

Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland

The Family in Irish Census of Population Statistics

By R. C. GEARY, Director, Central Statistics Office.

(Read before the Society on October 29th, 1954.)

This paper owes its inception largely to Paragraph 51 of the Majority Report of the Commission on Emigration and Other Population Problems, the opening sentences of which are as follows :—

“The social unit in this country is the family: Article 41 of the Constitution of Ireland affirms that the State recognises the family as the natural primary and fundamental unit group of society. There is a wealth of census material in which the family is implicitly or explicitly the unit. Nevertheless there is lacking a classification of the population by type of family (e.g. man, wife and young children only; man, wife and grown children; family wholly adult, etc.). If the statistics were available, it would have been desirable to analyse the population situation and trend using the family as the unit of society, but in this chapter and elsewhere in our Report we have had to have recourse exclusively to the individual as the basic unit of population.”

It is necessary at the outset to emphasise the experimental character of the paper, the principal object of which is to present the results of a special analysis of a sample of 6,280 families from the Census of Population of 1951. The traditional unit in the Irish population census, as in the censuses of all countries, is the individual. Here an attempt is made to use the family as a whole as the basic unit. The fact that the statistics have to be compiled from the census household schedules facilitates the inquiry to the extent that all the members of the household present on census date are returned on the same schedule, so that certain characteristics of the family as a whole can be derived from an inspection of the schedule. In other respects the household schedule is not well adapted to the compilation of statistics of families, in the first place because it is designed for the production of statistics relating to individuals (classified and sub-classified in a multitude of ways) and this means that much clerical labour is involved in extracting characteristics of families, unless these characteristics are recorded for particular individuals on the schedule. If it be decided to develop statistics of families at future censuses on the lines indicated in the present paper, as expanded or modified in the light of discussion in this Society or elsewhere, it will certainly be necessary to ask additional questions on the schedule. This is a very serious matter, for the total number of questions to be asked at the census is strictly limited

and the number of questions competing for inclusion is usually far in excess of the number which it is found practicable to adopt. Experience in Ireland and elsewhere has shown that an over-laden schedule leads to inaccurate or incomplete answering and greatly increases cost of compilation and delay in availability of census results. Whatever be decided about the development of statistics of families, the individual must continue to hold pride of place in the population census.

Furthermore, it is a severe restriction to the production of statistics of families of the type contemplated by the Population Commission that we have to make the best use we can of the simple type of question which it is judged expedient to ask at these periodic inquiries which, I should remind you, extend to every household in the country. No doubt a sociologist making a sample inquiry could ask many additional questions designed to elicit information on the non-statistical as well as the statistical aspects of the family. There are indeed so many features of family life which cannot be reflected in statistical aggregates or classifications that one may surmise that the contribution which statistics can make to the presentation of a reasonably complete picture is rather limited.

Existing Census Statistics of the Family.

In the foregoing quotation from the Majority Report of the Commission reference is made to the considerable amount of information compiled and published in which the family is implicitly or explicitly the unit. Such statistics include the following:—

- (i) Number of married men, widowers and widows (normally heads of households), classified by areas, ages, occupations, industries, etc.
- (ii) Statistics of housing and social amenities which show incidentally the number of private families classified by number of persons in the family, by number of rooms occupied, by nature of water supply, by rents paid, etc.
- (iii) Statistics of dependency (1926 and 1946) whereby number of married men, widowers and widows (distinguishing ages and occupations) are classified by number of dependent children under 16 years of age.
- (iv) Statistics of fertility of marriage (1946), showing number of married women, for each age at marriage and duration of present marriage, classified according to number of children born alive and sub-classified by age of husband at marriage, religion, broad occupational group of husband, etc.

As a methodological point, it may be observed that all these classifications of families are derived from the characteristics of individuals as recorded on the census schedule, (i) and (iii) as attributes of individual married men, widowers and widows, (ii) as relating to each head of household, and (iv) as relating to each married woman. Finally, reference may be made to two series of statistics, which have an obvious bearing on statistics of families. These are:

- (v) for each "social group" (based on an eleven-fold classification of the detailed list of occupations, with a twelve-fold sub-classification for the group Farmers and Farm

Managers according to rateable valuation of holding), the number of (a) persons gainfully occupied, (b) persons not gainfully occupied, and (c) children under 14.

- (vi) number of persons in each occupational group living on farms classified by rateable valuation (1946 and 1951).

In regard to (v), which was inaugurated at the 1951 census and which involves the classification of the whole population into social group (i.e. broad occupational group) on which dependent, it may be observed that, as a point of interest in the concept of "family" which will presently be discussed, dependents were attributed in principle to the social group of head of family. Gainfully occupied persons other than heads of families were allocated as single units to their appropriate social groups. Two families sharing the same board and therefore returned on the same household schedule were regarded as separate families. From this classification it will be possible to compute the average number of *all* dependents of each gainfully occupied person in each social group and not merely dependent children under 16 years of age—see (iii) above. In such a calculation, however, there is the implication that even a related group consists of as many sub-families as there are working members. The present paper has the merit, at any rate, of treating the related group as a unit though this raises its own formidable statistical difficulties. There are many definitions of "family." As so often happens in practice, the concept to be adopted depends on the use for which the statistics are required.

For the actual statistics on the foregoing aspects of the family I must be content to refer you to the relevant census reports and analyses. The rest of the paper deals exclusively with the results of the sample survey.

Concepts and Definitions.

The definition of "family" for the present inquiry differs in some respects from the census definition which is as follows:—

"A 'family' for census purposes is defined as any person or group of persons living in a single household (using the term in its widest sense to cover institutions and hotels, etc., as well as private households) and included in a separate census return as being in separate occupation of premises or part of premises. 'Private families' comprise all such families, with the exception of those enumerated in institutions and in hotels, boarding-houses, business establishments, etc., in which the number of resident boarders or resident shop assistants was three or more."

In 1946, persons living in private families, as defined, numbered 2,755,000 or 93% of the total population of 2,955,000.

The census private family accordingly does not necessarily connote a group related by blood or marriage. Domestic and other employees living in as well as temporary visitors are included in the group. On the other hand the family does not include members who may have been temporarily absent on census date, for example as seasonal workers in Britain or children at boarding schools. Actually the term "family," as used in the past for census purposes, is rather a misnomer. It would be better to use the term "household,"

reserving the term "family" for the group related by blood or marriage. There has heretofore been little danger of ambiguity in Ireland since the concept has been used only in connection with housing and social amenities for which the household is clearly more suitable than the related group, for example in classifying the population according to rooms in dwelling per person in household. One might perhaps have a mental reservation about the propriety of including temporary visitors. These, however, are very few on the particular date chosen for taking the census, and it is simpler to include them than to exclude them.

For the present paper, "family" is defined as a group of persons residing in the same household related by blood or marriage. It differs from the census private family in the following respects:—

- (1) Private domestic servants and other employees living in as well as temporary visitors are not regarded as members of the family and are in fact omitted entirely from the inquiry.
- (2) Related members of *all* boardinghouse keepers in the same household are regarded as families, boarders, domestic and temporary visitors being disregarded.
- (3) A single household consisting of more than one family is regarded as so many separate families: in the census such a household is considered a single census family.

Institutions (except boarding-houses) are excluded.

We have accordingly gone as far as the existing census material permits in isolating the related group. It would, of course, have been desirable to include members of the family temporarily absent on census date. If it be decided to develop the statistics of families at future censuses, it will be necessary to obtain particulars of such absent members. It would also be well to include in the system, as distinct categories, employees living in and boarders, treating each such person or group of related persons as separate "families."

