

**HOUSING FOR MARRIED STUDENTS**

**A Basis For A Positive Program**

**At**

**Virginia Polytechnic Institute**

**By**

**Jack M. Kandel**

**A Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the**

**Virginia Polytechnic Institute**

**in candidacy for the degree of**

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

**In**

**URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING**

**May 22, 1961**

**Blacksburg, Virginia**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Professor T. William Patterson for his assistance and guidance toward the development of this study.

Without the support of the Association of Married Students and the support of all student families that gave so generously of their time and patience, this study would not have been worth while.

Similarly, without the support of the V.P.I. Administration and support of the many land-grant colleges and universities that responded to the College Housing Survey, this study would not have been worth while.

A special debt is owed to my entire family. Without their patience and understanding, this study would have been impossible.

Without my wife's impetus, faith, and stimulation, I would have been impossible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGE
TITLE PAGE . . . . .	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
A. Purpose and Objectives . . . . .	1
B. Procedure . . . . .	2
C. Limitations . . . . .	4
II. BACKGROUND . . . . .	9
A. Community Growth . . . . .	9
B. College Growth . . . . .	13
C. Married Student Trend . . . . .	16
D. College Housing . . . . .	21
III. EXISTING PROBLEM AT V. P. I. . . . .	24
A. Enrollment . . . . .	25
B. Housing . . . . .	27
IV. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY OF MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING	31
A. Married Student Characteristics . . . . .	32
B. Married Student Housing Characteristics . . . . .	57
C. Married Student Housing Preferences . . . . .	77
C. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	89
V. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY OF COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAMS. . . . .	93
A. Financing . . . . .	94
B. Student Enrollment . . . . .	95

C. Housing Facilities . . . . .	95
D. Housing Policies and Programs . . . . .	97
E. Selected Comments . . . . .	98
F. Summary and Conclusion . . . . .	111
<b>VI. ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND LONG-RANGE BUILD- ING PROGRAM AT V. P. I. -- ENROLLMENT AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>118</b>
A. Conclusion . . . . .	118
B. Recommendations . . . . .	120
Aims and Needs . . . . .	120
Off-Campus Housing Program . . . . .	123
College Housing Program . . . . .	126
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>APPENDICES . . . . .</b>	<b>135</b>
Appendix A - Supplementary Tables . . . . .	136
Appendix B - A comparison of what is being done in the construction of new married student housing at fifteen midwestern colleges and universities . . . . .	142
Appendix C - Comments of Married Students . . . . .	146
Appendix D - Comments of College Administration . . . . .	149
Appendix E - Comments of Townspeople . . . . .	151
Appendix F - Questionnaire: Survey of Married Student Housing . . . . .	154
Appendix G - Questionnaire: Survey of College Housing Programs . . . . .	159
<b>VITA . . . . .</b>	<b>162</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
<u>Chapter II</u>	
2- 1. Population of Town and District - 1870-1960 . . . . .	11
2- 2. Enrollment by Years - V.P.I., Blacksburg, Virginia - 1872-1960 . . . . .	15
<u>Chapter III</u>	
3- 1. Enrollment Projection - V.P.I. . . . .	29
<u>Chapter IV</u>	
4- 1. Married Students by Age and Class - Fall, 1960 . . . . .	43
4- 2. Married Students Classified as Veterans and Non-Veterans, by Class - Fall, 1960 . . . . .	44
4- 3. Married Student Enrollment by Curriculums and Class - Fall, 1960 - Summary Enrollment . . . . .	45
a. School of Applied Science and Business Administration . . . . .	46
b. School of Agriculture . . . . .	47
c. School of Engineering and Architecture . . . . .	48
4- 4. Occurrence of Marriage Before and After Entering School . . . . .	49
4- 5. Years of Marriage . . . . .	49
4- 6. Age at Marriage by Husband and Wife . . . . .	50
4- 7. Present Age of Married Students by Husband and Wife . . . . .	50
4- 8. Number of Children in Family . . . . .	51
4- 9. Number of Children by Age and Sex . . . . .	51

