this way without compunction or loss of esteem in the eyes of the community. Some servants were looked after very well by their employers. Although Merlin Waterson clearly felt that, on the whole, servants in country houses who became seriously ill had to leave their employment, he said that this was not the case in Erddig; in 1912, when the second housemaid got scarlet fever, Mrs Yorke, with the aid of a junior maid nursed her back to health. The Clonbrock papers record the payment of doctors' fees for servants. In May 1909 wages were paid to the garden boy while he was sick in hospital.

It is impossible to ascertain to what extent servants suffered ill health. As they were probably better housed and better fed than a large proportion of the population, and their working conditions were better than in many other industries, they were probably healthier. J.T. Arlidge, M.D., in The diseases of occupation, in
1892 maintained that it was impossible to compare the health of upper servants in the homes of the wealthy to that of poor general servants in lodging houses and the homes of small tradesmen. He said the former suffered from the diseases caused by excess food and drink and lack of exercise, digestive disorders, diseases of the liver, gout and nervous maladies. The latter were overworked, had confined and insanitary sleeping accommodation, indifferent and even insufficient food, worry and stress, causing anaemia, headaches, dyspepsia, gastritis, rheumatism, neuralgia and varicose veins. Dr Arlidge was convinced that servants suffered a high rate of illness; this appears to have been an opinion gathered from his experience of cases where infectious and contagious diseases and fever were introduced into families by indoor servants and from his knowledge of asylum statistics where servants constituted a considerable proportion of the inmates. Records of illness among servants were extremely scanty partly because it was one of the few areas of working class employment not investigated by a royal commission in the nineteenth century. One ailment which was obviously associated with service was housemaid's knee; this was a painful swelling of the knee which afflicted those who did a lot of kneeling.

The annual report of the registrar general for Ireland in 1911 indicated that servants were among the healthier section of the population. Deaths per 1000 for the professional and independent classes were 16.3, for the middle class 16.5, for the artisan and petty shopkeepers 18.2 and for the general service class, to which servants belonged, it was 24.8. When the general service class is examined the rate of deaths for servants was 10 per 1000; the other groups in the class varied from 20.6 to 31.3 per 1000. As the majority of servants were young, these statistics are not particularly impressive. However when deaths from tuberculosis, one of the most common causes of death especially among the lower classes, at that time, were examined, the statistics for domestic servants were very favourable. The death rate for the professional class was 1.15 per 1000, for the middle class it was 2.35, for
army, police etc. 2.68, for coach and cab drivers it was 5.21, for the clothing trade it was 2.41; for servants it was 1.72, the second lowest.

Servants seem to have been healthier than their contemporaries in other industries. How they were treated when they became ill depended on the individual employer. Generally, however, if servants became seriously ill, they were returned to their families, moved to hospital or sent to the workhouse.
CHAPTER 8

**A CAREER IN SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1995 and 1999 there was a noticeable migration to the older age group. By the mid-2000s, the trend of male service was under 20, and by 2015, the trend was the reverse. This shows that men, just as women, did not remain in service. Men typically left to marry, either before employment or only when married or divorced.
CHAPTER 8

A CAREER IN SERVICE

All the evidence would seem to indicate that most servants did not consider service as a career. The fact that so few men - who usually regarded work as a career - were servants shows that this was true. It has already been seen that most women married and left service on marriage, the age structure of female servants indicates this. What is perhaps more interesting is that the age structure of male servants was not very different from that of female servants as is seen table Table 12. This shows that in 1881 and 1891 approximately 45% of male servants were aged 15 to 24, a span of ten years, while 42% were aged 25 to 65, a span of forty years.

TABLE 12

Percentages of male and female servants in different age groups - censuses 1881 to 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Under 15</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1901 and 1911 there was a somewhat higher percentage in the older age group. At the beginning of the period 54% of male servants were under 25, and in 1911, 44% were under 25. This shows that men, like women, did not remain in service. Some probably left on marriage, either because employers did not want married servants or
because there was no accommodation for them; others must have gone into other occupations. The training male servants got was useful if they wished to take up other employment. The big exodus from service by male servants, however, occurred before they had time or opportunity to attain most of these skills. Thus men must have left service for different occupations altogether. It was only in 1901 that any significant differences between the age structure of males and females is seen; a higher percentage, but not as high as might be expected, of men servants were found in the 25-45 age group. It is interesting to note that up to the early 1900s, a much higher percentage of young boys than girls was found in service. Most of these were probably employed as servants on farms.

The fact that domestic service was never properly structured or organised, and that efforts to found trade unions for domestic servants did not succeed, also shows an industry that lacked the force usually exerted by career-conscious workers. The rapidity with which many servants changed their situations, often without good reason, showed workers who were uncommitted and disinterested. There was no recognised training for service, no qualifications, no salary structure, no recognised promotional procedure, and no standardised conditions of work; none of the things associated with most careers. As service lacked these requirements it failed to attract recruits seeking a career, and so the existing situation was perpetuated.

In literature, servants tend to belong to two very different stereotypes, those that are continually moving from one situation to another, and the loyal family retainers. Evidence would seem to suggest that the majority belonged to the former category, but the two stereotypes were based on reality. Writers such as Katzman and McBride divided servants into those who served for five years or more and those, the majority, who served less than five years.¹ This division was first used by Miss Collet in 1899 when she showed that for servants who spent less than five years in the same household, the average length of stay was about 1.3 years; for servants who had spent more than five years, one servant in five
approximately, the average length of stay was 6.4 years, and for those over ten years, it was 16 years. The percentages for Ireland were similar to those for Great Britain.

The majority of writers agreed that servants did not remain long in their situations. Miss Collet's report showed that 54% of servants surveyed had been in their situations less than two years. Advertisements by servants seeking jobs indicated that they considered two years in one household a long period. Twenty six former servants and employers who communicated with the author recalled fifty situations in which they or their servants remained for periods of less than one year to a life time of 50 years. See Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

Duration of stay in situations recalled by servants and employers, (percentages in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 year or less</th>
<th>2-3 yrs</th>
<th>4-5 yrs</th>
<th>5-10 yrs</th>
<th>10-20 yrs</th>
<th>25-50 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11(22)</td>
<td>13(26)</td>
<td>8(16)</td>
<td>7(14)</td>
<td>5(10)</td>
<td>6(12)</td>
<td>50(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of servants remaining in the same situation for over 5 years was unusually high. These statistics must be regarded with certain reservations. First, servants and employers were depending on their memories, and were more likely to remember long 'situations'. Second, the people concerned were probably those who had most interest in their jobs or in their servants and had situations or servants for longer than the normal periods. Third, two people interviewed were not included; one was a man who worked for 50 years as a domestic servant on farms and never stayed longer than three years in any place, the other, a woman, changed jobs frequently but did not specify the number of jobs she had. If they had been included the number of short stays would have been much higher.
Casual remarks in autobiographies show that the gentry were also affected by the constant movement of servants from one situation to another. Barbara Charlton in her memoirs said: 'Butlers come and go at Hesleyside in unsatisfactory procession, ditto nurses'. Anita Leslie recalled 'driving across Central Park with the nurse of the moment'. Research done on the 1901 and 1911 censal returns and evidence obtained from manuscript sources confirm this. The country houses used in the 1911 study were examined to see how many of the servants had been employed by the same family in 1901. These were used rather than the Dublin houses for two reasons, firstly because of the much greater number of servants involved and secondly because the country houses were more likely to have been occupied by the same families. The comparison was done for 44 households, the 1901 enumerators' returns for the others were not available. It was found that of the 399 servants employed in 1901 only 28 were still with the same families in 1911. Only 7 per cent of the servants were still in the same employment ten years later, a not very long span in the context of a person's working life.

Information available on the turnover of staff in two upper class households showed a fairly high level of stability. Although half the servants stayed for comparatively short periods, the Dillon family of North Great George's Street had two servants employed for at least ten years and one for at least nine between 1896 and 1906. Three servants stayed at least 2 or 3 years and six others were employed for periods of one and two years. The household account book for the Robin Vere O'Brien family from 1907 to 1921 showed that one servant was with the family for at least 14 years, two at least 8 - 9 years, three at least 6 years, and three approximately 3 years. On the other hand, seven servants stayed one year or less.

It has already been mentioned that the turnover of staff in Irish country houses seemed to have been fairly rapid (see above, p. 31). Records of the Clements family from 1885 - 1892 mentioned 47 different servants in the seven-year period for 16 positions. Five servants were with the family for periods varying from 12 to 23 years; these
did not include any upper servant. Two of the longest-serving—a coachman and a gardener—may have lived out and were probably married and would therefore be more inclined to remain in a satisfactory job. There were nine servants with over five years' service and 38 with less.

In the six-year period from 1880 - 1886, 112 different servants are mentioned for 27 positions in the wages book in Dromoland Castle. The fact that a number of the positions—third housemaid, laundry-maid, footman, hallboy, second coachman and groom—remained unfilled for long periods meant that the turnover was even more rapid than the average of four servants in six years for each position which the figures suggest. Only one servant, the housekeeper, was employed from the beginning to the end of the period. Apart from this servant, the upper servants were also affected by the rapid turnover: in the six years there were five butlers, three ladies' maids, five cooks and five under-butlers on the payroll in Dromoland.

The Clonbrock family spent approximately £5 a year on servants' registry expenses. No details are given of the number or titles of servants hired in this way; however, if 15 servants a year were recruited, a conservative estimate, it is a large number of new servants for a family who employed 11 servants in 1901. In addition, the family also advertised in the Irish Times and the Morning Post when seeking servants. The personal account book of Luke Gerald Dillon showed that of ten servants employed in 1888, only one was still with the family six years later. Turnover of servants in Clonbrock was fairly rapid, however two ladies' maids, Rosella Vincent and Sarah Fuide, who were mentioned in the wages book in 1894 were still employed in Clonbrock in 1910.

The fact that various awards for loyalty and long service were initiated in a number of countries shows that high turnover was a universal problem. The Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants in America offered cash prizes and bibles to servants of one or more years' tenure. It is significant that
one year's service was considered worthy of award. Prizes were given in France for long service, the periods in question here were very long, thirty to fifty years. In England and Ireland a reward system for long service was started by the G.F.S.: the Irish report of the G.F.S. for 1883 recorded that premiums were granted to servants for long service. A few years later service cards printed in gold were given to servants with seven years or longer service, while gold was not used on the plainer cards presented to those with shorter periods of service. Reports for subsequent years mentioned the awarding of these good service cards. In 1893, 25 cards were presented for periods varying from 7 to 2 years. The following year one Dublin branch awarded 13 cards for 2 years in the same situation. In 1896, a servant got a card for 15 years' service while 21 got cards for periods of 6 to 2 years. Again, what is interesting is that two years' service was deemed worthy of a reward.

The main reason for leaving a situation was, no doubt, because the servant found it unsatisfactory. About nine of the former servants interviewed had spent very short periods in some jobs and moderately long to very long periods in other situations. This showed that if a job was satisfactory, those servants were willing to stay for years, some until they retired. A lady who wrote to the author said her mother employed untrained girls, when they were trained they left to get a better position. This was a custom with some employers, as advertisements for young servants in newspapers showed: untrained young girls were paid less than trained servants and therefore were used consistently by some mistresses. In many cases servants left to get promotion or an increase in wages. Except in the bigger houses, promotional outlets were non-existent or extremely limited, and even in households with large staffs, servants often had to change their jobs in order to improve their status. Account books showed that many servants got the same wages for years. Sometimes when a servant threatened to leave because of the higher wages offered elsewhere, an employer offered a rise to keep a good servant.

Even though jobs were generally plentiful, the whole process of finding a suitable situation could be quite difficult and expensive.
Most servants would hardly have embarked on it lightly. Letters, from the employing class, in The Lady of the House in 1896 blamed mistresses for the problem of 'obtaining and retaining good servants'. Mistresses were blamed for recruiting the wrong servants, not training them properly and not treating them with consideration and kindness.

Some servants, however, never stayed long in any situation, they were restless, perhaps looking for variety in what was probably a drab and uneventful life. Servants interviewed who liked service and had no complaints about the situations they had been in just said they liked a change after a year or two. One, who changed jobs frequently, described herself as 'an adventurous person'.

The ability to change jobs was the only real power servants had when work conditions were unfavourable. Servants never achieved the collective power which membership of an effective trade union could have supplied. Attempts to organise them in trade unions in Ireland met with very little success; this was also the experience in England, France and the United States. In England, abortive efforts to start a union were made in Dundee and Leamington in 1872. The next attempt occurred in 1891 when The London and Provincial Domestic Servants Union was formed. It failed to attract more than a tiny minority of the city's servants - 562, at its peak, in 1895 - it was dissolved in 1898. In 1910, a new union called the Domestic Workers' Union of Great Britain was established in London, and shortly afterwards a similar organisation was formed in Glasgow; again the union received very little support and had only a membership of 245 in 1912; it was terminated in 1918. Even though there was great union activity in the U.S.A. between 1897 and 1917 no effort was made to unionise servants. Attempts were made before that, in the early 1880s, and after 1917, but without much success. The isolated nature of the workforce was the main reason given for the lack of success in forming unions in England, France and the United States.

