ROCKWOOL Foundation Berlin
Institute for the Economy and the Future of Work (RFBerlin)

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES 42/25

An Analysis of Slaveholders According to the 1850 Census

Barry R. Chiswick, RaeAnn H. Robinson

www.rfberlin.com JULY 2025

An Analysis of Slaveholders According to the 1850 Census

Authors

Barry R. Chiswick, RaeAnn H. Robinson

Reference

JEL Codes: N10, N9, N31

Keywords: Enslaved People, Slaveholders, 1850 Census of Population, Schedule 2 – Slave Inhabitants, Occupations, Gender, Literacy, Nativity

Recommended Citation: Barry R. Chiswick, RaeAnn H. Robinson (2025): An Analysis of Slaveholders According to the 1850 Census. RFBerlin Discussion Paper No. 42/25

Imprint

RFBerlin
ROCKWOOL Foundation Berlin –
Institute for the Economy
and the Future of Work

Gormannstrasse 22, 10119 Berlin
Tel: +49 (0) 151 143 444 67
E-mail: info@rfberlin.com
Web: www.rfberlin.com

7/21/2025

An Analysis of Slaveholders According to the 1850 Census

Barry R. Chiswick*

RaeAnn H. Robinson*

Abstract:

This paper analyzes the characteristics of the free population who were recorded as "owners" of enslaved people in the antebellum Southern states. We utilize the first nationally representative sample linking enslaved and free people - the 1/100 sample microdata files of the 1850 Census of Population from Schedule 1 on free people, and Schedule 2 on the enslaved population - to identify the slaveholders and their slaveholdings. The reduced form regression analyses consider both owning at least one enslaved person, and among slaveholders the number held.

The findings indicate that 90 percent of the enslaved population were reportedly held by free males, that among men this was more likely for those who were married, but among women it was lower for the married, that for both genders slaveholding increased with age, being literate, and having been born in the US. Moreover, it varied by free men's occupation, in part because of the extent of self-employment and in part due to their wealth. While most slaveholders were self-employed farmers, many of the slaveholders were professionals, including clergy, doctors, and lawyers who used enslaved people in their household, in their professional practice, or in the farms/plantations that they also owned.

Keywords: Enslaved People, Slaveholders, 1850 Census of Population, Schedule 2 – Slave Inhabitants, Occupations, Gender, Literacy, Nativity

JEL codes: N10, N9, N31

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the IPUMS team at the Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota – particularly Kari Williams and Matt Nelson – for their assistance in understanding the 1850 Census data files. We also appreciate the participants at the 2023 International Atlantic Economic Society Annual Conference for their helpful comments, in particular Yiyuan Wang, as well as the participants at the 2025 Pennsylvania Economic Association Annual Conference, in particular Gustavo Barboza. We are grateful to Carmel U. Chiswick, Sharon Ann Murphy, and James Oakes for very helpful comments, as well as the editor and the two referees at *Cliometrica*.

*Department of Economics, George Washington University

1. Introduction

Enslaved labor played a pivotal role in the productive capabilities of the early republic. In 1790, the first US Census, enslaved people were reported as living in 15 of the 17 states and territories of the time, comprising 17.8 percent of the total population of the US. Over time, the relative proportion of enslaved people in the US declined to 13.8 percent by 1850 (De Bow, 1853, Table 1, pp. ix). The substantial immigration of Whites from Europe, as well as the barring of legal importation of slaves after January 1, 1808 contributed to this decline. Slavery was gradually abolished in the Northern states and what was then the Northwest Territory (now referred to as parts of the Midwest), though this injunction was not necessarily strictly obeyed (De Bow, 1854, Chapter 5, p. 84). By 1850, only 18 of the 36 states and territories (almost exclusively in the southern US) reported an enslaved population.[1] In 1850 over 3.2 million individuals were enslaved, and providing labor in many forms in both urban and rural areas. The decennial US Census never collected information on the type of labor performed by these enslaved individuals, resulting in a significant oversight in the true labor market activities of the total (free and enslaved) antebellum workforce.

Slavery is a topic that scholars of the nineteenth century United States have grappled with for decades. This pursuit has been hampered by the lack of reliable micro-level data on enslaved people across the slaveholding states, the slave owners, and the slaveholding institution. Qualitative sources "lacked the hard data needed to actually determine the scope and nature" of slavery in the US South, and were neither detached nor objective in their observations (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 51). The quantitative data that exist regarding the details of the lives and work of the slaveholders were often documented by records from large, prosperous plantations that employed dozens to hundreds of slaves and are, therefore, not representative of the institution as a whole.

Only in recent years – over one-and-a-half centuries after emancipation of the enslaved – has nationally representative quantitative data on enslaved peoples in the US become available through the Integrated Public

[1] According to De Bow (1853, p. ix), in the 1850 Census there were only 262 enumerated enslaved persons living outside of the South (in New Jersey and Utah Territory).

Use Microdata Samples (IPUMS), digitized by researchers at the Minnesota Population Center (MPC). Though lacking in detailed information about the occupations or work activities, marital status, nativity, or literacy of the enslaved population – information which was collected on the free people – this data set includes basic demographic variables for the enslaved population (age and gender), as well as the link between the enslaved and the reported slaveholder.[2] This linkage for free and enslaved people in all of the counties in which slavery was legal allows for a more nuanced study of the breadth and variation in the institution of slavery in the southern US. Moreover, it permits a multivariate analysis of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the slaveholders.

The most notorious employment of enslaved labor was in agriculture, particularly cotton and sugar plantations. In discussing the economics of slavery, Peter Coclanis (2010, p. 495) writes: "generally speaking, slaves were employed systematically in activities and in geographic areas where their labor earned or at least was expected to earn rates of return comparable to those possible in sugar or cotton." However, slaveholders spanned a wide demographic – in age, sex, and occupation; slaveholders ranged from plantation owners to merchants, clergymen to surgeons, bakers to tailors, from young girls to old men. What were the characteristics associated with a higher likelihood of a free person being recorded as a slaveholder? What about the size of their slaveholdings (that is, the number of enslaved people in their household)? How did these relationships vary with the occupation and demographic characteristics of the slaveholder? These questions, among others, will be addressed in this paper.

2. Literature Review

The body of literature on the American slave system in the decades before the Civil War is extensive. With such a morality-laden topic with varying ideological and philosophical viewpoints, controversies and critiques of scholarly works on slavery are common. Even those scholars whose works are considered classic,

[2] In addition to the lack of accounting for enslaved labor in mid-nineteenth century records of occupations, female labor was also virtually ignored. The Census asked the occupation of free males since 1850, but asked that of free females starting in 1860. See Chiswick and Robinson (2021) for a discussion of the re-estimation of free female labor market activity in 1860 and Chiswick and Robinson (2024) for an analysis of the substitution between free female labor and enslaved persons in the South in 1860.

making significant contributions to the study of American slavery, such as Eugene Genovese, Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, and James Oakes, present differing viewpoints of the institution of slavery. Whether the slaveholders were motivated by paternalism (as Genovese argues (1969/1988)) or upward mobility and economic gains (the stance of Oakes (1982/1998)), the importance of slavery to the southern economy is evident. On the eve of the Civil War, there were nearly "4 million slaves with a market value estimated to be between $3.1 and $3.6 billion" (Bourne, 2008). The majority of these enslaved workers were engaged in agriculture, particularly on cotton plantations with "close to 60 percent of slaves… involved in one or another aspect of cotton production" (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 95). However, that is not to say that the majority of slaves' labor – even those living on the plantations – was solely agricultural in nature. In fact, "during the last three decades of the antebellum era, slaves were involved in virtually every aspect of southern economic life, both rural and urban" (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 38). Rather than performing exclusively unskilled, drudgery tasks, enslaved labor took many forms, including a small minority of enslaved persons who worked as skilled artisans (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989; Oakes, 1982/1998).

Who, then, were the beneficiaries of these enslaved people's labor? It is neither correct to suppose that all White Southerners were slaveholders nor that slaveholding was a characteristic solely of large plantation owners. It has "long been recognized that southern slave owners were in the minority and that they were by no means a homogenous group" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. xii). In reality, "less than one-quarter of white Southerners held slaves, with half of these holding fewer than five and fewer than 1 percent owning more than one hundred" (Bourne, 2008). Yet, the limited microdata on slaveholders across the Southern states has made a comprehensive, quantitative study of slaveholders in decades immediately preceding the Civil War a challenging undertaking. There have been, however, numerous studies that analyze subsets of the slaveholding population.

Fogel and Engerman (1974/1989) published a landmark quantitative study of slavery that utilizes plantation records, slave narratives, archival census data and the official Census Reports from 1820 to 1860, economic data such as commodity prices and land values, as well as historical documents such as court records. The main objective of their book was to apply mathematical and statistical techniques to history in order to

correct "the traditional characterization of the slave economy" (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 4). One of the findings that Fogel and Engerman highlight as pivotal from their study is that the rate of return on slaves was high and persistent – a rate of return of about "10 percent" based on the market price of enslaved persons, which equaled or exceeded the average rates of return investors could obtain from non-agricultural enterprises (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 70). Their portrayal of Southern slaveholders is that they were "hard, calculating businessmen," economically savvy and profit-seeking (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 73).

There is nuance to slave usage versus slave ownership, in that enslaved persons were also "rented out" either when their labor was not needed or as an income source for their owner. Fogel and Engerman (1989, p. 53) report that "there was an extremely active rental market for slaves" with about "7.5 percent [of the slave labor force as a whole]… on hire at any moment of time" (Fogel and Engerman, 1974/1989, p. 56).[3] Clark (2013, p. 1-2) writes about slave renting in Virginia: "It was common in rural as well as urban areas; in agriculture as well as in manufacturing; in domestic work as well as craft productions…" as well as "middle class households' desire for domestic workers." Jones-Rogers (2019, p. 112) further describes slave-hiring markets as "a highly public family and community affair in which the sale, purchase, and hire of enslaved people took place among "throngs of men, women, and children." She also notes the existence of an "informal" market, particularly related to the circulation of wet-nurses among Southern White women, which took place "largely outside the brick-and-mortar slave market" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. 110).

The distribution of the enslaved population among slaveholders differed between urban and rural areas. In most Southern urban areas, there was "a broad diffusion of ownership, with a large proportion of White families having at least a few" enslaved persons (Wade, 1964, p. 20). In fact, for most of the first half of the nineteenth century, "the percentage of slaveholders in most towns was higher than the surrounding areas" (Wade, 1964, p. 20). A further difference in urban versus rural slavery was the gender distribution of the enslaved. Urban areas increasingly contained an imbalance in which enslaved women far outnumbered the enslaved men, many of whom had been sold to planters. The enslaved population left in the cities was primarily

[3] See also, Barton (1997), Clark (2013), Foshee (1985), and Zaborney (2012) on the rental market for enslaved persons.

more highly skilled enslaved males and enslaved females, who were often employed as domestics (when only one or two per holding) and by physicians, merchants, and clerks (when in larger holdings) (Goldin, 1976, p. 22).

Stephanie Jones-Rogers (2019) studied another subset of slaveholders that is often overlooked, White women. She utilized an extensive body of primary and secondary sources in her work, including court records and legal proceedings, plantation records and account books, and narrative sources such as diaries, correspondence, and interviews of both White women and former enslaved persons. She demonstrates that White women were not passive bystanders in the institution of slavery, but active participants. She focuses specifically on the experiences of married slave-owning women and demonstrates their "fundamental relationship to slavery as a relation of property, a relation that was, above all, economic at its foundation" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. xii-xiii).

Jones-Rogers (2019, p. 25) emphasizes the importance of slave ownership to women in the South at a time when female property ownership was constrained by the legal doctrine of coverture, in which upon marriage, a woman "no longer owned or controlled her property." However, slave-owning White women and their families often took steps to circumvent these constraints, such as through marriage contracts intended to grant a woman "control over all property she already owned or would acquire during her marriage" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. 31). This was important for slave-owning women, as slave-owning parents often "gave enslaved men, women, and children to their young daughters as gifts on special occasions like baptisms, birthdays (especially twenty-first birthdays), holidays, and marriage, or for no reason at all" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. 2). Wills were often written to stipulate that their female heirs would retain ownership of their inherited slaves even if she were married or became married. Ownership of enslaved persons represented a significant source of financial assets for these women, at a time when other opportunities for women accumulating wealth were few. Further, though there were legal restrictions on women's rights in other areas, a woman's legal right to her "human property" was widely recognized (Jones-Rogers, 2019). Coverture laws that granted husbands control over their wife's property were often relaxed in slave states with regards to ownership rights for enslaved people (Wishart and Logan, 2024). Yet, from Jones-Rogers's (2019) study while we learn that white

women owned slaves, we do not learn its prevalence.

We learn more about the prevalence of women owning enslaved people through their activity in the buying and selling of slaves as described in Wishart and Logan (2024). Focusing on the New Orleans market for enslaved peoples, using first names to identify the gender of the participants, they analyze market transaction records, notarized documents of sales, and notices of runaway slaves to study the extent of the participation of White women in the slave trade. They find that White women participated in more than 30 percent of the transactions (as either buyers or sellers) in the New Orleans slave trade overall and in about 40 percent in the trade of enslaved women (Wishart and Logan, 2024). Moreover, this activity by White women was not limited to older widows who inherited slaves from their deceased husbands, but was broad based across the women's age distribution.[4] Yet, New Orleans had its own unique history and it is not obvious that the experience there, while instructive, would represent the experience of White women throughout the South.

Not all enslaved persons were owned by individuals, a subject studied by Jennifer Oast (2016). These institutional slaves were "owned by a group of people united in a common purpose – nonprofit educational and religious organizations, the public (as organized into a state government), and for-profit companies" (Oast, 2016, p. 3). Oast's study highlights the pervasiveness of slavery in the white southern community, even for those individuals who did not own slaves themselves or live in a household with enslaved persons.