4-10.	Number of Students Employed While Attending School . . . . .	52
4-11.	Number of Students With Employed Wives . . . . .	52
4-12.	Location of Employment of Wives . . . . .	53
4-13.	Occupations of Employed Wives . . . . .	53
4-14.	Total Monthly Income Available . . . . .	54
4-15.	Income Expenditure Distribution . . . . .	54
	a. Housing and Utilities . . . . .	54
	b. Food . . . . .	55
	c. Clothes . . . . .	55
	d. Household Furnishings . . . . .	55
	e. Automobile and Services . . . . .	56
	f. Other Expenditures . . . . .	56
4-16.	Number of Students Having Their Wives With Them While Attending School . . . . .	67
4-17.	Number of Years Living in Off-Campus Housing as a Married Student . . . . .	67
4-18.	Number of Years Occupying Present Dwelling Unit . . . . .	67
4-19.	Number of Previous Dwelling Units Occupied Other Than Present Unit . . . . .	68
4-20.	Number of Years Occupying Previous Dwelling Unit . . . . .	68
4-21.	Number of Years Students Plan to Remain at Institution . . . . .	68
4-22.	Type of Structure Occupied by Tenure and Location . . . . .	69
4-23.	Location of Dwelling Unit Within Structure . . . . .	69

4-24.	Dwelling Units by Number and Type of Rooms Occupied . . . . .	70
4-25.	Adequacy of Room Sizes . . . . .	70
4-26.	Provision of Bathing Facilities in Dwelling Unit . . . . .	71
4-27.	Sharing of Bathing Facilities . . . . .	71
4-28.	Adequacy of Hot Water Supply in Dwelling Unit . . . . .	71
4-29.	Distribution of Dwelling Units by Number of Bedrooms, Monthly Rent, and Extent of Furnishings . . . . .	72
4-30.	Utilities Provided in Monthly Rent . . . . .	73
4-31.	Monthly Expenditure for Utilities in Excess of Rent Paid . . . . .	73
4-32.	Other Facilities Included in Rent . . . . .	74
4-33.	Condition of Furnishings Included in Dwelling Unit . . . . .	75
4-34.	Physical Condition and Services of Dwelling Unit . . . . .	75
4-35.	Number of Students Satisfied with Present Dwelling Unit . . . . .	75
4-36.	Number of Students Indicating Dwelling Unit May Violate Fire, Health, or Building Codes, or be Otherwise Unsafe . . . . .	76
4-37.	Preference of Dwelling Unit by Type of Structure and Location . . . . .	84
4-38.	Preference of Dwelling Unit by Number of Bedrooms and Monthly Rent . . . . .	85
4-39.	Preference of Dwelling Unit by Utilities and Monthly Rent . . . . .	85

4-40.	Preference of Dwelling Unit by Room Furnishings and Monthly Rent . . . . .	86
4-41.	Preference of Type of Rooms in Dwelling Unit . . . . .	86
4-42.	Special Facilities and Services Desired With Dwelling Unit . . . . .	87
4-43.	Preference of Housing Style . . . . .	87
4-44.	Preference of Exterior Construction Material . . . . .	87
4-45.	Number of Students Willing to Move From Present Dwelling Unit if Better Unit Were Offered at Price They Could Afford . . . . .	88
4-46.	Summary of Monthly Rent Students Willing and Able to Pay For Dwelling Unit of Preference . . . . .	88
4-47.	Placement of Responsibility for Providing Adequate Married Student Housing . . . . .	88

## Chapter V

A comparison of what is being done in the construction of new married student housing at thirty-seven land-grant colleges and universities.

Part I . . . . .	103
Part II . . . . .	109

## Appendix A

A-1.	Classes in Which Married Men Students Were Enrolled in the Winter Quarter, 1961 . . . . .	136
A-2.	Sources of Income of Married Students . . . . .	136
A-3.	Years of Marriage According to the Age of Wives and Husbands . . . . .	137



A-4.	Married Students Living On and Off Campus, by Class - Fall, 1960 . . . . .	138
A-5.	Students' Wives According to Proximity of Residence to Virginia Polytechnic Institute . . . . .	139
A-6.	Inventory of Dwelling Units for Rent by Monthly Rent, Number of Rooms, and Furnishings . . . . .	140
A-7.	Inventory of Dwelling Units by Utilities Provided . . . . .	141
A-8.	Heating System and Type Fuel Used . . . . .	141

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Purpose and Objectives

In the town of Blacksburg, as in many other college towns, the extent of community growth has been dependent, to a large measure, upon the growth of college enrollment and facilities. In turn the College has been dependent upon the community to supply certain services and facilities in accommodating both faculty and students who reside in the community. In particular, the burden of providing adequate housing facilities for these people has been left, for the most part, to the community at large.