The fact that servants usually worked alone or with one other undoubtedly made unionisation very difficult. Other reasons advanced
were the close relationship between employers and servants, the constant movement of servants from one situation to another, the unwillingness of upper and lower servants to join the same union, the fact that unmarried women looked on service as only a temporary occupation and the fear of servants of losing their places and being deprived of references. In Women's work it is stated: 'The difficulty of forming unions among women is undeniably great. Women are inexperienced in combination, and they entertain a lively and by no means groundless fear of the resentment of their employers'. A servant would suffer much more from a disapproving, if not antagonistic mistress, than a factory girl experiencing strained labour relationships in her place of work. Leonore Davidoff pointed out that, due to their isolation, it was impossible for wives and servants to build occupational or political ties with others in the same position, therefore aspirations for themselves and their children were seen in personal and individual terms. In an article on the G.F.S. in Past and Present, Brian Harrison said of class consciousness among women servants: 'class feeling could grow only slowly in an occupational group so penetrated with internal status divisions, so geographically scattered between a host of work places and so close in its contacts with the employer'. Conditions inimical to the growth of class consciousness were also inimical to the formation and sustenance of a trade union.

None of the former servants or employers with whom the author was in contact had any personal experience of a trade union. They said that there were no trade unions for servants, and during most of their working lives this was true. Attempts were made, however, to found a trade union for domestic servants. In 1911, Jim Larkin expelled women from the Irish Transport and General Workers Union (they were readmitted in 1918). On 5 September 1911 a special union for women, the Irish Women Workers' Union, was founded with James Larkin as president and his sister, Delia, as secretary. It collapsed during the 1916 rising but was resuscitated by Miss Louie Bennett early in 1917. In 1919 a Domestic Workers' Section of the union was started and put in the charge of Mrs. Margaret Buckley.
This branch organised a social club for workers and a registry office in Denmark House; a few months later an unemployment bureau was opened in conjunction with the registry office. The Domestic Workers' Section did not survive and was discontinued during the curfew of 1919. There was no further attempt to form a union for servants.

Miss Malony, who replaced Delia Larkin in the I.W.W.U., in her evidence to the Vocational Commission in 1940, said that before the Domestic Workers' Section was disbanded it had about 800 members in Dublin. In view of the number of servants in British trade unions, this was an extraordinarily large number and it seems strange that it did not make a greater impact. Mr. W. O'Brien, secretary of the I.T.G.W.U., in his evidence to the same commission said that domestic servants had never been organised. This was corrected by Miss L. Bennett. Mr. O'Brien then went on to say: 'some people are not organisable'. Miss Malony did not agree with this, she said it would be difficult but not impossible. There was, however, only one Irish union specifically for domestic servants and it was short-lived. Apart from providing a registry and social club, it does not appear to have achieved anything, not even awareness of its own existence.

In evidence given to the Vocational Commission, the Joint Committee on Vocationalism, which consisted of the National Council of Women of Ireland, the Joint Committee of Women's Societies and Social Workers and the Catholic Women's Federation of Secondary School Unions proposed that a home-makers organisation should be formed. When asked if they wanted to include servants, Mrs. Dempsey, the secretary of the W.F.S.S.U. said: 'it seems to be the only logical place in which to include domestic servants'. She then went on to say that servants were 'completely unorganised', that in the history of the trade union movement so far, 'not even in England have they succeeded in organising servants'. She mentioned the difficulty of laying down regulations for domestic servants and in doing this unwittingly highlighted the opposing interests of
mistresses and servants and the impossibility of catering for them in one organisation. Miss Malony said that in 1919-1920 there was a Domestic Employers' Association which met to set standards for domestic workers and which 'did achieve a remarkable success'. It was a small organisation which only existed for a couple of years.

Servants were not completely untouched by the trade union movement. A number joined The Regular Hotel and Club Workers International Union; this was seen in 1913 when the general secretary tried on their behalf to have the by-laws for registry offices changed. In 1923, domestic servants in Co. Waterford answered an appeal by the I.T.G.W.U. to support farm labourers in their struggle with the farmers about wages. The subcommittee on training of the women's advisory committee in 1919 thought it desirable that domestic workers should join trade unions, and that employers should recognise the unions and make it easy for their workers to become members.

An interesting fact is that domestic service did not appear to be free of practices usually associated with membership of trade unions. The sub-committee on organisation and conditions in 1919 stated that it would not be possible to allow the servant greater leisure unless 'she is prepared to accept as part of her conditions of service far greater interchange of duties with her fellow workers than has hitherto normally been the custom'. As has already been pointed out, advertisements for servants also showed that inflexibility existed. Some servants were intimidated by their mistresses but the reverse must also have occurred.

The failure of servants to unite and form trade unions or pressure groups no doubt contributed to the reluctance of parliament to bring in legislation favourable to servants. The domestic servant had the same status in the eyes of the law as a child, while the employer had extensive rights to protect himself against his servants. To terminate employment a month's notice was required on either side but an employer could dismiss a servant without notice if 'a good or valid
reason existed’. A master had to supply his servant with food and lodging but not with medical attention or medicine. A servant had to obey lawful orders, exercise care in carrying out his duties and 'abstain from doing that which he ought not to do'. Very little was done to reverse the legal imbalance. As a result of a couple of cases of extreme cruelty against servants in England in 1851, public outrage prompted parliament to bring in the Apprentices and Servants Act of 1851 which embodied safeguards for young people under eighteen years of age. The only other legislation was the ineffectual act to control registries in 1907. The bill to make compulsory the giving of character notes, and the bill introduced in 1911 to regulate conditions of service, never became law.

Domestic servants, however, benefited from general legislation - the provision of old age pensions in 1908, sickness benefits in 1911, and the Workman's Compensation Act of 1906. The National Insurance Act of 1911, which was designed to give workers free medical treatment and cash benefits while ill, met with strong opposition from both employers and servants - though principally from the former - in England and Ireland. A threepenny weekly contribution was required from mistress and servant. Mistresses resented being used as tax collectors. The Women's Freedom League urged that the act should be resisted because women were not consulted and it was passed by an assembly which did not include representatives of women. The Irish Citizen published articles from the W.F.L. and letters from the public on the subject. The W.F.L. refused to give the government information about employees or to pay any insurance contribution - a course also recommended by others. Women wrote furious letters to the papers saying that the act would divide society and implying that their maids were in agreement with them on the matter. A large protest meeting was held in England at the Albert Hall in November 1911; however, even before that, the campaign there was losing its impetus as servants realised the benefits of the scheme. The act came into operation in July 1912. The protest in Ireland continued longer but it too faded away. Some employers paid the whole cost of the stamp and indeed it could form part of the contract between mistress
Employers also opposed the Workman's Compensation Act, 1906, which made them liable for accidents incurred by servants whilst engaged in their employers' business. A writer to the Lady of the House said: 'here in Ireland, where so many people of limited incomes contrive to keep servants, the responsibility fixed upon them by the new Act is distinctly serious'. Employers could insure their servants or bear the full risk themselves; most decided to insure their servants. The Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 which gave those over seventy years of age, whose income from other sources did not exceed £21 per annum, five shillings a week pension was a great boon to domestic servants and indeed to thousands of old people.

Those who regard their occupation as a career expect that it will support them during their working life and provide, or allow them to provide, for their old age. Most workers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did not get a pension when they retired. They could expect, however, to remain in employment until they were 70 or 65 years of age, and could save for their old age. Servants, on the other hand, were at the height of their earning power at 35, had no security of tenure, found it increasingly difficult to find work after the age of 40 or 45, and, if they were unfortunate enough to lose their jobs, also lost their homes.

Evidence would seem to indicate that many servants were in a position to save. Their daily needs of board and lodging were supplied by their employers, and they had very restricted opportunities for spending their wages. As has already been seen, many servants sent money home regularly to their parents. In 1898, in evidence to the royal commission on the aged deserving poor, Miss Gertrude Tuckwell, honorary secretary to the Women's Trade Union League, suggested that a minimum earnings of 15/- to 16/- a week was necessary to allow a woman to subscribe to a friendly society; she was talking about a wage for a woman who would have to provide her own living expenses. This shows that servants earning an average wage of £12 - £14 a year, were in a position to save. Mr. G.T.C. Bartley, author of the old age pension scheme and the manager of the Penny Bank, in evidence to
the royal commission on the aged poor in 1895 supported this. He said that servants were a very much more thrifty class than people thought. Mr. Cardin, receiver and accountant general of the post office, in his evidence to the same commission in regard to post office saving said: 'but more especially does the practice prevail amongst servants and governesses and people of that class'. That commission seemed to establish that, if servants saved, they put money on deposit in the post office or savings banks. They did not subscribe to insurance or annuity schemes. Davidoff and Hawthorn said that groups such as friendly societies encouraged servants to save. There were very few friendly societies in Ireland and those that did exist almost totally neglected women. Reports of the G.F.S. in Ireland show that associates were told to encourage members to put their money in savings banks. Most former servants interviewed said that they were not able to save; this included a servant who was earning 15/- a week in 1911.

Servants earning low wages probably were not able to save, even if they were disposed to do so. Servants with average or above average wages were in a position to save and many put money in the post office or savings banks. They were, however, probably only able to provide in a very limited way for their old age. Servants saved for marriage and for periods when they might be ill or out of work and, of course, they helped their families. Some servants possibly saved a lot of money. Mary Davis, a domestic servant who was employed by George Mitchell of 20 Lower Sackville Street left £941.13.3 when she died in December 1895. Some of this money had been invested in shares in the Royal Bank. Interestingly she bequeathed her money to her employer and members of his family: either she had no near relatives or the Mitchells were closer to her than her family.

As servants got older they found it increasingly difficult to find work. Many advertisements for servants specified a young girl, and when a more experienced person was required, such as a cook or housekeeper, an upper age limit of 40 was often applied.
Margaret Powell, talking about a housemaid and parlourmaid who remained in an unsatisfactory household, said that as they were aged 63 and 65 it was not easy for them to find other employment. Anita Leslie described how her grandmother did not employ a governess because she considered her too old. When the woman burst into tears and said: 'it's because I'm too old - I'll never get another job', her grandmother gave the woman £5 but did not hire her. In her report in 1899, Miss Collet stated that: 'Rough mannered girls accustomed to service with "rough mannered employers" found it hard to get work as they got older. As soon as she wanted more than a very small wage she was dismissed and replaced by another young girl. Her background and experience were against her when she looked for jobs requiring a more mature person in a well-ordered household'. In Esther Waters, George Moore described a conversation between Esther and an ageing servant about wages while they waited to be interviewed for a job. The older servant said: 'Sixteen! I used to get that once; I'd be glad enough to get twelve now. You can't think of sixteen once you've turned forty, and I've lost my teeth, and that means a couple of pounds off'. She did not get the position, even at twelve pounds and as she left she said to Esther: 'I'm too old for anything but charing'. In spite of their experience, older men and women found less demand for their services.

Certain categories of servants had perhaps a shorter working life than others. Childrens' maids or nurses often found themselves without work when their charges got older or went away to boarding school. If the nurses were middle-aged they found it difficult to get another job. Sometimes the problem was solved by the same employer retaining them in another capacity, as a housekeeper, housemaid or perhaps as daughter's lady's maid. Most mistresses, however, preferred their maids to be young. Unemployment was a serious problem for middle-aged ladies' maids. Some, a lucky few, became housekeepers but this was not a popular type of promotion in the servants' hall. Also, when it came to marriage the lady's maid had two handicaps: 'she had almost certainly ideas above her station and she did not know how to cook'.
The number of older servants employed in Ireland was comparatively small, as is seen from census returns (see above, p. 29) and from the sample of Irish houses in 1911 (see below, p. 173). The same was true in England and France. The 1911 study showed an increase in the number of married and widowed women over the age of 35, showing that women returned to domestic work when their husbands died or their families were reared. Again, this also happened in England and France.

Servants could find themselves out of work and unable to get another situation from the age of 45 upwards. It was difficult for them to save sufficient for their old age, especially if that phase of their life commenced rather early. Indoor servants without a job were also often bereft of a home. Many former servants said that in old age domestic servants had to resort to the county home or workhouse. In the censuses of 1881 and 1891 'servants' accounted for 24 per cent of the inmates of workhouses, the largest occupation group listed. (In 1881 servants formed 5 per cent of the total population and this proportion decreased in subsequent years.) In 1901 and 1911 they formed 21 per cent of the population of workhouses. A certain percentage, 3 per cent in 1891, registered as housekeepers and the occupations of a large proportion of inmates - up to 32 per cent in 1891 - were unspecified; it seems probable that many of these were possibly servants also. Domestic servants were the second largest occupational group in lunatic asylums according to the Irish census returns; they formed 8 per cent of the total in 1881 and 9 per cent in 1891. There were probably more servants in asylums whose occupation was not recorded. A comparatively small number of all inmates were specified as 'hereditarily affected'. It is safe to assume that many were consigned to asylums because they were old and had nobody to look after them.

