

Footnotes

1. The writer calculated all ratios and any mistakes are his responsibility alone. The occupational figures for Cowling were very strange in that the figures for the 1831 'T' and 'All' categories were almost in opposite proportion to those of 1821. Such a reversal could either be due to a clerical error or to some economic trauma forcing many families onto poor relief. Whilst 1831 was a difficult year in trade, it seemed unlikely that the Parish would have been able to support such a high proportion of its workforce. Also there would have been stronger evidence for this trauma in the neighbouring communities of Glasburn and Sutton. Personally, I think that the figures for Cowlings occupational categories in 1832 should read 276 under the 'T' heading and 37 under the 'All' heading. Nevertheless, the high proportion of uninhabited houses in that year did perhaps imply that economic distress was causing people to migrate further afield for work.
2. In 1831, Leeds was on record as having an area of 21,450 acres; this was about eight times the size of Sutton.
3. The original document gave a figure of 118 inhabited houses and families. However, as this would imply an inexplicable drop from the 196 recorded in the 1821 census, I have assumed that the figure 118 was a misprint for 218. It is hard to believe that during a time of rapidly growing population Sutton would have undergone the demolition of 78 houses.
4. The valuation of land and property for Colne at 'County Rates' was £17,139.00
5. The reduction in acreage compared to 1841 may either be due to boundary changes or alternately to poor record keeping.
6. The estimated number of Smiths for Glasburn was derived from conflating the figures for Glasburn with those of Crosshills, which formed part of the Glasburn Township. (See D4 and D5 in the Statistical Supplement.) In this and the two other 'Number of Smiths' rows the figure in the N column refers only to the Number of inhabited houses, cottages and other permanent dwelling places where the head of the household has the surname 'Smith.' When compared to the whole population Glasburn, the Smiths were found to have: -
 - Less crowded living conditions
 - A higher proportion of males as compared to females
 - Almost the same proportion of people aged under 20
7. When compared to the whole population Kildwick, the Smiths were found to have: -

- Less crowded living conditions
- A far higher proportion of males as compared to females
- A significantly greater proportion of people aged under 20

8. Figures were obtained by conflating the number of Smiths living in the three districts of Sutton surveyed in the Statistical Supplement, (See D1 to D3). When compared to the whole population Sutton, the Smiths were found to have: -

- Less crowded living conditions
- A higher proportion of males as compared to females
- A significantly lower proportion of people aged under 20

9. These totals represent the Smiths who were found to be living in Sutton Glasburn and Kildwick during the time of the June 1841 Census. The figures were derived from conflating the figures recorded in D1 to D6 of the Statistical Supplement. For more specific details about those Smiths who were recorded in that sample please refer to that document.

10. According to the 1851 Census Pannal (where my Great Grandfather Edmund Smith stayed in 1857) possessed

- 169 inhabited houses
- 8 uninhabited houses (with none being built)
- A total population of 774 (consisting of 355 Males and 419 Females).
- A P/N Ratio of 4.58
- A M/F Ratio of 0.85

This mainly rural community was located near the Spa Town of Harrogate in North Yorkshire.

Comments

In summary, this data showed that: -

1. All communities enjoyed a fair degree of population growth over the 1801-1851 period. During that half century:

- Bingley & Micklethwaite grew by 325.53%
- Burton Pidsea grew by 144.85%
- Colne grew by 247.85%
- Cowling grew by 215.61%
- Kildwick grew by 98.56%
- Skipton grew by 218.82%
- Sutton grew by 205.19%

N.B: Cullingworth was included under the Bingley & Micklethwaite area in the Census Returns

2. In contrast to the other settlements geared to the manufacturing and handicrafts, Burton Pidsea specialised heavily in the agricultural sector throughout the period under analysis. The 'A/T' ratios for the 1811, 1821 and 1831 Census Returns showed this. (The 1801 Census Return could not be used because it had its own idiosyncratic way of calculating the numbers in particular types of employment.)
3. Overall, males tended to outnumber females but only by a slight amount. In some communities such as Burton Pidsea in 1801, females may have outnumbered males because of male migration. It was often the case that in time of economic upheaval it would be the young men would move out of the community first.
4. A high proportion of uninhabited houses as occurred at Cowling in 1831 may be connected to economic distress. People were packing up and moving to the cities for work. Conversely, the high evidence of building activity in the 1851 census occurred at the beginning of the mid-Victorian economic boom. Through employing this criterion it was possible to conclude that 1841 had been a very hard year; no new houses were being built at all whilst a sizeable number were being left empty.
5. The 1841 census lent weight to the view that most of the population had been born either in or very near their region. In most places the population contained a high proportion of people aged under, 20. In some cases this was over 50% of the total. This lent weight to the supposition that a lot of children were being born but only a relative few would make it into late adulthood. The structure of the population in the first half of the nineteenth century was very different from that of today with its high proportion of elderly.
6. Compared to rapidly growing cities such as Leeds or Manchester, overcrowding did not appear to have been a serious problem. The ratio of total persons to inhabited houses was in the 4.44 to 6.53 range. Such findings did not rule out the possibility of overcrowding – they only showed that it was not a widespread problem in the communities being looked at. A review of the

1841 census showed that labourers would tend to have 7 to 8 people per house whilst skilled workers would have only 4 to 5, which is roughly the size of many modern families. However, in weaving households the presence of handlooms would tend to take up a fair degree of space. There would not be much room for elaborate furniture of the kind seen in middle class households. The number of inhabitants in these wealthier households would sometimes be enlarged by the presence of resident, domestic servants.

7. When compared to the wider population, the 226 strong sample of Smiths were found to have: -

- Less crowded living conditions
- A higher proportion of (mainly income producing) males as compared to (often non-income producing) females
- A slightly lower proportion of (mainly dependent) people aged under 20

Such distinctions implied that the living standard enjoyed by this sample was marginally above the norm for the time.