

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JAMES FRANZ HAUN for the Ed. D.
(Name) (Degree)

in EDUCATION presented on April 17, 1967
(Major) (Date)

Title: THE PROBLEMS OF THE MARRIED COLLEGE STUDENT
AND POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO THEIR SOLUTION

Abstract approved Redacted for Privacy
Dr. Lester Beals

The purposes of this investigation are twofold: (1) to identify the functions necessary for an adequate student personnel program in the area of the college married student and (2) to develop recommendations based on the programs studied.

Securing and Treating of Data

The data for this study were obtained by using a questionnaire which was sent to each of the 48 land grant colleges in the continental United States. Forty-four of the colleges returned the completed questionnaire. The data consisted of the number of colleges having or desiring to have more involvement with the married student population on their campuses. The second phase of the research dealt with an experimental project conducted on the Oregon State University campus relative to married student involvement in a program aimed at their desires and needs.

Findings

The answers on the questionnaire show much agreement on these points: recognition of the married student should be centered in the student personnel services; need for additional research into this area of the college situation; more is being done to provide physical facilities for married students; more of the student personnel services are being made available to the married student; additional psychological services are needed particularly in the area of marriage counseling.

Less agreement was found in the areas of financing of the services to be offered. This one area provided many alternative possibilities but there was a definite lack of consistency in the solutions proposed.

The experimental program gave the opportunity to observe in action an approach to married student involvement with programming geared exclusively to their needs.

A tentative set of recommendations for student personnel services in the area of married student programming was determined from the identified functions necessary for an adequate student personnel program for married students. From this set of recommendations and consideration of the programs developed in the experimental project a constructive, progressive approach to the married student was devised.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for practice were drawn by the writer:

1. Provisions should be made, if possible, for both the husband and wife to continue their education without undue financial strain. There should be made available for aspiring husband-wife teams, a family financial plan whereby educational costs are reduced, or given a longer period to finance.

2. When simultaneous educational programs are planned by a married couple, and when finances are such that jobs are required, consideration should be given to family planning.

3. Marriage counseling services should be provided for married student families on college and university campuses.

4. Married student families should be made aware of available services offered by the university, such as health services.

5. Provisions should be made to establish a married student organization and committee structure developed to help coordinate a married student program.

6. A survey of married students on campus should be completed in order to obtain their interests and to locate individuals who could be used as leaders of married student programs.

7. Necessary funds should be allocated and a professional student personnel worker appointed to direct a separate activity

program. Married students should be encouraged to participate in activities that cannot be arranged as separate programs such as concerts, plays, exhibitions and other cultural events.

8. The married student activity program should be initiated with social activities, primarily in married housing units, and should be as inexpensive as possible.

9. Programs developed should be geared to incorporate both members of the couple, thereby giving the couple a mutual interest.

10. The student personnel worker who directs such a program should involve as many of the married students as possible in the planning and executing of the functions. The younger students, undergraduates and student wives seem to be a rich source of potential workers.

11. An attempt should be made to encourage the married student to move from a strictly social program to one that can give them the learning experiences they will need when they graduate and enter the community.

12. Provision should be made to allow the wife of the student to go outside of the confines of her home to release day to day tensions of the home and family. A center of this nature provides this means of escape.

The Problems of the Married College Student and
Possible Approaches to their Solution

by

James Franz Haun

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1967

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented April 17, 1967

Typed by Gwendolyn Hansen for James Franz Haun

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Lester Beals, School of Education, for his guidance and counsel in the preparation of this thesis.

Grateful acknowledgement is also made to Dr. Franklin R. Zeran, Dean, School of Education, for his counsel and support throughout the writer's graduate program, and to the writer's graduate committee, Dr. Robert Chick, Dr. George Carson, and Dr. Albert Leeland.

Appreciation is also expressed to Mr. Thomas Adams, Director of Housing, Oregon State University, and other members of the student personnel services who were so cooperative and helpful in supplying information for this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to my wife, Anne, and to my children, Tony, Jim and Julie, for their tireless assistance, patience, and encouragement in completing this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Procedure	4
Limitations of Study	7
Summary	7
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	9
Development of Student Housing	9
Student Personnel Work and Its Place in the College Community	12
The Married Student Impact	15
The Married Student Program	24
Attitudes and Values of the Married Student	30
Married Student Housing	33
Summary	36
III. FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE	37
Introduction	37
Development of the Questionnaire	38
Limitations	39
Married Student Housing--The National Picture	40
Services Rendered to Married Students	42
Programming for Married Students	44
Conclusions	45
Summary	50
IV. EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	51
Introduction	51
Playschool	54
Seminars	61
Mother Study Groups	64
Social Gatherings	65
Student Evaluation of the Center	66
Summary	71

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
Recommendations and Conclusions	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX A	85
APPENDIX B	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. National Survey Results on Married Student Population and Married Housing	41
2. National Survey Results on Services Offered to Married Students	43
3. National Survey Results on Social Recreation Facilities and Programs	46

A STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE MARRIED STUDENT AND THEIR POSSIBLE SOLUTION

I. INTRODUCTION

Need for the Study

The continued influx of married students to American colleges and universities indicates a persistent trend toward combining the pursuit of higher education with marriage. The democratic ideology places high value on the family and on the right of each individual to educational opportunities; thus the successful student marriage is of vital concern to our society. In a democratic society the importance of the individual is paramount. To benefit society, as well as the individual, democratic education must be designed to develop the highest potential of each individual.

The question of what to do about the married student and the married students' family faced every college and university in the nation at the end of World War II. Most college and university administrators believed that this was a temporary problem, which would disappear with the graduation of the World War II veterans, but it is evident today that this was a wrong assumption.

It would appear that the married student is here to stay. Although the World War II veteran has passed from the college scene, the number of married students since his departure has been on the

increase. The conclusion of the Korean Conflict brought with it additional veterans to the campuses, and as was true of their predecessors of World War II, many of them were married. The recent adoption, by the Congress of the United States, of a new veterans' education bill, will result in a return to the campus of many veterans of the "Cold War" conflicts, with an accompanying increase in the number of married students. Numbers of today's students contemplating a period of service upon graduation, are marrying while in college. Many high school graduates will be serving at least two years of military service for many years to come, prior to going to college, resulting in an older student than presently found on the campuses. The continued presence and increasing percentage of married students calls for new thinking on the part of college administrators, and one of the most important problems will be how best to house and program for this segment of the student population.

Before a sound program of housing for married students can be developed, it is necessary to determine what kind of program would best fit the needs of this portion of the student population. If institutions of higher learning are to be prepared in the future to provide for their married students, as they have for the single students, they need to understand what the housing problems of married students are and how they can best be solved. These problems do not stem just from physical plant operations, but involve social,

economic, and recreational problems different from those of the single student.

Assuming that the married student population will continue to be of concern to higher education in the future, the writer believes that an evaluation of what has been done in the past as well as what is contemplated in the future concerning the needs of the married students will have value for college administrators as they consider what should and could be done to provide for such students.

Statement of the Problem

This study deals with the emerging concern for the married student at Oregon State University as well as other colleges and universities with similar offerings and background. Special emphasis will be placed on the responsibility of college and university student personnel services in assisting this type of student. Consideration will be given to social, educational, recreational, and other needs of married students living together in a separate community. It is hoped that the results of this study will assist in developing better guidelines for the planning of housing and programs for married students.

The purpose of this study is: To study the need for an educational, social, recreational program for married students based on available theory and information, and to develop a pilot program in

keeping with the goals of higher education and the philosophy of the student personnel administration.

Procedure

Research on the married student program in the university and college setting has been primarily focused on individual aspects of one specific university's local problems. While there is no specific research or writings in the particular areas of concern to this study, much useful information is available. The writing of authorities in psychological and sociological theory have been most useful in identifying the needs and in developing conclusions on how to provide for such needs in a married student program.

The present problem with the tremendous development in building and establishing a "living in" program on the college campus is that there has been little connection between available information and attempts at educational programs. The main theme of one recent book on higher education is that American colleges and universities have practiced education with little regard for the scientific method or for developing a program based on systematic knowledge. Sanford in the introduction to the American College relates:

Practice in higher education, as in politics, remains largely untouched by the facts, and principles of science. What our colleges do, tends either to be governed by tradition or to be improvised in the fact of diverse, usually unanticipated, pressures. In the literature of

the field there is much partisan argument, and little evidence on the basis of which conflicting claims might be evaluated. Very little is known of what effects, if any, the experience of going to college has on students and less what particular features of the college environment determine such effects as have been observed. The empirical studies that have been done in the past have been mainly of the ad hoc variety, separated from systematic theory and so local in their orientation as make generalization impossible. This state of affairs has persisted despite the fact that during the past twenty five or thirty years psychology and the new social sciences have advanced rapidly, producing concepts and theories, methods of investigation and much factual knowledge, all of immediate relevance to problems of education (41).

A survey of land grant colleges and universities will be used to determine trends in married student housing and programs, on campuses similar to Oregon State University. The material gathered from the survey will help to establish housing construction plans and determine what other campuses are doing to program for the married student.

The nature of this study will necessitate the use of much original material. A considerable amount of the material involved in the evaluation of a married student program will be from Oregon State University, where attempts are being made to implement some of the areas being discussed. Training material, case studies, and the illustrative data has come from experience in this program.

The methods and procedures used in this study lie somewhat outside the usual study. The research will involve the gleaning of materials from the behavioral sciences and integrating them with

the results of a questionnaire aimed at evaluating present programs with married students. This material will be applied in an attempt to create an educationally sound and an operationally feasible married student program.

The recent situation at Oregon State University, which is probably not atypical, points up the need for the kind of program being discussed in this study. The examples used point up the need for more student personnel services for married students. Records show that during the school year 1963-64 there were three unsuccessful attempts at suicide among married students. These are the known attempts and do not include those who may have made the attempt but have not become a statistic. Referrals for psychiatric or counseling help numbered twenty-six. During the school year 1964-65 the attempts at suicide were lower with a corresponding drop in the counseling referrals.

Some college and university administrators may believe these examples are out of context and are isolated instances. The writer's conclusion, is that these situations come about because student personnel workers have not been able to extend their services to meet the needs of this part of the student community. In planning for the needs of married students, the university should assume that the married student has common problems with the single student, as well as the added responsibilities of a wife and family. Married

students have a real contribution to make to each institution of higher learning, if encouraged to do so.

Limitations of Study

1. This study is limited to identifying the need for and development of guidelines for student personnel services in the married student community.

2. The samplings to determine what programs have been developed by other universities and colleges are limited to Land Grant Institutions in the United States.

3. The wide range in enrollment of the Land Grant Institutions used in the samplings will cause differences of opinion about the services which will be recognized.

4. The responses to the statements in the questionnaire for this investigation involve judgments by the appropriate official.

5. The experimental project carried on at Oregon State University will by necessity limit the number of married students observed.