The census is compiled by attributing a considerable number of characteristics (area of residence, sex, age, conjugal condition, religion, occupation, etc.) to each individual and counting the number of individuals in a wide diversity of combinations of these characteristics. Analogously, for the present inquiry, certain characteristics were attributed to the family as a group. These were as follows:—

- (i) Type of Family in the following categories:—

Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian, with children or other relatives aged—

- 1 All under 15
- 2 Under 20 but some 15-19
- 3 Under and over 20
- 4 Youngest 20-29
- 5 Youngest 30-44
- 6A Youngest 45-64
- 6B Youngest 65 or over
- 7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives
- 8 Group of single persons
- 9 Single person

- (ii) Economic strength of family (quotient of number gainfully occupied by number in family) in the following categories :—
- 1 Five or more gainfully occupied and economic strength 1 to $2/3$
 - 2 $3/5$ to $1/2$
 - 3 $4/9$ to $1/3$
 - 4 $2/7$ or less
 - 5 No gainfully occupied person present in family on census date
- (iii) Social Group of Head of Family in the following categories :
- 1 Farmers and agricultural workers
 - 11 Under valuation £4 (including nil and no statement)
 - 12 Valuation £4 and under £10
 - 13 Valuation £10 and under £20
 - 14 Valuation £20 and under £50
 - 15 Valuation £50 and over
 - 2 Higher professional
 - 3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)
 - 4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)
 - 5 Semi-skilled wage-earners (manual) and labourers
 - 6 Own account (except in 1 and 2)
 - 7 No gainfully occupied person in family
- (iv) (a) Total males, (b) total females, (c) total persons
- (v) Classification of total in family in six age-groups :
(a) males, (b) females
- (vi) Number gainfully occupied : (a) total males, (b) total females, (c) total persons
- (vii) Number gainfully occupied in six social groups (as first six in (iii) above) : (a) males, (b) females.

Rural areas only

It will be noted that (1) the family characteristics are almost entirely different from those of the individual, and (2) they are far less manageable from the viewpoint of the production of statistics than in the case of individuals, and much less meaningful in their different groupings : for instance, it is hard to see what use can be made of a statistic representing number of families with one male earning member and two female earning members.

Ultimately it was decided to use the first three characteristics listed, namely Type of Family, Economic Strength and Social Group of Head of Family, as the bases of classification and to regard the other characteristics as measures to be added and averaged for each group of families in the various heads of the different classifications. In the appendix the summarised results of the sample inquiry are presented for (a) Town, (b) Rural and (c) All Areas¹ for each of the three classifications. The number of headings in each of the three basic classifications is few : these would be shown in much greater detail if a large sample of families had been included in the inquiry which, I repeat, is experimental, designed as much to find out what

¹ Town Areas are those of towns with population of 1,500 or over at the 1951 census. Rural Areas are those of the rest of the State (including smaller towns and villages).

kind of information can be obtained as to show the statistical results.

The *Type of Family* analysis is designed to give the statistics of which the Commission made specific mention. It will be noted that the headings are rather more inclusive than might have been considered desirable, for instance in bulking together families of husband—wife with those of widowers and widows and in including nephews, nieces and other relatives with sons and daughters. As I have already stated, this defect, if so it be, can be remedied if family statistics become part of the census proper. As regards Economic Strength, defined as the ratio of number of gainfully occupied to number in family (with *all* families with five or more gainfully occupied regarded as in the highest category), it is an academic question whether, instead, income per person in family should have been used since we do not dispose of this information at the census: incidentally this has been used as one of the bases of classification of the Household Budget Inquiry of 1951-52, the results of which will be published very shortly. Even if we had income information from the census, there is much to be said in favour of the concept adopted. It is probably true to say that, given the number of earning members and family size, for the great majority of families there is little difference between the different occupational groups in the problem of making ends meet. The social level largely imposes its own pattern of expenditure: to this extent expenditure is largely conventional. There are, of course, differences between the contribution which earning members (other than the household head) make to general expenses. It is reasonable to suppose that this contribution is related inversely to the income of the head and directly to the length of the dependent tail, which would mean that the contribution is generally larger at the lower income levels.

It may be of interest to show the detailed analysis of the 6,280 families in the sample by both size of family and number gainfully occupied in each family—see Table 1—since *Economic Strength* is based on this analysis.

TABLE 1.

Sample of 6,280 Families classified by Number in Family and Number Gainfully Occupied.

Number in family	Number Gainfully Occupied										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
1	267	565	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	832
2	218	847	278	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,343
3	70	670	497	96	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,333
4	36	467	198	263	29	—	—	—	—	—	993
5	17	326	82	125	108	4	—	—	—	—	662
6	9	239	61	67	58	35	2	—	—	—	471
7	4	147	31	34	28	28	12	—	—	—	284
8	2	78	20	21	23	12	6	2	—	—	164
9	3	36	10	29	11	9	4	6	1	—	109
10	—	26	6	—	3	7	3	1	—	—	46
11	—	4	5	—	5	3	3	2	—	1	23
12 and over	—	8	2	—	3	3	4	—	—	—	20
TOTAL	626	3,413	1,190	635	268	101	34	11	1	1	6,280

The five main Economic Strength categories were derived by grouping the families shown in Table 1; for example, those in category 1 comprise all families in the gainfully occupied columns 5-9 together with the combinations (number gainfully occupied/number in family) 1/1, 2/2, 2/3, 3/3, 3/4, 4/4, 4/5, 4/6 and those in category 5 include all families in the gainfully occupied column 0. It will be noted that in no fewer than 626, or just 10% of the total included, there was no gainfully occupied person present on census date. As the age distribution of such families, which will presently be discussed, shows fairly clearly, this is partly due to the fact that some members of such households are in receipt of Old Age or other pensions; and there may have been a few dividend holders. For the greater number, however, it seems likely that the breadwinner was absent on census date. To the extent to which this is the case this defect, from the viewpoint of classifying the family by Economic Strength and by Social Group of Head of Family, could be remedied by including on the census schedule particulars of members of the family temporarily absent.

As regards *Social Group of Head of Family*, the four-fold division by valuation of land and buildings in rural areas will be noted. It would perhaps have been well to subdivide heading 3 into which an undue proportion of the families fell. There would be no difficulty about this in a future inquiry.

I am not specially concerned here to defend the concept of Social Group except to state my positive opinion that of all the broad groupings of occupations it is the most useful for social analysis. In the classification of occupations by Social Group, regard is had primarily to amount of education or training required to practise the occupation, way of life (e.g. agricultural occupations are treated as a single group), and income. The concept also recognises a broad distinction between manual and non-manual workers. Of course, anomalies arise in the attribution of particular occupations to the Social Groups, but reasonable differences of opinion on this point would not materially change the general picture.

Method of Selection and Representativeness of Sample.

The families included are all those in a random selection of 40 folios from the 4,151 folios containing the household schedules of the 1951 Census of Population. The sample included 6,280 families with 22,906 persons. It is recognised that it would have been preferable from the viewpoint of sampling accuracy and representativeness to have made a random selection from the 660,000 private household schedules (taking, say, every hundredth schedule), but this would have involved handling all the 4,151 folios and would have greatly increased the work which was sufficiently onerous, using the folio as the sampling unit. In so far as comparisons can be made between the statistics of the sample inquiry with those of the census, these show that the sample can be accepted with reasonable confidence as representative. Following are some comparisons :—

A—Percentage of Population in Town and Rural Areas :

	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Census</i>
Town	39·5	41·8
Rural	60·5	58·2
Total	100—	100—

B—Females per Thousand Males :

	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Census</i>
Town	1,126	1,119
Rural	843	868
Total	946	965

C—Percentage Age Distribution.

	Males				Females			
	0-14	15-44	45-64	65-	0-14	15-44	45-64	65-
TOWN :								
Sample	31·4	42·3	19·9	6·4	28·3	42·2	21·0	8·5
Census	31·5	43·3	17·9	7·3	27·4	44·9	18·6	9·1
RURAL :								
Sample	28·3	39·5	20·6	11·6	32·1	36·2	21·3	10·4
Census	27·4	40·1	20·3	12·2	29·9	37·2	20·1	12·8

It may also be taken that the broad occupational distribution of gainfully occupied in the families sampled is in quite good accord with that of the census. It will always be borne in mind that boarders, employees living in and visitors (as well as all those in institutions) have been excluded from the sample, but are, of course, included in the census, so that comparisons of exact like with like cannot be made. These exclusions, as well as the fact that households of more than one family sharing the same board, treated as a single "family" at the census, have been regarded as consisting of so many distinct families for the present inquiry, have reduced the (sample) family size from slightly over 4 to 3·65 persons.

Analysis of Results : Preliminary Remark.