There were a number of homes, usually run by a committee of ladies, for elderly protestant women; some were specifically for domestic servants, others were simply for widows and aged single
women, many of whom may have been servants. The Asylum for Aged and Infirm Female Servants, 15 & 17 Drumcondra Road Lower, was typical of this type of home. It was intended for protestant servants of good character who from age or infirmity could no longer work. The servant was provided with lodging and coals. She had to be recommended by someone who was willing to subscribe £1 a year and at least 4/- weekly for the support of the servant. Servants entering this home had to have an iron bedstead, bedding and a few articles of furniture. If the subscription was not paid for two weeks, the servant had to leave. Women entering these homes were not destitute, they had to have an employer or friend willing to pay approximately £11 annually - a not inconsiderable sum - for their support. The number of people catered for in many of the homes was small; there were twelve inmates in the Asylum for Aged and Infirm Females in 1899. The fate of those women if, for any reason, their sponsorship was discontinued - a not unlikely event if they outlived their former employers - must have been hard indeed. Some religious orders provided homes for catholic servants. St. Joseph's Asylum, Portland Row, Summerhill was one of these. It catered for about 100 aged and virtuous unmarried women, many of whom were probably servants; it was free. When the total number of servants is considered, the number that these homes could cope with was small.

Some servants were provided for till they died, by their employers; they either continued working, no doubt less actively, or were regarded as retired. Mervyn Wall in Hermitage describes how Tony, the hero, as a schoolboy visited his cousin's farm and loved to accompany old Martha, the retired housekeeper, whose only duty now was to feed the hens. Retired servants were sometimes given cottages on estates or allowed to go on living in them until they died. Enumerators' returns for the 1911 census show, for example, that the Earl of Antrim had a retired butler, and the Earl of Portarlington a retired housemaid living on the estate. Elizabeth Smith described giving food and firing to ten pensioners, all people who had worked for them, some no longer living on their estate. Lord Aberdeen mentioned in We Twa that when he grew up he gave his nurse a modest pension.
The Yorke family in England provided loyal members of staff with pensions and cottages on their estate. The O'Brien family of Cahirmoyle gave generous pensions to some of their servants in 1903. The weekly wages book for the Powerscourt Estate showed that between 1906 and 1912, approximately six retired servants got a weekly pension of about 5/-; they also seemed to have cottages on the estate. Servants who worked for the gentry for a number of years had better prospects of an independent old age than those who worked in smaller households. Of course, even on an estate, only a small number could be provided for in this way.

A loyal servant who worked many years for the same employer might have expected to be remembered in his master's will. Research done on wills probated in Ireland between 1891 and the late 'twenties - about 154 wills - would seem to indicate, however, that only about 20 per cent of employers left bequests to servants. Most of these bequests were either small sums of money - £3 to £10 - or, at best, the equivalent of one year's wages. It must be remembered that this would only provide for a servant for a much shorter period if she had to pay for accommodation while she looked for a new situation or considered where she would spend her old age. Some servants got the equivalent of two years' wages and a few got sums of £100 - £200. At most, only six servants got sufficient money to live on in their old age. These included three annuities of £25, £26 and £50. Two servants got three quarters and one quarter of the residue of an estate - value unknown. Only one servant received what was undoubtedly a valuable bequest - £1,500, furniture and a house in Waterloo Road. It is impossible to know exactly how many servants benefited under the wills examined as some employers did not name servants but left sums to those who, for example, served them for five years or more; however the number was approximately 57.

Employers usually only left money to servants who had worked for them for a minimum number of years and varied sums bestowed according to the number of years served. They also generally stipulated that the servant had to be in their employment at the time of their death.
to benefit. There were great variations; some servants got generous bequests after comparatively short service, others with long service and, at an age when work was difficult to obtain, got little or nothing. It would appear from an examination of wills of people in the 1911 study, that where an employer expected his widow or other members of the family to maintain the household after his death, he probably did not feel any onus on him to provide for servants. Also, many elderly employers had only young servants who were, no doubt, in their employment for short periods. Providing for servants in this way was in the paternalistic tradition which gave employers responsibility for their servants even when the latter had grown too old to work. The Irish evidence would seem to show that very few employers sought to fulfil this type of obligation when making their wills. Certainly servants could not count on the generosity of employers to provide for them in their old age.

Employers had an abiding fear of hiring a dishonest or immoral servant; this is shown by their insistence on receiving good references from former masters. While this is quite understandable as the servants were being accepted into their homes, it should not be taken as an indication that domestic servants were more likely to have criminal tendencies than other workers. Statistics indicate that in Ireland servants formed a small proportion of convicted criminals. Indoor servants were approximately 10 per cent of the working population between 1881 and 1901, but accounted for only 3 per cent of convicted criminals. The two sets of figures are not strictly comparable because the servants, given as a proportion of the working population, were indoor servants, whereas the domestic servants in prisons also included outdoor servants and charwomen and are given as a percentage of the prison population which included those who had no occupation - 9 per cent of the total in 1898 - and prostitutes - 15 per cent of the total in the same year. A number of those returned as prostitutes were probably domestic servants at one time. In 1898, 46 per cent of convicted prisoners were labourers as against 4 per cent servants.
The criminal records of 983 convicts were examined and were found to include only eight servants, less than 1% of the whole. The records were randomly selected and covered the years 1880 to 1919. There were five cases of theft, one of abduction, one of concealed birth and one of manslaughter. Two of the larcenies were committed by women who had left or been discharged and returned to rob their former employers. A 48 year old woman, Mary Sherlock, said that the conduct of her employer towards her was 'very bad' and she threatened to bring an action against him. He promised her money if she refrained; he did not pay and two years after leaving she returned and stole £15. She was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment for housebreaking and robbery. The man sentenced for abduction had first of all seduced a fifteen-year-old fellow servant, when discovered and discharged he had absconded with the girl. The maid accused of a concealed birth had killed her new-born baby; it was her second illegitimate child. The manslaughter case will be discussed later. With the exception of manslaughter, these crimes are representative of those usually associated with servants - theft and sexual offences. Research in England and France would also seem to indicate that servants were not more likely than other occupational groups to be involved in criminal activities, in fact the reverse was true.

Servants were easily caught and accused, and if larcenies occurred they were usually the first to come under suspicion; it was easier for employers to attribute wrongdoing to servants than to members of their own family. It was easy to allow the crimes undoubtedly committed by some servants to grow into a general distrust of all servants. There is evidence that many servants may have been involved in petty larceny of food and drink; while reprehensible in itself, there is danger that in the general condemnation of the servant classes, distinctions were not made between relatively minor offences and serious crimes. An interesting fact is that, while most servants were women, four of these convicted servants were men. Male servants were much more likely to be involved in criminal activities. While they accounted for about 7 per cent of all
indoor servants, the percentage of male servants in prison varied from 20 to 40 per cent. Statistics quoted refer only to those convicted of crimes. Many thefts by servants would never have been discovered and, even if they were, many employers did not bring their servants to court, they merely discharged them. Likewise many of those who had illegitimate babies or became prostitutes ended up in workhouses, not in jail.

The most prevalent problems concerning servants, apart possibly from petty theft, were those involving illicit sexual relations. In nineteenth century France, "the domestic servant class was clearly the greatest supplier of prostitutes, in addition to having the most illegitimate births". An investigation into prostitution in the early twentieth century in London found that 293 out of 830 prostitutes, 35 per cent, had been domestic servants. In Ireland the mothers of illegitimate children were frequently domestic servants. Domestic servants were particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation by the master, sons and visitors to the house in which they worked. They were often regarded by the employing class as inferiors who could be abused with impunity. If the servant complained to her mistress she not only lost her job but was probably blamed for the indiscretions that had occurred. Unlike other workers, servants had virtually no private life. They were often lonely, deprived of the normal companionship of members of the opposite sex and so were particularly vulnerable: employers and their relations frequently took advantage of this situation. Merlin Waterson reported that: 'the records of divorce cases in the eighteenth century show that it was by no means unusual for relations between masters and servants to be paternal in a very literal sense'. Leonore Davidoff said: 'There is direct evidence that servants were desired and used as sexual objects themselves. Again this was a situation where the employer usually initiated the relationship and could, for the most part, escape its consequences'.

When girls seduced by masters or members of his family became pregnant they were often dismissed instantly without a character and literally put out on the street. Margaret Powell tells of
a pregnant housemaid who was dismissed immediately, without money and without a reference, even though her mistress knew that her son was responsible. In that case the master, unknown to his wife, paid the girl's debts and got her a flat. Powell added: 'It was always the same then. It was always the girl's fault if she got into trouble. Nobody ever blamed the man'. Arthur J. Munby, the barrister, described in his diaries meeting 'a distraught looking lass' from Devonshire who had come to service in London eighteen months previously. She had got work in a lodging house as a general servant and had been seduced by one of the lodgers. As a result of this she was dismissed. She had subsequently had a miscarriage, become destitute and was nearly reduced to becoming a prostitute. This typical sequence of events became the theme of novels, notably Esther Waters by George Moore. Frank O'Connor in An only child described how a lodger in the house where his mother was a servant, tried to seduce her.

When pregnant servants were dismissed they usually returned home or went to the workhouse. The report of the vice-regal commission on poor law reform in Ireland in 1906, recommended that girls who had a first illegitimate baby should be sent to a special institution kept by religious or philanthropic persons. It was hoped that suitable situations would be procured for them at the end of a year 'or such additional time, if any, as the managers of the institutions might think necessary for the strengthening of their character'. It was hoped in this way that girls who had had one 'misfortune' would be removed from the company of habitual offenders. The report described an experiment in Limerick workhouse where those with first illegitimate babies were kept in a special ward under the care of a sister of mercy. Most of these girls were placed in service. This was a very good development as it gave girls who were perhaps innocent victims an opportunity to lead a normal life again.

Some young girls going into service at 14 or 15 years of age were innocent of 'the facts of life'. A former servant who started work in 1913 at the age of sixteen said that she did not
know 'where babies came from'. She was 'educated' by the parlourmaid. In *The rat pit*, Patrick MacGill's heroine, Norah Ryan, was also innocent: 'the great fundamental truths of life were unknown to Norah: no one had ever explained to her why she was and how she had come into being'. Mrs Layton in *Life as we have known it* described going into service in Kentish Town at 15 years of age where, soon after her arrival, the mother died in childbirth: 'I knew nothing of the facts of life . . . and I really cannot say how I did get my knowledge'. Obviously not all servants were innocent victims of sexual liaisons. Some may have had dreams of marrying a son of the house or a friend of the family and in this way escaping from service.

As well as sexual involvement with the master or his family servants were often either seduced by male servants or formed liaisons with them. Barbara Charlton recalled the many maidservants ruined by the 'atrocious Inkley'. While admitting that he should have been discharged earlier, she did not blame herself for the downfall of the girls he subsequently seduced. She also described what she called the 'immoral goings on' at Hesleyside of which she said she was ignorant at the time. When Barbara Charlton's eldest son was dying in 1893 he told her that the laundry had been used as 'nothing but a brothel', and that some of the upper servants, whom she had thought led blameless lives, were among the most licentious of those involved. The indoor servants' amours in the pantry were also mentioned. A former lady's maid who visited many of the big houses in Ireland said it was not unusual for women servants to have men in their bedrooms at night.

Disapproval of pre-marital sexual relations was not equally strong in all parts of Great Britain. In some areas, for example Wales, some women were able to continue to work 'respectably' and bring up their illegitimate children. The birth of an illegitimate child did not necessarily lead to disaster for a servant; she might subsequently marry the father or another man and lead a normal life. In France, while the middle class found pre-marital relations
unacceptable, it was not necessarily at variance with the values of some rural-born individuals: since the eighteenth century the practice of consummating the relationship during courtship of those who expected to marry was widely tolerated. In Ireland, where the majority of the population were strict catholics, very much under the influence of the church, there was a puritanical attitude to sex and very little tolerance for premarital sex or prostitution. A pregnant servant could expect little sympathy from her mistress, or indeed from her parents, many of whom were probably kept in ignorance of their daughter's condition. In these circumstances workhouses in Ireland probably received many of these women. Joseph Robins in *The lost children* said:

The mother of an illegitimate child was almost always treated as a pariah. Dr Kirwan, parish priest of Kilcummin (Co. Galway), expressed views which were typical of those held throughout the country: 'I do not think there are six men in the parish who would marry women who had illegitimate children by other fathers; ... They form a justly high estimate of female purity; and the woman who has lost her virtue, unless repaired by a subsequent marriage, loses with it for life her character and her caste.'