Summary

This chapter reviews the need for student personnel services relative to the married college student and points out the need for guidelines for these services. The problems for this investigation

are twofold: to identify the functions necessary for an adequate student personnel program in married student programming, and to develop guidelines based on experimental design and survey. The writer has defined the basis for examination, stated the limitations, and explained the procedure followed in carrying out this investigation.

The following chapter summarizes the literature related to this study.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the review of the literature relevant to the student personnel services, student housing, and statistics pertinent to the married student are presented. The literature was used as a basis in developing the writer's questionnaire and the experimental project at Oregon State University.

Development of Student Housing

Institutions of higher learning, in general, recognize today that if students are to do their best academic work they must be concerned with the environment in which study takes place. The housing of students and the planning of relevant programs must be considered as an administrative responsibility. The consideration of the housing facilities as making definite contributions to the educational aims of the university, for both single and married students is becoming an accepted part of campus planning.

The attitude of American colleges and universities toward housing their students has undergone important changes since higher education got its start in this country approximately three hundred years ago. The colonial colleges established before the Revolutionary War found their pattern in the English college of that day. The college first of all, was a hall of residence. The tutors lived within

or near the colleges where they could keep surveillance over their students. Since the majority of the college presidents and large numbers of the faculty were ordained ministers, religious instruction and general education were closely related. The college teacher believed that kneeling in prayer with one of his students was as much a part of his duties as listening to a student's recitation.

The policy of colleges to provide housing for students so as to permit close supervision continued in colleges founded after the Revolutionary War. When Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, Vassar, Smith and other colleges for women appeared on the scene, they undertook to house the great majority of their students. Church-controlled and other private liberal arts colleges retained to a large extent the belief that furnishing housing was a vital and necessary part of college life.

With the turn of the century, a revival in the attitude toward student housing occurred. The newly established University of Chicago built dormitories. Yale, Princeton, and Harvard also sought to regain some of the benefits of college-controlled group living.

In nearly every American college and university, however, we see a continuing conflict of philosophy in regard to student housing. Advocates of strong control of the complete life of the student on one hand, vie with those who disdain any responsibility on the part of the

institution for its students outside of the formal classroom. The effect of these two conflicting ideas is very evident today; a situation results in which some students are housed by the university and over which some measure of social control is exercised by the institution, but in which the social life of the college residence unit is considered separate and distinct from the academic life of the classroom.

While colleges and universities knew that the conclusion of World War II would bring an unprecedented influx of students to their campuses, it was not easy to predict with any certainty just when that time would come. Much planning concerned with how to house great numbers was entered into by college administrators. Cheap and quickly available housing was needed if those who were to take advantage of the veterans' educational benefits were to be accommodated.

Housing for single students could be provided in many parts of the country by utilizing war time housing facilities as temporary dormitories. Also the support of local townspeople could be enlisted to help care for the single student. Housing for the new type of college student, those who were married, created a different problem, not only would he be accompanied by his wife, but in addition many would be bringing children. This type of student required an entirely different kind of housing from that which had been

customarily provided by colleges and universities.

The presence of large numbers of married students posed a most difficult housing problem, for such students had to be dealt with in many respects, quite differently from single students. This new segment of the college community had little interest in general student body affairs and other extra-curricular activities.

Married students were more concerned with their home situation and how to make their budgets balance. Many wives sought employment in order to supplement the family income. The wife postponed or dropped her educational goals in order to assume the role of breadwinner for the family, which often created an educational gap within the home.

Student Personnel Work and Its Place in the College Community

The place of student personnel services in the college community is to meet the needs of students, individually and in groups, in order that they may take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the university. The primary emphasis is placed on the welfare of the student, so he may achieve the goals that he sets for himself, and meet the demands that will be placed upon him by society. The achievement of these goals by the student will reflect in many ways the planning and organization of the institution he attends.

Fitzgerald states:

Student personnel services have become allied with administrative functions of the campus, and in this manner are less well identified as educative or instructional. Dependent upon the 'acceptance climate' of the campus, often demonstrated by the financial support accorded by top-level administrators, individual student personnel programs have flourished and become small operational empires, or integral parts of the educational experience (17).

Certainly not every student has the inclination to do more than is required by his regular class schedule. Similarly, not every instructor, excellent though he may be in the formal class structure, is able to work effectively in this constantly changing and frequently flowing area of social learning. Continuous research on student perceptions and values by counselors and group workers can keep the personnel programs adaptive and responsive to student and faculty needs.

Because of the flexibility and comparative freedom from meeting grade requirements in academic fields, student personnel work can act as the facilitating agent in establishing the out of class learning experience. Student personnel workers should not only contribute their own talents but should awaken teachers and students to the value of such experiences and offer assistance to those who seek ways of extending the learning process beyond the formal class structure. To investigate new ideas, to experiment with new ways of solving problems, (intellectual, aesthetic, and social) and to

nurture wherever possible the needs of creativity, are some of the areas that await the energy, insight, and direction that can be provided by the personnel worker.

A climate for learning can only exist on a campus where there is a deep respect for the student, for his potentialities and his immediate concerns and accomplishments. One sign of this respect is a genuine consideration of and support for exploratory struggles and activities of the student who seeks individual expression.

In the final analysis, then, a college "climate" is the sum total of the student, faculty and administrator's perceptions. A climate for learning exists best where the members of the college community have not only the chance to study but also the opportunity to act, individually or collectively, upon a common basis of experiences, understandings and commitments.

The student personnel staff must above all have an abiding interest in students, a faith in their capabilities, and an understanding of their aspirations. The word "student" is the key word in any definition of student personnel work. The student personnel staff must also be committed to the educational process and to helping achieve the goals of the institution. They must believe in the worth of these goals and work with the students, faculty and administration in achieving them.

The Married Student Impact

The impact of World War II upon institutions of higher learning was tremendous. The pressing demands of world conflict brought about a change in college and university approaches to instruction, testing and the use of instructional materials. Greater emphasis was placed on testing for skills, attitudes, and interests in order to better guide this great influx of students seeking additional education.

The conclusion of the war brought with it a migration to the college and university campus. This student population had in its midst an older and more mature student, as well as a great number of married students, partially supported by a government aid program of educational benefits to those men and women who had served their country. Many of these students had their college education interrupted or delayed from three to five years, and were returning now to institutions of higher learning to complete their education. Some had married while in the service or shortly after their discharge and with the adoption of the government educational program for veterans, were determined to complete their college work, establish their homes, and find their places in the world of work.

In addition to those students who had their education delayed after graduation from high school or who left college to enter the

service, there were those who had completed the General Educational Development Test to qualify for admission. These too, flocked to the colleges and universities in quest of an education, and many of them were married. Another group must be considered when discussing the great influx of students after the Second World War; those who graduated from college just before the war broke out and were almost immediately called into service. Many of these felt they should return to the campus for a period of re-education.

One striking aspect of the extension of educational opportunity, is shown in the increasing numbers of older and married students, who are attending American colleges. The presence of such students represents an essentially new force on the campus, different in ways, from other groups. Their expectations of good teaching and personnel services vary greatly from expectations of the undergraduate adolescents normally found on the college campus. Their attitudes vary substantially from those of the late adolescent. Studies of the veterans of the Second World War who enrolled as college students substantiate these points almost beyond question.

Recent data indicates that about one out of four students in American colleges and universities is married and that only slightly more than half of the regularly enrolled students are of the typical college age, that is 18 to 21 inclusive (44). Studies of college students indicate that the group which is increasing most rapidly in

proportion to the total student population of American colleges and universities, married or single, is composed of women over the age of 30. During a recent eight year period the actual numbers of such students in the colleges and universities more than doubled as contrasted with the increase in the total student population of about 50 percent. During this same period of time the number of men students over the age of 30 also increased substantially.

The effects of increasing numbers of older and married students on the whole college program, including student personnel work, is likely to be greater than the effects of the increase in the number of non-white and lower income students upon our programs, due to federal influence on this group. The additional enrollment of those from the lower social economic groups involves the process wherein these additional students accept almost without question the mores, the social customs, and the academic expectations of the majority group. This is caused because these "new" students have a great wish to adapt themselves into the mold which they perceive as a majority culture.

The same phenomenon is not in evidence among older, married students who come in increasing numbers to our campuses. They are much less willing to adapt themselves into a mold already formed. They expect to carry out interests which are already developed, modes of life already established, and academic expectations which

vary considerably from that of the late adolescent group which dominated the college or university previously. In effect, they form a powerful social influence on the campus, one that cannot be stifled by the presence of a majority culture of younger students.

The average age of people entering into marriage in the United States has decreased more than five years in the last 100 years. This factor alone has caused an increase in the number of younger married couples on campuses. The incidence of divorce is six times higher if both participants are under the age of 20, than if they are 20 years or older. At the present time in Oregon, 58 percent of the brides and 19 percent of the grooms are teenagers.

Adults have problems which are evident in all phases of their lives whether at work, at home, or in their social interaction outside of the home. At work there may be problems with the employer or with fellow employees, and at home it could be the children or a marital problem. The problems caused by minimal social interaction may be the result of the reluctance of the adult to get out of the house to mix with others, or when he does he may be suspicious of others, or seem to argue constantly with his friends.

On a national basis the figure of 10 percent has been used to indicate the numbers of persons suffering from some type of emotional disturbance. Two recent surveys, known as the Baltimore and Midtown studies, would indicate that as many as 23 percent

suffer from "impaired" mental health (42). In these studies "impaired" persons were defined as those with serious symptoms resulting in their functioning with great difficulty.

✓ Most universities admit they are not adequately meeting the students' needs either through marriage education or marriage counseling, but more universities than ever before are concerned about these areas and are making some kind of provision for them. Educators and counselors could well join hands to help educate university administrators in terms of two jobs that need to be done, and to assure them to the possibility of doing both jobs well. Caution should be used in departments where marriage education is offered, to insure that the instructor who takes on a counselor's work is adequately prepared. Counseling services dealing with marital problems must be sure that the counselor assigned to these cases is equipped to handle them. Finally, counselors and educators who are vitally concerned with the way in which families function, whether they are affiliated with an academic department or a counseling service, should learn to work together toward the common goal of better marriage education and counseling (20).

Recent figures released by the United States Census Bureau reveal that of all persons attending college between the ages of 14 and 34, approximately 24 percent are married (44). Of the 24 percent who are married, approximately 30 percent are men and 13

percent are women. Of these students attending college on a part time basis, 65 percent of the men and 37 percent of the women are married. Of those students attending college on a full time basis, 18 percent of the men and 6 percent of the women are married.

Probably the most significant question to be considered in college marriages, is whether the students are mature enough to face the responsibilities of marriage. Margaret Mead (29), has serious concerns about the college marriage and feels that they may be hindering students from making the most of their education.

The Reasons Married Couples Become Students

What are the reasons any person has for attending college? In most cases the objectives of the married student are exactly the same as for single students: the economic advantages of a college degree, the social pressure to have a degree, and the personal motivation to increase one's knowledge.