Perhaps the most comprehensive quantitative study of slaveholders in the mid-nineteenth century is presented by James Oakes (1982/1998, p. xv) to "establish an accurate portrait of the entire slaveholding class… to demonstrate that the slaveholders were a more diverse group than has generally been appreciated." Oakes undertook a statistical analysis of the southern slaveholders using the 1850 manuscript census returns from ten counties selected "for their diversity and representativeness" (Oakes, 1982/1998, p. 245). A sample of around 50 slaveholders from each county was selected using a random process. He conducted his statistical analysis on only 505 slaveholders and their households, including their demographic information from the

[4] For a *New York Times* article that discusses the research on White women's slave ownership by Jones-Rogers, Wishart and Logan, and other historians, see Swarns (2024).

census returns.

Oakes points out the distinction between the "typical" slave and the "typical" slaveholder; that is, "while the majority of slaves lived on units with more than twenty bondsmen, the majority of slaveholders owned five slaves or fewer" (Oakes, 1982/1998, p. xvi). Therefore, he diverges from the emphasis of studies of slavery on the elite planter class, and instead delves into the identities of the non-elite slaveholders, who made up the majority of the slaveholding class.

This study contributes to the existing literature by providing a broad and thorough analysis of slaveholders through the use of the one-in-a-hundred microdata sample of the entire Southern population in 1850. This allows for the study of a very large sample of who were, and were not, employers of enslaved labor across all of the counties in the Southern states.

3. 1850 Census of Population

The 1850 Census of Population was the first to list free people individually rather than by household (in Schedule 1 for Free Inhabitants). It was also the first to ask occupation, trade, or profession of the individual, although enumerators were instructed to ask this only of free males over the age of 15. Information on enslaved people was collected in a separate schedule of the census: Schedule 2, the Census of Slave Inhabitants and was limited in scope compared to the questions asked on Schedule 1 of free inhabitants. In particular, Schedule 2 did not inquire into the work activities of enslaved peoples.

While the 1850 Census report (De Bow, 1853, 1854) provides a broadly generalized overview of the enslaved population and the industries in which they were employed, [5] in addition to a similar overview of slaveholders, it lacks the detail that can be gleaned from the linkage between slaveholders and the enslaved. Moreover, these 1850 Census reports do not provide a multivariate analysis. The 1850 Census microdata files, therefore, are needed for an in-depth analysis of the relationship between the slaveholder and enslaved

[5] In a note titled "Occupation" De Bow (1854, p. 94) writes that "In no Census have the occupations of slaves been recorded" and then proceeds to estimate the industry (e.g., agriculture, service, etc.) and agricultural crop in which they are employed based on other census data.

populations.

4. A Note on Terminology

Enslaved people were to be listed by "owner" in the 1850 Census Schedule 2 returns. However, the enumerators were instructed to consider "the person in whose family, or on whose plantation, the slave is to be found employed" as the owner, as the main objective was "to get the number of slaves, and not that of masters or owners" (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989, p. 23). This was due, in part, to disagreements between congressmen about the purpose of collecting individual information on enslaved individuals and on their owners, with Southern congressmen concerned that the Census would become "an instrument of abolitionists and antislavery advocates" (Anderson, 2015, p. 58). Once assured that the list of names would not become public, and "not exploited by anti-slavery crusaders," the title heading "slave owner" remained, but the additional language was added for the enumerator to clarify that "a person listed as a "slave owner" could be a landlord or an employer – or even a caretaker, warden, or trustee – rather than the titleholder of the resident slaves" (Van Morgan et al, 2023, p. 5).

That is to say, as stated by De Bow (1853, p. iv and p. xxiii) in the initial 1850 Census report, the data collected in this census was not intended to reflect the legal "ownership" of enslaved persons, but rather indicate the free people (or household) with whom the enslaved persons were "residing" and where they were likely providing labor.[6] Further, the recording of slaveholders may be reflective to some degree of the societal norms or biases prevalent in the often-patriarchal South. Finally, "according to the November 1860 report of the Superintendent of the Census, the 1850 instructions were "not interpreted alike by all who executed them,"" (Nelson et al, 2024, p. 3). For these reasons, and especially considering the rental market for slaves, the term

[6] To address this issue, Goldin (1976, p. 19) "coined the term "usership," which refers to persons either employing their own slaves or hiring those of others." However, this semantic choice does not solve the issue that the enslaved persons are attributed to a single individual despite that other members of the household likely also "used" and may have legally "owned" the enslaved labor.

"slaveholder" rather than "slave owner" is used in this paper.[7]

The purpose of this paper is not to verify whether the identified slaveholders were the legal owners of enslaved persons, but rather to use the large-scale data recently made available to expand on previous studies of slaveholding that used subsets of the 1850 Census data. In fact, the team of researchers that studied and published the IPUMS slave schedule microdata files stated that "one use of the slave datasets will be to investigate slave ownership" (Hacker et al, 2025, p. 5). Further, the identification of "slaveholders" using the 1850 Census microdata files is consistent with previous studies on the topic using the 1850 Census manuscript returns.[8] A thorough discussion of the nuance of slave-ownership, particularly among women and married couples, can be found in Jones-Roger (2019), and detailed examination of the 1850 Census data files as well as the contemporary social and political context can be found in Anderson (2015, Chapter 2) and Nelson et al (2024).

5. Who Were the Enslaved Workers? Descriptive Statistics

There are 26.5 thousand enslaved people included in the 1/100 linked sample of Schedule 1 (Free Population) and Schedule 2 (Enslaved Population) for the 1850 Census.[9] The enslaved people range in age from infants to 125 years old: it is likely that precise age was not known for many enslaved people, which could account for the exaggerated upper ages reported, although there was also a belief among proslavery advocates that "the black race are longer lived," which may have biased the entries (Anderson, 2015, p. 48). Despite that "slaves under [the age of] ten and over sixty [were] seldom employed industrially," they were still required to be of use to their owners (De Bow, 1854, p. 94). For example, enslaved children served as the forced playmates and companions of the children of the slaveholders (Jones-Rogers, 2019). Additional demographic information on the enslaved population, such as marital status, number of children, and nativity,

[7] De Bow (1853, p. iv) recommended that more detail be collected on actual slave ownership in future censuses.

[8] See, for example, Goldin (1976) and Oakes (1982/1998).

[9] For the distribution of the population by enslaved and slaveholder status by state, see Appendix Table A-3.

was not collected in the 1850 Census.[10] There is, therefore, no information on the family relationships among the enslaved population.

Nearly half of the enslaved people in this sample are female. While it might seem that males would have been preferred by slaveholders for their employment in manual labor, enslaved females – particularly those of childbearing age – were highly valuable. As the legal importation of enslaved Africans was abolished in the early nineteenth century (1808), the expansion of the enslaved population depended on "natural" means; as such, slaveholders viewed enslaved females as "sound investments that would augment their wealth with little effort or additional expense" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. 21). This was due to laws that dictated that "whoever owned an enslaved woman also owned her offspring, regardless of who owned the father of the children she bore" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. 21). Enslaved women were also highly valued for a specific type of labor – as wetnurses for the infants of White women (Jones-Rogers, 2019 p. 114). Moreover, they provided domestic or household labor in addition to field labor. That is, enslaved females, not exempt from the heavy toil of forced manual labor, also served in a variety of productive roles that were highly prized by slaveholders. Further, the number of slaveholdings that were exclusively female is almost double the number that were exclusively male (561 versus 294 in the 1/100 sample), primarily in households with three or fewer enslaved people. They were likely primarily household servants.

Over 96 percent of enslaved persons in this sample lived in rural areas, while 76.7 percent lived on reported farms.[11] Enslaved females were less likely to live on farms than enslaved males, though the difference is small (74.9 percent versus 78.4 percent). The majority of enslaved people in this sample were concentrated in four states: Virginia (15.7 percent), Georgia (12.2 percent), South Carolina (11.7 percent), and Alabama (11.1 percent) (see Appendix Table A-3). The ratio of enslaved people to free people by state ranged from a low of 2 per hundred free people (Delaware) to a high of 112 per hundred free people (South Carolina – the

[10] See Logan and Pritchett (2018) for an analysis of the marital status of US slaves, compiled using hospital records.

[11] The apparent discrepancy between this figure and the estimate from the De Bow (1854, p. 94) 1850 Census Report of 84 percent of enslaved persons living in rural areas can be attributed to the difference in the definition of urban and rural areas between the two sources.

only state in which the number of enslaved people was greater than the number of free inhabitants). One-third of enslaved people were part of slaveholdings that were 10 individuals or fewer, while less than 10 percent were part of slaveholdings greater than 100.

For the overwhelming majority (70.1 percent) of enslaved people in this sample, the slaveholder was a self-employed farmer or planter (see Table 1). Under twelve percent of the enslaved individuals were listed under people with no reported occupation, mainly free women and children under the age of 16. Professionals controlled the next largest proportion of enslaved people (7.4 percent), of which the majority were physicians (3.9 percentage points), lawyers and judges (1.8 percentage points), and clergy (either of their own accord or on behalf of their religious institution – 1.2 percentage points). Many were enslaved by managers, officials, and proprietors (5.0 percent of enslaved persons). Craftsmen accounted for employment of 4.1 percent of the enslaved population, and blacksmiths and carpenters held the largest proportions within that group. Farm laborers used the smallest proportion of the enslaved population at only 0.01 percent.

6. Who Were the Slaveholders? Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 compares the demographic characteristics of slaveholders to those of all free people in the South. In the 1/100 linked sample for 1850, just over three thousand individuals were listed as slaveholders (about 4.7 percent of the free population in the US South) (Table 2). Consistent with the information presented in the 1850 Census report (De Bow, 1854, Table XC, p. 95), 58.4 percent of slaveholders in this sample resided in just five states: Virginia (16.2 percent when West Virginia is included, as was the case in 1850), Kentucky (12.3 percent), Georgia (10.9 percent), North Carolina (9.9 percent), and Tennessee (9.1 percent) (Table A-3). The overwhelming majority (92.7 percent) of slaveholders lived in rural areas, the majority of whom lived on a farm (68.1 percentage points). Further, the average slaveholding size was larger in rural areas than urban areas (9.6 enslaved persons versus 4.6 enslaved persons). The sizes of the slaveholdings in this sample are also consistent with the aggregate presented in the 1850 Census report (De Bow, 1854): about one-fifth of slaveholders had only one slave, just over half (55.1 percent) had five or fewer enslaved people, and less one percent were larger than 100 enslaved individuals. Female slaveholders had slighter smaller holding sizes on

average than their male counterparts (8.4 for females versus 9.3), and a higher proportion of the non-farm slaveholders were female (22.8 percent of non-farm slaveholders were female versus only 5.1 percent on farms).

Further, in the 1/100 sample, nearly 17 thousand, or 26.6 percent, of the free population in the South lived in a household with a slaveholder (Table 3). In five states, over one-third of the free population was living in a slaveholding household, illustrating how pervasive the institution of slavery was in the South.

While the majority of listed slaveholders were adults (age 16 and older), a small number of children – as young as one year of age – were listed as slaveholders (see Table 2). In some cases, child slaveholders inherited the slaves from their deceased parents (Zaborney, 2012). Alternatively, this could be due to the practice in the South of slave-owning parents "gifting" to their children human property, which was in some cases done in ritualized affairs and when the children (slaveholders) were only infants (Jones-Rogers, 2019). This was particularly the case for daughters of slaveholders, as slave-owning provided a level of financial security and, in effect, a dowry for women in the South. Although less than 11 percent of slaveholders in the sample were female, 35.3 percent of child slaveholders (under age 16) were female – both an indication of the practice of parents bestowing enslaved persons upon their daughters and the loss of ownership rights (whether legally or just in practice) of married women.

Nearly all of the slaveholders were White, although 20 free non-Whites (including both those recorded as Black and "Mulatto") were also listed as slaveholders in this 1/100 sample (0.6 percent of the slaveholders compared to 3.6 percent of the free Southern population). While 5.0 percent of the free Southern population were foreign born, only 3.1 percent of slaveholders were foreign born, mostly from Ireland (29.5 percent of foreign-born slaveholders), France (21.0 percent), and Germany (17.9 percent). Male slaveholders were far more likely than the average free man to be married, while the reverse is true for female slaveholders – likely due to ownership of enslaved people being defaulted to the husband. Slaveholders, both male and female, were more likely to be literate than the average free person, which is likely due to the association between slave-ownership and social class / socio-economic status.

In 1850, information on occupation was only collected for free males age 16 and over. A difference in occupational distribution certainly existed between slaveholders and non-slaveholders, and even between adult males living in slaveholding houses and those living in non-slaveholding houses (Table 4). Almost 97 percent of adult male slaveholders have a listed gainful occupation (see Table 4, Column 1). The most common occupation was being a farmer (owner or tenant) (70.0 percent), followed by craftsmen (10.1 percent), managers, officials, and proprietors (primarily owners of establishments) (7.6 percent), physicians (2.6 percent), and clergy (1.5 percent).[12] While 70.0 percent of slaveholders were farmers, the same is true of only 48.7 percent of all free males in the South. Similarly, professionals and managers (i.e., clergymen, lawyers, physicians, and proprietors) – who were more likely to be self-employed than to be hired workers – were more common occupations among slaveholders than the overall free adult male population in the South.

7. Explanatory Variables and Hypotheses

The determinants of slaveholder status analyzed here will consider two dimensions: first, whether or not a free person reported holding at least one enslaved person (a dichotomous variable equal to one if slaves are attributed to that individual, and zero otherwise); and, second, among those reporting at least one enslaved person, the number of enslaved persons in the holding. The analysis will be computed overall and separately by gender because nearly all of those reported in the census as slaveholders in the southern states are males (about 90 percent), and because the determinants of reported ownership may differ by gender.