In spite of the dire consequences for the women, seduction of servants and pre-marital sexual relationships seem to have been fairly common among servants in Ireland. Many former servants and employers had experience of working with or employing servants who had illegitimate children. Some servants had experience of masters who made sexual overtures to them or to other servants. One servant who was interviewed by the mistress for a job was told that while she was satisfied the master would have to approve before she could be engaged. A week after starting work the master came to her bedroom one night, she threatened to tell his wife and when he left the room she stole quietly out of the house and walked - it was now after midnight - to the home of a previous employer. Another servant said that the housemaid where she worked was known as the cook's 'sister', but was in fact her illegitimate daughter. The child had been in The House of Mercy, Baggot Street, when she left there she got a job where her mother was working. Incidents such
as thes show that many employers were compassionate and willing to engage servants who had illegitimate children and indeed to engage the child also. Girls who worked as farm servants in Ireland seemed to be especially vulnerable to seduction by the farmer, his sons or farm workers. A story is told of farm lads who, annoyed that they were not hired, shouted after a farmer who had engaged a servant girl instead: 'I suppose you paid £9 for her, and she'll have a child with you for the Christmas'.

Some farmers took precautions to avoid, as far as possible, illicit liaisons between farm servants. In *The farm* by Lough Gur, Mary Carberry tells the true story of a family who lived on a farm in Co. Limerick. The maids slept upstairs while the farm boys had a room in the yard; 'except for meals and prayers they were not allowed inside the house, nor was any sort of friendship allowed between them and the maids'.

Prostitution was commonly regarded as the likely fate of domestic servants who were unfortunate enough to lose their situation through illness, or as a result of illicit sex or for some other grave reason. An early report of the G.F.S. in Dublin about girls who went into service said: 'from time to time there comes news of those that are gone, sometimes glad tidings, but alas, too often tales of shame and misery, of wasted lives spent in the service of sin or vanity instead of in the service of God'.

Certainly illicit sexual relations led to the loss of situation, resort to the workhouse and possibly prostitution. Crimes such as concealment of birth, infanticide and suicide often followed. The largest group of mothers who committed infanticide in France were domestic servants. Others sent their babies to foundling homes or out to wet nurses, where many of them parished; this was the solution adopted by Esther Waters.

Some unfortunate girls who were dismissed committed suicide. Such a case was reported in the *Irish Times* in 1883, when a farm servant was found hanging from the rafters in a cowshed. It appeared she was seduced by a farmer's son. When it became obvious that she was pregnant, her mistress told her on a Friday that she would have to leave on the following Sunday; that night she killed herself. In France, servants accounted for a disproportionate percentage of those who committed suicide.
It is very difficult to determine to what extent servants were dishonest. The judicial statistics in the parliamentary papers do not record the crimes of which the prisoners were guilty. It is likely that most imprisoned domestic servants were guilty of theft; many of those guilty of prostitution would have been recorded under that 'occupation'. Manuscript sources about servants in big houses in Ireland examined, do not mention theft or other misdemeanours by servants. A number of servants are recorded as leaving or discharged and, no doubt, many were discharged for dishonesty. In her memoirs Lady Fingall recalled a footman who stole a considerable quantity of silver. Elizabeth Smith talked about a servant who was 'lazy, stupid and dishonest'. She stole eatables and wearables. Only one former employer mentioned employing a servant who was dishonest. She was about to get married and set up house and she helped herself to 'bits and pieces' such as cups, cutlery and saucepans. The employer said that this sort of dishonesty was not unusual. The majority of servants in Ireland would appear to have been honest. Most of those who were not were probably involved in petty larceny.

There is no doubt that many servants engaged in some kinds of dishonest practice to which employers objected. Some excuse could be found for this behaviour.

No people contemplate so strikingly the unequal distribution of wealth: they fold up dresses whose price contains double the amount of their year's wages; they pour out at dinner wine whose cost could have kept a poor family for weeks. Frank E. Huggest said: 'some girls were tempted into theft by their employer's abundant wealth and more than adequate opportunity'. This was true. On the other hand, most servants were not in need as were other sections of the population at the time. If they valued their positions, they were not likely to jeopardise them by stealing from their employers; if valuables were missing, servants were likely to be the first suspected. Two of the five cases of larceny among those found in the convict reference files were committed by servants after they had left their employment. A danger which employers feared was that a servant would give inside information to thieves outside the household.
In the case of serious crime, this was a more likely danger. Such an incident is described by Barbara Charlton in *The recollections of a Northumbrian lady*.

Servants were occasionally involved in more serious crimes such as manslaughter and murder. A murder occurred in 1880 which received a lot of publicity in the national newspapers. A servant, Margaret Skeen, murdered, not her employer, which was perhaps more usual, but her successor. Margaret was engaged by a Mr Brabazon who lived with his sister and her daughter near Drogheda. She was happy there for some time, but then the two ladies left and she was alone in the house with her employer. Margaret said that she discovered then that he drank to excess and 'an improper intimacy arose which resulted in her master brutally ill-treating her on several occasions'. Finally she left and went to live nearby with her sister who was married to Mr Brabazon's other servant. She asked Mr Brabazon for her 'discharge' which he refused to give, consequently she could not get another situation. Margaret said that she became desperate and started to drink. Meantime Mr Brabazon hired another servant.

On 7 January 1880, Mr Brabazon and his outdoor servant, Margaret's brother-in-law, went to Drogheda leaving Emma Bouchier, who had replaced Margaret Skeen, alone in the house. When they returned at 11 p.m. they got no answer and had to get into the house through a window. They found Margaret with blood on her face and arms. Emma's body was discovered in a well in the scullery with wounds on the head, neck and chest. Margaret Skeen had then rifled Emma's belongings and stolen some articles of clothing and some trinkets. The judge who tried the case felt that this 'if possible aggravated the crime'. It was stated afterwards that there was no suggestion that an improper relationship existed between the unfortunate girl who was murdered and her employer. Margaret Skeen was found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to penal servitude for life on 2 March, 1880. Her own explanation of the event is contained in her unsuccessful petition to the lord lieutenant: 'while labouring under the effects of drink and blinded by jealousy, I committed the crime'.
A number of notorious cases involving servants occurred in England. A valet murdered his employer, Lord William Russell, an uncle of the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell. Two women, under notice to leave, murdered their mistresses. In two of these cases theft and resentment against difficult employers were the causes of the crimes. In the third case, a particularly gruesome and horrific one, the servant was drunk at the time of the murder. These cases which were followed with great interest by both employers and servants had the effect of making the former even more particular about the credentials of prospective employees.
CHAPTER 9

DECLINE IN DOMESTIC SERVICE

The problem which beset the 19th century was much the same as the one which faced earlier centuries. The domestic worker in the 19th century suffered more than she ever did before. The demand for labor increased, and the vast expansion of industry created a need for a labor force that was not available. The working conditions for women were often brutal, and the lack of basic rights and protection for them was a major issue.

The situation was exacerbated by the fact that the majority of women were forced to work in menial jobs. The demand for domestic workers was at an all-time high, and the wages were low. The conditions in which they worked were often unbearable, and the lack of basic rights and protection for them was a major issue.

The problem of domestic service was not new, but it was exacerbated by the expansion of industry and the demand for labor. The situation was further compounded by the lack of basic rights and protection for women. The demand for labor was at an all-time high, and the wages were low. The conditions in which they worked were often unbearable, and the lack of basic rights and protection for them was a major issue.

The situation was further exacerbated by the fact that the majority of women were forced to work in menial jobs. The demand for domestic workers was at an all-time high, and the wages were low. The conditions in which they worked were often unbearable, and the lack of basic rights and protection for them was a major issue.

The problem of domestic service was not new, but it was exacerbated by the expansion of industry and the demand for labor. The situation was further compounded by the lack of basic rights and protection for women. The demand for labor was at an all-time high, and the wages were low. The conditions in which they worked were often unbearable, and the lack of basic rights and protection for them was a major issue.
Problems which beset domestic service such as the need for formal training, control of registry offices, standardisation of conditions and work practices, and unionisation of workers were never solved, they just faded away with the virtual demise of service. The decline started in the 1880s and although gradual at first, concern about it was expressed in magazine articles and G.F.S. reports in the 1890s and early years of the twentieth century. The report of the G.F.S. for 1901 stated that: 'the lack of servants and the demand for them is greater this year than last'. A decrease in the number of members in service and in the number of good service premiums was noted in 1902. Between 1890 and 1906, the number of applications for servants to the G.F.S. more than doubled, showing the growing difficulty in obtaining servants, while the number of girls placed, 112 in 1906, was approximately the same as in 1896 and 1892. The Ossory Ferns and Leighlin branch of the G.F.S. in their annual report for 1901 expressed concern about the great decrease of members in service and suggested that the 'department for members in service' should investigate the problem. It has already been pointed out how few protestants were applying for scholarships to train as servants in 1906 (see above, p. 65). In The Lady of the House in 1896 it was stated that: 'wherever one goes, one hears so much of the - almost - impossibility of finding good servants, and, if found, keeping them, that it has become evident that there is a serious hitch somewhere in the fitting-in of this department of domestic affairs with the requirements of modern life'. Readers were asked to submit their views on the causes of the difficulty. A writer to The Irish Homestead in 1903 deplored the dearth of 'respectable' servants which was becoming greater each year and described it as a 'national canker'.

The census returns showed that there was a drop in the number of servants in each census year from 1881 to 1926. It must be
remembered that, while the population of England and most western countries was rising, the population of Ireland was falling - there were about three quarters of a million people fewer in Ireland in 1911 than in 1881. This decrease in population meant that the proportion of servants to the whole population did not change as rapidly as the drop in numbers might suggest (Table 14). Between 1881 and 1911 indoor female servants in England and Wales did not decline in number but increased at a much slower rate, which did not keep pace at all with the growing population.  

TABLE 14

Number of indoor servants, male and female, in Ireland in census years 1881 - 1911, showing servants as a percentage of the working and total populations.

Source: Cen. Ire., 1881 - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>census year</th>
<th>number of servants</th>
<th>% of working population</th>
<th>% of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>250,381</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>211,095</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>175,500</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>135,325</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no obvious reasons in Ireland such as there were in England - industrial growth and the 1914-1918 war, when it was reckoned that 400,000 women left service for factory work and many never returned  for the decrease in the number of servants. Those who left were popularly regarded as emigrating or going into shops, factories or offices. There is no doubt that many emigrated. The number of emigrants rose from an annual average of 50,172 between 1871 - 1881 to an annual average of 59,733 between 1881 and 1891. Emigration affected young girls, especially those from lower class rural families, more than any other group, the class from which most Irish servants were recruited. The number of females emigrating between 1881 and 1891 rose by 92,100 on the previous ten year period. It dropped after that, but still 230,868 and 173,284 females emigrated between 1891 and 1901, and between 1901 and 1911 respectively.
About 80 per cent of these were at an age when they could have worked as domestic servants. The result was that while there were 233 female indoor servants to every 1000 families in 1881, this had fallen to 140 per 1000 in 1911.  

The vast majority of Irish emigrants at the time went to the U.S.A. and most of these entered domestic service (see above, p. 53). Robert Kennedy, in The Irish, noted that there was a large increase in the number of Irish immigrants who gave their occupation as 'servant' in selected years between 1875 and 1911. In 1875, 5,052 servants left Ireland to work in the U.S.; the number increased by 2,813 in 1881 and by a similar figure in 1891. In 1901 the increase was 1,848, it dropped to 178 in 1911. Of course many of those who had no specific occupation, which would have included most of the women, also became domestic servants. The fact that women who might be considered as fleeing from service in this country became servants in the U.S. should not come as a surprise. It was probably the only work available to them, or at least offered better wages and conditions than alternatives. America was a more democratic country than Ireland and domestic servants probably enjoyed a higher status; also the girls were strangers in a foreign country without preconceived ideas about their own social position within that society. It was also found in England that girls who rejected service in their own country became domestic servants when they emigrated to the colonies.

It is not as easy to discover where girls who remained in the country, and who would formerly have become servants, found alternative employment. The economic development of Ireland lagged behind that of all other north western European countries. Ireland could not offer the factory jobs of thriving industrial countries like England and France, or the new opportunities for women created by the first world war. Table 15 shows the percentages of females in the five censal classes of occupation in 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1911. The actual number of women in agriculture and industry decreased steadily between 1881 and 1911, but, due to the decrease in population, their position as a proportion of the occupied female population
TABLE 15

Percentages of females in the different occupational classes in the Irish censuses - 1881-1911.
Source: Cen. Ire., 1891 - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i professional class</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii domestic class*</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii commercial class</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv agricultural class</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v industrial class</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women occupied</td>
<td>634,793</td>
<td>592,140</td>
<td>549,874</td>
<td>430,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of female population</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments made in censal categories

1 139,092 females - almost all wives and other near relatives of the heads of families returned as housekeepers - were removed from 'occupied females' and the 'domestic class' in the 1881 census and put into the 'indefinite and non-productive class' in accordance with a change introduced in the 1891 census.