There is indication that some sections of the country, particularly in the Northeast, attach a stigma to the married students. In other parts of the country there has been no loss of social prestige in going to college and working for self support, married or single. This feeling is gradually becoming more prominent than ever before. The married student has advantages that the single student does not. For example, the married student does not have to use his time in

seeking dates for social activities. The married student has the potential advantage of a wife or husband who can work, when the couple does not have children and sometimes when they do.

The married student also has some disadvantages. He often has greater financial problems than a single student. The married student usually does not have time for participation in undergraduate activities. The burden of a family causes further problems. The housing for married students cannot be provided as is done for the single student. Quite often the wife will become discouraged with the role she must assume as a student wife.

When administrators thought of the married student as a veteran they planned for him as a temporary influence on higher education. If in the future, 20 to 25 percent of the students are married, college and university administrators must consider what effect it will have on the total program. Donnelly relates the facts as:

1. Married students are not all graduate students.
2. The reasons that married students have for coming to college are similar, if not the same, as those of the single students.
3. Married students have as great a need for housing as do single students (14).

The married student need for housing should be carefully evaluated. There are housing administrators who have fought

vigorously for residence halls for single students and are equally opposed to married student housing on the assumption that the university has no responsibility in this field. Institutions accept married students as a part of the student body and having done so, it should follow that they then accept some responsibility for their housing. It is recognized that public opinion has had some effect on the provision of student housing (6). Many people maintain that the married student has accepted an adult role in society and therefore should be responsible for his actions and livelihood.

The Married Student and His Place in the College Community

College marriages have now become an accepted part of the college and university social structure. Twenty years after World War II, there is a leveling off in the percentage of married students which now approximates, and in some cases exceeds the increase in numbers that followed the war.

The married student during the past ten years has been accepted by more administrators and college officials as well as by the single students. Dr. John A. Hanna, President of Michigan State University, states:

. . . the married student is not a liability, as was once believed, but an asset which lends quality, stability, and admirable strength of purpose to the student body as a whole (27).

That college officials accept married students as a part of the student body is definitely established by the trend in college and university housing. The editor of Look magazine relates:

Three hundred and sixty-six colleges and universities reported a total of 2,396 resident facilities constructed in the years 1950-58. Of these, 40 per cent were single student residences, housing 163,332 students; 10 per cent were sorority and fraternity residences and 50 per cent were married student resident housing for 9,176 families (30).

The general problem facing student personnel workers in the area of the married student has caused some administrators to draw the following conclusions. Married students are a segment of campus life and will become more so in the future. Married students' programs have failed to develop on a foundation of careful study. The need now is for development of a framework in which research is carried on.

There are others who feel that if a student has attained a degree of maturity, marriage is no handicap, but may be an asset to an education. Dr. David A. Henry, from the University of Illinois on whose campus there are in excess of 4,000 married students, states:

I believe that at the graduate level, marriage for students is essentially a good thing, where there is a real partnership between husband and wife, and where physical conditions of finance and housing can be managed without too great a strain.

I think all who have considered this question would say that maturity is the key. Where the students

know their goals and are prepared to undertake the responsibilities of marriage, domestic responsibility of marriage is no handicap to their student career (21).

Dr. Henry believes that most college students who undertake marriage are mature enough for marriage. He explains:

We must remember that 50 per cent of the males in the general population marry before their 23rd birthday, whereas only 10 to 15 percent of college students in that same group are married. This point indicates that in general, college students are more restrained in taking on marriage responsibilities than those who don't go to college (25).

Marital adjustment among married students can also serve as an indicator of maturity. Florence Aller defines marital adjustment as:

. . . the extent to which a husband and wife have developed harmonious, effective, mutually satisfying behavioral patterns that are conducive to optimum psychological growth (1).

The Married Student Program

Participation in extra-curricular activities has been generally encouraged because of the socialization value it holds for the student. However, such participation has been frequently overlooked as a factor that may influence the scholastic attainment of college students. The scant research available in this area suggests no negative effects of such outside of class activities. However, it should be noted that these studies are carried on with the single student population, with

no apparent concern with the married student population.

A review of the literature in the field of student personnel fails to reveal an attempt to conceptualize a framework for a married student program. Consideration of the married student in the college and university setting has been relegated to an insignificant role. Not many studies have been concluded and those that have are not based on past experiences. It is impossible to evaluate an educational program unless the purposes behind the programs are known.

According to Mueller (32), married students tend to be concentrated on the large co-educational campuses where special housing has been built for them. In 1956, one typical midwestern university reported that 17 percent of its students were married. At Oregon State University, in the fall of 1962, 1,395 men and 328 women of a total student enrollment of 10,037, were married. This is about 20 percent of the men and 11 percent of the women in 1963. Another increase was noted in 1964 when 21.5 percent of the men and 13 percent of the women were married.

In the fall of 1965 and 1966 the increase of married males remained at 22 percent. In the same two years the married women leveled off at 11.3 percent.

This increase in the married student population will be accompanied by the problems and anxieties that often accompany the

shift from a place in the world of work to a completely new phase of life, that of a student. Some of the student wives appear unprepared for the realities of living in competition with a degree. Husbands are, in many cases equally unprepared to handle the combined role of student, husband and father.

Only one out of ten college husbands kept his wife in school, and less than half of these student wives took full time college work toward a degree at Oregon State University. The addition of federal funds to help finance college educations will have some effect on the married student wife who wishes to continue her education. With this becoming a reality the married student population will increase in the next few years. It is also obvious that more of the wives are enrolling in school quite possibly to keep pace with their husbands.

Kate Meuller relates:

Whatever the college offers in the way of social and intellectual interaction is not so available to the married student as to the single student. . . . There is no time for tennis. . . . There is no time or money for concerts or dances or travel or social life. . . . The rich life of the campus lies all about them. . . the free chamber music, the recitals and lectures, the inexpensive concerts and plays, the art exhibits, the seminars with distinguished visitors, football and basketball games, and other sport attractions; but their participation is at a minimum.

Their first complain is fatigue, they simply cannot get everything done. They cannot find time even to be together, and the greatest hazard of all is the husband who is unwilling to do his share of the family chores. Emotional stress and deprivation (of money and time)

are powerful deterrants to learning and many of the married students are reluctant and irregular students (32).

A study conducted by Richard Chambliss, in 1958, dealing with the married students emphasizes a number of problems found with this group. Of the students surveyed 79 percent mentioned housing problems related to maintenance, fire hazards, sanitation, traffic, equipment, laundry facilities, nurseries, play areas and shopping.

Chambliss relates:

It is evident that some students among those who are married, particularly those living off campus, feel that they have no part in the social life of the campus. A few thought that special social programs for married students should be arranged. . . .It is evident. . . that among married students a psychological need for some kind of social recognition is keenly felt. These students are troubled not so much by their loss of identity with the college age group as by uncertainty as to their new status. Separated in some degree from their unmarried classmates they have not yet joined the groups that form around occupation, community, and civic responsibility. As students, they are detached from social life within it. Even the student wife, busy with her job must sometimes feel a need for status not wholly satisfied by the promise of a settled life beyond the degree (9).

Building and maintaining a reputable graduate school includes providing living facilities for the married graduate students. If the married graduate student cannot find acceptable accommodations for his family, he will seek his education at an institution that has these facilities.

A study conducted by Norman Oppelt in 1960, at Michigan

State University brings about some interesting comparisons between single and married students (36). Eight conclusions drawn from the study are:

1. Married male undergraduates are most concerned about problems having to do with finances.
2. Financial problems are significantly greater among the married male students than the unmarried.
3. Wives of married students are primarily occupied with working to support the family and few of them are continuing their formal education.
4. On the basis of the father's education and occupation the married male undergraduate came from a lower social-economic level than the unmarried males.
5. The married students participated significantly less in all types of campus extra-curricular activities, except in the area of student organizations.
6. Married students are as well satisfied with opportunities to attend or participate in most extra curricular activities as are the unmarried students.
7. Married students make less use of the counseling center and health center than do the unmarried students.
8. There is no significant relationship between marital status and the use of financial aids, scholarships, and placement offices

among male undergraduates.

These results support previous research in the relationship of marital status to participation in extra curricular activities. Rogers (1958), Marchand and Langford (1952), Bailey (1957), Lantagne (1959), and Williamson, et al. (1954), all found that married students participate less in extra curricular activities than the single student. It is noteworthy that the married students were well satisfied with their opportunities to attend all types of activities, except inter-collegiate athletics. It would seem that the concern some student personnel administrators have about the lack of extra curricular activities for married students is not shared by the students themselves.

✓ The findings that finances are the major source of problems for married students agree with six other researchers in this area, Attman and McFarland (1960), Bailey (1956), Cushing (1948), Donnelly (1956), Lantagne (1959), and Reimer (1952).

Several studies concerning wives of married students are also quite significant and interesting. It appears that few of the wives who were not college graduates at the time will complete a degree. Some of them are sacrificing their own education in order to help their husband earn his diploma. Further study is needed to determine what effect this difference in education will have on their lives and particularly whether or not it will cause marital problems.

The problems of the married students seem to be most commonly related to immediate needs of finances, whereas the single males are more likely to be concerned about educational and personal social difficulties. A study by Jones (1958) indicates that married students are better able to cope with emotional problems and tensions than unmarried students.

Attitudes and Values of the Married Student

A frequent result of marriage among college students is that one or both drop out of college and most often this is the wife. The reasons for withdrawal may be financial or may be due also to some traditional attitudes about the role of women in our society. A study by Schab (42), in 1965, at the University of Georgia, asked whether women should seek a college education. The random selected group indicated that 89.8 percent of the graduate group and 78.6 percent of the undergraduate group indicated a positive response. The difference between the groups was not large enough to be statistically significant.

This hypothesis could not be upheld when the two groups were asked the question concerning the need women had for a college education. The graduate students were much more certain of the female's educational needs. The difference was significant at the one percent level.

Schab carried his study further, relating the benefits of marriage to academic achievement. The differences in opinion between both groups were again found to be statistically significant at the one percent level. The undergraduate men were in agreement with the idea that marriage improves grades in 90 percent of their replies. Only 55 percent of the graduate group indicated a belief similar to that of the undergraduates.

Another area of interest to married students is that of interpersonal relations and their role in the home. Since the male in our society is supposed to be the main support of his family, these students were asked about the desirability of the wife seeking a career. Both the undergraduate and graduate male students had similar negative feelings concerning the working wife. They agreed that the wife should decide. But a significant difference, at the five percent level, appeared when the arrival and care of children was an influencing factor.

If the wife is working, the husband must face the possibility that she may be more successful than he. The graduate married men were shown to be much more tolerant of feminine success than were married men in general.

A study conducted by Schab dealing with a comparison of male undergraduate and graduate students' attitudes and values while married gives some interesting conclusions. Schab relates:

1. Graduate married men were more convinced that women needed a college education than were the undergraduate married men.

2. Graduate married men felt more strongly than did undergraduate married men that college men need stricter regulation.

3. Graduate students believed college students should not marry while still in college.

4. The graduate group was more inclined to allow their wives financial freedom to operate the home and to share family responsibilities than was the undergraduate group.

5. Graduate students would accept a woman executive at both the immediate job and the presidential level more willingly than would the undergraduate group.