It may be well to begin the analysis proper by recalling some of the well-known facts of Irish demography from which the statistical pattern of families so largely derives. With a birthrate slightly above the European average, Ireland has the lowest marriage rate and probably the highest fertility rate of births per marriage in Europe. The average age at marriage is somewhat higher in Ireland than in Britain; in 1945-46 the difference was 3·4 years for bridegrooms and 1·4 years for brides. These differences are not high, especially when one bears in mind that the rural population is proportionately large in Ireland. That no fewer than one person in four never marries is an incomparably more serious social problem than the age at marriage. The low marriage rate must result in a high proportion of families consisting of groups of fairly elderly persons. It also results in a substantial number of large families of considerable Economic Strength. The families would, of course, be larger still in average size were it not for emigration which consists for the greater part of young unmarried persons. On recent experience more than one out of three persons born in Ireland emigrate.

Type of Family.

Table 2 shows the percentage distribution of number of families and persons classified by Type. The outstanding feature of the table is its revelation of the fact that the "simple family" of parents or guardians and children under 15 (Type 1) is so untypical. It contains only 28% of the families and 36% of the population. It is, of course, also true that this type is the largest single group in the classification adopted. In almost every discussion on the economics of the family (and on the incidence of taxation in particular) the family of "man, wife and three children" (with young children clearly in mind) is usually postulated. These constitute an important group, but its importance must not be exaggerated to the point of virtual ignorance of all other groups.

TABLE 2.

Families classified by Type, showing Percentages in each Type and Percentages aged 45 or over.

Type of Family	Number of Families			Number of Persons			Percentage of Persons aged 45 or over		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian with children or other relatives—									
1 All under 15 ...	31.0	26.7	28.4	36.7	35.9	36.2	7.1	10.1	8.9
2 Under 20 but some 15-19 ...	10.2	8.7	9.3	14.9	12.7	13.5	30.4	24.6	27.1
3 Under and over 20	11.7	9.9	10.6	19.3	15.9	17.2	27.3	28.1	27.7
4 Youngest 20-29 ...	10.2	12.1	11.4	9.7	11.7	10.9	43.7	44.2	44.0
5 Youngest 30-44 ...	6.0	9.0	7.9	4.6	7.4	6.3	51.6	48.4	49.3
6 Youngest 45 or over	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.1	2.3	2.2	94.7	90.8	92.2
7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives ...	15.0	10.6	12.3	6.9	4.7	5.6	62.3	76.8	70.2
8 Group of single persons	5.7	9.5	8.0	4.0	6.5	5.5	56.4	65.0	62.6
9 Single person ...	7.1	10.3	9.0	1.9	2.8	2.5	70.8	72.4	71.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	28.0	32.0	30.4

While the table shows the position at a point of time, namely, census date, 1951, it also gives some kind of picture of the evolution of the family, though, in the nature of things, there is no possibility of depicting this evolution with the graphic simplicity of Shakespeare's Seven Ages of Man. The final columns of Table 2, in showing the percentage of persons in each family type aged 45 or over, gives some indication of the ageing process, which is clear enough up to Type 6 but then becomes more involved. The family, even of given type, is so heterogeneous in character that a single statistic like average age of individual in it or percentage over a certain age is useful for analysis only up to a point and may even be misleading.

As regards comparison of Town and Rural, Type 1 families are proportionately less numerous in rural areas, but since rural families of this type are larger (see Table 3) the proportions for *persons* are

very similar. The proportions in Type 7 are much larger in towns, whereas Types 8 and 9 are relatively more numerous in rural areas.

Table 3 shows that there are wide variations in size of family amongst the different types ranging from 1 for Type 9 to nearly 6 for Type 3, the general average being 3.65. There is a remarkable similarity in this comparison between town and rural areas. Numbers in Types 1-3 are much larger than in the other Types.

TABLE 3.
Families classified by Type, showing Persons per Family and Economic Strength.

Type of Family	Persons per Family			Economic Strength		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian, with children or other relatives—						
1 All under 15	4.34	4.89	4.65	0.219	0.199	0.207
2 Under 20 but some 15-19	5.32	5.31	5.31	0.345	0.344	0.344
3 Under and over 20 ...	6.04	5.86	5.94	0.554	0.547	0.550
4 Youngest 20-29 ...	3.50	3.51	3.50	0.667	0.688	0.681
5 Youngest 30-44 ...	2.77	2.96	2.90	0.538	0.644	0.614
6 Youngest 45 or over ...	2.52	2.62	2.58	0.397	0.495	0.459
7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives	1.69	1.63	1.66	0.432	0.475	0.454
8 Group of single persons ...	2.56	2.50	2.52	0.584	0.638	0.623
9 Single person	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.640	0.816	0.761
TOTAL ...	3.67	3.64	3.65	0.402	0.429	0.418

It is rather important to emphasise that, throughout the paper, children and adult women are counted as units, just as adult males are. If children and adult women are measured, as they sometimes are, as more or less arbitrary fractions of the adult male considered as the unit, then the Economic Strength of Type 1 might be increased. This correction can be made from the data in the appendix tables, provided that the experimenter can satisfy himself about the validity of the fractions he uses. However, no reasonable adjustment could alter the fact, which is perhaps the most important which emerges from Table 3, that Type 1 families are economically weaker than the other types displayed. This, of course, is well-known. The function of the statistician in this, as in so many other matters, is not so much to reveal that a certain state of affairs exists as to measure its incidence.

Table 4 will show that a high proportion of children fall into the economically vulnerable families of Type 1. The small-family advocate would do well, however, to bear in mind, before he reaches too hasty conclusions, that Type 1 is but the first stage in the evolution of the family; that, as the table clearly shows, the economic situation of the large family rapidly improves as time goes on. The anti-Malthusian need have little fear in the Irish context, about meeting the Malthusian on the economic ground on which he invariably takes his stand. This, however, is not to be taken as implying complacency on the speaker's part, that the last word has been said on mitigating the economic stress on parents of young children.

In connection with the age distribution of individuals classified by Type of Family, the analyst is confronted with a choice. He can show the percentage distribution for each type or he can show for each age group the percentage distribution amongst each type. Table 4 has been designed according to the latter concept because it highlights the two aspects of the age distribution in families which seem most important, namely, the type-location of children and of elderly persons. The table shows that over 70% of children under 15 years of age are in families of Type 1, Types 2 and 3 accounting for practically all the remainder of the children. There is no significant difference between town and rural areas in this regard. A very large proportion of the children are living under conditions of low Economic Strength.

Table 5 shows Economic Strength according to number of children in family.

TABLE 5.

Economic Strength in Families classified by Number of Children in Family.

Number of children aged 0-14	Town	Rural	All Areas	Theoretical rate for "simple" families	Ratio column (4) to column (5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Economic Strength				
0	0.568	0.647	0.618	0.500	1.24
1	0.406	0.424	0.415	0.333	1.25
2	0.324	0.314	0.319	0.250	1.28
3	0.266	0.249	0.257	0.200	1.29
4	0.202	0.194	0.197	0.167	1.18
5	0.212	0.169	0.185	0.143	1.30
6	0.164	0.136	0.143	0.125	1.14
7	0.191	0.142	0.161	0.111	1.45
8 or over	0.159	0.131	0.138	0.095	1.45
All families	0.402	0.429	0.418	0.324	1.29

The figures in the last two columns require a word of explanation. Those in column (5) represent simply the fractions $1/2$, $1/3$, etc., i.e. the situation postulated is of families consisting only of one breadwinner with wife and children aged 0-14. The last two entries are computed from the average number of children a in the families in the sample, using the formula Economic Strength $a/(a+2)$. It will be seen that in all cases Economic Strength is greater in the actual than in the theoretical case by a more or less constant percentage (see column (6)) up to families of 6 children, after which, rather unexpectedly, the divergence perceptibly widens. The general reason why the figures in column (4) are in excess of those in column (5) is clear: the actual families contain some with two or more members gainfully occupied, normally the head with older sons or daughters at work. The unexpectedly high ratios for families with 7 or more

children aged 0-14 must mean that such families also have a higher proportion of those with two or more earning members than have families with four young children.

As regards adult age groups in Table 4, the high proportion of young adults aged 15-29 in families of Types 2-4, and the heavy concentration in the age group 30-44 (mostly parents of young children) of Type 1 will be noted. Persons aged 45-64 are well represented in all types of family; it will be observed that the proportion borne by Type 8 (groups of single persons) is twice as great in rural as in town areas.

The Aged.