2 For comparison purposes scholars were removed from the 'professional class' and 'occupied class' and put in the 'indefinite and non-productive class' in the 1881 and 1891 censuses to keep them in line with a change made in the 1901 census.

* Domestic class includes outdoor servants, hotel and club workers, charwomen, washing and bathing service, hospital and institutional services as well as indoor servants.
remained remarkably constant. It was only between 1901 and 1911 that there was a real decrease in employment of women in agriculture. While there were changes within industry between 1881 and 1911, there was virtually no change in the proportion of the total female work force employed in industry. There was a significant increase in the professional class and commercial class between 1881 and 1911. While most of the increase in the former probably came from the middle and upper classes - daughters who hitherto would have remained at home as dependents - some were, no doubt, women who might in earlier times have become servants and now became teachers or entered the religious life. Table 16 shows some of the occupations in which the greatest changes occurred between 1881 and 1911 and also those which might have been expected to absorb those who abandoned service.

**TABLE 16**

Number of women in certain occupations in 1881 and 1911, showing each as a percentage of the total occupied female population in that year.

*Source: Cen. Ire., 1881 - 1911*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>occupations</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>% of occupied</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>% of occupied</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nuns</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>8,887</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>13,358</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15,005</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil service</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers &amp; clerks</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial clerks</td>
<td>15,382</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general shopkeepers</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4,989</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drapers</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confectioners/pastrycooks</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innkeeper/hotel/lodging</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total occupied</td>
<td>634,793</td>
<td></td>
<td>430,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decline in service was steady and increased over time: there was one servant for every 20 of the population in 1881, this fell to

*Too small to compute*
one per 22 in 1891, one per 25 in 1901 and only one per 32 in 1911. It should be noted that the percentage of women unemployed in Ireland in 1911 had risen by 5 per cent since the previous census (see above, Table 15). In 1911 there were 7,970 male indoor servants in the twenty-six counties, this had fallen to 1,818 in 1926; female indoor servants decreased from 98,774 in 1911 to 63,766 in 1926. In the latter year indoor domestic servants were only 5 per cent of the working population of the twenty-six counties.

The reason for the growth in emigration was possibly due as much to dissatisfaction with life in Ireland, especially rural Ireland, as it was with dissatisfaction with domestic service. This was probably true, especially at the end of the last century. Robert Kennedy gives the subordinate status of women in rural areas in Ireland which he maintains was greater than in other European countries as a reason for women leaving Ireland. From famine times there was a tradition of emigration to the United States especially in country areas. The attractions of life there and in England were well known from those who had emigrated over the years. A knowledge of the English language made integration relatively easy. Single people, especially single women, found it easier to emigrate than wives and mothers and there was a growing number of single people in the Irish population after the 1870s.

The nearness to England and the ready access to English newspapers and magazines meant that some of the ideas which made service increasingly less attractive to English girls also affected their Irish counterparts. Given alternatives, as girls were in England, they became dissatisfied with the working conditions of servants, especially the long hours and the lack of freedom. Writing in 1903 Charles Booth noted that: 'a very independent spirit is a marked characteristic of the lower classes of servants' and he added: 'to such as these the loss of independence which service entails becomes unbearable'. The low status of domestic service was now more keenly felt. Mrs. J. Ramsay McDonald, honorary secretary of the Legal Committee of the Women's Industrial Council, giving evidence to the Royal Commission on the Poor Law and Relief of
Distress, 1910, attributed the disinclination of girls to enter service in England as 'a question of social caste'. She said they did not want service when their friends worked in shops and factories. Women in Ireland were affected by democratic ideas current in the U.S.A. and England, movements such as the emancipation of women were, no doubt, altering traditional ideas and so expectations rose without the means to satisfy them being available in the country.

Meanwhile employers were seeking solutions to what was known as 'the servant problem'. One method advocated was the use of 'lady helps'. This was first tried in England in the 1870s when needy gentlewomen were recruited as upper servants. It was not very successful, for, like governesses, lady helps belonged neither to the world of the servant nor of the employer and, where other servants were involved, they were often a cause of friction. Mrs Crawshay advocated lady helps as a means of solving two problems, lack of servants and 'abundance of starving ladies'. She said that many social difficulties would be solved if young ladies would agree to become lady helps in their own homes: 'families rich only in daughters will spare of their super-abundant "helps" to serve as upper servants in the houses of more wealthy people; and in those of the childless'. The idea of the lady helps was revived in England in the early 1900s with the establishment of organisations such as the Guild of the Dames of the Household at Cheltenham in 1902, the Guild of Aids at Bath and the Central Bureau for the Employment of Women in London. Again this did not meet with much success. Letters advocating the use of lady helps in Ireland and offering advice on training appeared in the 1890s. One writer said that it was usually supposed that the lady help was needed in a large establishment where many servants were employed, but that many advantages would ensue if the lady help 'was willing to enter more humble families and to make herself more generally useful'. In 1908 an article in The Lady of the House suggested that ladies should train as dames of the household in Cheltenham, and stated that there were a number of Irish girls in training there and that it was possible to get suitable places in Ireland when finished. Details about applications, fees and duration of training - this could vary from two weeks for parlourmaids, to three months for cooks and childrens' nurses -
were given. The Guild of the Dames of the Household also laid down conditions of employment. The introduction of 'lady helps' in Ireland probably met with even less success than in England. No servant in the Dublin households was described as a 'lady help'. When they were mentioned in magazines it was usually with disparagement, they were usually described as being too much of the 'lady' and not enough of the 'help'. This reflected the ambiguity of their position and differences in how they saw themselves and their employers saw them. Employers complained that these women were apt to remember what they used to be rather than their present circumstances.

A more radical suggestion to alleviate servant shortages and servant discontent was to introduce central kitchens. A letter to The Lady of the House in 1896 advocated a culinary depot in each street where meals could be prepared; the menu would be sent around to each house in advance and orders taken. The writer hoped that the same type of competition which existed between shops and tradesmen would develop in this service. The idea was revived many years later in an effort to apply the more efficient methods of industry to the organisation of the home. This time it was linked with the employment of what was known as 'the eight-hour home assistant'. This person arrived in time to lay the table for breakfast, receive the hot cooked meal which had been ordered the previous day from the 'central' or 'neighbourhood' kitchen, make tea and toast and serve the meal, return the dishes to the container for collection and then proceed to do the other household chores. In order to cover the full day until after dinner, a shift system would be necessary. In a large house the employment of two assistants working together might be required. Lunch and dinner would be delivered hot, appetising and ready to serve; savings from the elimination of waste and breakages were promised. However attractive these ideas may have appeared to some at the time, they were never seriously entertained. They had been mooted in England at various times from the early 1890s but never really put into practice.
Two suggestions which do not appear to have been given serious consideration were firstly that housewives and other members of the family should do the housework themselves, and secondly, that greater use should be made of labour-saving appliances. These were the two methods by which, for most people, the 'servant problem' was eventually solved. Technological advances and new inventions did not affect the housewife until the first years of the 1900s and indeed did not affect many for several decades later.

In America household guides at the turn of the century showed that technology had changed many household tasks. Middle class apartments had central heating, hot water and modern appliances. These changes came more slowly in Europe. It was indeed maintained that the presence of servants delayed the technical improvement of homes for many years. Gas cookers were manufactured commercially in the 1850s, but it was 1900 or later before they were installed in private kitchens. Gas lighting was available in many English urban homes in the 1860s, and gas geysers for heating water were on the market in 1868. Most people, however, continued to use candles and lamps until the advent of electric light which, in England, occurred in the 1880s. By the end of the nineteenth century electric cookers, hot plates, kettles, frying pans and polishers were available. Vacuum or suction cleaners came on the market between 1904 - 1907. They were not generally used, however, for many years.

Gas was first used to light the streets of Dublin on the 5 October 1825. As in England, its use was gradually adopted for lighting private houses. In the middle of the nineteenth century a pamphlet prepared in England for the Alliance and Dublin Consumers' Gas Company described the first gas cooker: 'By the aid of a simply constructed apparatus gas performs the respective processes of roasting, baking, frying, boiling, steaming etc. that cannot be attained by means of the common fire. Two or three days' experience are sufficient to enable servants to conduct any of the above mentioned operations with certainty as respect time'. This piece of 'simply constructed apparatus' did not appear in Dublin.
homes until the first decade of the new century. Gas company records show that meters were installed in some of the most prosperous areas in Dublin - Merrion Square, Northumberland Road, Highfield Road, Mountjoy Square, to the Guinness family in Castleknock, in the Gresham Hotel - in 1907 and 1908. This shows that people were beginning at that time to use gas for cooking, heating and water-heating.

In 1892, Dublin Corporation through their electric lighting committee first supplied street lighting and offered current to citizens who wished to install electric lighting in their own homes. Previous to this, private companies had supplied electricity for some street lighting in Dublin - in 1881 electric lighting was used in Stephen's Green and Nassau Street. In 1903 the electricity works were moved from Fleet Street to the Pigeon House, where there was much greater capacity to generate electricity. In 1904, however, there were only 650 consumers in Dublin and most of these were using electricity only for lighting or as power for industry. There was an electrical exhibition in the Mansion House, Dublin, from October 30 to November 4, 1911, at which electric cookers, fires, hot plates and heaters for shaving water were exhibited. It is clear from the catalogue that these appliances were new to most people at the time. An electricity showroom was opened at 39 Grafton Street in response to the criticism that the electricity department of the corporation lacked marketing expertise. By the 1920s no house was considered modern or properly equipped unless it had electric light but it was only in the mid 1920s that the public was beginning to realise the advantages of using electricity for cooking, heating, washing, ironing and vacuum cleaning. In the years before the Shannon scheme was inaugurated, Ireland had by far the lowest consumption of electricity of any modern European country - 16 units per head of population. In 1923 there was a consumption of 26 units per head in Dublin as against 105 in Amsterdam. There were 40,000 houses in Dublin City and only 13,000 or less than one third had electricity installed. Only 23 per cent of people in Cork and 29 per cent of the population in Limerick had electricity. In the areas of the Free State where electricity
was available, only 26 per cent of the population had it installed. Ireland was slow to avail of the benefits of electricity and the wide range of appliances which electricity made possible. Of course there were labour saving appliances before the advent of gas and electricity. There were for instance hand-operated washing machines, mechanical vacuum cleaners, ice boxes, but they were probably used by very few people. It is reasonable to suspect that labour saving appliances became popular in this country only when women had to do their own housework.

After the first world war in England, a determined effort was made to force women into domestic service. If an unemployed woman was offered a job as a servant and she refused it, she lost the right to unemployment benefit. In 1919, 650,000 women were unemployed, of whom only 500,000 were receiving unemployment benefit. The others who had refused domestic service were denied relief. Between 1921 and 1924, the government organised two programmes to train unemployed women as domestic servants and 11,388 were trained under these schemes.

All efforts in Ireland, England and elsewhere to halt the decline in domestic service failed and a trend which started in the 1880s continued inexorably and with increasing momentum during the following sixty to seventy years. It was not just a question of solving an economic problem, of improving the efficiency of an industry: domestic service was also part of the social fabric, a structure by which one group in society not only laboured on behalf of another group, but by their existence gave status and caste to their employers. The very titles 'master' and 'servant' defined not just economic relationships but also positions in society. When change came, it came not for economic reasons alone, not just because other more attractive jobs became available - this was a factor but certainly not a dominant factor in Ireland. Change came because the inferior dependent position of the servant became unacceptable
in a more democratic world. The widening of women's horizons, ideals of equality and emancipation, which were strengthened by a world war, all affected a country which had close language and communication links with powerful neighbours. Ireland was not able to satisfy these aspirations and so 25 to 35 years and another world war passed, and thousands of people emigrated before domestic service virtually ceased to exist.
APPENDIX A

STUDY OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF SERVANTS

IN DUBLIN AND IN COUNTRY HOUSES

IN IRELAND IN 1911

It was decided to select 500 houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £20, 500 with one at £20 to £30 and 500 houses with a rateable valuation of £30 - £50. A deliberate decision was taken to over-represent the first group as the pilot study had shown that the number of householders in this category employing servants was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.V. of House</th>
<th>100 or under</th>
<th>101 - 300</th>
<th>301 - 500</th>
<th>500 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When selecting the sample of Dublin houses for this study, rateable valuation of houses was used as the criterion of the social and economic status of the occupier. Samples of houses with rateable valuations of £10 - £19, £20 - £39 and £40 or over were chosen. It was considered very unlikely that any household with a rateable valuation of less than £10 would have a servant and this was borne out by the pilot study and also by the small number of households in the lowest group selected, £10 - £19, in which servants were employed.

To decide what proportion of each of these classes should be selected, a sample of all houses in Dublin city and the urban county districts was taken from Thom's directory for 1911. The total number of inhabited houses in the area was 51,911 and a sample of 3,948, 7.6 per cent, was selected by picking 12 houses at random from each page of the directory. The percentage of houses in each rateable valuation category is shown in Table 17.