6. Married undergraduate men felt college women were discriminated against more than did married graduate men.

7. The undergraduate would choose to marry non-college women more than would the graduate men.

8. Undergraduates believed marriage benefitted their grade achievement more than did the graduate group.

9. Undergraduate married men would restrict a college education to their male children more often than would the graduate married men.

10. Undergraduate married men would resent a wife who was more successful while the graduate group indicated they were more

willing to accept such a state of affairs (42).

Married Student Housing

About one-fourth of the college population of just under four million is presently housed in some form of institutional housing. Within the next decade this population will have grown to more than six million, creating more of a demand on housing facilities.

In planning, college administrators are not as concerned as they might be when dealing with the need for married graduate housing. The writer feels that administrators should be planning for future needs in married student housing as well as taking care of present demands.

Mr. Vance Packard, one of America's most prominent social critics and the author of three best selling non-fiction books on the changing American society, outlined in a speech given at Pennsylvania State University in 1963, the "seven great changes of our time." Two of them, the population explosion and the growing importance of education, should be of concern to all college and university administrators, and especially those responsible for the housing of students.

It must be assumed that, along with increasing enrollment in our colleges by 1970, there is a strong possibility that the demands for married graduate student housing are going to double (37).

In comparison to the residence hall for single students, staff requirements and administrative costs for married graduate housing are considerably less. In married student housing, colleges do not provide as many special services or staff as in residence halls for single students. However, as administrators have learned from studies of management, it is important that this part of the housing program be organized with a workable delegation of authority. It is necessary to have personnel responsible for applications and processing leases, resident management, maintenance billing and collecting. The program should go further, by providing a trained administrator to coordinate some form of educational, and social-recreational programming as well.

A college may spend thousands of dollars informing students of the benefits they will derive and the pleasant atmosphere in which they will live, only to ruin the whole relationship by disturbing policy statements that are thoroughly irritating to the students. Policy decisions that will affect the living habits of the students could better be improvised with the help of student members participating in policy making.

The involvement of married students can be accomplished with the use of a student-faculty housing committee, or by putting into practice a married student council. This is accomplished on many campuses for the single student, but too often the married student

is not involved.

Institutions of higher learning purchased temporary buildings for classrooms, offices, and temporary housing units from obsolete military bases at the conclusion of World War II. Arthur Adams, president of the American Council on Education, has a series of stories of those first days after the war, when he was provost at Cornell University. Married veterans were moved into hastily assembled war housing before it was ready, and before the streets were paved, complicated by a very wet rainstorm. The first disaster occurred when the pipes froze, and the second disaster, when the diaper service in Ithaca went out of business.

In a speech before the Association of College and University Housing Officers at their 1963 meeting in Los Angeles, Mr. James Driscoll, of Cornell University summarized the feelings of housing officers, pertaining to what they had learned about married student housing. Apartment type housing has become an integral part of college housing as the more conventional single student residence halls. In most instances, Boards of Trustees and Boards of Education have accepted married student housing as a responsibility of higher education. The expansion of family housing is a good capital investment. It can in most situations be 100 percent self-amortizing. With a few exceptions, state and municipal governments have accepted such property as educational in nature and therefore tax

exempt. Married students can be successfully housed in a great variety of structural forms, such as highrise, lowrise, one story, two story, one floor, two floors, and even private housing. The recognition of married students' social, cultural, and recreational needs is a necessity. Facilities to enhance the programs for married students must also be considered in the over all building program.

Summary

The studies and related literature reviewed in this chapter relate to certain aspects of the college married student, namely; student housing in general; student personnel work; the influx of married students; the reasons married couples go to college; the married student place in the college community; married student programs; attitudes of married students; and, married student building programs.

This review of literature reveals the concern in the area of the married student on college campuses. Almost every writer infers the need for more study in this field. Consequently the need for developing administrative procedures in connection with the married student is apparent.

Chapter III reports the findings from the questionnaire used in this investigation.

III. FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

The findings from the questionnaire are reported in this chapter by the three main sub-divisions of the writer's questionnaire. Thus the findings can be directly referred to the questionnaire.

In reporting the findings, the 44 responding land-grant colleges recorded their information in three sub-divisions which are: general housing statistics; married student housing information; and programs provided for married students by the college or university.

Provision was made for checking each function listed in the questionnaire, either as existent at the university or college, or as desired by the respondent as a function of the university. For this investigation, the number of respondents checking each function was totaled.

The general purpose of the investigation was to chart the current dimensions of what colleges and universities have planned for the married student population. The questionnaire consisted of twenty-nine brief statements, mailed to Deans of Students and Directors of Housing.

Results are based on a 93 percent return (44 out of 48) of the questionnaires mailed. Three limitations on the findings were made

explicit: results represent perceptions of Deans of Students and Directors of Housing; for several categories of institutions, particularly in the East, there could be some bias due to somewhat lower return rates; the results apply only to the situation as of the period 1965-66.

Development of the Questionnaire

During the winter of 1965 a preliminary survey questionnaire was developed. The writer pretested the questionnaire by sending it to the Directors of Housing at three Regional Colleges and the two major universities of the State of Oregon, for their comments and evaluation. The final questionnaire was very similar to the pretested questionnaire, as found in Appendix A.

The final instrument consisted of 29 statements organized into three categories entitled: General Statistics; Services Information; and Married Student Programs. In each category, space was provided for writing additional issues and providing a summary estimate of the programs now being offered or contemplated.

The questionnaire was developed to give some indication as to a correlation between school size and provisions for single as well as married students. This correlation then was extended to determine the relationship between school size and projected building plans for married and single, and the total population of married and

single students. These statistics then were correlated to the programs that were developed or contemplated for married students at each university.

Deans of Students were asked to complete the questionnaire to provide a student personnel perspective of programming for married students. Their responses were used to compare any significant differences between student personnel administrators and Directors of Housing who were more likely to be business oriented than student personnel. This added an interesting contrast to the survey results. It should be noted that this contrast was not significant.

Limitations

The most important limitation of the results to be presented is that they represent only the perceptions of Deans of Students and Directors of Housing.

While the existence of any problem is seldom known except as it is viewed by someone, it is unlikely that the existence of married problems of College A is the same in the eyes of the evaluators in College B. In like manner the Dean of Students, the Director of Housing, and the editor of the school newspaper may each perceive the problems of the married student in a different perspective. The results cannot be said to describe some sort of objective reality;

instead they provide a picture of married student problems as seen by administrators.

An inevitable limitation on the validity of results in mail survey research stems from the possible differences between respondents and non-respondents. A 93 percent rate of return is exceptional in view of the general experience in survey research.

The survey instrument asked for information about married student housing and problems during the period of 1960 to 1966. In the absence of comparable data for previous years, analysis of historical trends is not possible. Some brief speculations about the near future are offered at the end of Chapter V.

Married Student Housing--The National Picture

In Table 1, figures are presented which show the proportions of the 47 institutions reporting the total school enrollment in the fall of 1965; the percentage of their married students that are graduate students; the percentage of their student population that are married; the number of married student apartments provided by the university; the percentage of students housed by the university, both married and single; the percentage of married students upon which the university bases its building program; policy for eligibility; priority system for assignment; limitations on the length of occupancy in married student housing; the percentage of turnover

Table 1. National Survey Results on Married Student Population and Married Housing

	RANGE	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE
Total Student Enrollment Fall 1965	Under 5,000 to 20,000	10,000	10,000-15,000	5,000-10,000
Per Cent of Enrollment Married	Under 5% to Over 45%	14%	16%-25%	16%-25%
Per Cent of Married Graduates	Under 5% to Over 45%	Over 45%	16%-25%	Over 45%
Number of Married Apartments	Under 100 to Over 500	330	301-400	Over 500
Students Housed by the University				
Single (percentage)	10%-20% to Over 50%	43%	31%-40%	41%-50%
Married (percentage)	Under 5% to Over 20%	2%	11%-15%	Under 5%
Percentage of married students the University Building Program is Based on	10%-15% to Over 25%	Under 10%	21%-25%	10%-15%
Percentage of Yearly Turnover Expected	Under 10% to Over 50%	26%	31%-40%	21%-30%
Percentage of Increase in the Married Student Population	10%-15% to Over 50%	15%	31%-40%	10%-15%

anticipated each year; the percentage of increase in number of married students over the past five years.

These general statistics provide a basis upon which future plans for married student housing can be planned. The percentages indicate the progress made in the past years for married students.

Services Rendered to Married Students

This section of the results gained from the questionnaire is restricted to a consideration of what services are rendered to the married students by the university.

It would be well, at the outset, to take special note of the significance of the factors influenced by institutional size. The size induced feelings of impersonality, alienation, and the feeling of being lost that has been so widely discussed by students and administrators alike, was not a significant factor in the results. However, it should be taken into consideration that a relatively large student population on a given campus, will in like manner create a correspondingly large number of married students. This would be justified mathematically by utilizing the percentage of married students presently enrolled multiplied by this percentage.

In Table 2, figures are presented which show the extent to which the 44 institutions have made student personnel services available to married students. The institutions reported on the

Table 2. National Survey Results on Services Offered to Married Students

SERVICE	YES	NO
Counseling service for married students and wives provided by the University	64%	36%
Counseling service for non-registered wives provided by the University	43%	57%
Psychiatric help offered to non-registered student wives by the University	20%	80%
Health Center service made available to non-registered wives	9%	91%
Health Center service made available to the families of students	5%	95%
Student Health Insurance made available to families of married students	45%	55%
Married Student programs are coordinated through the University Activity Center	32%	68%
Programs provided for wives by the schools within the University	36%	64%
University wide program for student wives organizations	61%	39%
Limitation of married student participation in University sponsored activities	5%	95%

following: availability of family counseling through the counseling center; the use of the counseling center by a non-registered wife; availability of the health service by non-registered members of the student's family; availability of student health insurance for married students' families; the use of the activity center to coordinate married student programs; planned programs for married students by the university; student wives organizations; limitations on married students in activity programs sponsored by the university.

Results of this section, found in Table 2, give some indication as to what direction the student personnel programs are proceeding when concern is shown for the married student on the campus.

Programming for Married Students

The third section of the survey is given over to a consideration of the way in which some colleges and universities have organized their married student housing to answer the following: provision for a social recreational facility; cost and operation of the facility; programming cost responsibility; scheduling of social recreational activities; building responsibility; program coordination; activities provided; and, accessibility to the building to other groups.

Generally speaking, the incidence of organized married student programming in 1965-66, was found to be greater in the

larger universities and colleges. Geographically, the married student is not as readily recognized in the New England States as he is in the Mid-West in terms of program needs. Southern institutions seem to be making greater strides in developing housing units and programs than other areas of the country.

From Table 3, one can gain additional perspective on the relative growth in married student programming and its correlation with size of institution and the increasing enrollments of married students. There are some indications that an increase in married student programs is becoming more a part of university and college planning. It would also seem that the increase in married students has caused a re-evaluation of the programs as well as a change in married student housing projects.