Marital Status

According to laws regarding property ownership in marriage and the custom at the time, the property

[12] It is not possible to determine whether the enslaved persons reported as owned by clergymen were their personal property, or that of their church/religious institution. A denomination was listed for three-quarters of the clergymen who were reported slaveholders. Of those, half were Methodist, one-quarter were Baptist, and the remainder were Presbyterian, Lutheran, Episcopalian, and Jewish.

of a woman reverted to her husband at the time of marriage, referred to as coverture laws. [13] There were exceptions to this – prenuptial contracts could specify that the wife retains ownership of the property, including enslaved people under her ownership at the time of marriage, and individuals (especially fathers and widowed mothers) could specify in their wills that their female heirs retain ownership of the property (including enslaved peoples) that they inherit (Jones-Rogers, 2019). While such contracts have been studied extensively, they appear to be the exception rather than the norm. Moreover, in a family's reporting of ownership for social reasons there would be a tendency to report all the enslaved peoples of a family as being owned by the family head, which would generally be an adult male if one was present. This has implications for the effect of marital status on reported slave ownership by gender – females recorded as slaveholders are more likely to be unmarried, either because they were young and had not yet married, or were older and were never married or widowed, while a positive association between being married and slaveholding is expected for men. The Minnesota Population Center imputed data on marital status only permits the identification of persons who were currently married, spouse present in the household, in contrast to all other marital statuses (never married, divorced, widowed, or married but living separately).

Age

Enslaved people were assets for the household and it would be expected that asset ownership would increase with age, in part because of inheritance from deceased older relatives (primarily parents) and also because of their own asset accumulation as a population ages.

Education

Aside from occupation, the only other information on the human capital of free people in the 1850 Census is whether or not those age 20 and over were self-reported as "illiterate," that is, "cannot read and

[13] As a result, "in the south, slave-owning women possessed the kind of wealth that prospective suitors and planters in training hoped to acquire or have at their disposal" (Jones-Rogers, 2019, p. xiv). Slave-ownership acted as a type of dowry for southern women. However, many married female slave-owners refused to give up rights to the enslaved people they brought to the marriage, and sought to maintain control of them – in both a legal and physical sense (Jones-Rogers, 2019). In addition, these coverture practices would discourage wealthy slave-holding widows from remarrying.

write," where literacy could be in any language and the degree of literacy was not reported. In the data under study, about 20 percent of the free people age 20 and over were reported as illiterate, 15 percent for men and 25 percent for women. It is expected that the illiterate were poorer and of a lower social class, making it less likely they would have the capital necessary to buy (or rent) and maintain enslaved workers.

Nativity

The free population of the US was predominantly native-born in 1850, though immigration had increased over the first half of the nineteenth century, especially in the 1840s.[14] The immigrants in 1850, five percent of the free Southern population, predominantly from the British Isles and Germany, would have been less acculturated into the American slave system, and therefore less likely to be slaveholders. Moreover, most of the free foreign born in the US in 1850 were relatively recent immigrants from Europe, either fleeing poverty (particularly the Irish) or as political refugees (particularly the Germans), and would have come to the US with few assets and would have been in the US for too little time to accumulate the assets needed to purchase and maintain enslaved workers (Ferrie, 1999).

Agriculture

It is also hypothesized that slaveholding would vary by the occupation of and self-employment status of the free adult men. Since, with very few exceptions, enslaved workers were not paid "wages" (in money or in kind) in accordance with their productivity, shirking on the job by enslaved persons was a rational way for them to respond and this "quiet non-cooperation" was one of their few forms of resistance to the oppression. This, therefore, required more policing by their owner or his/her agent than would be necessary for free hired wage workers. Policing is less costly if slaves can be easily monitored, as would be the case for household servants and for field workers doing simple repetitive observable tasks in groups. Policing would be more costly if enslaved workers were left to their own devices or if they operated machinery that was easy to damage and expensive to repair. This suggests that slave ownership would be more profitable if slaves engaged in field

[14] For an analysis of the occupational attainment of the foreign-born population of the US in the antebellum period using the Census microdata files, see Chiswick and Robinson (2024).

work with other slaves, rather than engaged in the newly emerging factories of the time. This generates the hypothesis that households are more likely to utilize at least one slave if they are either a wealthy urban household, employing a small number of slaves as domestic or business help, or a rural farm household. In terms of holding size, it is expected to be significantly larger in rural farm households than in other households.

It is expected that the likelihood of slave ownership, as well as the size of the slave holdings, would vary with the primary agricultural crops of the area in which the free individual resides. While we do not know the particular crops grown on individual farms, we control for this indirectly through crop production at the county level and state fixed effects. Agricultural production by county is included in the model for the five main staple cash crops of the south – hemp, rice, sugar (cane sugar and cane molasses), tobacco, and cotton (Haines, et al., 2018). Areas in which sugar, in particular, as well as cotton and tobacco to a lesser extent, are produced are expected to utilize more enslaved labor, and thus be home to more slaveholders and larger slaveholdings.

Non-Farm Self-Employment

Among men not reported as being farmers, reported ownership of slaves would be more likely among those who are self-employed, compared to those who are likely to be hired wage or salary workers. This is because business owners would be the responsible party for all enslaved persons engaged in their place of work. Further, self-employed individuals would generally be those that have accumulated more assets (in comparison to their hired workers) and would therefore also be more likely to have the capital necessary to purchase enslaved persons and the income necessary to provide for the daily needs of enslaved workers for their personal/household or business use.

Self-employment status is not recorded in the 1850 Census. However, slaveholding among non-farmers would be hypothesized to be more likely among merchants (managers, proprietors) and self-employed craftsmen who are likely to employ one or more enslaved persons, especially for physically demanding tasks (e.g., blacksmiths and carpenters, in contrast to sedentary crafts such as goldsmiths or silversmiths). Least likely to be slaveholders would be hired workers, including farm and non-farm laborers, clerical and sales

workers, service workers, and those who do not report an occupation. Professionals, with the exception of clergy, would have more higher income earners and would have engaged enslaved persons in support of their business or as household servants. Enslaved persons attached to clergy may either be legally owned by the clergyman or owned by the church where the clergyman officiates, increasing the likelihood and size of slaveholding among the clergy.

Moreover, higher income merchants and professionals may also own farms or plantations, which employed enslaved workers. In the social circles of the slave-holding Southern states, owning a plantation with many slaves was by itself an indication of social standing and a source of prestige. That is, there was "conspicuous consumption" value from slave ownership among wealthy merchants and professionals, over and above their productive labor.

State Fixed Effects

State fixed effects are included in the analyses to control for differences in climate, proximity to navigable rivers and ports, land and soil quality, proximity to free states, state history, state legislation, and other unmeasured factors that might influence slaveholding that vary across the states. Recall that 1850 was a time of intense debate over federal versus state rights, when much legislation was still determined at the state level. The regulation of slaves (and other property rights) was a power reserved for the states under the Constitution, so that the federal government would only interfere to protect the rights of the owners (Huston, 1999; Finkelman, 2012).

8. Regression Analysis of Slaveholders

This section presents the multivariate statistical analysis of slaveholders. These are reduced form equations. It is possible that some of the explanatory variables may be endogenous to slaveholding, but there are not suitable instrumental variables available given the limited data collected and a lagged variable is not possible due to the single cross section format of the data to correct for this potential endogeneity. Two separate equations are estimated. First, logit analysis is used to determine which characteristics are associated with a greater likelihood of a free individual being a slaveholder in the South in 1850 (where the dichotomous

dependent variable is equal to one for being a slaveholder). Then, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis is used to study the relationship between the size of their holdings among slaveholders and their demographic characteristics. There is a positive skewness in the frequency distribution of slaveholding.[15] As a result, the dependent variable is the natural logarithm of the number of enslaved persons recorded for each slaveholder.[16]

A limitation of this two-step procedure is that the number of enslaved peoples may not be independent of the decision to be a slaveholder. The same explanatory variables appear to be significant in both equations which precludes finding instrumental variables for estimating a selection correction model. This limitation may bias estimates of the partial effects.

In all cases, the sample of slaveholders is limited to free people age 20 and over living in the Southern states, as this encompasses the vast majority of slaveholders and as certain of the explanatory variables (literacy and occupation) were not recorded for younger individuals.

See Appendix A for a detailed explanation of the data and variables used in the regression analyses. See Appendix B for the full regression analysis tables. Table 5 reports a summary of the basic regression results, separately by gender of the slaveholder.

[15] Frequency Distribution of Number of Enslaved Persons by Slaveholder, 1850 Census, Percents

Number of Enslaved Persons per Holding	Slaveholders		Enslaved	
	Percent	Cum. Percent	Percent	Cum. Percent
0-1 [a]	19.9	19.9	2.2	2.2
2-5	35.2	55.1	12.7	14.9
6-10	21.2	76.3	17.9	32.8
11-30	18.0	94.3	33.5	66.3
31-100	5.1	99.4	25.0	91.3
101-199	0.5	99.9	6.7	98.0
200 or More	0.1	100.0	2.0	100.0
Sample Size:	3,033		26,498	

[a] A small percentage (0.76 percentage points) of individuals listed as slaveholders in this sample had no enslaved persons attributed to them. They are excluded from the OLS regression analysis of the size of slaveholdings.
Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

[16] Essentially similar results emerge if the absolute number of enslaved persons recorded for each slaveholder is the dependent variable. These regression results are available upon request (Appendix Table C-1).

8.1 The Likelihood of Being a Slaveholder

The results of the logit analysis, where the dichotomous dependent variable is equal to unity for slaveholders, 0 otherwise, illustrate typical characteristics of slaveholders in the South (see Table 5 or see Appendix Table B-1 for details). Free females were significantly less likely than their male counterparts to be recorded as slaveholders, all else equal (Appendix Table B-1, Column 1). Older free people were more likely than their younger counterparts to be slaveholders, although among women the age gradient is flatter than for men (Table 5, Columns 1 and 2). Being married significantly increases the likelihood of being a slaveholder among males, while the effect is negative and statistically significant among females. Slaveholders were far more likely to be native born than foreign born, and to be literate rather than illiterate, though in both cases this difference is much smaller in magnitude among females. These findings are consistent with the hypotheses developed in Section 7.

If there is no control for occupation, free men were less likely to be slaveholders if they lived in urban rather than rural areas, while women in urban and rural households were equally as likely to be slaveholders (Table 5, Columns 1 and 2). However, when controls are added for occupational categories, including farming (the benchmark), there is no difference in the probability of being a slaveholder among free men living in urban and rural areas. That is, free men who are not farmers are equally as likely to be slaveholders if they live in urban or rural areas (Appendix Table B-1, Column 4).

Men who are more likely to be self-employed, that is, who are employed as clergy, lawyers and judges, physicians, and managers, officials, and proprietors, are more likely than farmers to be slaveholders, all else equal (Appendix Table B-1, Column 4). It is not known if their slaves were used in their business activities, as household or childcare servants, or in secondary employments or businesses. Those in the heterogeneous category "other professionals" (primarily teachers, as well as pharmacists, dentists, and editors) were as likely as farmers to be slaveholders. However, men reporting occupations in other categories (craft, farm and non-farm laborers, clerical/sales, service, and no occupation reported) are significantly less likely than farmers to be slaveholders, all other characteristics the same, as they were less likely to be self-employed.

The prevalence of slaveholding varies across the South, even after controlling for the demographic characteristics of slaveholders (Appendix Table B-1, Column 4). Free men living in Virginia and in the Deep South (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas) are associated with a higher likelihood of being a slaveholder than among comparable males living in Kentucky, the benchmark. On the other hand, living in the border regions (District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Tennessee, Missouri, and Arkansas) is associated with a lower likelihood of being a slaveholder than for those living in Kentucky.

There were no female slaveholders in Delaware, Florida, or the District of Columbia. Among other states, free women living in Texas were significantly more likely, and those living in Maryland or what is now West Virginia were significantly less likely, to be slaveholders than women living in other parts of the South.

As farming was such a prevalent occupation in the 1850 economy (the recorded occupation of almost half of all adult men, and 70 percent of adult slaveholding men, see Table 4), it is useful to also conduct the analysis separately for farmers and non-farmers (Appendix Table B-1, Columns 5 and 6). While the results are consistent between the two groups in terms of the signs of the partial effects of the demographic variables, the magnitudes and statistical significance differ.

Occupational categories are included in the analysis among the men who are not farmers (Appendix Table B-1, Column 5), with managers, officials, and proprietors as the benchmark. The results reinforce the idea that the self-employed were more likely to be slaveholders than wage and salary workers. Clergy, lawyers and judges, and physicians – all groups which were more likely to be slaveholders when compared to farmers in Appendix Table B-1, Column 4 – are equally as likely as those in the proprietor group to be slaveholders when farmers are excluded. However, craftsmen, laborers, clerical/sales, service workers, and those with no reported occupation remain significantly less likely to be slaveholders.

Among farmers, there is a steep age gradient in which older men are significantly more likely than their younger counterparts to be slaveholders, which could arise because large-scale plantation farming was often a family business and the ownership of enslaved persons – and other assets – was more likely to be

attributed to the oldest male family member (Appendix Table B-1, Columns 5 and 6). In contrast, among non-farmers, while the youngest men were less likely to be slaveholders, the likelihood of slaveholding increasing with age was more muted.

Being foreign-born had a significantly negative effect on the likelihood of reported slaveholding among non-farmers, while it was negative but not significant among farmers. Less than 2 percent of farmers were foreign born, and those that were foreign born were much less likely to be engaged in large-scale plantation agriculture. Being illiterate is associated with a much lower likelihood of slaveholding among farmers – likely due to the positive correlation between literacy and wealth – while the effect was also negative but much smaller in magnitude among non-farmers. Finally, among farmers, geography seemed to play a much larger role in the likelihood of slaveholding; living in the Cotton Belt – Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and parts of Virginia – is associated with a significantly higher likelihood of slaveholding among farmers. Among non-farmers, location seemed to have less of an effect, with the exception of the border states in which slaveholding was less likely, even when other variables are held constant.

County-level agricultural production levels for five major cash crops are added to the logit equation, which is restricted to adult free men who were recorded as farmers (Appendix Table B-1, Column 7). The five major cash crops are hemp, rice, sugar, tobacco, and cotton. When this is done, the demographic variables retain their signs and significance in the analysis for farmers (Appendix Table B-1, Columns 6 and 7), except that living in an urban area now has a positive but barely significant effect. Urban-dwelling farmers were likely wealthy men who reported their occupation as farmers/planters but lived in an urban area as an absentee landowner.