### TABLE 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.V. of houses</th>
<th>Percentage of houses in sample in different R.V. categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than £10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 - £19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20 - £39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40 or over</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was decided to select 250 houses with a rateable valuation of £20 - £39, 250 with one of £40 or over and 300 houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £19. A deliberate decision was taken to over-represent the last group as the pilot study had shown that the number of householders in this category employing servants was
extremely small and it would be impossible to make any authoritative deductions from a very small number of cases. Even with the larger sample, servants working in small houses in which one young girl was employed, were under-represented in this study.

An effort was made to have a fairly wide geographical coverage of Dublin city and the urban districts and to have the three rateable valuation groupings represented in this wide coverage. It was of course inevitable that different areas in the city and suburbs were represented differently in the three groupings; for example, the city centre and inner northern and southern areas are represented to a greater extent in the rateable valuation £10 - £19 group than in the other two. Rathmines and Rathgar was strongly represented in the £20 - £39 group and Pembroke, Blackrock and Kingstown (Dun Laoghaire) in the £40 and over sample.

The houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £19 were drawn from the Drumcondra, Clonliffe Road, Fairview, South Circular Road, Rathmines, Pembroke and Kingstown areas. The next group, £20 - £39, was drawn from the Gardiner Street area, Drumcondra Road, Iona Road, St. Lawrence Road, Seafield Road, and also from Rathmines, Rathgar, Pembroke and Kingstown. The houses with a rateable valuation of £40 and over were from city centra areas such as Merrion Square, Mount Street, Fitzwilliam Square, Mountjoy Square, Rutland Square, Leeson Street, and also from Pembroke, Blackrock, Kingstown, Killiney and Ballybrack. Streets of houses with the required rateable valuation were selected from the districts mentioned. An effort was made to choose streets where there was uniformity in rateable valuation. This was not easy, as houses and terraces with very low rateable valuations occurred in the middle of, or adjacent to, high valuation houses. Also, commercial areas were found in or near residential streets, especially in the city centre. Having selected the streets and roads for each rateable valuation grouping, a number between 1 and 5, 2 was picked. Every fifth house, starting from the second house on the street, was chosen. Where a house was vacant, or used for commercial purposes, or the census return was missing, or the
rateable valuation was unsuitable, the next house was taken. Terraces with different rateable valuations and rows of business premises were omitted. The sample selected consisted of 307 houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £19, 252 with one of £20 - £39, and 248 with a rateable valuation of £40 or over. Half of the houses were from the suburbs, Blackrock, Kingstown, Killiney, Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar, where there was a high concentration of servants - one for every ten people. In Dublin city in 1911, there was one for every 25 of the population.²

A sample of 53 prominent citizens was selected from Thom's directory, by choosing people who held important positions in the church and the government, administration and defence of the country, including leading lawyers, doctors and educators, and some of the most important businessmen.

Sixty country houses in Ireland were selected from a list of mansions in Ireland prepared for the House of Commons in 1906;² four or five of the largest mansions in each county in Ireland were chosen. It was intended originally to get the enumerators' returns for two country houses from each county. The returns for some of those selected were missing, many of the families were away leaving only a caretaker or a couple of servants in the house and therefore these returns were not worth using. In the end a few counties were not represented at all, Donegal, Armagh and Londonderry. Some counties were represented by three houses and some by one, but the 60 chosen gave a good coverage of the whole country.

²Cen. Ire. 1911.

²Untenanted lands (Ireland). Return to an order of the honourable the House of Commons, dated 27 March 1905; - for a return of untenanted lands in rural districts, distinguishing demesnes on which there is a mansion, showing: (1) rural district and electoral division; (2) townland; (3) area in statute acres; (4) valuation (poor law); (5) names of occupiers as in valuation lists, p. 1-357, H.C. 1906 (250), C, 179-575.
The information from the enumerators' forms was codified and the following data were recorded:

1 sex of head of household
2 religion - catholic, protestant, other, and not available
3 social class
4 occupational class
5 occupation
6 income (if available)
7 rateable valuation of the house
8 location of house - for Dublin the street, for country houses the province
9 number in household (excluding servants)
10 number of children under 11 years of age
11 number of children of 11 years and over
12 children, or other members of the family, who were earning, other than the main breadwinner
13 women, other than the wife, not working outside the home
14 number of boarders kept
15 number of servants
16 number of male servants
17 male employers if single or widower
18 if head of country house was not at home
19 servants in country house away from home with employer

For each servant the following information was recorded:

1 sex
2 religion
3 literacy
4 age, in 5 year intervals.¹
5 occupation as servant, e.g. butler, general servant
6 marital status
7 place of birth - Dublin city or county, adjoining counties, rest of Leinster, Munster, Ulster, Connacht, G.B., others, not available
Country houses - local (same county), adjoining county, elsewhere in Ireland, England & Wales, Scotland, abroad, not available.

¹This gave greater accuracy on the actual age structure and was more useful when discussing marital status than the census groupings. At the same time it enabled comparison with the age structure of domestic servants given in census reports during the period.
For the classification of the heads of households according to social standing and occupational class the method used by Guy Routh in *Occupation and pay in Great Britain, 1906-1960* was used, but adapted to suit Ireland in the early years of the century. As Guy Routh was only interested in pay and occupation, some self-employed people, proprietors and employers, were omitted; these have been put into the middle class and 'employers and proprietors' class. Owners of very large businesses were allocated to the upper class and 'proprietors of large businesses'. People whose income was derived from property, annuities, and investment were omitted from the Routh classification. For this study, people of independent means, or who were presumed to have independent means, were allocated to the upper or middle classes depending on the rateable valuation of the houses, and general factors such as the occupations of other family members. University professors and heads of colleges were allocated to the upper and higher professional classes, and teachers to the middle and lower professional classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL CLASS</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL CLASS</th>
<th>NO. OF OCCUPATIONAL CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>Independent means</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher professional</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proprietors of large businesses</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
<td>Lower professional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers &amp; proprietors</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers &amp; administrators</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent means</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER MIDDLE</td>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foremen, supervisors, inspectors</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-SKILLED</td>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSKILLED</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The classification was based on that used in the British census of 1951.
The upper class consisted only of the higher professions, owners of very large businesses and the wealthier of those with independent means. The extra information available on enumerators' returns allowed distinctions to be made between those of 'independent means' - 45 per cent of whom were put into the middle class.

One of the aims of this study was to compare the keeping of servants with the status and income of the head of household. For this reason social class as well as occupational class was important. While there are very close links between social class and occupational class they are not identical. Other factors such as education are taken into consideration when defining social class. Many of those who are considered semi-skilled from the occupational point of view are allocated to the lower middle class, examples of these are shop assistants, store keepers, members of the armed forces, drivers of passenger and goods vehicles and most domestic servants. For this reason, while there are many semi-skilled workers in the sample there are very few people in the semi-skilled social class. Also, there is no precise relationship between remuneration and social class. Lower professional people belong to the middle class but many earned less than skilled workers in the lower middle class.

It was found that the rateable valuation of a house was a good indicator of whether or not servants were likely to be employed; 96 per cent of houses with a valuation of £40 or over had servants, 69 per cent of those with a valuation of £20 - £39 had servants, but only 11 per cent of those with a valuation of £10 - £19 had servants employed. Rateable valuation was also a good indicator of the social class of the occupier (see below, Table 18).

While there was of course overlap between social class and houses of different rateable valuations, over 80 per cent of the lowest valuation houses were occupied by people belonging to the lower middle class; over 80 per cent of the £20 - £39 houses were occupied by the middle and lower middle classes; while almost all houses with rateable valuations of £40 and over were occupied by the upper and middle classes.
TABLE 13

Percentages of occupiers in different social classes according to R.V. of houses (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rateable valuation £</th>
<th>upper</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>lower middle</th>
<th>semi-skilled</th>
<th>unskilled</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(244)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; over</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>(228)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(786)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rateable valuation was also a good indication of occupational class. While there was of course overlap, the houses with the highest valuation had a very high proportion of heads with high status occupations, 69 per cent belonged to occupational class 1 and 26 per cent to occupational class 2. On the other hand, 60 per cent of those living in houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £19 belonged to occupational class 3 and 20 per cent to class 4.

A very close link was found between social class and the employment of servants; 98 per cent of the upper class employed servants, 71 per cent of the middle class and only 23 per cent of the lower middle class. All servants were employed by these three social classes.
**CHART 1**

Percentage of each social class employing servants

**TABLE 19**

The keeping of servants in households of different sizes - small and medium houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number in household</th>
<th>total no. of households</th>
<th>number employing servants</th>
<th>% employing servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourteen per cent of occupiers of small houses who kept boarders had a servant, 11 per cent of those without boarders had a servant. In the medium-sized houses, 58 per cent of those who kept boarders had servants, but 72 per cent of those who did not keep boarders had servants. Only one person in a house with a rateable valuation of £20 - £39 who kept boarders had two servants, whereas 24 of those without boarders in this category had two servants and three employers had three servants.

Only 5 per cent of people who lived in houses with a rateable valuation of £40 or over kept boarders. The number involved was very small but the findings reinforced what was seen in the previous category, namely, people who kept boarders were less likely to have servants than those who did not keep boarders but those with a number of boarders, four or more, did keep a servant. Four of those who kept servants lived in Clarinda Park, Kingstown. Three of them described themselves as boarding-house keepers.

Households with young children of ten years or under were examined to see if they were more likely to employ servants than those without young children; this was done for each rateable valuation grouping.

**TABLE 20**

Percentage of occupiers in different sized houses with and without young children, employing servants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.V. of houses</th>
<th>with young children</th>
<th>without young children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; over</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People with young children were more likely to have servants. The exception was people living in large houses, but, in large houses, servants were usually employed anyway and this difference was not significant. When the total number of servants in these houses was
examined it was found that households with young children had an average of 2.6 servants, those without young children had an average of 2.2 servants. In the homes of prominent citizens, those with young children employed an average of five servants, while those without young children had an average of 4.6 servants.

Household composition was studied to see if the presence of women, other than a wife, who were not students or working outside the home, affected the employment of servants. In the lowest rateable valuation houses, £10 - £19, 78 per cent of houses had only wives at home - if other women lived there they worked outside the home. All households with servants had only wives in the home to do the housework. The findings for the other categories are shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21 (i)

Percentage of medium-sized houses with wives only or with additional female relatives, employing and not employing servants (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>household composition</th>
<th>R.V. £20 - £39</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servants</td>
<td>no servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife only</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[113]</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other women relatives</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[62]</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21 (ii)

Percentage of large houses with wives only or with additional female relatives, employing and not employing servants (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>household composition</th>
<th>R.V. £40 or over</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servants</td>
<td>no servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife only</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[119]</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other women relatives</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[119]</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Households with a rateable valuation of £20 - £39 with other women relatives at home were less likely to have servants than those with only wives in the homes. In the large houses, rateable valuation of £40 or over, the presence or not of other women relatives did not affect the employment of servants. Houses with wives only and those with other women relatives had an average of 2.3 servants per household. In homes of prominent citizens both types of household had an average of 4.8 servants per household.

### TABLE 22 (i)

Percentage of small houses with one or more earners employing or not employing servants (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of earners in house</th>
<th>R.V. £10 - £19</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servants</td>
<td>no servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 22 (ii)

Percentage of medium sized houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of earners in house</th>
<th>R.V. £20 - £39</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servants</td>
<td>no servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 22 (iii)

Percentage of large houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of earners in house</th>
<th>R.V. £40 &amp; over</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servants</td>
<td>no servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two or more</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In houses with a rateable valuation of £10 - £19, 57 households had 2 - 4 earners, in addition to the head, and did not employ a servant.

The number of servants in servant-keeping households with a rateable valuation of £20 - £39 was exactly the same for houses with only the head earning and for those with more than one earner, it was 1.14 servants per household. For those with a rateable valuation of £40 or over, households with only the head earning, had an average of 2.3 servants per household. Those with more than one earner had an average of 2 servants per household. All prominent citizens had servants. Households in which there was only one earner had an average of 5 servants, those with more than one earner had an average of 4.

There was a very significant negative correlation between the employment of servants and the number of people earning and this was true in houses of all categories. Where there was only one earner, servants were more likely to be employed, and, apart from the smaller houses, the number of servants was greater.