In this regard the question arises whether the responsibility for providing adequate housing for these two groups, at a reasonable cost, has been met. Furthermore, to what extent and under which circumstances does the responsibility for providing adequate housing facilities for the institutional population belong to the community and to what extent does it belong to the institution itself?

Thus, the purpose of this study is in part to answer the latter question and in part to determine the extent of the housing problem in regard to married students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

The specific objectives here are to test the adequacy of married student housing from the standpoint of space and of facilities provided for the rent dollar; to determine the extent of the financial burden of housing upon this group; to determine and project the existing and future housing needs; to provide, in contrast, an indication of trends in housing for married students at other institutions; to assess this institution's policies and programs and their resultant effects upon community development; and finally, to provide a factual basis for formulating a housing program, should such a course of action be undertaken by either private initiative or by the Institute's authorities.

B. Procedure

The conduct of this study was based on review of existing literature, personal interviews, housing field inspections, correspondence, survey questionnaires, and personal experience as a married student.

The survey questionnaires were developed, distributed, collected, and tabulated by the author.

Survey of Married Student Housing

Based on a listing of married students provided by the Tabulating Department at V.P.I., 816 questionnaires were distributed through the College Post Office in March, 1961. Upon receipt of the returns, it was

found that 36 questionnaires were returned by the Post Office indicating that the intended recipients were no longer attending school. Another 22 questionnaires were eliminated because of their being sent to the wrong box numbers, because the student was not married, or the questionnaire was inadequately completed. Thus, it was surmised that of the 816 names listed only 774 married students were actually enrolled during the winter quarter. Statistically, then, the 161 usable returns represent 20.6 percent of the married student enrollment as of March, 1961. In general, this proportion is adequate as a sample representing the majority of the married student body. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed in the Appendix.

#### Survey of College Housing Programs

This survey was made in order to have a basis for recommending a housing program at V. P. I., and to have a valid comparative index of married student housing programs at other institutions.

Because V. P. I. is a land grant college, and has somewhat different responsibilities than comparable privately endowed institutions, the survey was limited to all land grant institutions in the United States as the basis for comparative analysis in regard to institutional housing programs in this group.

Of the 69 questionnaires submitted to the housing directors of the land grant institutions, 41 were returned to the author. In assaying the returns, it was found that 30 institutions had married student housing programs, 6 had no such housing program, and 5 refused to answer the questionnaire unless authorized by the Association of College and University Housing Officers. The effective, or statistically valid, returns (36) represent 52 percent of the total distributed. It is believed that this proportion constitutes a statistically dependable sample and that the results obtained are adequately representative of the total number of land grant institutions. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed in the Appendix.

C. Limitations

Survey of Married Student Housing

Because of the nature of some of the subject matter, certain of the tables must be interpreted with caution. This is particularly true in cases where the questions may have been misinterpreted or not fully understood by the person filling out the questionnaire. In questions pertaining to monthly income and distribution, answers may have been guessed at or inaccurately determined. This may have been the result of the difficulty of calculating such figures or simply the lack

of factual information. In answer to the question on monthly incomes, some respondents may have included income earned during summer vacations or while on a student co-op program as monthly incomes currently received. Similarly, interpretations of housing preference may be tenuous depending on the respondent's housing experience and background, knowledge of housing quality, and cost of housing and its related facilities as part of the total picture of the housing market. In the analysis of rent, the complexity of the possible combinations of services included in rent places a limitation on the refinement of the analysis in regard to value received per rent dollar. Naturally, the size and number of rooms desired varies not only with the size of the family, but also with special needs for student and family activities which are not reflected in the results. Further statistical limitations will be discussed in the section on Analysis of Survey of Married Students in Chapter IV.