The final column of Table 4 affords some information on the serious problem of loneliness as it affects elderly persons. The only families in which there are elderly persons living alone are those of Type 7 and 9 which between them account for just one-quarter of persons aged 65 or over in private families. The proportion is higher in town than in rural areas—31 as compared with 22%. Type 7 contains, however, families of two persons as well as of one person. Numbers of persons aged 65 or over living alone as percentages of all persons in private families in this age group are as follows:—

				<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Persons</i>
Town	10·7	21·6	17·2
Rural	13·1	11·3	12·3
All Areas	12·5	15·2	13·8

Always bearing in mind that these percentages are but approximations derived from a sample inquiry, it may be estimated from them and the known total of persons aged 65 or over in the State, that the number in this age group living alone is about 42,000. This figure does not, of course, include elderly persons in hospitals and other institutions who numbered 12,000 in 1946. In 1951 the total number of persons in the State aged 65 or over was 316,000.

Economic Strength.

Passing now to analyses based on Economic Strength, Table 6 shows percentage distribution of families and persons, and Table 7 average size of family and average Economic Strength for each group. We have already noted that in one-tenth of the families no gainfully occupied person was present on census date 1951, and that this does not necessarily mean that the Economic Strength of such families was nil but, in probably the majority of such cases, that the bread-winner was absent. We must accordingly regard these families as of unknown Economic Strength. They contain 5½% of the population in private families. Just 60% of the population are in family groups of Economic Strength one-third or more. Table 7 shows how the size of family increases with decreasing Economic Strength, being nearly twice as large for group 4 (with average Economic Strength about 0·2) as for group 1 (with average Economic Strength about 0·8). Table 8 shows that nearly 70% of

children are in the economically weakest group 4. As regards elderly persons, it is satisfactory to note that over two-thirds are in the two groups of highest Economic Strength, whereas 19% are in groups with no member gainfully occupied. It is interesting to recall in this connection that 74% of all persons aged 70 or over in the State are in receipt of Old Age pensions.

TABLE 6.

Families classified by Economic Strength—Percentage Distribution, Families and Persons.

Economic Strength of Family	Number of Families			Number of Persons		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
1 Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength 1 to 2/3 ...	25.2	37.2	32.5	23.2	29.0	26.7
2 3/5 to 1/2 ...	22.4	19.3	20.5	18.5	16.0	17.0
3 4/9 to 1/3 ...	17.0	13.1	14.6	18.8	14.5	16.2
4 2/7 or less ...	22.4	22.3	22.4	32.5	35.9	34.6
5 No member gainfully occupied ...	13.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	4.6	5.5
TOTAL	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--

TABLE 7.

Families classified by Economic Strength, showing Persons per Family and Economic Strength.

Economic Strength of Family	Persons per Family			Economic Strength		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
1 Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength 1 to 2/3 ...	3.37	2.83	3.00	0.756	0.793	0.780
2 3/5 to 1/2 ...	3.03	3.02	3.02	0.521	0.519	0.520
3 4/9 to 1/3 ...	4.05	4.03	4.04	0.348	0.350	0.349
4 2/7 or less ...	5.31	5.84	5.63	0.197	0.181	0.187
5 No member gainfully occupied ...	1.98	2.07	2.02	—	—	—
TOTAL ...	3.67	3.64	3.65	0.402	0.429	0.418

TABLE 8.

Percentage Distribution of Persons by Economic Strength, in each Age Group.

Economic Strength of Family	All Ages	0-14	15-29	30-44	45-64	65 and over
		TOWN				
1 Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength 1 to 2/3 ...	23.2	4.8	40.5	18.0	33.7	27.1
2 3/5 to 1/2 ...	18.5	5.8	24.3	18.2	27.1	28.4
3 4/9 to 1/3 ...	18.8	21.1	19.2	20.5	16.7	9.9
4 2/7 or less ...	32.5	62.3	13.7	38.8	15.3	3.4
5 No member gainfully occupied ...	7.0	6.0	2.3	4.4	7.2	31.2
TOTAL TOWN	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--
		RURAL				
1 Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength 1 to 2/3 ...	29.0	2.5	45.3	31.6	39.4	48.8
2 3/5 to 1/2 ...	16.0	5.0	20.9	14.0	24.9	24.1
3 4/9 to 1/3 ...	14.5	14.2	17.7	14.4	15.0	9.1
4 2/7 or less ...	35.9	73.6	14.1	37.4	17.0	4.2
5 No member gainfully occupied ...	4.6	4.7	2.0	2.6	3.7	13.8
TOTAL RURAL	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--
		ALL AREAS				
1 Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength 1 to 2/3 ...	26.7	3.4	43.2	26.2	37.2	42.1
2 3/5 to 1/2 ...	17.0	5.3	22.4	15.7	25.8	25.4
3 4/9 to 1/3 ...	16.2	16.9	18.4	16.8	15.7	9.3
4 2/7 or less ...	34.6	69.2	13.9	38.0	16.3	3.9
5 No member gainfully occupied ...	5.5	5.2	2.1	3.3	5.1	19.2
ALL AREAS ...	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--

Social Group of Head of Family.

Tables 9 to 11 relate to the third basic classification, namely Social Group of Head of Family. It will be observed that 44% of the population in private families are in the agricultural group, the next highest proportion being in group 3 which, we have already noted, is too inclusive and would be sub-divided in a future inquiry. Table 10 shows that (except for Group 7) families are largest in group 5 (semi-skilled and labourers) and smallest in group 2 (higher professional). It may come as a surprise that the average size of agricultural families is not larger—it is about equal to the general average in both town and rural areas. The Economic Strength is approximately in the inverse order of family size. It will be noted that the average family size increases with farm valuation. It is fairly evident that the unexpectedly small size of agricultural families is due, at least in part, to emigration from small holdings.

As regards age distribution, it will be noted that the percentage in agriculture increases regularly with age from 40% for children to 52% for elderly persons.

TABLE 9.

Families classified by Social Group of Head of Family—Percentage Distribution, Families and Persons.

Social Group of Head of Family	Number of Families			Number of Persons		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	3.0	69.7	43.5	3.0	71.2	44.2
11 Valuation under £4 (incl. nil and no statement) ...		17.6			17.9	
12 Valuation £4 and under £10... ..		15.4			14.9	
13 Valuation £10 and under £20... ..		16.1			16.4	
14 Valuation £20 and under £50... ..		14.1			15.0	
15 Valuation £50 and over		6.5			7.0	
2 Higher professional ...	2.7	0.9	1.6	2.8	0.5	1.4
3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)	43.3	6.5	21.0	44.7	7.0	21.9
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	15.1	3.5	8.1	17.1	3.9	9.1
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners and labourers	12.3	7.3	9.3	15.3	9.0	11.5
6 Own account	10.7	4.0	6.6	10.1	3.8	6.3
7 No member gainfully occupied	13.0	8.1	10.0	7.0	4.6	5.5
TOTAL ...	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--	100--

TABLE 10.

Families classified by Social Group of Head of Family, showing Persons per Family and Economic Strength.

Social Group of Head of Family	Persons per Family			Economic Strength		
	Town	Rural	All Areas	Town	Rural	All Areas
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	3.70	3.71	3.71	0.396	0.481	0.481
11 Valuation under £4 (incl. nil and no statement) ...		3.69			0.399	
12 Valuation £4 and under £10... ..		3.52			0.516	
13 Valuation £10 and under £20... ..		3.69			0.508	
14 Valuation £20 and under £50... ..		3.86			0.500	
15 Valuation £50 and over		3.93			0.512	
2 Higher professional ...	3.75	2.24	3.25	0.406	0.608	0.452
3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)	3.79	3.90	3.81	0.442	0.351	0.424
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	4.16	4.06	4.13	0.401	0.326	0.381
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners and labourers	4.57	4.46	4.52	0.410	0.322	0.369
6 Own account	3.47	3.43	3.45	0.469	0.441	0.459
7 No member gainfully occupied	1.98	2.07	2.03	—	—	—
TOTAL ...	3.67	3.64	3.65	0.402	0.429	0.418

TABLE 12

Percentage Distribution of Gainfully Occupied for Each of the Three Basic Classifications of Town Families.