TABLE 23
Percentage of employers who were catholic, protestant, etc. according to R.V. of houses (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.V. £</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>63 (22)</td>
<td>34 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>29 (51)</td>
<td>66 (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>29 (69)</td>
<td>64 (153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prom. citizens</td>
<td>28 (15)</td>
<td>68 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>(316)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24

Percentage of R.C. and protestant servants in different sized houses (no. of servants in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.V.</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>protestant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>89.0 (32)</td>
<td>11.0 (4)</td>
<td>100 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>89.7 (184)</td>
<td>10.3 (21)</td>
<td>100 (205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>76.5 (418)</td>
<td>23.5 (128)</td>
<td>100 (546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prom. citizens</td>
<td>63.0 (160)</td>
<td>37.0 (94)</td>
<td>100 (254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25

Percentage of servants of different religious affiliations employed by catholics and protestants in Dublin houses in 1911 (numbers in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion of employer</th>
<th>Religion of servants</th>
<th>Total servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.C. (157)</td>
<td>97 (297)</td>
<td>100 (306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prot. (316)</td>
<td>67 (461)</td>
<td>100 (684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (20)</td>
<td>32 (219)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown (9)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total (502)</td>
<td>(801)</td>
<td>(1049)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26

Percentage of servants in different age groups in small, medium and large houses (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>size of house</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>citizens</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>47 (17)</td>
<td>19 (39)</td>
<td>8 (43)</td>
<td>11.5 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
<td>37 (76)</td>
<td>22 (119)</td>
<td>26 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>11 (4)</td>
<td>16 (32)</td>
<td>27 (147)</td>
<td>21 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>7 (14)</td>
<td>11 (59)</td>
<td>9.5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>8 (16)</td>
<td>9.5 (52)</td>
<td>11 (28)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>5 (30)</td>
<td>8 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>1.5 (3)</td>
<td>6 (33)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>2.5 (14)</td>
<td>3.5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>1.5 (3)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>2.5 (6)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100 (36)</td>
<td>100 (203)</td>
<td>100 (546)</td>
<td>100 (254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 27

Percentage of servants in different age groups in Dublin houses and in country houses (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ages of servants</th>
<th>houses</th>
<th>country houses</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>12 (128)</td>
<td>18 (104)</td>
<td>14 (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>26 (268)</td>
<td>30 (170)</td>
<td>27 (438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>23 (236)</td>
<td>17 (93)</td>
<td>21 (329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>9 (98)</td>
<td>12 (65)</td>
<td>10 (163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>9 (96)</td>
<td>9 (50)</td>
<td>9 (146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>5 (28)</td>
<td>5 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>5 (49)</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>5 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>3 (32)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>3 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>2 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>2 (26)</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>2 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>2 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100 (1039)</td>
<td>100 (561)</td>
<td>100 (1600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of servants in Dublin houses and in country houses in different age groups.
TABLE 28

Percentage of servants single, married and widowed in different age groups in Dublin houses (number in brackets)

(i) FEMALE SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>widowed</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>98.4 (123)</td>
<td>1.6 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>100 (252)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>97.7 (217)</td>
<td>1.4 (3)</td>
<td>.9 (2)</td>
<td>100 (222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>95.4 (82)</td>
<td>2.3 (2)</td>
<td>2.3 (2)</td>
<td>100 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>80.5 (74)</td>
<td>4.3 (4)</td>
<td>15.2 (14)</td>
<td>100 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>78.1 (43)</td>
<td>5.5 (3)</td>
<td>16.4 (9)</td>
<td>100 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>74.4 (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6 (11)</td>
<td>100 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>70.4 (19)</td>
<td>7.4 (2)</td>
<td>22.2 (6)</td>
<td>100 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>74.0 (17)</td>
<td>4.3 (1)</td>
<td>21.7 (5)</td>
<td>100 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>66.7 (18)</td>
<td>3.7 (1)</td>
<td>29.6 (8)</td>
<td>100 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>66.7 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3 (6)</td>
<td>100 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>91.6 (889)</td>
<td>1.9 (18)</td>
<td>6.5 (63)</td>
<td>100 (970)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) MALE SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>widowed</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>100.0 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>100.0 (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>85.7 (12)</td>
<td>14.3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>55.6 (5)</td>
<td>44.4 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>80.0 (4)</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>60.0 (3)</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>70.6 (43)</td>
<td>22.0 (15)</td>
<td>7.4 (5)</td>
<td>100 (68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentages of women in different age groups in the general population compared with servants in Dublin houses in 1911, married and widowed.
TABLE 29
Percentage of servants single, married and widowed, in different age groups in country houses (number in brackets)

(i) FEMALE SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>widowed</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>100.0(73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>100.0(122)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>100.0(66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>98.0(50)</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>5.0 (2)</td>
<td>100 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>88.0(37)</td>
<td>13.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>87.0(20)</td>
<td>11.8 (2)</td>
<td>17.6 (3)</td>
<td>100 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>70.6(12)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>100.0 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td>60.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>95.5(394)</td>
<td>1.5 (6)</td>
<td>3.0 (13)</td>
<td>100 (413)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) MALE SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age group</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>widowed</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>100.0(31)</td>
<td>2.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>98.0(46)</td>
<td>7.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>93.0(26)</td>
<td>15.4 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>84.6(11)</td>
<td>37.5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>62.5 (5)</td>
<td>20.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>80.0 (4)</td>
<td>43.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>33.3 (1)</td>
<td>66.7 (2)</td>
<td>14.0 (1)</td>
<td>100 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
<td>50.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>86 (127)</td>
<td>13 (19)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>100 (148)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 30

Birthplace of servants in Dublin houses in percentages and numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>birthplace</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin city</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meath, Wicklow, Kildare</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest of Leinster</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaught</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other countries</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, e.g. Ireland</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1036</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 31

Birthplace of servants, according to the size of house, in percentages (number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>birthplace</th>
<th>R.V.</th>
<th>homes of prominent citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£10 - £19</td>
<td>£20 - £39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin city &amp; county</td>
<td>57 (20)</td>
<td>39 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest of Leinster</td>
<td>17 (6)</td>
<td>38 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other three provinces</td>
<td>17 (6)</td>
<td>17 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>6 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (35)</td>
<td>100 (206)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 32

Servants - occupations and numbers in Dublin houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>occupations</th>
<th>number of servants</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general servant</td>
<td>145 22 3 2 2 2 1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>71 48 17 16 13 13 1 5 1</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housemaid</td>
<td>1 37 38 25 18 17 5 2 2 7</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlourmaid</td>
<td>20 28 17 10 9 2 2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house/parlour</td>
<td>1 21 4 2 1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>4 2 2 4 2 1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>19 81 51 25 15 14 3 1 1 3</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchenmaid</td>
<td>1 1 3 9 9 2 1 1 3 3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundrymaid</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse/children's maid</td>
<td>2 21 18 13 7 5 1 1 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady's maid</td>
<td>2 3 3 3 1 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general man</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butler</td>
<td>2 2 3 2 4 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footman</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house steward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pantry/hallboy</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chef</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coachman/chaufer</td>
<td>2 4 5 7 2 2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of categories</td>
<td>7 12 14 15 15 14 11 10 8 12</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of households</td>
<td>243 129 57 30 18 15 3 2 1 3</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupations</td>
<td>Number of servants</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housemaids</td>
<td>3 5 9 11 9 12 10 8 18 13 3 6 7 3 8 4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlourmaids</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house/parlour</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>1 4 2 1 1 5 2 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>4 2 6 3 2 5 4 3 5 3 1 2 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchenmaid</td>
<td>2 6 3 1 7 3 3 7 5 1 2 3 2 4 2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>1 3 1 3 2 5 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundrymaid</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 8 2 2 2 2 1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairymaid</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stillroom maid</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady's maid</td>
<td>1 2 2 3 1 3 4 4 1 3 2 1 4 1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>2 6 5 4 7 3 2 4 2 2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general servant</td>
<td>1 6 1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not specified/other</td>
<td>1 7 8 2 1 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steward house/estate</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butler</td>
<td>1 1 3 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under butler</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footman</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 7 4 3 8 7 2 3 2 2 5 2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallboy</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 3 2 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valet</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general man</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coachman/chauffeur</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom/stableman</td>
<td>1 1 1 4 4 1 3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. of occupations</strong></td>
<td>3 9 5 11 14 11 16 14 13 19 14 10 14 16 9 15 12</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no. of country houses</strong></td>
<td>1 4 2 6 6 4 7 4 3 7 4 1 2 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

WAGES OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Average Wages</th>
<th>Minimum Wages</th>
<th>Maximum Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; under 20</td>
<td>£30.5</td>
<td>£22.0</td>
<td>£42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; under 25</td>
<td>£35.0</td>
<td>£25.0</td>
<td>£47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; under 30</td>
<td>£40.0</td>
<td>£30.0</td>
<td>£50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; under 35</td>
<td>£45.0</td>
<td>£35.0</td>
<td>£55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; under 40</td>
<td>£50.0</td>
<td>£40.0</td>
<td>£60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>£55.0</td>
<td>£45.0</td>
<td>£65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>£60.0</td>
<td>£50.0</td>
<td>£70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>£65.0</td>
<td>£55.0</td>
<td>£75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>£70.0</td>
<td>£60.0</td>
<td>£80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>£75.0</td>
<td>£65.0</td>
<td>£85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>£80.0</td>
<td>£70.0</td>
<td>£90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>£85.0</td>
<td>£75.0</td>
<td>£95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>£90.0</td>
<td>£80.0</td>
<td>£100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the table are based on a sample of 100 returns.

The figures for age groups 45-49 and 50-54 are probably due to the small number of responses being representative of the age group.
### Table 34

Average wage at different age-periods of some categories of servants in Ireland, 1894-1898


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>cook</th>
<th>housemaid</th>
<th>parlourmaid</th>
<th>nurse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 &amp; under 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>£12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 &amp; under 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>£17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 &amp; under 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>£18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; under 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; upwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>£19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number in returns</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inconsistencies are probably due to the small numbers concerned being unrepresentative of the age group.
TABLE 35

Average wages of female domestic servants in Ireland, classified according to number of servants in household, 1894 - 1898

Source: Report by Miss Collet, p 10/18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>household employing</th>
<th>Dublin</th>
<th>Belfast</th>
<th>Cork &amp; Limerick</th>
<th>total Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one servant</td>
<td>£10.8</td>
<td>£12.6</td>
<td>£9.5</td>
<td>£11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two servants</td>
<td>£13.5</td>
<td>£13.9</td>
<td>£11.1</td>
<td>£13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three &quot;</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
<td>£16.7</td>
<td>£13.9</td>
<td>£15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four &quot;</td>
<td>£16.6</td>
<td>£17.1</td>
<td>£14.7</td>
<td>£15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over four &quot;</td>
<td>£19.8</td>
<td>£19.7</td>
<td>£17.4</td>
<td>£18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 36

Average wage according to the number of servants in household for some categories of servants in Ireland, 1894 - 1898


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>household employing</th>
<th>cook</th>
<th>housemaid</th>
<th>parlourmaid</th>
<th>nurse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>two servants</td>
<td>£14.1</td>
<td>£13.0</td>
<td>£16.4</td>
<td>£11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three &quot;</td>
<td>£16.7</td>
<td>£14.2</td>
<td>£16.0</td>
<td>£14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four &quot;</td>
<td>£19.4</td>
<td>£14.0</td>
<td>£18.0</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five &quot;</td>
<td>£23.5</td>
<td>£16.6</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
<td>£17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six &quot;</td>
<td>£26.6</td>
<td>£14.8</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
<td>£16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over six &quot;</td>
<td>£30.2</td>
<td>£16.8</td>
<td>£26.0</td>
<td>£20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number in return</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 37

Wages of some female servants as quoted in the 1906 edition of Mrs I. Beeton's Book of household management.

Source: Horn, The rise and fall, p. 130.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position</th>
<th>wages, all-found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>general servant</td>
<td>£12 - £28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>£20 - £60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlourmaid</td>
<td>£20 - £35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head housemaid</td>
<td>£20 - £28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under-housemaid</td>
<td>£14 - £18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 38

Average wages of female domestic servants (at different age-periods) according to position.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class of work</th>
<th>ages</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales (excluding London)</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>between maid</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>£12.4</td>
<td>£10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>19 &quot;</td>
<td>£13.7</td>
<td>£13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchenmaid</td>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td>£16.6</td>
<td>£15.0</td>
<td>£15.0</td>
<td>£11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse-housemaid</td>
<td>21 and under 25</td>
<td>£14.9</td>
<td>£16.0</td>
<td>£14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>21 &quot; 25</td>
<td>£14.9</td>
<td>£14.6</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
<td>£10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housemaid</td>
<td>21 &quot; 25</td>
<td>£17.5</td>
<td>£16.2</td>
<td>£17.1</td>
<td>£13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>25 &quot; 30</td>
<td>£21.0</td>
<td>£20.1</td>
<td>£19.5</td>
<td>£15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlourmaid</td>
<td>25 &quot; 30</td>
<td>£22.2</td>
<td>£20.6</td>
<td>£20.1</td>
<td>£16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundrymaid</td>
<td>25 &quot; 30</td>
<td>£27.3</td>
<td>£23.6</td>
<td>£20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>25 &quot; 30</td>
<td>£21.8</td>
<td>£20.2</td>
<td>£20.6</td>
<td>£17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady's maid</td>
<td>30 &quot; 35</td>
<td>£28.1</td>
<td>£24.7</td>
<td>£24.4</td>
<td>£24.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook-housekeeper</td>
<td>40 and upwards</td>
<td>£41.6</td>
<td>£35.6</td>
<td>£22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>40 &quot;</td>
<td>£34.3</td>
<td>£52.2</td>
<td>£45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* only one case
TABLE 39

Wages paid to indoor servants at Englefield House, Berkshire.