The greater the production of the five major cash crops in the county of residence, the more likely was the farmer to be a slaveholder (Appendix Table B-1, Column 7). Non-slaveholding farmers in the South in 1850 had family-operated, small, self-sufficient farms that were more focused on food crops for family use, such as corn and wheat.

8.2 Determinants of Slaveholding Sizes

Slaveholdings in this sample ranged in size from 1 enslaved person to 330 enslaved persons. Although the majority of slaveholdings were small (55.1 percent of slaveholders had five or fewer enslaved persons), there were also many larger holdings. Using ordinary least squares (OLS) analysis, this section analyzes how the natural logarithm of the size of their holdings relate to their demographic and economic characteristics, with a particular emphasis on their occupations.

The majority of reported adult free women slaveholders owned 5 or fewer enslaved persons, were the head of their own household (85 percent), were not currently married (95 percent), and lived in a home with their own children (73 percent). Though occupation was not required to be recorded for women, it was listed for almost 14 percent of female slaveholders – almost all of whom were recorded as farmers/planters.[17]

Table 6 shows the distribution of enslaved people by the occupational category of the male slaveholders. As mentioned previously, the majority of enslaved persons were held by farmers (70.1 percent, Table 1). However, the average size of slave holdings for farmers was relatively small; there were a substantial number of smaller farms that employed no or only a few enslaved persons that counterbalanced the large plantations where hundreds of enslaved persons labored (Table 6). Seventy-eight percent of Southern free farmers (owners, tenants, and managers) had no slaves, and another 8 percent had only one to three. Less than one-half of a percent held 50 or more enslaved people. There were only three occupations in Table 6 in which eleven percent or more of the free men held 11 or more enslaved people – clergy, lawyers and judges, and physicians. Physicians had the highest average holding size; however, in looking at the occupational string data, two individuals who had significantly large holdings (more than 100 enslaved persons) were coded by the IPUMS team as physicians, but their occupation written by the enumerators was "physician and planter" indicating they were also a wealthy farmer or plantation owner. Only 0.5 percent of free men held more than

[17] The reported labor force participation rate (measured by whether an occupation was reported in the census) of free women was very low in the antebellum period, only 16 percent in 1860, the first census to ask for the occupation of women (Chiswick and Robinson, 2021).

50 slaves, while the overwhelming majority (70.9 percent of adult free men) were not recorded as slaveholders.

The results of the regression analysis of the natural logarithm of the size of slaveholdings among adult slaveholders are reported in summary fashion in Table 5 and in detail in Appendix Table B-2, separately by gender. The size of the slaveholding increased with the slaveholder's age, as expected, similar to other asset accumulation. Among women, this effect is not significant except among the older age groups – those 45 and older – who were more likely to be widows to whom their late husband's property passed and for whom coverture practices discouraged remarriage. In general, female slaveholders had significantly smaller holdings than their male counterparts, all else equal. Similarly, illiteracy was associated with smaller slaveholdings among males, but had no significant effect on holding size among females. Foreign-born slaveholders, whether male or female, had a smaller number of enslaved persons, on average, than their native-born counterparts, all else equal . In all cases, slaveholders in urban areas had significantly fewer slaves than those in rural areas, likely due to economies of scale in plantation farming and urban space constraints. Slaveholding sizes for men were largest in the Cotton Belt states, though among female slaveholders, geographic location was not associated with differences in holding sizes. Thus, the hypotheses discussed in Section 6 are largely consistent with the data.

Surprisingly, being currently married (and enumerated in the same household as their spouse) was associated with significantly lower holding sizes among male slaveholders, while it had a positive but statistically insignificant effect among female slaveholders. That is, married men were more likely than their currently unmarried counterparts to be slaveholders, but their average holdings were smaller (Appendix Tables B-1 and B-2). This is a robust finding for men as it appeared in various alternative specifications of the slaveholding equation. The data support possible explanations. First, a higher proportion of unmarried slaveholding men, particularly among the larger holdings (greater than 20 enslaved persons), were unrelated to the head of the household; it is possible that these men were the overseers or managers of the estates and were enumerated at their place of employment. Second, the majority of the currently unmarried slaveholding men were over the age of 50; they may have been widowers and inherited enslaved persons of their deceased wives that were added to their own holdings. In total, only about 15 percent of adult male slaveholders were

unmarried (defined as not currently married or not living with their wife), whereas just under half of all adult men were unmarried. However, among the adult males with the largest holdings, the proportion of currently unmarried men increases to more than 22 percent, likely due to a combination of the two above factors – the recording of the large plantation manager as the slaveholder, and the higher likelihood of older men being widowers.

Among males, the analysis of slaveholding sizes can also include their reported occupation. The results for demographic variables remain unchanged when including occupation (Appendix Table B-2, Column 4). Only physicians have significantly larger slaveholding sizes than farmers (the benchmark), all else equal. Slaveholding men in most other occupations report smaller holdings compared to farmers, especially among craftsmen, non-farm laborers, service workers, and those with no occupation reported. When the analysis is restricted to non-farming slaveholders (Appendix Table B-2, Column 5), with managers, proprietors, and officials as the benchmark, only physicians had significantly larger holdings, whereas craftsmen and service workers had smaller holdings, all else equal. Given that physician is their only or first reported occupation, these may well be gentlemen farmers.

When the five staple cash crops are added to the analysis (Appendix Table B-2, Column 7), the demographic results are again largely unchanged. However, there is a positive relationship between local agricultural output and slaveholding sizes among farmers for four of the crops – hemp, sugar, cotton, and tobacco.[18] These crops were common on plantations and for large-scale farming, in which enslaved labor was most efficient and brought the highest returns.

To summarize, among adult male slaveholders, an increase in the number of enslaved persons was associated with their being older, unmarried, literate, being a physician, and living in a rural area particularly in the Cotton Belt / Deep South, as opposed to the border states. These results, except possibly for marital status for men, are consistent with the hypotheses in Section 7.

[18] When the number of enslaved persons per holding is the dependent variable, rice production is positively associated with the size of the holding, but hemp production is no longer statistically significant.

9. Summary and Conclusions

This paper uses multivariate statistical analysis to study the characteristics of slaveholders in the US antebellum period for all of the counties in the South, with a substantially larger dataset than had previously been available. It does this by analyzing the linked slaveholder-enslaved person one-in-a-hundred (1/100) microdata sample from the 1850 Census of Population. One of the benefits of using a large random sample of the entire Southern population is that the results are not restricted to an analysis of descriptive statistics, one-way or cross-tabulations, limited to a particular crop (e.g., cotton), or limited to small samples in a few selected counties. Reduced form multivariate regression analysis is employed to study how various demographic, economic, agricultural, and geographic variables are associated with the likelihood of a free person being a slaveholder (logit analysis) and, if so, the size of their slaveholding (OLS analysis), controlling for other variables.

Among adult (age 20 and older) free males living in the South, only 17.8 percent were reported as slaveholders, compared to only 2.3 percent for adult free females. The average slaveholder was middle age (25 to 44 years old, with an average age of 43.6 years), male (89.1 percent), White (99.4 percent), native born (96.9 percent), and literate (95.5 percent for males and 89.5 percent for females). The average slaveholding size was about 9 enslaved persons, but the majority (55 percent) of slaveholders owned 5 or fewer enslaved persons. Very few of the slaveholders (2 percent) owned 50 or more slaves. Seventy percent of the adult male slaveholders were farmers – as owner, manager, or tenant.

Slaveholding patterns differed – in both likelihood and size of slaveholdings – by gender. Free women were less likely to be slaveholders and had smaller slaveholdings on average. Being married was associated with a lower likelihood of owning slaves among free women, likely due to property ownership laws and customs at the time (coverture). Free women in urban areas were as likely as their rural counterparts to be reported as slaveholders. Reported slave ownership was more likely among free women living in Texas and less likely among those living in the border states of Maryland and present-day West Virginia. The size of slaveholdings was largely unrelated to women's demographic and other characteristics, except that it was

smaller for women in urban areas.

The analysis in this study suggests that about ten percent of slaveholders were female, and that among slaveholders their average holdings were smaller than among males.[19] Just as there was a tendency to underreport in the 1860 Census the labor market activity of free women in the antebellum period (see Chiswick and Robinson, 2021), at least in part due to social norms, there may have been a tendency to underreport their slaveholdings, giving preference to their husbands, in the 1850 Census. Further, Census enumerators themselves may have tender to attribute people enslaved by a household to the presumed male head of the household. Further research will be needed to sort through these and possibly other hypotheses regarding the apparent difference in the rate of women in the slave transaction data and the census data.

Free men were more likely to be slaveholders and, if so, to have larger holding sizes as they aged. However, this was largely driven by the patterns for farmers, in which large, family-operated plantations influenced the results. Among non-farmers, though the youngest adult men were less likely to be slaveholders (probably due to a lack of asset accumulation), the reported slaveholding likelihood and size of slaveholding did not increase significantly with age among middle age and older men. The size of slaveholdings does not vary significantly with occupation among men who were not farmers, all else constant, with the exception of physicians having larger holding sizes on average, primarily because some of them have a secondary occupation as plantation owners. Living in counties with higher production of the main cash crops that experienced economies of scale – cotton, tobacco, and especially sugar – is associated with a greater likelihood of a free man being a slaveholder and having more enslaved people.

To summarize the results of the multivariate analysis, other variables the same, the likelihood of a free

[19] The study by Wishart and Logan (2024) of the New Orleans slave market suggests that about 30 percent of slave transactions involved a woman as either buyer or seller, using given names to identify gender. This discrepancy may be due to several factors: the New Orleans slave market may not be representative of transactions throughout the South because of the unique history of New Orleans and Louisiana, and its late incorporation in the US; there may have also been a difference in the turnover to stock ratio of enslaved persons for the same stock by the gender of the slaveholder (i.e., women may have been more active in slave transactions for the same stock of enslaved people). Moreover, the 30 percent of transactions in which woman are either buyers or sellers implies that women were much less likely to be 30 percent of buyers and much less likely to be 30 percent of sellers.

individual being a slaveholder increased if they were male, older, native-born, married, literate, likely self-employed, and living in an urban area in the Deep South. Among slaveholders, an increase in the number of enslaved persons per holding was associated with being male, older, literate, likely self-employed, and living in a rural area particularly in the Cotton Belt / Deep South, as opposed to the border states. These results are consistent with the hypotheses developed in Section 7.

The results of this first comprehensive, quantitative analysis on a large, nationally representative microdata sample from the 1850 Census Southern states show how pervasive the slavery system truly was in the South in the decades before the Civil War. While a large number of slaveholders fit the profile of the stereotypical slaveowner – an older, white, native-born, married male who utilized enslaved labor on his plantation, growing sugar, cotton, or tobacco for sale – there were slaveholders that were the opposite of that archetype in every respect – young, female, foreign born, unmarried, clergymen, physicians, lawyers, and craftsmen. Indeed, slaveholding was more prevalent among those in occupations in which self-employment was the norm. Further, while less than five percent of the free population in the South were reported slaveholders, over one-quarter lived in slaveholding households, and in several states this increased to almost 40 percent. The institution of slavery was not only connected to the slaveholders themselves, but also with other individuals living in their households and non-slaveholding households, and, as a result, the larger economy of the South, and the US economy as a whole.

Tables

Table 1

Distribution of Enslaved People by Occupational Category of Slaveholders, Southern States, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

Occupational Category of Slaveholder	Percent of Enslaved People	Average Number of Enslaved People per Holding	Average Proportion of Enslaved Females per Holding
Professionals			
Clergy	1.2	8.9	0.6
Lawyers/Judges	1.8	12.9	0.6
Physicians	3.9	17.0	0.6
Other Professionals	0.5	5.7	0.6
Farmers	70.1	10.2	0.5
Managers, Proprietors, Officials (n.e.c.)	5.0	6.7	0.6
Craftsmen	4.1	4.4	0.6
Farm Laborers	0.01	15.5	0.5
Non-Farm Laborers	0.5	4.4	0.5
Clerical/Sales	0.6	8.3	0.7
Service	0.2	2.9	0.8
Non-Occupation/None	11.6	8.6	0.6
Total	100.0	9.2	0.5
Sample Size	26,498	3,033	3,033

Note: Farmers includes farm owners, tenants, and managers. Does not include farm laborers. Managers, Proprietors, and Officials (n.e.c.) were primarily merchants, store or tavern keepers, or grocers. Non-occupation includes students, retired, and other non-occupations (e.g., esquire, none), as well as males under the age of 16 and all female slaveholders. Column 1 may not add to total due to rounding.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Demographic Characteristics of Free People, by Slaveholding Status, Southern States, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	All Free People		Slaveholders	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gender:				
Male	33,389	51.4	2,702	89.1
Female	31,563	48.6	331	10.9
Total	64,952	100.0	3,033	100.0
Race:				
White	62,622	96.4	3,013	99.4
Black	1,424	2.2	7	0.2
"Mulatto"	906	1.4	13	0.4
Total	64,952	100.0	3,033	100.0
Nativity (Country of Birth):				
United States	61,678	95.0	2,938	96.9
Foreign Born	3274	5.0	95	3.1
Total	64,952	100.0	3,033	100.0
Location:				
Urban	6,637	10.2	222	7.3
Rural Non-Farm	17,393	26.8	747	24.6
Rural Farm	40,922	63.0	2,064	68.1
Total	64,952	100.0	3,033	100.0
Age:				
Under Age 16	30,313	46.7	17	0.6
16-24	12,143	18.7	139	4.6
25-44	15,078	23.2	1,549	51.1
45-64	5,986	9.2	1,070	35.3
65 and Over	1,432	2.2	258	8.5
Total	64,952	100.0	3,033	100.0
Marital Status for Males (age 16 and older):				
Married, Spouse Present	9,380	52.5	2,279	84.7
Other	8,488	47.5	412	15.3
Total	17,868	100.0	2,691	100.0
Marital Status for Females (age 16 and older):				
Married, Spouse Present	9,372	55.9	15	4.6
Other	7,399	44.1	310	95.4
Total	16,771	100.0	325	100.0
Literacy for Males (age 20 and older):				
Yes	12,865	85.2	2,561	95.5
No	2,226	14.8	120	4.5
Total	15,091	100.0	2,681	100.0
Literacy for Females (age 20 and older):				
Yes	10,343	74.8	290	89.5
No	3,484	25.2	34	10.5
Total	13,827	100.0	324	100.0