Classification of Families	Males gainfully occupied in Social Group*—						Females gainfully occupied in Social Group*—						Gainfully occupied		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	Male	Female	Total
	As percentage of total MALE workers						As percentage of total FEMALE workers						As percentage of ALL workers		
A—Type of Family:															
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian with children or other relatives—															
1 All under 15	3.6	4.5	47.0	21.3	15.5	8.0	—	—	55.8	14.0	18.6	11.6	94.1	5.9	100.0
2 Under 20 but some 15-19	2.1	2.4	42.0	27.2	19.2	7.1	—	1.6	51.6	27.0	17.5	2.4	72.8	27.2	100.0
3 Under and over 20	2.7	2.2	43.7	22.4	20.8	8.0	—	1.7	59.3	20.9	14.8	3.2	64.5	35.5	100.0
4 Youngest 20-29	2.6	3.4	49.5	24.7	12.4	7.4	1.0	1.0	63.5	14.9	13.5	6.2	64.6	35.4	100.0
5 Youngest 30-44	2.9	2.2	48.5	24.3	15.4	6.6	—	2.3	72.1	7.0	10.5	8.1	61.3	38.7	100.0
6 Youngest 45 or over	2.2	—	51.1	15.6	11.1	20.0	—	—	76.7	3.3	3.3	16.7	60.0	40.0	100.0
7 With no children or other relatives	4.9	1.8	51.6	15.2	10.8	16.1	2.1	4.2	52.1	2.1	14.6	25.0	82.3	17.7	100.0
8 Group of single persons	6.1	5.1	36.7	21.4	17.3	13.3	—	1.8	63.1	7.2	9.9	18.0	46.9	53.1	100.0
9 Single person	8.2	12.2	28.6	20.4	12.2	18.4	1.6	—	60.3	9.5	1.6	27.0	43.7	56.3	100.0
B—Economic Strength															
1 Five or more occupied and Economic Strength															
1 to 2/3	3.1	3.3	44.9	23.6	16.6	8.5	0.6	2.1	59.9	15.4	12.3	9.7	58.4	41.6	100.0
2 3/5 to 1/2	4.1	2.0	46.7	21.3	15.1	10.7	—	0.4	62.2	16.2	12.7	8.5	70.3	29.7	100.0
3 4/9 to 1/3	2.7	4.0	43.9	22.2	18.5	8.7	—	—	60.7	17.0	17.9	4.5	81.1	18.9	100.0
4 2/7 or less	3.2	3.8	47.7	21.7	15.3	8.3	—	3.7	66.7	7.4	14.8	7.4	95.4	4.6	100.0
C—Social Group of Head of Family															
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	77.5	—	10.8	6.8	4.9	—	15.7	—	59.9	8.1	8.1	8.1	80.3	19.7	100.0
2 Higher professional	2.5	84.0	11.1	1.3	—	1.3	—	33.5	42.7	18.9	—	4.9	79.4	20.6	100.0
3 Lower professional, etc.	0.1	1.2	87.3	6.8	3.7	0.9	—	1.2	82.7	8.0	5.3	2.8	67.7	32.3	100.0
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	0.3	—	5.1	88.3	5.3	1.0	—	—	41.4	37.7	18.1	2.8	78.6	21.4	100.0
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners (manual) and labourers	—	—	9.2	7.2	83.1	0.6	—	—	23.4	28.2	47.8	0.7	70.9	29.1	100.0
6 Own account	0.3	0.3	14.1	8.9	3.1	73.4	—	0.6	35.3	11.0	2.2	50.8	68.3	31.7	100.0

*Classification same as that of C—Social Group of Head of Family in first column

Social Group of All Gainfully Occupied.
Table 12 shows the percentage distribution to Social Group of gainfully occupied persons in town families classified in three basic ways. The corresponding table for rural areas is less significant because of the predominance of agriculture. It could, however, be derived from the appendix tables, if desired.

As regards A-Type of Family, male workers naturally predominate in Type 1 families. The percentage of males is also high for Type 7. Females, on the other hand, constitute more than half the labour force for Types 8 and 9. The distribution of male workers is very similar for Types 1-5 and for Types 6-7. The high proportion for Social Group 6 in Types 6-9 and for males in Social Group 2 in Type 9 will be noted.

It is clear that the higher Economic Strength of families (section B of the table) derives very largely from female employment. There is no significant difference for either males or females in distribution in Social Groups.

As regards section C of the table, we naturally find a heavy concentration of the percentages in the Social Group of Head, and that this concentration is more marked in the case of males than females. On the latter point it may be interesting to show the percentages of females gainfully occupied heads of families for Town and All Areas—see Table 12A.

TABLE 12A.
Gainfully Occupied Heads of Families—Females as Percentage of Total. Town and All Areas.

Social Group of Head of Family			Town	All Areas
1	Farmers and agricultural workers	5.5	12.4
2	Higher professional	4.5	8.0
3	Lower professional, etc.	18.1	17.9
4	Skilled wage-earners (manual)	5.6	4.9
5	Semi-skilled wage-earners (manual) and labourers	...	9.9	6.0
6	Own account	25.8	23.6
TOTAL ...			14.8	13.1

About one-eighth of the occupied heads of families are women. The proportion is nearly a quarter in the Own Account group.

Perhaps the most interesting question which arises from this kind of analysis is the degree of association of other gainfully occupied persons in the family with the social group of the head of family, which derives from Section C of Table 12. Table 12B shows the percentage distribution of "others" gainfully occupied in each social group.

TABLE 12B.
Percentage Distribution of Male Gainfully Occupied other than Head of Family in Each Social Group of Head. Town Areas and All Areas

Social Group of Head of Family	Social Group*												
	TOWN						ALL AREAS						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	Farmers and agricultural workers †...	30.3	—	33.3	21.2	15.2	—	82.9	0.3	4.8	3.5	6.9	1.6
2	Higher professional ††	11.8	23.5	52.9	5.9	5.9	24.0	28.0	40.0	4.0	—	4.0	—
3	Lower professional, etc.	0.6	4.2	53.9	24.8	13.5	3.0	4.2	3.6	52.1	23.2	14.1	2.8
4	Skilled wage-earners (manual) ...	0.7	—	18.4	58.1	19.1	3.7	5.4	0.6	15.7	53.6	20.6	4.2
5	Semi-skilled wage-earners (manual) and labourers ...	—	—	28.5	22.3	47.7	1.5	19.2	—	20.1	17.3	41.6	1.8
6	Own account ...	1.0	1.0	42.3	26.8	9.3	19.6	11.8	0.7	36.6	27.4	9.1	14.4
TOTAL ...		2.1	2.5	40.6	30.1	19.7	5.0	57.1	1.1	15.6	11.9	11.6	2.7

*Classification same as Social Group of Head of Family—see first column.

†Based on small numbers in Town Areas.

††Based on small numbers.

The propensity of "others" of assignment in the same group as the head is quite apparent from Table 12B in the loading of the percentages on the "diagonals" which are always much greater than the percentages for all families on the last row of the table, e.g. for all areas 82.9 compared with 57.1, 28.0 with 1.1, etc. The percentage distribution in the two manual groups 4 and 5 will be seen to be quite different. Even more interesting is the fact that for broad group 5 in towns over 50% of "others" are in groups 3-4. It might be well to explore further the important question of occupational mobility within families in a future full-scale family inquiry. Clearly it will be necessary to have regard to individual occupations as well as to occupational groups in such a study.

Conclusion.

The analysis of the material may be left at this point. I should add that, in addition to the three basic classifications given in the appendix, the three sub-classifications on the same lines for each pair (e.g. Type of Family sub-classified by Economic Strength) are also available in manuscript and can be inspected by interested persons. Machine cards, three for each family, with the data specified on pages 3 and 4 punched on them, have been retained so that additional information can be derived from them, if desired. It would be very useful if the Society and members of the Commission could express their views on the following questions:—

- (1) Should statistics relating to families be produced (on a representative sample or on a complete basis) at future censuses?
- (2) If so, should this information be on the lines indicated in the present paper, as modified and extended in the manner indicated in the text?
- (3) What additional points should be covered by family statistics produced from the census?

In the discussion it will be well to bear in mind the limitations on the type of question which can be asked in an inquiry of nation-wide scope. Decision as to whether the inquiry should be by sample or complete may perhaps be left to the census takers. No serious conflict of opinion on these questions is likely to arise, at any rate, between the Society and the Commission since seventeen of the twenty-four Commissioners and the Commission Secretary are Society members.