The results of the questionnaire give some indication that additional study of married students and college responsibility is needed. It is evident from the results that the responsibility for the married student lies somewhere between the Dean of Students and the Director of Housing, with neither taking full responsibility at the present time.

Conclusions

When the responses from all of the colleges and universities were combined to form a national picture, it was evident that size

Table 3. National Survey Results on Social Recreational Facilities and Programs

Social Recreational Facility provided in Married Student Housing	YES 27%	NO 73%
Cost of the building and its operation is assumed by the University	YES 59%	NO 41%
Cost of the programs is assumed by the University	YES 31%	NO 69%
Responsibility of scheduling the Centers' use:		
Unit Manager	20%	
Recreation Department	7%	
Housing Office	14%	
Activity Center	16%	
Other	43%	
Responsibility for the building:		
Housing Office	30%	
Unit Manager	20%	
Other	50%	
Type of activities to be carried on in the Center:		
Nursery School	2%	
Social	60%	
Recreational	61%	

of the institution had a direct bearing on the program provided. The increase in married students was in proportion to the growth rate of the institution, and the greatest increase was found in the graduate student population.

Fifty-eight percent of those responding indicated that between 16 and 25 percent of their student body was married. This correlates closely with the national average of 24 percent. Land grant colleges seem somewhat lower in numbers of married students, than the non-land grant colleges. The average number of married students attending land grant colleges was 19.5 percent.

The statistics indicate that land grant colleges are less likely to offer married student housing than single student housing. Sixty-five percent of the colleges responding provide housing for about 40 to 50 percent of their single students, while 46 percent offer less than five percent to their married student population, even though this segment constitutes 24 percent of their population. This figure could be biased by the statistics returned by the New England area, where married student housing is nearly non-existent.

Each institution surveyed attempts to provide married student housing for 10 to 15 percent of their married students. However, in most cases they have not been able to keep up with the demand, with the press of single student housing taking priority in building programs.

The amount of married student housing provided by each campus has caused some system of priority of assignment to be established. Due to the need for graduate students to handle teaching, laboratory, and research assignments on campus, 51 percent assign graduate students first. All institutions indicated that other students were assigned on a basis of class and date of application. The remaining 49 percent assigned married student housing on a date of application basis only. In each case it was evident that the aforementioned institutions had more available housing than other reporting institutions.

A trend was seen in the increased use of counseling services in the past three years. Each institution indicated that it had developed, or is in the process of developing policies to provide this service to the married student, husband or wife, regardless of whether or not both were registered in school. Sixty-seven percent indicated that married students have the privilege of using the counseling center. The availability of psychiatric help, however, evidenced that only 21 percent made this available. This is a questionable figure since in many institutions the health service did not have a psychiatrist on their staffs.

The use of the health center created a different picture when the non-registered wife of a student was involved. Eighty-eight percent indicated that the wife could not utilize the center, unless

registered as a student. This did not however, keep the registered member of the family from utilizing the service. Nearly half of the universities provided a low cost family health insurance policy for those who desired to purchase this protection.

Provision for a building to hold social recreational activities in married student housing also has been slow in materializing. However, there is a trend toward this type of facility on some campuses. The responsibility for operating and financing the building and programs has been the greatest deterrence in providing this type of facility. Thirty percent of the respondents to the questionnaire had a center in operation. Thirty percent more indicated that they will have or are planning one in the near future. Sixty percent felt that the cost of building and operating should be handled by the university, with the help of a social fee assessed against the project occupants. The facility use would be primarily social-recreational in nature. Sixty-three percent felt that this would be its primary function, with a secondary function of providing a pre-school area for children. The respondents felt that the facility should be made available to all married students regardless of their place of residence. Fifty-one percent felt that a financing structure could be worked out to accomplish a total married student program, including building, financing and desired activities.

Summary

Much that is good could eventually come from the programs developed by colleges and universities for the married student. Those who participated in the survey felt that more should be done to meet the needs of married students. In the interim, however, whether the encounter between those who favor developing married student programs and those who feel they have no responsibility in this area, proves to be devastating or satisfying, well may depend in large measure on the wisdom and sincerity with which these people move to recognize the married student.

Chapter IV will review an experimental project with married students living in university housing, and with their social recreational center.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

This experiment was initiated on the assumption that a community center is needed by married students to carry on a program of social, recreational, and educational activities for wives, children and husbands. It was assumed that a community center could provide the opportunity for married students to develop a program which would help reduce the everyday stresses and provide enriching and meaningful experiences.

A married student housing unit of 57 couples was selected. This group of units was selected as they provided an accessible group of married students that exemplified the marital, economic and social tensions characteristic of this segment of the student population.

An initial step in the planning was a conference with the unit manager of Campus Court and his wife to discuss the proposed program and to learn if they were willing to serve in an advisory and coordinating capacity. The manager and his wife were more than willing to participate for they believed that the program was a very important addition to the married student housing project. They thought that the center could also create an atmosphere of unity among the residents. Once the coordination was assured, the residents were

contacted to learn if they would like to participate in the experiment and what they would like to include in the program. The program to be discussed was centered around social activities, discussion groups, and a play school or nursery.

The initial meeting was something less than successful as only 14 couples attended. However, those who attended were very enthusiastic about the possible benefits that could be derived from the programs. They agreed to contact those who did not attend with the aim of attaining their impressions for the proposed center. The second meeting was far more promising as 34 couples attended, and the decision was made to implement the program for one academic quarter.

The residents, having agreed to attempt the program, left the task of finding a center large enough to hold the activities desired. It was necessary to have a structure of sufficient size to handle a large group with flexibility to handle small groups simultaneously. A three bedroom apartment which became vacant at this time, seemed to meet the needs of the center. Permission was obtained from the University administration to use the apartment at no cost for one term. If the program proved successful, there was the possibility of continuing the project for another year. Based on the observation of those responsible for the program and the students' evaluation, the programs have been continued.

After arrangements for the center were completed, organizational

meetings were held with residents. The group was divided into several small committees, consisting of five couples. Committee meetings were held to formulate a plan of action. Those residents who did not get involved directly were kept informed of developments by information bulletins. The nonparticipants were given the opportunity to express their desires and opinions about the center through the use of a list of topics, posted in the laundry facilities and center. The results from the lists and the committee meetings provided the bases for establishing a play school for pre-kindergarten age children; mother study groups, which discussed the child's growing up processes; social activities; and a lecture discussion series on such topics of interest as first aid, current political events, and family finance. It was necessary to embark on the project as quickly as possible due to the limited time for providing the services and proving their necessity.

The first activity in the center evolved around a work-social gathering to get the building ready for the program to follow. This initial group activity was most rewarding. It served as a mixer for the occupants and helped to create a feeling of cooperative effort in the project. This activity took on the semblance of organization with the division of responsibility for the cleanup and decoration of the building. Five groups of ten couples had the responsibility of a room and could do as they pleased to make it suitable for the programs. The

materials used for curtains and other decorative supplies were obtained from surpluses in the housing project and other areas on the campus. This activity did a great deal to create interest in the center and helped to provide for inter-action among residents. The structure was ready, the residents were ready, the only thing left was to provide the programs.

Playschool

Organization of the school became the major concern. Who was eligible to attend the school? What time of day should the school be operated? Where could an instructor be found? These were just a few of the questions that had to be answered.

Developing this program without funds necessitated much improvising and the use of considerable imagination and ingenuity. The mothers whose children would be attending collected materials that would be applicable to this age of children. Discarded toys were repaired and made usable. In addition to the repaired toys, the mothers decided that it would be advantageous to allow the children to bring one toy of their own choice each session. These toys were to be marked with the child's name and returned at the end of the session. This had a twofold advantage, as the children had an opportunity to play with other children's toys on a sharing basis, and were also responsible for keeping track of an item that belonged to them. The

program worked well without the loss of toys.

Blocks of wood of various sizes and shapes were obtained from a lumber mill in the vicinity. These blocks of wood were used as building blocks and for painting projects by the children. The blocks were provided by the company at no cost.

It was also possible to obtain paper products from a paper corporation in the area, at no cost. Through the cooperation of a representative of the firm it was possible to obtain outdated construction paper, notebooks, butcher paper, and various other items that were most useful in the school crafts program. At the conclusion of the school session, many items were given the children to take home so they could work on tasks that were started during the program.

The most critical of the problems was the instructor. Because of the lack of funds, it was not possible to pay a great deal for such a person's services. While looking for an instructor, other questions arose. Would it be necessary to have a certified person to operate the playschool? Should the instructor be trained in child psychology or should more emphasis be placed on recreational programs? Would the person have to be college trained? The answers to these questions were gained from discussions with qualified people in family life, nursery education and recreation departments. It was determined that a certified graduate was not necessary for the type of program to be offered. Primarily because of the facilities available it was decided

to attempt a program more in line with recreational needs, rather than teaching basic mechanics in the learning process.

The search for an instructor involved the School of Education, the Recreation Department, and the School of Home Economics. To secure a person with some training in child psychology and knowledge of recreational programs involving children of this age group was particularly difficult due to the time element involved. It was not possible to secure a person from the University staff, so attention was turned to the married student community. Finally one of the student wives who had two years of experience in recreational playground work, in Oregon and California, was selected.

Once the instructor was obtained, an organizational meeting with the mothers was held to determine the age level of the children to attend, the extent of the program, and what part the mothers themselves could play in the program. A count was taken to determine the number of children five years of age and who were not in kindergarten, and the number of children under five years. With the results of this survey it was decided to set the age limits at a minimum of three and one-half and preferably four years, with the maximum age of five. There were eighteen children in this age range with the majority in the pre-kindergarten five year age group.

The organizational meeting included the determining of a time to hold the school and the number of meetings per week. The mothers

PROGRAM FOR CAMPUS COURT COMMUNITY CENTER FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL 1965

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WESNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
9 10 Playschool 11 1 2 3 4 7	Home Study Group I Home First Aid II	Playschool Wife Coffee Hour Lecture-Discussion	Home Study Group II Home First Aid I	Playschool
9 10 Playschool 11 1 2 3 4 7	Home Study Group I Home First Aid II	Playschool Lecture-Discussion	Home Study Group II Home First Aid I	Playschool Group Social
9 10 Playschool 11 1 2 3 4 7	Home Study Group I Home First Aid II	Playschool Coffee Hour Lecture-Discussion	Home Study Group II Home First Aid I	Playschool
9 10 Playschool 11 1 2 3 4 7	Home Study Group I Home First Aid II	Playschool Lecture-Discussion	Home Study Group II Home First Aid I	Playschool Group Social

Playschool--18 children between the ages of 3 1/2 and 5 involved plus 2 mothers at each session.

Instructor Mrs. M. Carr. Classes are held from 10-11:30. Activity involved crafts, PE, and group projects.

Home Study--30 mothers involved in two sections of 15 each. Group leader Mrs. B. Schatz.

Group Social--50 involved under the coordination of the social committee.

Home First Aid--Approximately 26 involved divided into two sections of 13 each.