Note: Detail may not add to total due to rounding.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table 3
Distribution of Slaveholders by Southern State, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

State	Percentage of Slaveholders	Percentage of State Free Population that were Slaveholders	Percentage of State Free Population Living in Slaveholding Household
Alabama	8.0	5.6	34.2
Arkansas	1.6	3.0	17.5
Delaware	0.3	0.9	7.5
District of Columbia	0.3	1.9	12.4
Florida	0.8	4.5	24.2
Georgia	10.9	6.4	36.2
Kentucky	12.3	4.8	27.6
Louisiana	4.8	5.4	26.1
Maryland	4.5	2.7	17.2
Mississippi	6.4	6.9	39.4
Missouri	5.3	2.6	16.4
North Carolina	9.9	5.3	27.8
South Carolina	7.3	8.0	39.8
Tennessee	9.1	3.5	20.9
Texas	2.2	4.4	26.0
Virginia	15.0	6.9	39.4
West Virginia	1.2	1.3	7.8
Total (All States)	100.0	4.7	26.6
Sample Size	3,033	64,952	64,952

Note: While Virginia in 1850 included what became West Virginia in 1861, they were identified separately in the IPUMS microdata file.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table 4

Occupational Distribution of Free Males, Age 16 and Older, by Southern State, by Slaveholding Status, Percents, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	(1) Slaveholders	(2) Non-Slaveholders, in Slaveholding Household	(3) Non-Slaveholders, in Non-Slaveholding Household	(4) All
Professionals				
Clergy	1.5	0.4	0.4	0.5
Lawyers/Judges	1.4	0.9	0.2	0.5
Physicians	2.6	1.7	0.4	0.9
Other Professionals	0.9	2.0	0.9	1.1
Farmers	70.0	30.1	47.8	48.7
Managers, Proprietors, Officials (n.e.c.)	7.6	4.0	2.8	3.7
Craftsmen	10.1	13.9	17.4	15.8
Farm Laborers	0.2	10.0	4.9	4.9
Non-Farm Laborers	1.1	4.7	11.7	9.1
Clerical/Sales	1.0	5.1	1.5	1.9
Service	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.9
Non-Occupation/None	3.1	26.6	11.0	12.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample Size	2,691	2,529	12,597	17,868

Note: Farmers includes farm owners, tenants, and managers. Does not include farm laborers. Managers, Proprietors, and Officials (n.e.c.) were primarily merchants, store keepers, tavern keepers, and grocers. Non-occupation includes students, retired, and other non-occupations (e.g., esquire, none). Columns may not add to total due to rounding.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table 5
Abridged Results of Regression Analysis of Slaveholders, Ages 20 and Older, by Gender, Southern States, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	Slaveholder or Not		Natural Logarithm of Enslaved Persons Among Slaveholders	
	Females	Males	Females	Males
Age less than 25	-0.0104***	-0.143***	0.70	-0.30**
	(-5.82)	(-14.78)	(1.54)	(-2.69)
Age 45 to 64	0.00839***	0.0548***	0.32*	0.34***
	(6.91)	(9.91)	(2.18)	(7.43)
Age 65 and greater	0.00622***	0.0749***	0.59**	0.47***
	(4.56)	(7.52)	(3.00)	(5.82)
Foreign Born	-0.00576**	-0.110***	-1.02*	-0.40**
	(-2.58)	(-8.96)	(-2.51)	(-3.24)
Married	-0.0195***	0.114***	0.12	-0.30***
	(-11.25)	(18.25)	(0.31)	(-4.92)
Illiterate	-0.00781***	-0.183***	-0.21	-0.77***
	(-5.89)	(-18.79)	(-1.01)	(-7.61)
Urban	0.000130	-0.0267**	-0.63**	-0.42***
	(0.10)	(-2.66)	(-3.12)	(-4.66)
Sample Size	13,373	15,091	300	2,614

Note: Benchmark age group is age 25 to 44, and state fixed effects are held constant.

Note for slaveholder regressions: Logit regression model; coefficients are marginal effects at the mean (MEM); t-statistics in parentheses. ***, **, and * represent statistical significance at the 0.1 percent, 1 percent, and 5 percent levels, respectively. Includes all free individuals, age 20 and older, separately by gender.

Note for natural logarithm of number of enslaved persons regressions: OLS regression model; t-statistics in parentheses. ***, **, and * represent statistical significance at the 0.1 percent, 1 percent, and 5 percent levels, respectively. Includes census-designated slaveholders age 20 and older, with a positive number of enslaved persons attributed to them, separately by gender.

Source: Full regression equations reported in Appendix Tables B-1, Columns 2 and 3, and B-2, Columns 2 and 3.

Table 6

Distribution of Ownership of Enslaved People by Occupation of Free Men, Age 16 and Older, Southern States, Percents, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

Occupation	Number of Slaves						Sample Size	Percent of Sample
	0	1-3	4-10	11-50	More than 50	Total		
Professionals								
Clergy	57.3	17.7	13.5	9.4	2.1	100.0	96	0.5
Lawyers/Judges	55.8	12.8	19.8	10.5	1.2	100.0	86	0.5
Physicians	58.4	11.2	18.6	8.7	3.1	100.0	161	0.9
Other Professionals	87.1	5.7	5.7	1.6	0.0	100.0	194	1.1
Farmers	78.8	7.6	7.8	5.4	0.4	100.0	8,850	49.5
Managers, Proprietors, Officials (nec)	69.3	13.2	13.1	4.0	0.5	100.0	657	3.7
Craftsmen	78.0	10.7	7.1	2.8	0.4	100.0	2,843	15.9
Farm Laborers	99.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0	922	5.2
Non-Farm Laborers	98.3	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	100.0	1,661	9.3
Clerical/Sales	92.5	2.9	3.2	1.4	0.0	100.0	348	2.0
Service	90.1	8.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	161	0.9
Non-Occupation/None	96.2	1.9	1.1	0.7	0.1	100.0	2,149	12.0
All Occupations	70.9	11.0	10.7	6.9	0.5	100.0	17,868	100.0

Note: Farmers includes farm owners, tenants, and managers. Does not include farm laborers. Managers, Proprietors, and Officials (nec) were primarily merchants, store keepers, tavern keepers, and grocers. Non-occupation includes students, retired, and other non-occupations (e.g., esquire, none). Rows and columns may not add to total due to rounding.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

References

Anderson, M. J. (2015). *The American Census: A Social History*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bourne, J. (2008). "Slavery in the United States". EH.Net Encyclopedia, edited by Robert Whaples. http://eh.net/encyclopedia/slavery-in-the-united-states/

De Bow, J. D. B. (1853). *Seventh Census of Population, 1850, An Appendix,* US Census Office, Washington: Robert Armstrong, Public Printer.

De Bow, J. D. B. (1854). *Statistical View of the United States: Compendium of the Seventh Census*, US Census Office, Washington: Beverly Tucker, Senate Printer.

Barton, K. C. (1997). "'Good Cooks and Washers': Slave Hiring, Domestic Labor, and the Market in Bourbon County, Kentucky," *Journal of American History*, 84, September, pp. 436-460.

Carter, S. B., et. al. (2006). *Historical Statistics of the United States: Millennial Edition*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chiswick, B. R., and Robinson, R. H. (2021). "Women at Work in the United States since 1860: An Analysis of Unreported Family Workers," *Explorations in Economic History*, 82, October Article 101406.

Chiswick, B. R., and Robinson, R. H. (2024). "An Analysis of the Occupations of Free Women in the Antebellum United States," *Cliometrica*, 18, pp. 363-403.

Chiswick, B. R., and Robinson, R. H. (2024). "The Labor Market Attainment of Immigrants in the Antebellum United States," IZA Discussion Paper No. 17382. *Research in Labor Economics* (forthcoming)

Chused, R. H. (1983). "Married Women's Property Law: 1800-1850," *Georgetown Law Journals*, 71(5), pp. 1359-1425.

Clark, C. (2013). Book Review of *Slaves for Hire: Renting Enslaved Laborers in Antebellum Virginia* in *Civil War Book Review*, Winter, 15(1), Article 11.

Coclanis, P. (2010). "The Economics of Slavery," in *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas*, ed. Robert L. Paquette and Mark M. Smith, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Craig, P. B. (2019). "Married Women's Property Laws," American Women: Online Research Guide, The Law Library of Congress. Accessed 9/23/2023 at: https://memory.loc.gov/ammem/awhhtml/awlaw3/property_law.html.

Ferrie, J. P., (1999). *Yankeys Now: Immigration in the Antebellum United States, 1840-1860.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Finkelman, P. (2012). "Slavery in the United States: Persons or Property?" in *The Legal Understanding of Slavery: From the Historical to the Contemporary*, Jean Allain, ed., Chapter 6, pp. 105-134, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fogel, R. W., and Engerman, S. L. (1974/1989). *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery*, 1989 edition, New York: Norton.

Fogel, R. W., and Engerman, S. L. (2006). "Slave Hires, 1775-1865," Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2006-10-11. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR07422.v3

Foshee, A. W. (1985). "Slave Hiring in Rural Louisiana," *Louisiana History*, 26(1), Winter, pp. 63-73.

Genovese, E. D. (1969/1988). *The World The Slaveholders Made: Two Essays in Interpretation*, 1988 edition, Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.

Goldin, C. D. (1976). *Urban Slavery in the American South 1820-1860: A Quantitative History*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hacker, J. D., Huynh, L., Nelson, M. A., and Sobek, M. (2025). "IPUMS Full Count Datasets of Enslaved Persons and Slaveholders in the United States in 1850 and 1860," *Historical Methods*, pp. 1-12.

Haines, M., Fishback, P., and Rhode, P. (2018). "United States Agriculture Data, 1840 – 2012," Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2018-08-20. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35206.v4

Huston, J. L. (1999). "Property Rights in Slavery and the Coming of the Civil War," *The Journal of Southern History*, 65(2), pp. 249-286.

IPUMS-USA. (2004). Menard, R., Alexander, T., Digman, J., and Hacker, J. D. Public Use Microdata Samples of the Slave Population of 1850-1860, Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. http://usa.ipums.org/usa/slavepums

IPUMS-USA (2021). Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Foster, S., Goeken, R., Pacas, J., Schouweiler, M., and Sobek, M. Census of Population microdata originally released in 1998, current version 2021, Version 11.0, 1850 Census of Population 1% Sample. Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V11.0

IPUMS-USA (n.d.). "Family Interrelationships," IPUMS User Guide, Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. https://usa.ipums.org/usa/chapter5/chapter5.shtml

Jones-Rogers, S. E. (2019). *They Were Her Property: White Women as Slave Owners in the American South*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Logan, T. D., and Pritchett, J. B. (2018). "On the Marital Status of U.S. Slaves: Evidence from Touro Infirmary, New Orleans, Louisiana," *Explorations in Economic History*, 69(3), pp. 50-63.

Minnesota Population Center (2004). "1850-1860 Slave Samples Variables," https://usa.ipums.org/usa/slavepums/codes/sh1typed_codes.shtml, Accessed 8/9/2022.

Nelson, M. A., Magnuson, D. L., Hacker, J. D., Sobek, M., Huynh, L., Roberts, E., and Ruggles, S. (2024). "IPUMS Full Count Datasets of the U.S. Censuses of Population 1850-1880," IPUMS Working Paper No. 2024-03.

Oakes, J. (1982/1998). *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*, 1998 edition, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Oast, J. (2016). *Institutional Slavery: Slaveholding Churches, Schools, Colleges, and Businesses in Virginia, 1680-1860*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reidy, J. P. (1983). "Review of *The Ruling Race,*" *The Journal of Negro History*, Winter, 68(1), pp. 95-97.

Swarns, R. L. (2023). *The 272: Families Who Were Enslaved and Sold to Build the American Catholic Church*, Random House.

Swarns, R. L. (2024). "Scholars Thought White Women Were Passive Slavers. They Were Wrong." *New York Times*, November 22.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989). *200 Years of Census Taking: Population and Housing Questions, 1790-*

1990, US Department of Commerce, Washington: US Government Printing Office.

U.S. Office of the Census (1850). "Instructions to U.S. Marshalls," *Seventh Census of Population, 1850*, Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2020). *2019 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*, Washington: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics.

Van Morgan, S., Papenfuse, E. C., Becker, S., and Hopkins, S. B. (2023). "A Maryland Mystery: Johns Hopkins, The Census of 1850, and Slavery," https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/gu2wr.

Wade, R. C. (1964). *Slavery in the Cities: The South 1820-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wishart, B. and Logan, T. D. (2024). "Her Property Transactions: White Women and the Frequency of Female Ownership in the Antebellum Era," NBER Working Paper 32529, May, DOIL 10.3386/w32529.

Zaborney, J. J. (2012). *Slaves for Hire: Renting Enslaved Laborers in Antebellum Virginia*, Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

7/18/2025

Appendices to: "An Analysis of Slaveholders According to the 1850 Census"

Barry R. Chiswick and RaeAnn H. Robinson

Department of Economics, George Washington University

Appendix A: Definitions of Variables

Sample:

This sample consists of all free individuals in the 1850 Census of Population, Schedule 1 (Free Persons), IPUMS, 1% sample (current version 2021) who lived in the areas where slavery was legal in 1850: Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia (part of Virginia in 1850), North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and District of Columbia. In addition, if any of those individuals were listed as slaveholders in Schedule 2 (Enslaved Persons) of the 1850 Census of Population, they have been indicated as such in the data. The selection of the sample of enslaved persons was determined based on the 1% free people (Schedule 1) sample; that is, all enslaved persons linked to the individuals indicated as slaveholders in the 1% free people sample are included in the enslaved persons sample.