APPENDIX TABLES.

NOTE : Following is the interpretation of code numbers for Gainfully Occupied in tables :—

- 1 Farmers and agricultural workers.
 - 2 Higher professional.
 - 3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual).
 - 4 Skilled wage-earners (manual).
 - 5 Semi-skilled wage-earners (manual) and labourers.
 - 6 Own account (except in 1 and 2).
-

TABLE I.

Number of Persons in Sample of Families classified by Sex, Age Group and Social

Type of Family	Number of Families	Number in Family			Males aged—					
		Total	Male	Female	0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65-
TOWN										
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian with children or other relatives—										
1 All under 15	766	3,321	1,638	1,683	944	1	92	442	157	2
2 Under 20 but some 15-19	253	1,345	653	692	243	198	—	39	160	13
3 Under and over 20	289	1,747	865	882	144	191	270	32	201	27
4 Youngest 20-29	252	881	418	463	—	—	206	58	98	56
5 Youngest 30-44	149	413	168	245	—	—	—	92	24	52
6A Youngest 45-64	55	139	45	94	—	—	1	1	29	14
6B Youngest 65 and over	20	50	14	36	—	—	—	2	7	5
7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives ...	371	627	282	345	—	1	26	77	106	72
8 Group of single persons	140	358	122	236	6	11	16	30	45	14
9 Single person	175	175	55	120	—	—	6	11	21	17
TOTAL TOWN	2,470	9,056	4,260	4,796	1,337	402	617	784	848	272
RURAL										
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian with children or other relatives—										
1 All under 15	1,018	4,977	2,513	2,464	1,572	—	76	510	335	20
2 Under 20 but some 15-19	331	1,757	906	852	338	278	2	48	212	27
3 Under and over 20	378	2,211	1,243	968	205	255	395	80	200	108
4 Youngest 20-29	461	1,618	937	681	—	—	438	167	145	187
5 Youngest 30-44	343	1,012	568	444	—	—	—	346	57	165
6A Youngest 45-64	87	229	111	118	—	—	—	6	82	23
6B Youngest 65 and over	37	96	50	46	—	1	1	8	8	32
7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives ...	403	655	319	336	—	—	5	61	130	123
8 Group of single persons	361	904	555	349	11	7	29	151	250	107
9 Single person	391	391	313	78	—	1	18	82	132	80
TOTAL RURAL	3,810	12,850	7,514	6,396	2,126	542	964	1,459	1,551	872
ALL AREAS										
Husband and/or wife, widow, widower or guardian with children or other relatives—										
1 All under 15	1,784	8,298	4,151	4,147	2,516	1	168	952	492	22
2 Under 20 but some 15-19	584	3,102	1,558	1,544	581	476	2	87	372	40
3 Under and over 20	667	3,958	2,108	1,850	349	446	665	112	401	135
4 Youngest 20-29	713	2,499	1,355	1,144	—	—	644	225	243	243
5 Youngest 30-44	492	1,425	736	689	—	—	—	438	81	217
6A Youngest 45-64	142	368	156	212	—	—	1	7	111	37
6B Youngest 65 and over	57	146	64	82	—	1	1	10	15	37
7 Husband and/or wife, widow or widower with no children or other relatives ...	774	1,282	601	681	—	1	31	138	236	195
8 Group of single persons	501	1,262	677	585	17	18	45	181	295	121
9 Single person	566	566	368	198	—	1	24	93	153	97
TOTAL, ALL AREAS	6,280	22,906	11,774	11,132	3,463	944	1,581	2,243	2,399	1,144

Group of Gainfully Occupied in Each Type of Family. Town, Rural and All Areas.

Females aged—							Gainfully occupied			Males gainfully occupied in Social Group*						Females gainfully occupied in Social Group*					
0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65-		Total	Male	Female	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
TOWN																					
936	3	182	484	73	5	728	685	43	25	31	322	146	106	55	—	—	24	6	8	5	
242	209	1	92	144	4	464	338	126	7	8	142	92	65	24	—	2	65	34	22	3	
171	183	230	50	238	10	968	624	344	17	14	273	140	180	50	—	6	204	72	51	11	
—	—	188	44	171	60	588	390	208	10	13	188	94	47	28	2	2	132	31	28	13	
—	—	—	108	45	92	222	136	86	4	3	66	33	21	9	—	2	62	6	9	7	
—	—	1	1	57	35	56	33	23	1	—	14	5	5	8	—	—	18	1	1	3	
—	—	2	2	4	28	19	12	7	—	—	9	2	—	1	—	—	5	—	—	2	
—	2	43	81	137	82	271	223	48	11	3	115	34	24	36	1	2	25	1	7	12	
7	6	29	51	93	50	209	98	111	6	5	36	21	17	13	—	2	70	8	11	20	
—	—	6	28	44	42	112	49	63	4	6	14	10	6	9	1	—	38	6	1	17	
356	403	682	941	1,006	408	3,637	2,578	1,059	85	83	1,179	577	421	233	4	16	643	165	138	93	
RURAL																					
467	6	200	644	136	11	988	944	44	618	6	98	57	121	44	17	—	21	—	2	4	
337	211	2	108	188	6	604	507	97	376	—	44	23	54	10	51	1	31	11	3	—	
219	203	178	55	285	28	1,208	980	228	732	2	66	60	100	20	96	—	94	30	2	6	
—	—	246	51	253	131	1,115	888	227	703	6	48	32	75	24	164	1	46	11	—	5	
—	—	—	175	69	200	654	526	128	435	4	19	19	37	12	103	2	15	3	3	2	
—	—	—	6	67	45	121	98	23	83	1	1	5	6	2	17	1	4	—	—	1	
—	—	1	7	4	34	40	35	5	34	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	2	
—	1	20	65	147	103	311	266	45	194	—	24	14	18	16	26	—	12	1	—	6	
10	11	29	68	159	72	577	511	66	440	7	16	5	17	17	29	—	22	—	1	14	
—	—	2	5	39	32	319	273	46	218	14	6	10	12	13	35	—	2	—	—	9	
333	432	678	1,184	1,347	662	5,937	5,023	909	3,842	40	322	225	441	158	541	5	247	56	11	49	
ALL AREAS																					
403	9	382	1,128	209	16	1,716	1,629	87	643	37	420	203	227	99	17	—	45	6	10	9	
579	420	3	200	332	10	1,068	845	223	383	8	186	115	119	34	51	3	96	45	25	3	
390	386	408	105	523	38	2,176	1,604	572	749	16	339	200	230	70	96	6	298	102	53	17	
—	—	434	95	424	191	1,703	1,268	435	713	19	236	126	122	52	166	3	178	42	28	18	
—	—	—	283	114	292	876	662	214	439	7	85	52	58	21	103	4	77	9	12	9	
—	—	1	7	124	80	177	131	46	84	1	15	10	11	10	17	1	22	1	1	4	
—	—	3	9	8	62	59	47	12	34	—	9	2	1	1	3	—	5	—	—	4	
—	3	63	146	284	185	582	489	93	205	3	139	48	42	52	27	2	37	2	7	18	
17	17	58	119	252	122	786	609	177	455	12	52	26	34	30	29	2	92	8	12	34	
—	—	8	33	83	74	431	322	109	222	20	20	20	18	22	36	—	40	6	1	26	
389	835	1,360	2,125	2,353	1,070	9,574	7,606	1,968	3,927	123	1,501	802	862	391	545	21	890	221	149	142	

* See note on page (19).

TABLE II.