Lec-Dic Group--Unknown at this time but have a sign up of 15. Subjects will vary according to survey made on demand.

As can be seen the center is used every day of the week on a regularly scheduled basis, other activities have been carried on that are not on this basis such as seminars for exams and general discussions held by members of the community.

decided that the morning would be the best time, as it would eliminate conflicts with other scheduled events. This also provided for the continuance of established routines at home. It was decided to hold the sessions on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, from 10:00 to 11:30 a. m.

To better facilitate the school and the children, the mothers agreed to participate in the program with the instructor. Two mothers were assigned to each session. They would handle anything that arose in the nature of an emergency, as well as contributing to the program. This participation was quite enlightening to many of the mothers as it gave them an opportunity to observe their children engaged in activities with other children about the same age. They were able to obtain information about projects that could be carried out on their own, which would keep children busy and required little effort or expense.

The program was presented in such a way that it was diversified and stimulating to the children. The instruction made available projects in art, crafts, physical education, and music. Each day included a craft project, made from inexpensive or costless items, brought from home. These items included empty bottles, bottle caps, cereal boxes, and other containers usually discarded when the contents were gone. The art projects included drawing with crayons, painting, and using play dough, which was purchased with the money available. Group games were played to develop a feeling of cooperation

among the children. Exercises were carried on to stimulate physical activities. Several songs were taught the children to help them appreciate music to some degree. Many children's books were accumulated to be used during the story period. Most of these books were left in the center at the conclusion of the school, which gave the center a start on a children's library.

It was found that there were items that had to be purchased, such as glue, band-aids, medical supplies, rubber bands, art materials and other miscellaneous supplies. A plea was made to several organizations in the community as well as on campus for some small donation to the program. The campus ministers donated \$25 to the cause which helped to make the initial purchase of supplies. The Associated Students of Oregon State University provided \$25 for the treasury, which was used to purchase recreational supplies and more school equipment. The participants of the school paid a membership fee of 50¢ per term. This money was used to cover the operational expenses of the building and to provide funds to add recreational programs for the center. It was also used to cover the cost of heating and lighting the building. The custodial service of the building was carried on by the residents.

It is interesting to note that from the student evaluation of the programs attempted at the center, the playschool had the greatest degree of enthusiastic response. It required the most effort on the

part of the organizers and the participants, but this could well be the key to success of any of the programs.

In each case they were pleased with the operation, and hopeful of continuing the program. The mothers were more than cooperative in aiding the programs by helping. They came to observe on days that were not work days for them. It was evident that they enjoyed seeing their children participating in activities with other children. Student evaluation indicated that they learned ways to stimulate their children at home, which they felt helped reduce tensions there.

Continuance of the playschool program is dependent on the availability of funds. The Office of Economic Opportunity can help establish Head Start Child Development Programs for Pre-school children from low-income families. Head Start Child Development Programs will be financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity up to 90 percent of the total cost. The local share of costs may be made up either in cash or by providing space, equipment, utilities, or personal services. Costs which can be included in a Head Start Program budget include: salaries, rent and utilities, toys, equipment, teaching materials and books, transportation, food, health, psychological and social services, insurance, staff training, expert consultants, and limited renovation of the facilities. Additional funds would allow the program to expand and increase the number of operational days, thereby reaching more children.

Lecture-Discussions

It was necessary to survey the residents to determine their desires in the program. A list of topics was posted in the laundry facilities and the center to gain the information for the program. A committee of five volunteers took charge of the program, compiled the results and ranked their findings. The survey showed a desire for lecture-discussions in the following areas, by order of preference: First Aid in the Home; Current Events, particularly foreign policy; Family Living and Low Income Budgets; Child Psychology and Child Raising.

This program turned out to be the most difficult to initiate. Questions arose similar to those which appeared during the establishment of the playschool. Who would be the group leader? What topics would be of interest to the residents? What student participation would be necessary to carry on the program? Should the program be geared to the nonworking wives, or to gain the interests of couples? These were the questions that raised the most concern.

Some of the same problems encountered in the playschool confronted this program. The lack of finances to hire discussion leaders was not as crucial here as in the other programs. Graduate students in the fields selected volunteered to participate. Many of the people contacted were more than willing to participate because of the benefits that could be given the residents.

The initial session was on Family Living and Low Income Budgets. This was not the most desired but was selected because the group leader was readily available. The group leader was the president of the Campus Ministers. The program was well organized and proved to be quite stimulating for those who attended; however, this group amounted to only 14 couples in the housing project. The program gave the committee some valuable information regarding the future sessions. It was necessary to survey the campus activity calendar to avoid conflicts with other campus activities. It was essential to schedule the program on a night that would not conflict with regular school routines, such as laboratory work and tests, to further insure good attendance.

The session consisted of a thirty minute lecture on the subject followed by a one hour discussion period. The format seemed quite satisfactory to the participants, as the discussion period was quite lively. The evening was concluded with the serving of coffee, prepared by the committee.

The second session was on Home First Aid, conducted by a volunteer member of the Corvallis Fire Department. This discussion was handled with a team approach by four members speaking on a topic in their special area.

In each session the team of four was available for individualized help to those who desired it. There were four sessions, two at night

and two during the day. The first session was on artificial respiration, during which the various methods were presented. The fire department made available some dolls built especially for mouth to mouth respiration demonstration. These were used for practical exercises by the participants. The second session was on burns most common to the home. It included demonstrations of burn-causing hazards in the home, and how to treat these burns. These demonstrations were excellent and were a highlight of the session. The third session covered cuts, sprains, and broken bones, and the treatment of shock. The fourth session covered the psychological aspects of accident prevention. Each of the first two sessions was introduced by a film obtained through the County Health Department.

It is evident that these sessions were extremely condensed, and as a result some of the effectiveness of the program was lost. However, they were well received by those who participated and apparently most rewarding.

✓ The session on current events never really got off the ground due to the term coming to a close. Two sessions were held, one on events leading to the Cold War and one on the Cold War today. The attendance was affected by the time of the term, just before finals, in which they were attempted. It was decided by the committee, as a result of this experience, to hold all lecture-discussions at the first of the term or immediately after mid-term examinations, but well in

advance of finals. Spring term is a difficult term to initiate a program of any nature, particularly in a married housing project where the majority of residents are graduate students completing work on an advanced degree. Completing degrees and getting ready for graduation took a toll of the participants in the current events seminar. The necessity for packing and preparing to leave the University also had its effect on attendance.

Mother Study Groups

This segment of the program in the community center was organized and carried out by the residents. Two mothers in the project were members of a community group that was discussing an approach to child psychology. They were extremely interested in the program offered by the community group and made an appeal to initiate a new group to be held in the Campus Court Community Center. Both of the mothers had been in the program for nine months or more and were eligible to serve as discussion leaders, according to the community program chairman.

An information bulletin was circulated among the mothers to learn if any would be interested in a mother study group. The response was sufficient to start one session. The initial group had

a membership of fifteen; however, as the program developed it was found that a second group had to be formed in order to keep the groups small and workable. The program concluded with 36 members participating once a week, 18 on Tuesday and 18 on Thursday, for 14 weeks.

The number attending created a problem of what to do with the children while the mothers were meeting. A plan was devised so the children of the mothers attending on Tuesday would be taken to the community center, where two mothers from the Thursday session would care for them. This arrangement was reversed for the Thursday session. While the plan worked well for all concerned, it necessitated having the Mother Study Groups meet in the apartments of those participating.

Social Gatherings

The social gatherings were divided into two distinct categories. Some socials were organized for the entire population of the project area; others were organized by individuals for those whom they desired to entertain. The gatherings for all of those living in the project were publicized by information bulletins. Each person desiring to attend was asked to contribute some item for the party.

These closely resembled the old-fashioned country "potluck" affairs. In each case they were well attended and evidently enjoyed, as they usually continued into the small hours of the morning.

The gatherings arranged by individuals were limited to people residing in Campus Court or other registered married students of the University. Any resident desiring to use the Center was required to register with the manager to make sure there was not duplication of events. This also provided a record of the building use. Activities such as dinners, card parties and club meetings were held in the building on this basis.

Coffee hours were sponsored by the Housing Department of the University every Wednesday morning to give the wives an opportunity to mix during the day. The members suggested that some of the foreign student wives give talks about their countries during these sessions.

Student Evaluation of the Center

In order to determine the success of the center, a questionnaire was developed with ten broad questions (Appendix B). Each question gave the respondent the opportunity to express himself. Some questions required a yes or no answer with space for

explanation of the responses. The primary objective of the questionnaire was to determine whether the residents of the married housing units desired to continue the community center. The results of the questionnaire were more than gratifying. There was a 100 percent return or 57 couples out of the 57 units responded, which in itself would indicate high interest in the program.

The following is a summary of the results, with comments about the answers as supplied by the residents:

Do you feel a community center of the type offered is worthwhile? The response was 100 percent affirmative. The residents felt that the center offered them an opportunity to meet other couples living in the project. Social interaction of couples was stimulated and provided an opportunity for discussions of mutual problems involving home and school. They felt that it helped to overcome some of the frustrations caused by being married students with limited budgets for social activities. The programs offered were planned to meet the needs of young married couples, regardless of the size of family. There were things offered that the couples without children could participate in as well as those with children. The center gave the residents a chance to work on a project cooperatively with the same goals sought by all. These goals in most cases were outside the usual routine of school and work. In most cases the program could involve the husband as well as the wife. Location of the center was a favorable factor to many, as they felt it was easy to reach, therefore involving no transportation difficulties. The lecture-discussions provided an educationally broadening experience by having subjects outside the usual field of study. The center made it possible for couples to participate in activities at little or no cost, yet were very rewarding.

Did you participate in any of the programs offered at the community center? The response showed that 82 percent of the residents participated in all of the programs, while 18 percent participated on a limited basis. Those residents with children and intending to return to the University the next fall took the greatest interest in the center. Those not returning and particularly those finishing their degree work were less interested. However, among those not returning a large number of the wives participated in the programs for the first part of the term. The responses to this question indicated that the closer to the end of the regular school year, the less likely the residents will participate in regularly scheduled events. The residents who responded negatively usually qualified their answers by stating that they felt the programs

offered things in which they would have liked to participate, but because of being employed during the day it was impossible for them. Their evenings were given to household tasks or baby sitting while the husband studied on campus. The newness of the project kept some from participating, but when they found that the programs were enjoyed by others, they expressed a desire to take part.

In rank order list the programs you feel were most beneficial. The three most popular programs were: the playschool; the mother study sessions; and the lecture-discussions. It was interesting to note that the mothers (21) who did not have children in the school were enthusiastic about the program. This could have been due to their observations of the school, or their hope that the school would continue in the future. Regardless of the motives, the most popular item on the program was the playschool. The mother study groups were next in popularity, and indications are that this program needs to be expanded. A great deal of work must be done on the seminar sessions to provide a program that will stimulate attendance.