The sample and linkage are described by the IPUMS team as follows: "This dataset is a 1-in-100 sample of the slave and free population in 1850. The dataset contains all persons present in the original 1850 IPUMS sample, regardless of whether or not they were slaveholders. For all free persons, there are variables identifying serial and person number in the original 1850 IPUMS data as well as slaveholder status. For all [enslaved] persons, there are variables indicating serial number of the slaveholding household in which they lived, location of the slaveholding on the slave schedules, and age, race, and sex of [the enslaved person]. Using the SERIAL and PERNUM variables, these data can easily be integrated with the 1850 Free Population data available at the IPUMS-USA website" (IPUMS-USA, 2004, 1850-1860 Slave Samples, User's Guide). More information about the Slave PUMS can be found here: https://usa.ipums.org/usa/slavepums/documentation/about.html

- The sample for the regression analysis is limited to free individuals age 20 and older.
- Note that household relationships were not recorded in the census, but imputed in the microdata files by the IPUMS team (IPUMS-USA, n.d., "Family Interrelationships").
- There were 20 enslaved persons included in the 1850 Slave PUMS who were dropped from the sample because it was not possible to identify a slaveholder in the 1850 Free Persons sample.
- There were 23 individuals who were recorded as slaveholders but had no slaves attributed to them. This could be due to their enslaved persons living elsewhere because they were rented or run away (fugitive) slaves, or living separately as urban slaves. These individuals were not included in the OLS regression analysis on size of slaveholdings.
- Agricultural data by county was unavailable for 3,412 free people in the 1% sample (5.3 percent of the sample), of whom 1.4 percentage points were slaveholders.

Slaveholder variables:

- Slaveholder: This is a dichotomous variable that takes the value of 1 if the individual was indicated as a slaveholder in Schedule 2 of the 1850 Census.
- Number of Slaves Owned: This variable counts the number of enslaved persons owned (or, recorded as held by) a given household in Schedule 2 of the 1850 Census. In the vast majority of cases (about 97 percent), there was only one slaveholder in the household, so all enslaved persons can be attributed to that slaveholder. In a small number of cases there were multiple slaveholders in the household: 77 of the 2,930 slaveholding households, 2.6 percent of the slaveholding households, which comprised 5.3 percent of the slaveholders in the sample. It is not possible to identify which enslaved persons were owned by which slaveholders. Five households included in the sample report having 3 slaveholders and one reports having 4 slaveholders in residence. For the purposes of the statistical analysis in this study, since the individual enslaved persons cannot be attributed with confidence to a specific slaveholder in these cases, all enslaved persons are attributed to the head of household. The single household in which neither slaveholder is the head of household is excluded from the statistical

analysis. That is, the regression analysis for slaveholding sizes is restricted to reported slaveholders with a positive number of enslaved persons attributed to them. The natural logarithm of the number of enslaved persons in the holding is used as the dependent variable in Table 5 and Appendix Table B-2, while the absolute number is used in Appendix Table C-1, available on request.

Explanatory Variables:

- Age: This is the individual's reported age in years. Age is entered as a set of categorical variables, with ages under 25, 25-44, 45-64, and 65 and older. The age group 25 to 44 is the benchmark.
- Married: This is a dichotomous variable that indicates the individual is presumed to be married with their spouse present (in the same household). Marital status was not asked in the 1850 Census. Therefore, this variable is constructed using the IPUMS pointer variable for spouse, which identifies the imputed relationships between household members, with an estimated 99 percent accuracy rate (IPUMS-USA, n.d.)
- Non-white: In the 1850 Census, Schedule 1, IPUMS, 1% sample, 97.8 percent of the free individuals were coded as white, with the other free people coded as: Black/African American/Negro (1.4 percent), Mulatto (0.8 percent), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (0.0 percent – 9 individuals). Persons for whom there was no explicit racial coding on the Census forms were assumed to be White. Only 0.6 percent of slaveholders (20 individuals in the sample) were classified as non-White. The enumerator was responsible for classifying the individual's race and was not specifically instructed to ask the race of the individual. This variable was not included in the regression analysis.

Most enslaved persons purchased by free Blacks were their family members and were quickly manumitted, until the early nineteenth century when restrictions on slaveholders' rights to free their slaves were enacted by southern legislatures. After that, "Blacks who purchased slaves were forced to retain their property intact or move to a free state" (Oakes, 1982/1998, p. 47-48). Thus, government coercion was used to reinforce the institution of slavery even among those who wanted to free their enslaved persons.

- Illiterate: This is a dichotomous variable that takes the value of 1 if the individual is recorded as "cannot read and write." The census enumerators were instructed to record those individuals who could not read and write in any language (English or their native language). However, the degree of literacy was not defined; therefore, it is unknown whether being able to read/write one's own name qualified them as literate or how individuals who could read but not write were classified. Further, this question was only asked of individuals 20 years of age and older.
- Urban: This is a dichotomous variable that takes the value of 1 if the location of the household is considered urban. Urban areas are made up for the most part of households in cities and incorporated places with 2,500 or more inhabitants. Additionally, it includes townships and other political subdivisions (not incorporated municipalities). Urban residence serves as the benchmark.
- Foreign Born: This is a dichotomous variable that takes the value of 1 if the respondent was recorded as born outside the United States.
- Crop Production by County in 1849: Hemp – The combined number of billions of tons of dew-rotted hemp and water-rotted hemp production. Rice – The number of billions of pounds of rice production. Tobacco – The number of billions of pounds of tobacco production. Cotton – The number of billions of bales of ginned cotton (bales of 400 pounds) production. Sugar – The combined number (in billions) of hogsheads of cane sugar (hogsheads of 1,000 pounds) and number of gallons of cane molasses production. The data comes from the US Agriculture Data compiled by Haines, Fishback, and Rhode (2018). Their source for this data was De Bow, 1853, Table XI.
- State Fixed Effects: Dichotomous variables for each of the states and the District of Columbia in which slavery was legal in 1850, with Kentucky as the benchmark. Kentucky had approximately the mean percent of the free population as slaveholders and population living in slaveholding households (see Table 4).
- Occupations: Occupations are based on the IPUMS coding of the occupation string data from the census manuscripts into the 1950 Occupation Classification System. Though the census enumerators were

instructed to only list the principal occupation or profession if an individual were engaged in multiple occupations, in a small number of cases (around 0.3 percent of those with an occupation recorded) the enumerator listed more than one occupation. The majority of those with multiple occupations were recorded as a farmer/planter and something else. IPUMS coded those with multiple occupations reported by the first listed occupation. For example, an individual who was recorded as "Farmer & Miller" in the occupation string data from the census returns was coded by IPUMS as a Farmer, while one who was recorded as "Miller & Farmer" was coded as a Miller. While census enumerators were instructed to list an occupation, trade, or profession for males age 16 and over in 1850, in some cases they reported an occupation for women: 13.0 percent of female slaveholders had an occupation listed, the most common of which was farming (80.4 percent), followed by tavern keeping (4.4 percent).

Table A-1

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in Regression Analysis

Free People, Age 20 and Older, Southern States, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	All	All, by Gender		Males, by Farm Status [a]	
		Females	Males	Farmer	Non-Farmer
Slaveholder	0.11	0.03	0.18	0.25	0.11
	(0.322)	(0.185)	(0.395)	(0.439)	(0.328)
Age Less Than	0.22	0.23	0.22	0.17	0.26
25	(0.416)	(0.421)	(0.411)	(0.375)	(0.440)
Age 25 to 44	0.52	0.51	0.53	0.52	0.54
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.499)	(0.500)	(0.499)
Age 45 to 64	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.25	0.17
	(0.405)	(0.403)	(0.407)	(0.435)	(0.371)
Age Greater	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.04
Than 65	(0.217)	(0.221)	(0.213)	(0.235)	(0.187)
Female	0.48	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.500)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Foreign Born	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.02	0.19
	(0.281)	(0.250)	(0.306)	(0.129)	(0.396)
Married	0.63	0.64	0.62	0.76	0.47
	(0.483)	(0.480)	(0.486)	(0.430)	(0.499)
Illiterate	0.20	0.25	0.15	0.17	0.13
	(0.398)	(0.434)	(0.355)	(0.374)	(0.332)
Urban	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.00	0.26
	(0.331)	(0.328)	(0.333)	(0.0510)	(0.437)
Sample Size	28,918	13,827	15,091	7,671	7,420

[a] Here, "Farmer" includes those with an occupation recorded as farm owner, manager, or tenant. It does not include farm laborers, nor individuals living on a farm with other occupations reported.

Source: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table A-2

Frequency Distribution of Occupation for Free Males, Age 16 and Older, by Slaveholding Status, Southern States, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

Occupation	All	Slaveholders	Non-Slaveholders
Professionals			
Auditors	0.01		0.01
Actors	0.02		0.03
Artists	0.02		0.02
Clergymen	0.54	1.52	0.36
Professors	0.03	0.15	0.01
Dancing Master	0.01		0.01
Dentists	0.03	0.07	0.03
Editors	0.03	0.11	0.02
Civil Engineers	0.01		0.01
Mechanical Engineers	0.01		0.01
Lawyers and Judges	0.48	1.41	0.31
Musicians and Music Teachers	0.02		0.02
Apothecarist/Druggist (Pharmacists)	0.09	0.04	0.10
Daguerreotypers (Photographers)	0.01		0.01
Physicians and Surgeons	0.90	2.56	0.61
Surveyors	0.02		0.02
Teachers	0.78	0.52	0.83
Professional, Technical, Kindred Workers (nec)	0.02	0.04	0.01
Farmers (Owners, Tenants, and Managers)	48.66	70.01	44.88
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors			
Landlords	0.03	0.11	0.01
Officers, Pilots, Captains	0.17	0.11	0.19
Officials and Administrators	0.16	0.48	0.10
Postmasters	0.04	0.07	0.03
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors (nec)	3.27	6.80	2.64
Clerical and Sales			
Agents	0.03		0.03
Bookkeepers	0.03	0.07	0.02
Collectors, Bill and Account	0.03	0.04	0.03
Mail Carriers	0.02		0.02
Messengers and Office Boys	0.02	0.04	0.01
Telegraph Operators	0.01		0.01
Railroad Agents	0.01	0.04	0.01
Clerical and Kindred Workers (nec)	0.05	0.07	0.05
Auctioneers	0.02		0.02
Hucksters and Peddlers	0.11		0.13
Insurance Agents	0.01	0.04	
Newsboys	0.01		0.01
Salesmen and Sales Clerks (nec)	1.58	0.67	1.75
Craftsmen and Operatives			
Bakers	0.17	0.11	0.18
Blacksmiths	1.38	0.89	1.46
Bookbinders	0.03	0.04	0.03

Table A-2 continued

Occupation	All	Slaveholders	Non-Slaveholders
Boilermakers	0.03	0.04	0.03
Brickmasons and Stonemasons	0.58	0.45	0.60
Cabinetmakers	0.43	0.26	0.46
Carpenters	2.66	1.78	2.81
Printers	0.24	0.15	0.25
Engravers	0.01		0.01
Foremen (nec)	0.92	1.11	0.88
Forgemen and Hammermen	0.02		0.02
Inspectors	0.02		0.01
Jewelers	0.13	0.15	0.13
Machinists	0.08		0.09
Mechanics and Repairmen (nec)	0.67	0.63	0.67
Millers	0.50	0.45	0.51
Millwrights	0.12		0.15
Molders, Metal	0.07	0.04	0.07
Painters, Construction and Maintenance	0.24	0.15	0.26
Paperhangers	0.01		0.01
Pattern Makers	0.02		0.03
Plasterers	0.20	0.04	0.23
Plumbers and Pipe Fitters	0.01		0.01
Rollers, Metal	0.02		0.02
Shoemakers and Repairers	0.95	0.15	1.10
Stationary Engineers	0.18	0.04	0.20
Stone Cutters and Carvers	0.09	0.04	0.10
Caulkers	0.02		0.02
Tailors	0.73	0.52	0.76
Tinsmiths and Coppersmiths	0.16	0.15	0.17
Upholsterers	0.01		0.01
Craftsmen and Kindred Workers (nec)	0.81	0.59	0.85
Members of the Armed Services	0.21	0.15	0.19
Apprentices	0.06		0.07
Boatmen	0.27	0.04	0.31
Brakemen, Railroad	0.01		0.01
Stage Drivers	0.04		0.05
Milkmen	0.02		0.03
Dyers	0.01		0.01
Filers, Metal	0.01		0.01
Furnacemen, Smeltermen	0.06	0.04	0.07
Butchers	0.29	0.15	0.32
Mine Operatives	0.18	0.04	0.21
Painters, Non-Construction	0.01		0.01
Sailors and Deck Hands	0.90	0.33	1.00
Sawyers	0.05	0.07	0.05
Spinners	0.02		0.03
Firemen	0.07		0.08
Coachmen, Hackmen	0.03		0.04
Cart and Wagon Drivers	0.44	0.07	0.50
Weavers	0.05		0.06

Table A-2 continued

Occupation	All	Slaveholders	Non-Slaveholders
Operative and Kindred Workers (nec)	1.62	1.45	1.66
Service			
Private Household Workers (nec)	0.10		0.11
Attendants	0.01		0.01
Barbers	0.09	0.07	0.09
Barkeepers	0.12		0.15
Boarding House Keepers	0.03		0.03
Cooks, except Private Household	0.07	0.04	0.08
Guards, Watchmen, Doorkeepers	0.10		0.11
Stewards, except Private Household	0.03		0.03
Sextons	0.01		0.01
Marshals and Constables	0.10	0.26	0.07
Policemen	0.09	0.11	0.09
Porters	0.04	0.04	0.05
Practical Nurses	0.01		0.01
Sheriffs and Bailiffs	0.06	0.04	0.06
Waiters	0.04		0.05
Toll Gate Keepers	0.01	0.04	0.01
Laborers			
Farm Foremen	0.01		0.01
Farm Laborers, Wage Workers	4.87	0.11	5.73
Farm Service Laborers, Self-Employed	0.03	0.04	0.03
Fishermen and Oystermen	0.08	0.07	0.09
Gardeners	0.16		0.19
Stevedores	0.03		0.03
Lumbermen	0.08		0.09
Laborers (nec)	8.75	1.04	10.13
Other			
At School/Student	0.94	0.04	1.10
Retired	0.02	0.07	0.01
Invalid/Disabled	0.02		0.02
Inmate	0.01		0.01
Other Non-Occupation [a]	11.04	2.94	12.49
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00
Sample Size	17,868	2,691	15,126

[a] The occupation category was left blank by the census enumerator for about two-thirds of these respondents, with almost all of the remainder reporting "none." About half are ages 16 to 22.