Number of Persons in Sample of Families classified by Sex, Age Group and Social

Economic Strength of Family	Number of Families	Number in Family			Males aged -					
		Total	Male	Female	0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65-
TOWN										
Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength—										
1 1 to 2/3	623	2,102	1,014	1,088	59	131	332	144	261	87
2 3/5 to 1/2	553	1,676	767	909	71	108	133	145	226	84
3 4/9 to 1/3	420	1,702	824	878	279	90	93	169	166	27
4 2/7 or less	554	2,943	1,468	1,475	846	64	55	318	172	13
5 No member gainfully occupied	320	633	187	446	82	9	4	8	23	61
TOTAL TOWN	2,470	9,056	4,260	4,796	1,337	402	617	784	848	272
RURAL										
Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength—										
1 1 to 2/3	1,419	4,016	2,597	1,419	59	196	619	646	620	457
2 3/5 to 1/2	785	2,217	1,161	1,056	101	145	170	209	332	204
3 4/9 to 1/3	499	2,009	998	1,011	291	120	108	177	227	75
4 2/7 or less	851	4,974	2,514	2,460	1,577	74	64	422	340	37
5 No member gainfully occupied	306	634	244	390	98	7	3	5	32	99
TOTAL RURAL	3,810	13,850	7,514	6,336	2,126	542	964	1,459	1,551	872
ALL AREAS										
Five or more gainfully occupied and Economic Strength—										
1 1 to 2/3	2,042	6,118	3,611	2,507	118	327	951	790	881	544
2 3/5 to 1/2	1,288	3,893	1,928	1,965	172	253	303	354	558	288
3 4/9 to 1/3	919	3,711	1,822	1,889	570	210	201	346	393	102
4 2/7 or less	1,405	7,917	3,982	3,935	2,423	138	119	740	512	50
5 No member gainfully occupied	626	1,267	431	836	180	16	7	13	55	160
TOTAL, ALL AREAS	6,280	22,906	11,774	11,132	3,463	944	1,581	2,243	2,399	1,144

Group of Gainfully Occupied in Economic Strength Groups. Town, Rural and All Areas.

Females aged—						Gainfully occupied			Males gainfully occupied in Social Group*						Females gainfully occupied in Social Group*					
0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65--	Total	Male	Female	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
TOWN																				
71	121	268	167	364	97	1,590	929	661	29	31	417	219	154	79	4	14	396	102	81	64
84	101	170	169	276	109	873	614	259	25	12	287	131	93	66	—	1	161	42	33	22
289	95	126	185	143	40	593	481	112	13	19	211	107	89	42	—	—	68	19	20	5
832	72	97	352	112	10	581	554	27	18	21	264	120	85	46	—	1	18	2	4	2
80	14	21	68	111	152	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1,356	403	682	941	1,006	408	3,637	2,578	1,059	85	83	1,179	577	421	233	4	16	643	165	138	93
RURAL																				
45	113	258	188	523	292	3,185	2,535	650	2,085	29	112	82	158	69	426	4	141	42	4	33
108	99	132	162	390	165	1,150	985	165	742	2	71	49	92	29	76	—	63	9	4	13
300	118	117	203	208	65	703	631	72	430	5	56	41	69	30	31	1	34	2	2	2
1,484	92	138	567	152	27	899	877	22	585	4	83	53	122	30	8	—	9	3	1	1
96	10	33	64	74	113	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2,033	432	678	1,184	1,347	662	5,937	5,028	909	3,842	40	322	225	441	158	541	5	247	56	11	49
ALL AREAS																				
116	234	526	355	887	389	4,775	3,464	1,311	2,114	60	529	301	312	148	430	18	537	144	85	97
192	200	302	331	666	274	2,023	1,599	424	767	14	358	186	185	95	76	1	224	51	37	35
589	213	243	388	351	105	1,296	1,112	184	443	24	267	148	158	72	31	1	102	21	22	7
3,316	164	235	919	264	37	1,480	1,431	49	603	25	347	173	207	76	8	1	27	5	5	3
176	24	54	132	185	265	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3,989	835	1,360	2,125	2,353	1,070	9,574	7,606	1,968	3,927	123	1,501	802	862	391	545	21	890	221	149	142

*See note on page (19)

TABLE III.

Number of Persons in Sample of Families classified by Sex, Age Group and Social

Social Group of Head of Family	Number of Families	Number in Family			Males aged—					
		Total	Male	Female	0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65-
TOWN										
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	73	270	142	128	36	11	29	18	40	8
2 Higher professional	67	251	129	122	41	9	18	27	27	7
3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)	1,069	4,047	1,902	2,145	556	173	289	382	394	108
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	373	1,550	791	759	261	86	115	169	122	38
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners and labourers	304	1,390	675	715	244	78	94	112	131	16
6 Own account	264	915	434	481	117	36	68	68	111	34
7 No member gainfully occupied	320	633	187	446	82	9	4	8	23	61
TOTAL TOWN	2,470	9,056	4,260	4,796	1,337	402	617	784	848	272
RURAL										
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	2,656	9,857	5,503	4,354	1,353	415	780	1,114	1,164	677
11 Valuation under £4 (including nil and no statement)	672	2,481	1,382	1,099	427	77	172	279	288	141
12 Valuation £4 and under £10	586	2,064	1,210	854	284	94	155	254	246	177
13 Valuation £10 and under £20	614	2,267	1,248	1,019	280	105	185	247	279	152
14 Valuation £20 and under £50	537	2,075	1,149	926	262	94	166	243	238	146
15 Valuation £50 and over	247	970	514	456	100	45	102	91	115	61
2 Higher professional	33	74	41	33	2	—	5	12	15	7
3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)	250	974	472	502	183	29	52	94	89	25
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	133	540	284	256	108	13	33	60	55	15
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners and labourers	280	1,250	695	555	300	49	64	123	133	26
6 Own account	152	521	275	246	82	29	27	51	63	23
7 No member gainfully occupied	306	634	244	390	98	7	3	5	32	99
TOTAL RURAL	3,810	13,850	7,514	6,336	2,126	542	964	1,459	1,551	872
ALL AREAS										
1 Farmers and agricultural workers	2,729	10,127	5,645	4,482	1,389	426	809	1,132	1,204	685
2 Higher professional	100	325	170	155	43	9	23	39	42	14
3 Lower professional, employers and managers, salaried workers and wage-earners (non-manual)	1,319	5,021	2,374	2,647	739	202	341	476	483	133
4 Skilled wage-earners (manual)	506	2,090	1,075	1,015	369	99	148	229	177	53
5 Semi-skilled wage-earners and labourers	584	2,640	1,370	1,270	544	127	158	235	264	42
6 Own account	416	1,436	709	727	199	65	95	119	174	57
7 No member gainfully occupied	626	1,267	431	836	180	16	7	13	55	160
TOTAL, ALL AREAS	6,280	22,906	11,774	11,132	3,463	944	1,581	2,243	2,399	1,144

Group of Gainfully Occupied in Each Social Group of Head of Family, Town, Rural and All Areas.

Females aged—						Gainfully occupied			Males gainfully occupied in Social Group*						Females gainfully occupied in Social Group*					
0-14	15-19	20-29	30-44	45-64	65-	Total	Male	Female	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
TOWN																				
38	12	15	23	37	3	127	102	25	79	—	11	7	5	—	4	—	15	2	2	2
34	16	18	27	23	4	102	81	21	2	68	9	1	—	1	—	7	9	4	—	1
563	184	327	460	472	139	1,788	1,210	578	2	14	1,056	83	45	10	—	8	477	47	30	16
270	56	127	141	136	29	621	488	133	1	—	25	431	26	5	—	—	55	50	24	4
263	72	107	134	103	36	570	404	166	—	—	37	29	336	2	—	—	39	47	79	1
108	49	67	88	124	45	429	293	136	1	1	41	26	9	215	—	1	48	15	3	69
80	14	21	68	111	152	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1,356	403	682	941	1,006	408	3,637	2,578	1,059	85	83	1,179	577	421	233	4	16	643	165	138	93
RURAL																				
1,314	319	470	781	1,009	461	4,740	4,033	707	3,757	6	72	55	115	28	534	1	114	42	4	12
430	64	108	195	211	91	989	907	82	840	1	19	9	35	3	51	—	19	9	1	2
228	60	77	169	203	117	1,066	903	163	834	—	10	16	39	4	129	—	15	15	—	4
271	87	119	180	245	117	1,151	951	200	880	3	14	14	29	11	151	1	30	10	3	5
259	72	100	166	237	92	1,037	866	171	811	2	19	14	11	9	126	—	36	8	—	1
126	36	66	71	113	44	497	406	91	392	—	10	2	1	1	77	—	14	—	—	—
9	2	7	6	6	3	45	38	7	4	33	1	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	—
189	32	56	113	88	24	343	256	87	14	—	226	6	9	1	2	—	77	4	1	3
111	11	30	53	40	11	176	159	17	8	1	1	139	8	2	—	—	7	8	—	2
240	43	52	111	83	26	403	364	39	42	—	7	9	304	2	3	—	27	2	5	2
74	15	30	56	47	24	230	178	52	17	—	15	16	5	125	2	—	19	—	1	30
96	10	33	64	74	113	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2,033	432	678	1,184	1,347	662	5,937	5,028	909	3,842	40	322	225	441	158	541	5	247	56	11	49
ALL AREAS																				
1,352	331	485	804	1,046	464	4,867	4,135	732	3,836	6	83	62	120	28	538	1	129	44	6	14
43	18	25	33	29	7	147	119	28	6	101	10	1	—	1	—	11	12	4	—	1
752	216	383	573	560	163	2,131	1,466	665	16	14	1,282	89	54	11	2	8	554	51	31	19
381	67	157	194	176	40	797	647	150	9	1	26	570	34	7	—	—	62	58	24	6
503	115	159	245	186	62	973	768	205	42	—	44	38	640	4	3	—	66	49	84	3
182	64	97	144	171	69	659	471	188	18	1	56	42	14	340	2	1	67	15	4	99
176	24	54	132	185	265	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3,889	835	1,360	2,125	2,353	1,070	9,574	7,606	1,968	3,927	123	1,501	802	862	391	545	21	890	221	149	142

*See note on page (10).