What do you feel should be added or deleted from the existing program at the community center? It was the feeling of the majority of the residents that the program should be enlarged to include more social activities for the adults. There was indication that some form of recreational program could be followed. In general, they felt the program to be adequate. The desire was expressed for more evening lecture sessions, particularly if scheduling could be done far in advance so residents could plan their time to insure attendance. Diversity of offerings was also mentioned as a way to help stimulate attendance.

Do you feel that more programs should be offered that would allow couples to attend and participate in the center? The response was 88 percent in the affirmative. It was the consensus of the group's opinion that social

and recreational programs be held at the center. The problems of time and money which arose in the other programs were evident in the social programs that were held. They believed that social programs helped to establish new friendships outside of their individual fields of study. Until the center was opened many people who had lived in the project for a year did not know a majority of the others. The social functions gave the older residents a chance to discuss some of the problems they had encountered during their stay in the project. Social gatherings took on the flavor of a cultural exchange as some of the occupants of the project were from outside the United States.

Do you feel that there should be more educational lecture-discussions held at the center? The response was 95 percent in the affirmative. The negative responses were from people who did not participate in the program. They thought the center was duplicating the offerings of the University. However, the purpose of this program was to offer non-credit discussion, with topics selected by the residents. As indicated by the affirmative response, the majority were in favor of the program and gave some suggestions for additional discussion.

Should there be a coordination board established to handle the programs offered at the center? The response was 98 percent in the affirmative. Those responding suggested that such a board would develop the program in addition to serving as a coordination board. Another purpose of the board would be to develop policies concerning the use of the building, and to recommend these to appropriate University officials. Residents desired to voice their concerns about the center to a board made up of other residents in the project. It was suggested that the board consist of five members selected from residents. It was found that during the experimental stage of development, the center could not operate effectively with one or two people trying to organize the activities of the center. The board would have the responsibility to establish

a committee system to carry on the program. This arrangement would have the advantage of making the programs at the center the responsibility of the participants, and success would be contingent on their ability to make the programs attractive.

What do you feel is the most beneficial thing about the center? Two items repeated themselves most often in the questionnaire. The center gave the residents an opportunity to become involved in something other than their studies and living situation with its accompanying problems. It provided an opportunity for group activities in the residential area that brought about many new, family friendships. These two benefits would seem to be the major reasons for having a center available for the residents.

What do you feel is the most detrimental thing about the center? Of those responding to this question the majority felt that the greater share of activities offered in the center were geared to the couples with children, leaving the childless couples with very little involvement. It was mentioned that the bulk of the load was carried by a few people and results would be better if this work were shared by others in the project. The establishment of a board would help to eliminate this complaint.

Summary

The problems encountered were not so great that they could not be overcome with additional planning and better internal organization. The more involvement by the residents of the project, the better chance of success for the programs offered. Additional committee organizational structure would greatly facilitate program

development. Programs originating among the residents should result in better attendance. The elimination of hurried programs and activities would provide a better basis upon which to proceed. The center proved to be worth all the effort put into it. With experience and better organization, it could be a real asset to the University married students' program. The program can serve its full purpose with additional planning, equipment and adequate means of financing.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the problems encountered by married students on college campuses and to formulate a program framework for such students. The continued influx of married students to American colleges and universities indicates a persistent trend toward combining the pursuit of higher education with marriage.

This study was stimulated by the observation that while some student couples appear to take education in stride, combined with marriage, achieving harmony and mutual satisfaction in the marriage relationship, others are unable to do so. Some experience difficulty in accepting the rigorous demands on time and energy entailed in financial support of the family, the pursuit of educational goals, and the rearing of children or other responsibilities.

A review of the research related to married students, their housing, and the administrators approach to their problems was conducted. This review reveals the concern in the area of married students on the college campuses by student personnel workers. It is evident that a need for additional study in this area would be helpful in developing administrative procedures for work with this segment of our student population. The literature reveals a concern for the married student, but suggests that little is being done to

remedy the existing problems.

Information was collected from a mailed questionnaire, sent to 48 land-grant colleges. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine how these colleges and universities planned for the married student. The questionnaire consisted of 29 statements divided into three sub-headings: general housing statistics; married student information; and programs presently provided or contemplated.

A general concensus of the 93 percent that responded to the survey were in favor of developing married student programs. The primary question of who would finance such an operation brought about the most controversy. The basis for the controversy about financing the program came from whether funds would come from rents derived from the tenants, from general housing funds, or from the university instructional budget. It was not possible to gain any significant trend in this area. It was felt that the success of the programs would depend to a great extent on the wisdom and sincerity of those who desire to recognize the married student.

* Interviews with married students living on campus as well as those who live off campus were held. These interviews were used to gain some perspective into what the students themselves see as their roles in the college community. Their ideas were used in structuring the experimental project conducted at Oregon State University.

The experiment was initiated to study married student reaction to a planned program of activities. Student involvement in the organization and planning of the programs gave the writer some insight into problems that might occur from such a program. It was evident that additional planning is a necessity for maximum success. A program council, composed of students, project managers, and a representative of the student personnel services would provide an organizational structure in which a planned program of activities could be accomplished. The student evaluation of the program brought forth the strengths and weaknesses of the project and should be given a great deal of consideration when contemplating the married student program. The writer feels that the experiment was rewarding to those who participated.

Since many of the leaders of tomorrow are in the nations' colleges and universities today, an integral part of the curricula must give emphasis to a respect for and support of the cultural and humane arts; strengthening of emotional and psychological stability; and fostering of high democratic values. Two major avenues exist in institutions of higher education to assist students in internalizing these qualities: the instructional program and the supporting student personnel services. Alone neither is sufficient; together much can be accomplished.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The writer believes that the married student poses special problems to the campus scene. His housing is more costly, his interests and the role he plays in student activities are far different from those of the single student. The married student tends to be more serious in his attitudes toward college work. He gives more time to the academic and less to the extracurricular than does the single student. His social life is primarily centered about the home, rather than the living group.

When the lack of participation by married students in campus activities and the real importance of the experiences that can be gained through participation in campus activities are considered, along with the fact that over 24 percent of the college students are married, the problem becomes apparent.

Despite disagreement over some aspects of student personnel work, a universally accepted concept is concern for the total growth and education of each and every student, married students, as well as unmarried students. One way to accomplish this growth and education is through an activity program. The functions of a program of student activities include: leadership training; continuation under favorable circumstances of the socialization process of the individual; and practicing beneficial group interaction and relationships. The

activity program within any college or university is the responsibility of student personnel workers. Student personnel workers, faculty, and administrative officers must take positive action concerning the allocation of the necessary time, effort and money to search for solutions to this problem of married student activities, and enact appropriate programs.

Lack of participation by married students in campus activities is a problem of sufficient magnitude that student personnel workers, within whose field of responsibility the problem falls, must devote the time, effort, and money necessary to discover and enact possible solutions. In working toward possible solutions, student personnel workers should keep in mind that:

1. Married students do feel a need for some social activity and do not seem to be satisfied with their present degree of participation in campus activities.

2. Finances, time, and perhaps the boy-meets-girl flavor of campus activities are some of the reasons for low participation of married students in the usual activity program.

3. The social life of married students revolves around couples of similar status and tends to be of an impromptu and inexpensive nature.

4. Married students seem interested in social activities as opposed to non-vocational classes or recreational activities, and

desire a program separate from that open to the total campus community.

5. Student wives, undergraduate students, and the younger students seem more likely to participate in activities than the older or graduate students.

Research and logic, which are two means of establishing and testing principles, are highly esteemed and extensively used in the field of student personnel work as well as other fields. As one compliments the other, both must be used to gain full measure from each. When confronted with a problem, the student personnel worker must rely heavily upon research findings and his own judgment. Formulation of reasonable conclusions and recommendations for action to alleviate the problem are based on the combined results.

The following recommendations for practice were drawn by the writer:

1. Provisions should be made, if possible, for both the husband and wife to continue their education without undue financial strain. There should be made available for aspiring husband-wife teams, a family financial plan whereby educational costs are reduced, or given a longer period to finance.

2. When simultaneous educational programs are planned by a married couple, and when finances are such that jobs are required, consideration should be given to family planning.

3. Marriage counseling services should be provided for married student families on college and university campuses.
4. Married student families should be made aware of available services offered by the university, such as health services.
5. Provisions should be made to establish a married student organization and committee structure developed to help coordinate a married student program.
6. A survey of married students on campus should be completed in order to obtain their interests and to locate individuals who could be used as leaders of married student programs.
7. Necessary funds should be allocated and a professional student personnel worker appointed to direct a separate activity program. Married students should be encouraged to participate in activities that cannot be arranged as separate programs such as concerts, plays, exhibitions and other cultural events.
8. The married student activity program should be initiated with social activities, primarily in married housing units, and should be as inexpensive as possible.
9. Programs developed should be geared to incorporate both members of the couple, thereby giving the couple a mutual interest.
10. The student personnel worker who directs such a program should involve as many of the married students as possible in the planning and executing of the functions. The younger students,

undergraduates and student wives seem to be a rich source of potential workers.

11. An attempt should be made to encourage the married student to move from a strictly social program to one that can give them the learning experiences they will need when they graduate and enter the community.

12. Provision should be made to allow the wife of the student to go outside of the confines of her home to release day to day tensions of the home and family. A center of this nature provides this means of escape.

The before mentioned recommendations are but suggestions; however, as they indicate, something can be done to alleviate the situation found in most colleges and universities when dealing with the married students. The student personnel worker cannot take the attitude that there is a well planned activity program, but if the married students do not participate he must discover why they do not. If it were only the students' loss it should be reason enough, but it is the loss of society as well. Colleges and universities can no longer overlook this segment of our student population. The conclusion of this writer is that those responsible for student affairs should take action now.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aller, Florence. Some factors in marital adjustment and academic achievement of married students. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 41:609-616. March, 1963.
2. Altman, Sophie and Dorothy McFarlane. Bridal suites in the ivory tower. *Overview* 1:50-51. 1960.
3. Arbuckle, Dugald. Student personnel services in higher education. New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1953. 356 p.
4. Bailey, R. P. Do you take this coed. . . .? *Wisconsin Journal of Education* 90:11-12. 1957.
5. Berdie, Ralph F. After high school what? Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1954. 7 p.
6. Blackwell, T. E. Should housing for married students be taxed? *College and University Business* 22:86. February, 1957.
7. Burgess, E. and H. Locke. The family. New York, The American Book Company, 1945. 256 p.
8. Burma, John H. Student attitudes toward participation in organizations. *Sociological Society Research* 32:625-629. 1947.
9. Chamblis, Richard. Married students at a state university. *Journal of Educational Sociology* 34:409-416. May, 1961.
10. Cocking, Walter E. College and university residence facilities constructed, 1950-1959. *American School and University* 166:76. June, 1962.
11. Conant, James B. Slums and suburbs. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961. 140 p.
12. Craig, William G. The student personnel profession: an instrument of national goals. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 3:161-184. June, 1962.