Notes: Nec means "not elsewhere classified." Occupations coded from string data into 1950 Occupation Classification System by IPUMS, Minnesota Population Center. If more than one occupation were listed (which occurred in about 0.3 percent of entries), IPUMS used the first listed occupation. Detail may not add to total due to rounding. 51 individuals had a slaveholding status not determined, and are included in column 1 but not 2 or 3.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table A-3

Distribution of the Population, by Southern State, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	Enslaved People			Slaveholder			All Free People		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
DE	8	8	16	8	0	8	418	425	843
MO	381	374	755	146	15	161	3,290	2,958	6,248
VA	2,148	2,003	4,151	396	60	456	3,372	3,281	6,653
AL	1,504	1,434	2,938	217	26	243	2,208	2,133	4,341
AR	152	148	300	44	3	47	868	719	1,587
FL	151	148	299	23	0	23	293	223	516
GA	1,595	1,634	3,229	300	30	330	2,648	2,540	5,188
LA	944	914	1,858	119	27	146	1,453	1,243	2,696
MS	954	960	1,914	181	13	194	1,517	1,293	2,810
NC	1,120	1,147	2,267	266	35	301	2,831	2,875	5,706
SC	1,565	1,545	3,110	196	26	222	1,410	1,379	2,789
TX	281	253	534	65	3	68	863	686	1,549
KY	974	1,024	1,998	334	40	374	3,990	3,819	7,809
MD	441	397	838	113	24	137	2,580	2,544	5,124
TN	1,051	1,045	2,096	250	26	276	3,977	3,816	7,793
WV	102	97	199	34	3	37	1,415	1,360	2,775
DC	4	13	17	10	0	10	256	269	525
Total	13,375	13,144	26,519	2,702	331	3,033	33,389	31,563	64,952

Note: In the 1/100 sample, 2 enslaved persons (females) lived in New Jersey in separate households and, thus, there were also two (male) slaveholders. These individuals are not included in the analysis. Current designation of states; Virginia and West Virginia were one state in 1850.

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Appendix B: Regression Analysis of Slaveholding, 1850 Census

Table B-1

Logit Analysis of Free Person's Likelihood of Being a Slaveholder, Age 20 and Older, Southern States, with state fixed effects, 1850

	All	Females	Males				
	(1)	(2)	(3) All	(4) All	(5) Non-Farmers	(6) Farmers	(7) Farmers
Age Less Than 25	-0.0700***	-0.0104***	-0.143***	-0.113***	-0.0492***	-0.205***	-0.217***
	(-17.92)	(-5.82)	(-14.78)	(-12.79)	(-7.20)	(-11.01)	(-11.09)
Age 45 to 64	0.0318***	0.00839***	0.0548***	0.0452***	0.00921*	0.0929***	0.0951***
	(14.20)	(6.91)	(9.91)	(9.06)	(2.33)	(9.13)	(8.88)
Age 65 and Greater	0.0396***	0.00622***	0.0749***	0.0663***	0.00276	0.141***	0.141***
	(10.35)	(4.56)	(7.52)	(7.37)	(0.32)	(7.97)	(7.58)
Female	-0.0957***	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(-35.00)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foreign Born	-0.0495***	-0.00576**	-0.110***	-0.0706***	-0.0316***	-0.0734	-0.0771
	(-9.89)	(-2.58)	(-8.96)	(-6.23)	(-5.31)	(-1.88)	(-1.84)
Married	0.0171***	-0.0195***	0.114***	0.0847***	0.0643***	0.0775***	0.0942***
	(7.56)	(-11.25)	(18.25)	(14.35)	(12.38)	(6.19)	(7.14)
Illiterate	-0.0702***	-0.00781***	-0.183***	-0.149***	-0.0474***	-0.274***	-0.276***
	(-18.99)	(-5.89)	(-18.79)	(-16.58)	(-5.73)	(-16.55)	(-15.94)
Urban	-0.00889*	0.000130	-0.0267**	-0.0114	0.00228	0.160	0.183*
	(-2.33)	(0.10)	(-2.66)	(-1.17)	(0.50)	(1.84)	(2.02)
Hemp	--	--	--	--	--	--	78.21***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(6.03)
Rice	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.00490**
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(2.74)
Sugar	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.233*
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(2.36)
Tobacco	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.0322***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(5.72)
Cotton	--	--	--	--	--	--	9.274***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(10.52)

Table B-1 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Clergy	--	--	--	0.105*	0.0231	--	--
	--	--	--	(2.41)	(0.62)	--	--
Lawyers and Judges	--	--	--	0.175***	0.0758	--	--
	--	--	--	(3.31)	(1.62)	--	--
Physicians	--	--	--	0.158***	0.0743*	--	--
	--	--	--	(4.22)	(2.11)	--	--
Other Professionals	--	--	--	-0.0610**	-0.0965***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-3.11)	(-5.10)	--	--
Managers, Proprietors,	--	--	--	0.0809***	0	--	--
Officials	--	--	--	(4.57)	(.)	--	--
Craftsmen	--	--	--	-0.0766***	-0.113***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-11.32)	(-8.03)	--	--
Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-0.138***	-0.145***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-14.38)	(-8.84)	--	--
Non-Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-0.133***	-0.146***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-21.12)	(-9.87)	--	--
Clerical/Sales	--	--	--	-0.0582**	-0.0867***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-2.93)	(-4.30)	--	--
Service	--	--	--	-0.0459	-0.0871***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.66)	(-3.75)	--	--
Non-Occupation/None	--	--	--	-0.0951***	-0.117***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-11.65)	(-7.85)	--	--
Delaware	-0.0431***	0	-0.103***	-0.0821***	-0.0527***	-0.101**	-0.0788
	(-10.03)	(.)	(-8.94)	(-7.56)	(-7.20)	(-2.87)	(-1.82)
Missouri	-0.0251***	-0.00302	-0.0627***	-0.0552***	-0.0334***	-0.0856***	-0.0874***
	(-6.84)	(-1.63)	(-6.84)	(-7.09)	(-4.50)	(-5.39)	(-5.23)

Table B-1 continued

	All	Females	Males				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Virginia	0.0246***	-0.000401	0.0653***	0.0765***	0.0267**	0.135***	0.164***
	(4.99)	(-0.24)	(5.32)	(6.49)	(2.62)	(6.00)	(6.87)
Alabama	0.0184**	0.00274	0.0403**	0.0315**	0.00408	0.0723**	-0.0128
	(3.23)	(1.09)	(2.94)	(2.67)	(0.35)	(3.25)	(-0.56)
Arkansas	-0.0165**	0.00405	-0.0437**	-0.0414***	-0.0250*	-0.0597*	-0.0388
	(-2.81)	(0.70)	(-3.04)	(-3.55)	(-2.08)	(-2.49)	(-1.41)
Florida	-0.0115	0	-0.00513	0.00589	0.0162	0.00782	0.00344
	(-1.22)	(.)	(-0.19)	(0.23)	(0.60)	(0.15)	(0.06)
Georgia	0.0220***	0.000337	0.0542***	0.0471***	0.0175	0.0901***	0.0695**
	(4.11)	(0.16)	(4.16)	(4.10)	(1.52)	(4.24)	(3.06)
Louisiana	0.0201**	0.00551	0.0419*	0.0434**	-0.00994	0.213***	0.160**
	(2.80)	(1.68)	(2.44)	(2.73)	(-1.03)	(4.97)	(3.14)
Mississippi	0.0193**	-0.000355	0.0577***	0.0407**	0.0114	0.0885***	0.0262
	(3.01)	(-0.13)	(3.61)	(3.00)	(0.81)	(3.53)	(1.03)
North Carolina	0.00641	-0.00202	0.0184	0.0250*	0.0119	0.0490*	0.0789***
	(1.37)	(-1.20)	(1.56)	(2.34)	(1.04)	(2.46)	(3.60)
South Carolina	0.0360***	0.000392	0.0899***	0.0735***	0.0258	0.132***	0.0301
	(4.94)	(0.18)	(5.09)	(4.70)	(1.78)	(4.66)	(1.08)
Texas	0.0374***	0.0444***	0.0550**	0.0429*	0.0440	0.0491	0.0918*
	(3.77)	(3.42)	(2.61)	(2.34)	(1.95)	(1.53)	(2.53)
Maryland	-0.0246***	-0.00424**	-0.0610***	-0.0407***	-0.0421***	0.0322	0.0484
	(-6.39)	(-2.71)	(-6.19)	(-4.39)	(-5.96)	(1.17)	(1.63)
Tennessee	-0.0122**	-0.00142	-0.0307**	-0.0251**	-0.000826	-0.0489**	-0.0525**
	(-3.21)	(-0.80)	(-3.22)	(-3.04)	(-0.09)	(-3.06)	(-3.08)

Table B-1 continued

	All	Females	Males				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
West Virginia	-0.0400***	-0.00661***	-0.0975***	-0.0808***	-0.0419***	-0.139***	0
	(-11.04)	(-3.76)	(-10.76)	(-10.19)	(-5.10)	(-8.92)	(.)
District of Columbia	-0.0291***	0	-0.0547*	-0.0311	-0.0297**	-0.0273	0
	(-3.64)	(.)	(-2.20)	(-1.20)	(-2.63)	(-0.13)	(.)
Sample Size	28,918	13,373	15,091	15,091	7,420	7,671	7,286

Note: Logit regression model; coefficients are marginal effects at the mean (MEM); t-statistics in parentheses. ***, **, and * represent statistical significance at the 0.1 percent, 1 percent, and 5 percent levels, respectively. State fixed effects included with Kentucky as the benchmark. For age brackets, age 25-44 is the benchmark. Observations from states with no female slaveholders (DE, FL, and DC) were dropped for the regression on females. Agricultural data were not available for WV and DC.

Columns:

(1) Includes all free individuals, age 20 and older
(2) Includes all free females, age 20 and older
(3) Includes all free males, age 20 and older
(4) Includes all free males, age 20 and older, plus occupation variables with farmers as the benchmark
(5) Includes only free males, age 20 and older, who are not recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant) with Officials, Managers, and Proprietors as the benchmark
(6) Includes only free males, age 20 and older, who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant)
(7) Includes only free males, age 20 and older, who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant), plus agriculture crop variables

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021.

Table B-2

OLS Regression Analysis of the Natural Logarithm of the Size of Slaveholdings, Age 20 and Older, Southern States, with occupation and state fixed effects, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Age Less Than 25	-0.24*	0.70	-0.30**	-0.32**	-0.33	-0.29*	-0.28*
	(-2.24)	(1.54)	(-2.69)	(-2.87)	(-1.62)	(-2.22)	(-2.12)
Age 45 to 64	0.33***	0.32*	0.34***	0.29***	0.25**	0.30***	0.31***
	(7.61)	(2.18)	(7.43)	(6.50)	(3.12)	(5.62)	(5.78)
Age 65 and Greater	0.48***	0.59**	0.47***	0.42***	0.12	0.46***	0.47***
	(6.61)	(3.00)	(5.82)	(5.25)	(0.65)	(5.10)	(5.28)
Female	-0.34***	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(-4.14)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foreign Born	-0.43***	-1.02*	-0.40**	-0.30*	-0.41**	0.14	0.011
	(-3.61)	(-2.51)	(-3.24)	(-2.45)	(-3.04)	(0.62)	(0.05)
Married	-0.29***	0.12	-0.30***	-0.29***	-0.13	-0.35***	-0.33***
	(-4.76)	(0.31)	(-4.92)	(-4.88)	(-1.29)	(-4.78)	(-4.59)
Illiterate	-0.68***	-0.21	-0.77***	-0.77***	-0.61**	-0.80***	-0.81***
	(-7.52)	(-1.01)	(-7.61)	(-7.71)	(-2.74)	(-7.16)	(-7.25)
Urban	-0.45***	-0.63**	-0.42***	-0.21*	-0.18	-0.12	-0.054
	(-5.52)	(-3.12)	(-4.66)	(-2.21)	(-1.91)	(-0.30)	(-0.13)
Hemp	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.23***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(3.40)
Rice	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.0000043
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(0.59)
Sugar	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.0017***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(3.87)

Table B-2 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Tobacco	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.000070*
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(2.54)
Cotton	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.024***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(5.19)
Clergy	--	--	--	-0.28	-0.094	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.70)	(-0.56)	--	--
Lawyers and Judges	--	--	--	0.19	0.39*	--	--
	--	--	--	(1.06)	(2.30)	--	--
Physicians	--	--	--	0.29*	0.47***	--	--
	--	--	--	(2.20)	(3.38)	--	--
Other Professionals	--	--	--	-0.13	0.083	--	--
	--	--	--	(-0.59)	(0.39)	--	--
Managers, Proprietors,	--	--	--	-0.19*	--	--	--
Officials	--	--	--	(-2.27)	--	--	--
Craftsmen	--	--	--	-0.64***	-0.44***	--	--
	--	--	--	(-8.93)	(-4.93)	--	--
Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-1.60	-1.11	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.54)	(-1.16)	--	--
Non-Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-0.53**	-0.35	--	--
	--	--	--	(-2.61)	(-1.75)	--	--
Clerical/Sales	--	--	--	0.071	0.32	--	--
	--	--	--	(0.32)	(1.51)	--	--
Service	--	--	--	-1.00***	-0.79**	--	--
	--	--	--	(-3.79)	(-3.21)	--	--
Non-Occupation/None	--	--	--	-0.43***	-0.21	--	--
	--	--	--	(-3.38)	(-1.54)	--	--