DISCUSSION.

Mr. Honohan proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Geary for his paper. He suggested that the paper demonstrated successfully the limitations of attempting to present census statistics on a family basis. While this was so, many interesting and instructive figures were brought out. It was surprising to learn that 36% of all those over the age of 65 were either single persons living alone or married couples living alone. Again, it was almost startling to note that only 28% of *all* families (or 36% of the persons involved) were in the category husband and wife with all children under the age of 15. Many writers take it for granted that the normal "pattern" of family life comprises a man, wife and say 3 children, and it will come as a surprise that the percentage of such cases is so small. Such concepts have indeed formed the basis for estimating an optimum population for the country, and this knowledge ought to be a salutary check on such exercises.

The paper suggests many lines of thought. What, for instance, is a family? The whole human race could be regarded as a family, but one must obviously draw the line. Is the limitation based on relationship by "blood and marriage" satisfactory? It is very wide in one sense, but when the qualification of living in the same household is imposed (Dr. Geary implies that this is unavoidable), it is perhaps a less satisfactory grouping than we might hope for. In a country which is noted for its heavy migration, the extent of the dispersal of families, temporary in many instances, (e.g. the extent to which one of the parents is absent, the extent to which daughters are "absent" in the Civil Service in Dublin and so on) is a social phenomenon which it would be interesting to assess.

The speaker thought that the value of family statistics was to a large extent sociological, and he wondered whether some of the economic analysis was a little over-ambitious. In particular, it seemed to him that there was insufficient justification for using the ratio of the number gainfully occupied related to the number in the family as a measure of economic strength or weakness, as the case may be.

The paper was most interesting, and the subject was deserving of further study. There could, however, as Dr. Geary points out, be no question of looking forward to a day when the whole of our Census machine would be switched over to a family basis. It was important to realise that, while the family was the basic *unit group* of society, as our Constitution says, the individual must surely be regarded as the basic *unit*.

Dr. M. D. McCarthy: I wish to express appreciation of the value of the paper, and to suggest that its precise status has not been understood by some of those who spoke. It was an attempt to extract as much information as possible regarding the family from an inquiry designed for quite other purposes, and its principal value was that it indicated the limits of such an attempt. In one sense the actual statistical results produced were secondary. There are very strict limitations to the amount and type of information on the family which can be got by such means. The Census of Population inquiry has to be replied to by the whole population, and has to be designed for its own specific purpose. In addition, it had to elicit uniform

replies from persons of all standards of education. To gather other types of information it would be more appropriate to make sample surveys, but contrary to the views which have been expressed by some speakers, such surveys have in the final results to be analysed by statistical methods. Nobody could merely from an inspection of 5,000 case histories derive any valid conclusions. The results would eventually have to be put on punched cards, and the Central Statistics Office would be more than glad to help in doing that for any reputable sociological inquiry. More than that, the response to such an inquiry would to a large extent be determined by the form of questionnaire, the drafting of which is a highly specialised and technical task, and the Office would be willing to put its experience in this field at the disposal of persons or groups who are anxious to carry out such work.

The main difficulty in producing family statistics is that apparently nobody is able to indicate the kind of characteristics under which families should be classified in such an inquiry. The Central Statistics Office do not merely produce statistics for their own sake. They are designed to provide data for the solution of specific problems either for administration or economics or sociology. The Office has first of all to be made aware of the type of problems there are or the kind of questions for which answers are required. It could, of course, on its own, attempt to guess what information was desirable, but it would be far more suitable, and the results far more valuable, if expert sociologists and economists would state their problems. There is no use saying, as the Commission on Population said, that family statistics are needed unless some experts, either individually or collectively, would state what exactly the statistics should contain or what problems they are needed to solve.

The question of whether or not statistics of families are to be produced at the next Census of Population, and, if so, what these statistics should be, remains to be solved, and the Office has not been much aided by the discussion at this meeting. One point, however, is clear and that is that very little more can be produced from the Census type of inquiry than what has been given in the paper, and if there are any other points which need to be covered these gaps should be filled by sample inquiries.

Dr. Geary, in reply: In presenting my paper I said that the Office was quite neutral on the question of whether family statistics should be included in future Censuses, and that we would not pursue this idea unless we had the emphatic support of the Society and the Commission. Having listened to the discussion, I must say that I find an absence of enthusiasm. Father Newman, while inclined to answer the first question in the final paragraph in the affirmative, qualified his answer by the proviso that the Census material should be linked with a social survey. As Professor McCarthy pointed out, statistics can be applied qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Actually this is frequently done at the Census of Population, for example, in the social amenities statistics in the 1946 Census such questions were asked as "Is water laid on (yes or no)?" I also agree with Professor McCarthy that it is very hard to come to any definite conclusions or establish any train of cause and effect without expressing the results of the Survey in statistical terms. Without statistics, the personal judgment of the inquirer will enter largely

into the statement of results. Father Newman is, however, quite right in his suggestion that the social surveys should be linked with the more generalised Census results by arranging that some of the questions in the social survey should be identical with those of the Census.

On Mr. Honohan's point about the three families (out of 6,000!) with juvenile heads, I am reminded that, on the publication of the Census of 1926, when much new statistical ground in many directions was broken, one of the Dublin papers saluted the event by a double column head: "One Female Chimney Sweep!" The Office naturally thought that the lady was one of those inevitable mistakes which occur when one publishes millions of figures, but inquiry revealed that the lady certainly did exist. The few curious family types to which Mr. Honohan has drawn attention may also be a fact. Please do not be surprised, however, if in the printed version of the paper these few cases have disappeared, not necessarily because they do not exist but because we want to avoid awkward questions.

The definition of "family" also gave speakers a certain amount of trouble. I think that Mr. Honohan answered himself when he suggested that if permanently absent members of the group are to be included, the next stop is the whole human race! As I stated in the paper, one can have many valid definitions of "family" or "household," depending on the use to which the statistics are to be put. For the paper the notion of dependency-relationship was paramount. To Mr. Crowley's objection to the definition, I would make two observations: (i) that his concept is that used in the Census, and (ii) from the dependency point of view I would hesitate to ask the family domestic to contribute to my support if I lost my job. A number of speakers who accepted the blood and marriage concept of the paper would have liked to isolate the group of man, wife and children under 15. As stated in the paper, there would be no difficulty about this at a future Census inquiry, but in view of the small proportion of orphans in the whole population of children (shown by the Census), the statistical picture which emerged from the paper would not be substantially altered.

The concept of Economic Strength came in for some rough handling. None of the critics, however, addressed himself to the arguments in favour of the concept which were developed (though perhaps too briefly) in the paper. If a sufficient number of families had been included in the sample, it would be possible to produce analyses for the different social groups of head of family: indeed material on these lines is derivable from the manuscript tables referred to in the last paragraph of the paper. May I direct the attention of critics to Table 10 which shows that the average Economic Strength does not alter very much with different social groups? I have noted for consideration Mr. Mortished's suggestion that we should use the term "Dependency Ratio" for the concept, though this is more like the inverse of Economic Strength. I remain convinced that in particular social groups and in all social groups together the more persons there are at work in the family the better!