Source: Horn, The rise and fall, p. 186.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper laundrymaid</td>
<td>£22</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second laundrymaid</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third laundrymaid</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth laundrymaid</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper housemaid</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£22</td>
<td>£22</td>
<td>£22</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second housemaid</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third housemaid</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth housemaid</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchenmaid</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butler</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£80</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valet</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under-butler</td>
<td>£34</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£38</td>
<td>£38</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footman</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£32</td>
<td>£32</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second footman</td>
<td>£14</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second coachman</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helper</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odd man</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£35</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odd man</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£28</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 40

Movement in nominal wages/prices/real wages 1879 – 1914.

Source: Burnett. *A history of the cost of living*, p. 254*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>period</th>
<th>nominal wages</th>
<th>prices</th>
<th>real wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879-1887</td>
<td>nearly stationary</td>
<td>falling</td>
<td>rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1892</td>
<td>rising</td>
<td>rising &amp; falling</td>
<td>rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1897</td>
<td>nearly stationary</td>
<td>falling</td>
<td>rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1900</td>
<td>rising fast</td>
<td>rising</td>
<td>rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1914</td>
<td>stationary</td>
<td>rising</td>
<td>falling slowly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chart of Prof. A.L. Bowley

Statistics quoted in the same work show that the wages of clerical workers in Great Britain more than doubled between 1911 – 1913 and 1924 (p. 299). The cost of living went up by about two and a half times over the same period (p. 307).
TABLE 41

Wages paid to staff in Dromoland, Ashfield and Clonbrock between 1880 and 1895, showing wage rises and the number of servants holding each position.¶

¶ Dromoland Castle had a staff of 26. Ashfield a staff of approx. 17. Clonbrock a staff of 11.

The number of servants who held each position is shown by the figure in brackets.

A rise in wages to any servant is indicated by a hyphen linking two figures.

Source: See table 11, p. 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position</th>
<th>Dromoland Castle 1880 - 1886</th>
<th>Ashfield 1885 - 1892</th>
<th>Clonbrock 1888 - 1890 1894 - 1895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>butler</td>
<td>£60;£70;£60;£65 (4)</td>
<td>£60;£50;£45-£50;£60;£50 (5)</td>
<td>£60 (1) £40 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under butler</td>
<td>£32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footman</td>
<td>£32 rising to £34; £28-£30;£24 (3)</td>
<td>£10-£12;£12-£14;£16-18; £18;£24-£26 (6)</td>
<td>£26;£20 (2) £24;£20 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hall boy</td>
<td>£12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odd man</td>
<td>£12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coachman</td>
<td>£35 (1)</td>
<td>£30-£35 (1)</td>
<td>£40 (1) £55 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second coachman</td>
<td>£25;£24 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom</td>
<td>£14-£18 (1)</td>
<td>£14;£12;£14-£16 (3)</td>
<td>£18 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener</td>
<td></td>
<td>£45;£35;£40 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td>£50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£55 (1) £40 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook/housekeeper</td>
<td>£50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>£24-£26;£26;£26-£28-£30 (3)</td>
<td>£25 (1)</td>
<td>£25 (1) £28;£25 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first nurserymaid</td>
<td>£13;£12-£13;£9-£10 (4)</td>
<td>£12-£14-£16 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second nurserymaid</td>
<td>£12;£8 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schoolroom maid</td>
<td>£10;£12;£12-£16;£14 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head housemaid</td>
<td>£21;£20;£18;£20 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second housemaid</td>
<td>£14;£16;£17;£14 (4)</td>
<td>£16;£16;£18 (3)</td>
<td>£14 (1) £18 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housemaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14-£16-£18 (1)</td>
<td>£18 up to £20 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under housemaid</td>
<td>£12;£11;£15 (3)</td>
<td>£8;£10-£12;£9-10;£12 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head laundressmaid</td>
<td>£20;£24 (2)</td>
<td>£20 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second laundressmaid</td>
<td>£12;£16 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third laundressmaid</td>
<td>£10 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchenmaid</td>
<td>£18;£20;£18;£28-£29;£20;£22 (7)</td>
<td>£10-£9-£12;£14-£16 (3)</td>
<td>£12-£20 (1) £22 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second kitchenmaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>£8 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scullerymaid</td>
<td>£10;£12;£8;£9-£12 (5)</td>
<td>£8 (1)</td>
<td>£9 (1) £10 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second scullerymaid</td>
<td>£8;£9 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stillroom maid</td>
<td>£10;£8;£9 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairymaid</td>
<td>£14;£12;£14;£16 (4)</td>
<td>£15 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second dairymaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>£12;£15;£12 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

BEQUESTS TO SERVANTS

For accounts of 43-110 bequests arranged in accordance with:

It is not known that these unions had servants, but individuals whose people were likely to employ servants were pictured.

For accounts of 43-110 bequests arranged in accordance with:

It is not known that these unions had servants, but individuals whose people were likely to employ servants were pictured.
BEQUESTS TO SERVANTS

In an effort to ascertain the likelihood of servants being remembered by employers in their wills, a random sample of wills probated in different years was taken. A very small sample of wills, approximately twelve, were selected for each of the years 1891, 1896, 1901 and 1911, and a much larger sample of 108 wills for 1922. In all, 154 wills were examined. If possible, Dublin people with addresses in middle and upper class districts were chosen. For 1901, Cork city was used as there were no Dublin wills available. Servants were mentioned in 32 wills, 20 per cent of the sample.

Seven employers left their servants very small amounts of money, varying usually from £3 - £10. Fourteen left sums varying from £20 to £60 or from one to two years' wages. Eleven bequeathed comparatively large sums varying from £100 - £200, and including the six wills already discussed.

1P.R.O.I., Principal registry will book, 1891 G-M; 1896 A-F; 1901, box of wills for Cork city; 1911, box of wills for Dublin city.

2P.R.O.I., Principal registry will book, 1922, N-Z.

3It is not known that those chosen had servants, but addresses where people were likely to employ servants were picked.

4For amounts of £3-£10 bequeathed to servants see:
   Principal registry will book, 1891 G-M, Patricia Madden Thornhill; 1896 A-F, Arthur Cullen; Grace Cox, will probated 23 January 1896; Eliza Mitchell Blanchard, will probated 27 January 1896; 1922 N-Z, Rose Webb, will probated 21 July 1922; Mary Ryan, will probated 11 August 1922; Margaret Louisa Stephens, will probated 6 June 1922.
   Amounts of £20-£60:
   1891 G-M, Catherine Jessop, will probated 5 January 1891; 1896 A-F, Charlotte Eves, will probated 4 February 1896; 1901 Cork city wills, Rev. James Joseph Ambrose, will probated 16 May 1901; Hannah Baker, will probated 3 May 1901; 1911 Dublin wills, Denis O'Meara, will probated 5 October 1911; 1922 N-Z, Sarah Warren, will probated 21 October 1922; Benjamin Whitaker, will probated 7 December 1922; Henrietta Georgina Seymour, will probated 17 November 1922; Burton Richardson Phillipson, will probated 13 September 1922; Joseph Seymour, will probated 25 April 1923; Philip Brown Robinson, will probated 15 May 1922; William O'Brien, will probated 7 June 1922; Thomas Stanley, will probated 12 June 1922; Elias Solomons, will probated 29 August 1922.
At least forty three servants benefited under these wills - in the case of two wills it was not possible to determine the number of servants involved. Of these, six at most obtained sufficient to live on if they could not find another position (see above, p. 137). Great variations occurred. One employer left an annuity of £50 to a servant who was in her employment less than eleven years, another £26 per annum to a servant in similar circumstances. A woman who left almost £8,000 gave £20 to her maid who was with her for over eleven years and was 57 when her mistress died.

The wills of all prominent citizens selected in the sample who were aged 60 or older in 1911 were sought. Thirteen wills were located, and four of these, just over one third, left money to servants. Mr William Martin Murphy, the newspaper proprietor, who died in 1919, left £50 to his butler who had not been in his employment in 1911. A gardener got £25 and, if not required or fit to work, was to get a pension of £1 per week. This was the most generous legacy. His housekeeper, who had been in his employment in 1911 and possibly much longer and who was 65 years old in 1919, just got a lump sum of £75. Other servants got the equivalent of three months' wages.

Amounts £100-£200:
1911 wills, Stephen O'Shaughnessy, will probated 10 May 1911; 1922 N-Z, Francis Newell, will probated 22 December 1922; Ellen Arthur Shaw, will probated 20 December 1922; H.E. William Fetherstonhaugh-Whitney, will probated 20 September 1922; Margaret Wooloughan, will probated 21 October 1922.


4P.R.O.I. Principal registry, will probated 28 July 1919, T5311; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 61/78.
The Rt. Hon. Christopher Palles authorised his niece, at her
discretion, to pay servants who had at least five years' service,
a sum or sums not to exceed one year's wages. The Hon. Charles
Alexander Cameron left £200 to his housekeeper who had been in his
service at least 20 years and who was 62 in 1921 when he died. He
left £50 and £20 respectively to two other servants who were not
employed by him in 1911. Dr James Little, a physician who died
in 1917, left £25 to a servant who had been in his employment for
ten years or more; others got £5 for each two years of service.
A number of employers who had middle aged or older servants in 1911
left nothing to them in their wills when they died a few years
later. Of course, the servants may have left or died in the
meantime.

The wills of employers aged 70 years or over in 1911 who lived
in houses with a rateable valuation of £40 or higher were also
sought. These, like those of the prominent citizens, gave information
also on servants who were not remembered by their employers. Twenty
wills were found for those aged 70 or over in 1911. Servants were
mentioned in four cases. Bequests varied from £25 to £100, the
average was £50. These were not generous amounts when it is

1 P.R.O.I. will probated 29 March 1920; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 88/9.
2 P.R.O.I. will probated 30 March 1921; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 56/83.
3 P.R.O.I. will probated 15 February 1927; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 76/4.
4 P.R.O.I. Sir William Watson had a housekeeper of 69 in 1911; he left
nothing to servants. Will probated 17 August 1915; Cen. Ire. 1911,
Dublin 75/2. Samuel Walker, Lord Chancellor of Ireland had a 57
year old coachman in 1911; he died that year and left nothing to
servants; he was survived by his wife and family. Will probated
29 August 1911; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 79/109.
5 P.R.O.I. Principal registry: Edmund John Byrne, will probated
30 March 1915; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 56/76. Lady Ann Trench, will
probated 23 May 1924; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 56/82-4; Matilda Mary
Thompson, will probated 24 May 1927; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 84/23;
John J. Hogan, will probated 10 January 1929; Cen. Ire. 1911,
Dublin 84/20.
considered that many of these people were extremely wealthy. The total number of servants benefiting was eight. Some of those who did not leave anything to servants had older servants in their employment in 1911 who were not remembered when the employer died comparatively shortly afterwards. If it is assumed that employers, for whom wills were available, had as many servants when they died as they had in 1911, then eight servants from a total of 29 were remembered in wills. In the case of prominent citizens 13, and a possible four or five more (one bequest depended on staff having 5 years' service, there were ten servants involved) out of a total of 73 servants received bequests. Only one of these servants got sufficient to support him in his old age.

An interesting will, from the point of view of the provision made for servants, was that of Cornelia Adair of 11 Portman Square, Middlesex, which was probated on 18 March 1922. She died worth £40,840.8.5 and left varying sums to servants depending on the length of time spent in her service; all had to be in her employment and not under notice at the time of her death. First of all, she made special provision for her secretary, chauffeur, a housekeeper in Glenveagh and a manageress in England.

To each of my indoor and outdoor servants not otherwise provided for by my said Will or any codicil thereto who shall be in my service at my death and shall have been in such service for ten years or longer and shall not then be under notice whether given or received to leave such service the amount of two years wages in addition to any monies owing to them respectively by me at my death.

Those in her service 'for at least five years but for less than ten' got one year's wages and those in her service 'for at least three years but for less than five years' got half a year's wages.

1For example Ann Halliday had a 53-year-old housekeeper in 1911, did not leave anything to servants; of course that housekeeper may have left or died in the meantime. P.R.O.I. will probated 26 January 1917; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 84/22. Also James North had a 66-year-old cook in 1911, did not leave bequests to servants in 1914. Will probated 4 June 1914; Cen. Ire. 1911, Dublin 55/1-2.

2P.R.O.I. Principal registry, will probated on 18 March 1922.
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