Table B-2 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Delaware	-0.88*		-0.87*	-0.88*	-0.88	-0.90*	-0.74
	(-2.34)		(-2.29)	(-2.38)	(-0.93)	(-2.18)	(-1.81)
Missouri	-0.12	-0.54	-0.090	-0.093	-0.21	-0.024	-0.058
	(-1.22)	(-1.60)	(-0.84)	(-0.88)	(-1.21)	(-0.19)	(-0.45)
Virginia	0.37***	-0.0028	0.42***	0.45***	0.33*	0.51***	0.59***
	(4.95)	(-0.01)	(5.29)	(5.73)	(2.58)	(5.17)	(5.83)
Alabama	0.52***	0.50	0.53***	0.50***	0.39*	0.54***	0.28*
	(5.84)	(1.83)	(5.64)	(5.40)	(2.30)	(4.96)	(2.04)
Arkansas	0.058	-1.21	0.11	0.069	0.24	0.050	0.14
	(0.35)	(-1.53)	(0.67)	(0.41)	(0.65)	(0.27)	(0.74)
Florida	0.31		0.33	0.43	0.052	0.70*	0.68*
	(1.35)		(1.45)	(1.90)	(0.16)	(2.39)	(2.32)
Georgia	0.35***	0.061	0.38***	0.36***	0.085	0.48***	0.42***
	(4.29)	(0.23)	(4.42)	(4.32)	(0.59)	(4.69)	(3.75)
Louisiana	0.55***	0.50	0.56***	0.53***	0.21	0.72***	0.38*
	(5.03)	(1.75)	(4.67)	(4.54)	(1.19)	(4.78)	(2.06)
Mississippi	0.41***	0.099	0.44***	0.39***	0.56**	0.37**	0.24
	(4.22)	(0.26)	(4.34)	(3.97)	(3.06)	(3.12)	(1.83)
North Carolina	0.24**	-0.043	0.27**	0.28**	0.33*	0.28**	0.38***
	(2.82)	(-0.16)	(3.02)	(3.16)	(2.07)	(2.70)	(3.56)
South Carolina	0.60***	0.54	0.61***	0.59***	0.73***	0.54***	0.35*
	(6.58)	(1.92)	(6.28)	(6.17)	(4.51)	(4.61)	(2.57)
Texas	0.34*	0.27	0.37*	0.33*	-0.029	0.46**	0.56**
	(2.38)	(0.35)	(2.52)	(2.24)	(-0.11)	(2.63)	(3.20)

Table B-2 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Maryland	0.041	-0.0036	0.033	0.056	-0.33	0.24	0.30*
	(0.38)	(-0.01)	(0.28)	(0.49)	(-1.72)	(1.64)	(2.12)
Tennessee	0.17*	-0.098	0.20*	0.21*	0.19	0.22*	0.20
	(2.05)	(-0.35)	(2.25)	(2.40)	(1.30)	(2.04)	(1.73)
West Virginia	-0.057	-1.26	-0.0033	-0.019	-0.090	0.013	
	(-0.31)	(-1.18)	(-0.02)	(-0.10)	(-0.26)	(0.06)	
District of Columbia	-0.50		-0.50	-0.52	-0.56		
	(-1.36)		(-1.35)	(-1.44)	(-1.64)		
Constant	1.46***	1.26***	1.45***	1.54***	1.32***	1.53***	1.37***
	(18.10)	(6.36)	(17.33)	(18.48)	(8.53)	(15.40)	(13.17)
Sample Size	2,914	300	2,614	2,614	763	1,851	1,825
Adj. R^2	0.105	0.155	0.107	0.146	0.211	0.103	0.132

Note: OLS regression model; t-statistics in parentheses. ***, **, and * represent statistical significance at the 0.1 percent, 1 percent, and 5 percent levels, respectively. State fixed effects included with Kentucky as the benchmark. For occupations, Farmers is the benchmark in column (4) and managers, proprietors and officials in column (5). For age brackets, age 25-44 is the benchmark. Three states (DE, FL, and DC) had no female slaveholders. Agricultural data were not available for WV and DC.

Columns:
Among slaveholding individuals, age 20 and older, with a positive number of enslaved persons attributed to them:
(1) Includes all free individuals
(2) Includes all free females
(3) Includes all free males
(4) Includes all free males plus occupation variables with farmers as the benchmark
(5) Includes only free males who are not recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant) with Officials, Managers, and Proprietors as the benchmark
(6) Includes only free males who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant)
(7) Includes only free males who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant), plus agriculture crop variables
Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021

References for Appendices A and B

De Bow, J. D. B. (1853). *Seventh Census of Population, 1850, An Appendix,* US Census Office, Washington: Robert Armstrong, Public Printer.

De Bow, J. D. B. (1854). *Statistical View of the United States: Compendium of the Seventh Census*, US Census Office, Washington: Beverly Tucker, Senate Printer.

Haines, M., Fishback, P., and Rhode, P. (2018). "United States Agriculture Data, 1840 – 2012," Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2018-08-20. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35206.v4

IPUMS-USA. (2004). Menard, R., Alexander, T., Digman, J., and Hacker, J. D. Public Use Microdata Samples of the Slave Population of 1850-1860, Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. http://usa.ipums.org/usa/slavepums

IPUMS-USA (2021). Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Foster, S., Goeken, R., Pacas, J., Schouweiler, M., and Sobek, M. Census of Population microdata originally released in 1998, current version 2021, Version 11.0, 1850 Census of Population 1% Sample. Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V11.0

IPUMS-USA (n.d.). "Family Interrelationships," IPUMS User Guide, Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota. https://usa.ipums.org/usa/chapter5/chapter5.shtml

Minnesota Population Center (2004). "1850-1860 Slave Samples Variables," https://usa.ipums.org/usa/slavepums/codes/sh1typed_codes.shtml, Accessed 8/9/2022.

Oakes, J. (1982/1998). *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*, 1998 edition, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Appendix C: OLS Regression Analysis of Size of Slaveholdings

Table C-1

OLS Regression Analysis of Size of Slaveholdings, Age 20 and Older, Southern States, with state fixed effects, 1850 Census, 1/100 Sample

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Age Less Than 25	-0.48	4.89	-0.85	-0.87	-1.91	-0.17	0.074
	(-0.31)	(0.98)	(-0.53)	(-0.54)	(-0.67)	(-0.09)	(0.04)
Age 45 to 64	3.77***	1.85	4.07***	3.74***	4.25***	3.43***	3.34***
	(6.23)	(1.15)	(6.26)	(5.71)	(3.84)	(4.29)	(4.20)
Age 65 and Greater	5.20***	7.06**	4.74***	4.45***	-0.029	4.80***	4.90***
	(5.04)	(3.28)	(4.11)	(3.84)	(-0.01)	(3.64)	(3.73)
Female	-4.78***	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(-4.12)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foreign Born	-2.25	-9.46*	-1.79	-0.96	-2.85	7.52*	4.75
	(-1.36)	(-2.11)	(-1.01)	(-0.54)	(-1.51)	(2.18)	(1.39)
Married	-3.68***	2.08	-3.86***	-3.79***	-0.96	-4.79***	-4.57***
	(-4.37)	(0.51)	(-4.41)	(-4.36)	(-0.65)	(-4.48)	(-4.28)
Illiterate	-5.73***	-3.20	-6.44***	-6.40***	-3.73	-7.20***	-7.56***
	(-4.53)	(-1.40)	(-4.44)	(-4.42)	(-1.20)	(-4.35)	(-4.62)
Urban	-5.63***	-5.89**	-5.74***	-4.09**	-4.13**	-4.45	-3.62
	(-4.90)	(-2.67)	(-4.44)	(-2.93)	(-3.10)	(-0.74)	(-0.61)
Hemp	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.31
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(1.30)
Rice	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.00034**
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(3.26)
Sugar	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.045***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(6.69)

Table C-1 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Tobacco	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.0011**
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(2.83)
Cotton	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.30***
	--	--	--	--	--	--	(4.50)
Clergy	--	--	--	-3.03	-1.21	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.25)	(-0.51)	--	--
Lawyers and Judges	--	--	--	3.90	6.35**	--	--
	--	--	--	(1.54)	(2.65)	--	--
Physicians	--	--	--	6.62***	8.48***	--	--
	--	--	--	(3.42)	(4.37)	--	--
Other Professionals	--	--	--	-2.52	0.35	--	--
	--	--	--	(-0.77)	(0.12)	--	--
Managers, Proprietors,	--	--	--	-1.98	0	--	--
Officials	--	--	--	(-1.64)	(.)	--	--
Craftsmen	--	--	--	-4.48***	-2.50*	--	--
	--	--	--	(-4.31)	(-1.99)	--	--
Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-8.44	-6.51	--	--
	--	--	--	(-0.56)	(-0.48)	--	--
Non-Farm Laborers	--	--	--	-3.05	-0.98	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.03)	(-0.35)	--	--
Clerical/Sales	--	--	--	-2.04	1.07	--	--
	--	--	--	(-0.62)	(0.36)	--	--
Service	--	--	--	-6.58	-4.36	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.72)	(-1.26)	--	--
Non-Occupation/None	--	--	--	-3.01	-0.27	--	--
	--	--	--	(-1.61)	(-0.14)	--	--

Table C-1 continued

	All	Females	Males				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Delaware	-4.09		-3.85	-3.83	-0.55	-4.81	-3.04
	(-0.77)		(-0.71)	(-0.71)	(-0.04)	(-0.80)	(-0.51)
Missouri	-0.58	-3.82	-0.31	-0.16	-0.33	0.18	0.22
	(-0.41)	(-1.04)	(-0.20)	(-0.10)	(-0.13)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Virginia	4.30***	0.86	4.74***	5.04***	4.77**	5.21***	5.54***
	(4.05)	(0.34)	(4.12)	(4.39)	(2.68)	(3.58)	(3.75)
Alabama	7.15***	5.53	7.43***	7.32***	7.48**	7.46***	3.65
	(5.74)	(1.83)	(5.52)	(5.46)	(3.15)	(4.62)	(1.81)
Arkansas	1.47	-2.29	1.78	1.49	0.33	1.65	2.39
	(0.63)	(-0.26)	(0.73)	(0.61)	(0.06)	(0.59)	(0.85)
Florida	7.63*		7.90*	8.76**	3.88	12.6**	11.1**
	(2.38)		(2.41)	(2.68)	(0.83)	(2.91)	(2.59)
Georgia	4.80***	2.61	5.12***	5.16***	1.66	6.68***	5.48**
	(4.20)	(0.90)	(4.16)	(4.22)	(0.82)	(4.43)	(3.29)
Louisiana	10.1***	7.72*	10.5***	10.4***	5.48*	13.6***	3.80
	(6.56)	(2.47)	(6.10)	(6.09)	(2.19)	(6.11)	(1.39)
Mississippi	5.11***	-0.19	5.54***	5.25***	4.39	5.77***	3.74
	(3.76)	(-0.05)	(3.84)	(3.66)	(1.72)	(3.34)	(1.94)
North Carolina	2.81*	0.71	3.08*	3.32**	4.45*	3.29*	4.10**
	(2.37)	(0.25)	(2.41)	(2.60)	(1.97)	(2.14)	(2.59)
South Carolina	9.01***	5.40	9.49***	9.46***	13.1***	8.09***	4.10*
	(6.98)	(1.75)	(6.78)	(6.78)	(5.73)	(4.70)	(2.01)
Texas	3.33	-0.41	3.74	3.47	-0.81	4.99	5.90*
	(1.64)	(-0.05)	(1.76)	(1.64)	(-0.22)	(1.95)	(2.30)

Table C-1 continued

	All	Females			Males		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		All	All	All	Non-Farmers	Farmers	Farmers
Maryland	1.47	0.39	1.51	1.64	0.18	2.43	2.65
	(0.97)	(0.12)	(0.89)	(0.97)	(0.07)	(1.15)	(1.25)
Tennessee	1.96	-1.51	2.36	2.47	2.17	2.67	1.86
	(1.64)	(-0.49)	(1.84)	(1.93)	(1.07)	(1.67)	(1.12)
West Virginia	-0.32	-4.56	0.0029	0.041	0.22	0.095	
	(-0.12)	(-0.39)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.03)	
District of Columbia	1.15		1.70	1.50	2.06		
	(0.22)		(0.32)	(0.28)	(0.43)		
Constant	7.54***	5.56*	7.36***	7.86***	4.05	8.32***	6.77***
	(6.67)	(2.55)	(6.14)	(6.46)	(1.85)	(5.68)	(4.41)
Sample Size	2914	300	2614	2614	763	1851	1825
Adj. R^2	0.074	0.123	0.074	0.089	0.148	0.078	0.116

Note: OLS regression model; t-statistics in parentheses. ***, **, and * represent statistical significance at the 0.1 percent, 1 percent, and 5 percent levels, respectively. State fixed effects included with Kentucky as the benchmark. For occupations, Farmers is the benchmark. For age brackets, age 25-44 is the benchmark. Three states (DE, FL, and DC) had no female slaveholders. Agricultural data was not available for WV and DC.

Columns:
Among slaveholding individuals, age 20 and older, with a positive number of enslaved persons attributed to them:
(1) Includes all free individuals
(2) Includes all free females
(3) Includes all free males
(4) Includes all free males plus occupation variables with farmers as the benchmark
(5) Includes only free males who are not recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant) with Officials, Managers, and Proprietors as the benchmark
(6) Includes only free males who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant)
(7) Includes only free males who are recorded as farmers (owner, manager, or tenant), plus agriculture variables

Sources: IPUMS-USA, 2004; IPUMS-USA, 2021