13. ✓ Cushing, Hazel M., Velma Phillips and Alice Stevenson. Economic status of married college students. *Journal of Home Economics* 40:25-26. 1948.
14. ✓ Donnelly, Ruth N. Planning for married students. *College and University Business* 21:33-56. November, 1956.
15. Dressel, Fred B. An evaluation of selected personnel services offered to married students at Indiana University. Master's thesis. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1963. 105 numb. leaves.
16. _____ . Logic, research and the married college student. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43:921-924. May, 1965.
17. Fitzgerald, Laurine E. Faculty perceptions of student personnel functions. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 3:164-179. June, 1962.
18. Frank, Lawrence K. Housing for married students. *Journal of Home Economics* 49:413-414. May, 1957.
19. Havighurst, Robert J. *Developmental tasks and education*. New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1950. 189 p.
20. Heider, Fritz. *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958. 146 p.
21. Henry, David. Maturity is the key to successful college marriage. *U. S. News and World Report* 48:89. June 6, 1960.
22. Houghland, Kenneth R. The answer to our married student housing problem. *College and University Business* 31:33-35. January, 1962.
23. Johnson, Walter F. *et al.* *Pupil personnel and guidance services*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961. 338 p.
24. Kretschmer, Vernon. Family housing facilities. *College and University Business* 22:42-44. March, 1957.
25. ✓ Lantagne, Joseph E. College marriages. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 3:98-105. March, 1962.

26. Lantagne, Joseph E. Do married men succeed in college? *Journal of School Health* 29:81-91. February, 1959.
27. Married students. *Newsweek* 49(2):94. March 4, 1957.
28. McCracken, Charles W. Student personnel work and the climate for learning. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 42:882-883.
29. Mead, Margaret. A new look at early marriages. *U. S. News and World Report* 48:80-85. June 6, 1960.
30. More married students. *Look* 13:42. October 27, 1959.
31. Morris, Elizabeth L. Married undergraduate couples at Indiana University 1955-1957. Master's thesis. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1957. 76 numb. leaves.
32. Mueller, Kate Hevner. Married students on campus. *College and University* 35:155-163. Winter, 1960.
33. _____. Some problems of recruiting in college personnel. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 4:215-219. June, 1962.
34. _____. Student personnel work in higher education. Cambridge, Mass., The Riverside Press, 1961. 385 p.
35. Nygreen, Glen T. Marital adjustment in the University of Washington married student community. Ph. D. thesis. Seattle, University of Washington, 1954. 156 numb. leaves.
36. Oppelt, Norman T. Characteristics and activities of married college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 6:228-231. June, 1965.
37. Parsons, David H. Housing for married students. *College and University Business* 24:22-33. January, 1958.
38. Poling, Daniel W. Adair village: A post war project in community living for married students of Oregon State College. Ph. D. thesis. Eugene, University of Oregon, 1956. 247 numb. leaves.
39. Ricker, Harold C. College students live here. New York, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961. 12 p.

40. Rogers, Everett M. Effect of college marriages on participation in college life. *College and University* 33:193-199. 1958.
41. Sanford, Nevitt (ed.) *The American college*. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. 574 p.
42. Schab, Fred. The married college student: A comparison of male undergraduates and graduate students attitudes and values. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 7:154-158. May, 1966.
43. Thorpe, Alice C. How married students manage. *Marriage and Family* 13:104-105. 1951.
44. U. S. Bureau of Census. Current population reports--Population characteristics. Washington D. C., March 27, 1959. p. 247. (Series P-20, No 93)
45. White, Lynn. The social responsibility of scholarship: History. *Journal of Higher Education* 32:7. October, 1961.
46. Williamson, E. G. Cultivating understanding of student personnel services within the university. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 3:151-156. December, 1962.
47. _____. *Student personnel service in colleges and Universities*. New York, McGraw-Hill Inc., 1961. 474 p.
48. _____. Student personnel work in the future years. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 5:201-206. June, 1964.
49. Williamson, E. G., W. Layton and M. L. Snoke. A study of participation in college activities. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1964. 12 p.
50. Wise, W. M. Student personnel work--Future trends. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 39:112-115. May, 1961.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Questionnaire
National Survey

/

Institutions Participating in the Survey Questionnaire

1. Arizona State University
2. University of Arkansas
3. Auburn University
4. Univ. of California at Davis
5. Clemson University
6. Colorado State University
7. University of Connecticut
8. Cornell University
9. University of Delaware
10. Florida State University
11. University of Georgia
12. University of Idaho
13. University of Illinois
14. Iowa State University
15. Kansas State University
16. Louisiana State University
17. University of Maine
18. University of Maryland
19. University of Massachusetts
20. Michigan State University
21. University of Minnesota
22. Mississippi State University
23. University of Missouri
24. Montana State University
25. University of Nebraska
26. University of Nevada
27. University of New Hampshire
28. New Mexico State University
29. North Carolina State
30. Ohio State University
31. Oklahoma State University
32. Oregon State University
33. Pennsylvania State University
34. Purdue University
35. Rutgers State University
36. South Dakota State
37. University of Tennessee
38. Texas A. & M.
39. University of Vermont
40. Virginia Poly
41. Washington State University
42. West Virginia University
43. University of Wisconsin
44. University of Wyoming

SURVEY ON THE MARRIED STUDENTS POSITION
IN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Name of University _____

Name and title of person completing the questionnaire _____

- PLEASE CHECK THE ANSWER THAT BEST STATES YOUR
UNIVERSITY'S POSITION -

1. Total student enrollment Fall term 1965?
 _____ 5000 and less _____ 5,000-10,000 _____ 10,001-15,000
 _____ 15,001-20,000 _____ over 20,000

2. What percentage of your total student population is married?
 _____ less than 5% _____ 6%-15% _____ 16%-25%
 _____ 26%-35% _____ 36%-45% _____ over 45%

3. What percentage of your married students are in graduate school?
 _____ less than 5% _____ 6%-15% _____ 16%-25%
 _____ 26%-35% _____ 36%-45% _____ over 45%

4. How many married student apartments are provided by the university?
 _____ less than 100 _____ 101-200 _____ 201-300
 _____ 301-400 _____ 401-500 _____ over 500

5. What percentage of students are housed by the university:
 A - Single _____ 10%-20% _____ 21%-30% _____ 31%-40%
 _____ 41%-50% _____ over 50%
 B - Married _____ less than 5% _____ 5%-10% _____ 11%-15%
 _____ 16%-20% _____ over 20%

6. What percentage of your married students does the university base its building program for married students?
 _____ 10%-15% _____ 16%-20% _____ 21%-25% _____ over 25%

7. What policy does the university use in determining eligibility for married student housing?

<input type="checkbox"/> all are	<input type="checkbox"/> Frosh. &	<input type="checkbox"/> Soph. &
<input type="checkbox"/> accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> above	<input type="checkbox"/> above
<input type="checkbox"/> Junior	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior	<input type="checkbox"/> Grad.
<input type="checkbox"/> & above	<input type="checkbox"/> & above	<input type="checkbox"/> only

8. What priority system is used in selection? Rank in order:

<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching fellows	<input type="checkbox"/> Freshmen	<input type="checkbox"/> Juniors
<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate assistants	<input type="checkbox"/> Sophomores	<input type="checkbox"/> Seniors
<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate students		

9. Does the university place any limitation on the length of occupancy in married housing?

YES NO

If yes how long: 1 2 3 4 more than 4 years.

10. What percentage of turnover does the university expect each year in married housing?

<input type="checkbox"/> 10% or less	<input type="checkbox"/> 11%-20%	<input type="checkbox"/> 21%-30%
<input type="checkbox"/> 31%-40%	<input type="checkbox"/> 41%-50%	<input type="checkbox"/> over 50%

11. What percentage of increase has the university experienced in married students during the past five years?

<input type="checkbox"/> 10%-15%	<input type="checkbox"/> 16%-20%	<input type="checkbox"/> 21%-30%
<input type="checkbox"/> 31%-40%	<input type="checkbox"/> 41%-50%	<input type="checkbox"/> over 50%

12. Does the university provide family counseling service for married students and wives through the counseling center:

YES NO

13. Does the wife of a student have the opportunity to utilize the counseling center if she is not a registered student?

YES NO

14. Does the university provide psychiatric help for married student wives?

YES NO

15. Are the services of the Health Center made available to student wives if not registered as students?
 _____ YES _____ NO
16. Is the Student Health Center made available to the families of married students?
 _____ YES _____ NO
17. Is Student Health Insurance made available to married student families?
 _____ YES _____ NO
18. Does the university coordinate married student programs through the activity center?
 _____ YES _____ NO
19. Do the schools within the university provide programs for student wives?
 _____ YES _____ NO _____ EXAMPLE
20. Does the University have a university-wide student wives organization?
 _____ YES _____ NO
21. Is there any limitation placed on married student participation in university sponsored activities?
 _____ YES _____ NO IF SO, GIVE AN EXAMPLE _____
22. Is a social-recreational facility provided in the married student housing?
 _____ YES _____ NO
- IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION #22 WAS NO, PLEASE ANSWER THE REMAINING QUESTIONS AS IF YOU HAD A CENTER.
23. Is the cost of the building and its operation, used as a social-recreational center, assumed by the university?
 _____ YES _____ NO IF NO, WHO DOES _____

24. Does the university bear the cost of the program carried on in the social-recreational center?
 _____ YES _____ NO IF NO, WHO DOES _____
25. Who has the responsibility for scheduling the social-recreational centers use?
 _____ Unit _____ Recreation _____ Housing
 _____ Manager _____ Department _____ Office
 _____ Activity
 _____ Center _____ other (specify) _____
26. Who has the responsibility for the building?
 _____ Housing _____ Unit _____ Activity
 _____ Office _____ Manager _____ Center
 _____ other (specify) _____
27. Does the university coordinate the program with other university activities?
 _____ YES _____ NO
28. What type of activities are carried on in the social-recreational center? (check more than one)
 _____ Nursery _____ Seminar
 _____ School _____ Sessions _____ Social _____ Recreation
 _____ Continuing
 _____ Education _____ others (specify) _____
29. Do other agencies on campus have access to the facility?
 _____ YES _____ NO
30. The writer would appreciate any further comments you may have concerning the married student now on campuses in the United States and his position in the campus community.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire
Student Evaluation of the Center

DIRECTIONS: please answer the following questions in order that we may evaluate the worth of the community project. Even though you may not have participated in the programs your opinion would be appreciated. If the question requires a yes or no answer please justify why you have answered as you did.

1. Do you feel a community center of the type offered is worth while? YES NO

2. Did you participate in any of the programs offered at the community Center? YES NO (Why or Why not?)

3. In Rank order list the programs you feel were most beneficial.

4. What do you feel should be added or deleted from the existing programs at the community center?

5. Do you feel that more programs should be offered that would allow couples to attend and participate in the center? YES NO

6. Do you feel that there should be more educational seminars held at the Center? YES NO

7. Should there be a coordination board established to handle the programs offered at the Center? YES NO

8. What do you feel is the most beneficial thing about the Center?
Explain your answer.

9. What do you feel is the most detrimental thing about the Center?
Explain your answer.

10. Any further comments that you might have will be greatly appreciated.