The overall limitation of this survey as a description of the housing status of married students is reflected in the very nature of the cold statistics. Statistics by themselves cannot show certain qualitative aspects of housing, though an attempt at this was made in the questionnaire. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine what aspects of housing may be distasteful to a group who are accustomed to "better

things in life, " or tolerable to those who are not. Nor can a proper representation be given to poor functional arrangement of space, quality in equipment, taste in furnishings, worn-out or uncomfortable furniture, or to the effects of external social pressures and standards of one's neighbors, family, or community. The social and educational implications of inadequacies must remain, of necessity, matters of opinion.

Of the many possible combinations of statistical tables that could have been derived, the tables presented in this report were selected as the most significant.

#### Survey of College Housing Programs

In analyzing the results of this survey, two particular discrepancies in answers were noted. In the question on whether married student enrollment was increasing, the author failed to clarify in the question whether the enrollment trend was to be reported in absolute numbers or as a percentage of total enrollment. Thus, in analyzing this portion of the questionnaire, some caution must be taken in its interpretation. In the question related to the amount of money the institution is planning to spend on new housing facilities, the author again failed to refine the question to make it clear whether it was for married student

housing only and this may have been interpreted by the respondent to include all student housing expenditures. In some cases this was noted and corrected by the responding institution and duly indicated in the table. In some cases, because of incomplete answers, it was difficult to ascertain the number, type, and size of dwelling units, as well as services included in the rent. This also holds true as to number of dwelling units considered temporary and permanent. In some cases this was noted by the respondent as separate listings and in other cases listed as a total of all dwelling units. Some of the latter information was determined from accompanying literature and not from the questionnaire itself. Some of the more subjective questions are actually opinions of the individual respondent and not necessarily the policy or attitude of the institution.

#### Overall Limitations

Other than the survey questionnaires and their statistical limitations, the chapters discussing institutional policies and community planning implications are based on factual publications as well as personal interviews with leading policy makers and interested individuals. In assaying such research information the author recognizes the fact that of necessity, the published plans and programs are not always followed, and in implementation because of unforeseen circumstances,



many changes may have to be made. Similarly, opinions of individuals cannot always be accepted as valid and at times may be biased toward a particular point of view. Similarly, because of the nature of the material in attempting to aid the reader by informing him of the basic factors and issues at large, the author must of necessity interject his own opinions and impressions, and cannot claim complete "objectivity" in his presentation. Although the author has not attempted to avoid stating his beliefs or discussing controversial subjects in the hope that this would result in a more thought-provoking study, he has attempted to make clear the difference between facts and opinions.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Community Growth

The infamous Draper's Meadow massacre in 1775 brought attention to this then almost unknown area in Southwest Virginia. Three years after this tragedy the Town of Blacksburg was established. The agricultural nature of the community was altered somewhat in 1854 when the Olin and Preston Institute was established. The community experienced little further change in its nature until 1872. In a sense, this date can be considered the beginning of Blacksburg's history for in 1872, one year after the incorporation of the town, the Virginia State Legislature decided to take advantage of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862 and established the new Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College in Blacksburg. So eager was the community for this college, that the county offered the State the Olin and Preston Institute as well as \$20,000 to help close the deal. Thus, in 1872, the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College revitalized a dormant agricultural community and altered its role to the present one of being a college bedroom community.

Unquestionably, the growth of the town, and its immediate environs, has been directly related to and dependent upon the growth of the institution. The College, with its large yearly building program and its regular

annual payroll, became its biggest single enterprise. With the increase in student enrollment and faculty, the community of necessity expanded its retail service facilities. New homes were built to house the influx of faculty and other college employees. Materials and construction firms prospered, hotels and shops were built, and rooming houses were filled to overflowing with students. The town population grew with each new increase in college enrollment. From 1872 till 1960, the community population increased from 500 to over 7,000 inhabitants--exclusive of college students. The population more than doubled in the ten year period between 1950 and 1960 from 3,352 to 7,070 (See Table 2-1).<sup>1</sup> As the population increased, the corporate limits began to expand with annexation of district property in 1935 and 1954.

True as it may be that the town is predominantly dependent for its economic vitality upon the College, this dependency has not been as strong in recent years as it was prior to 1940. During the war years, the Radford Arsenal was established, located approximately 12 miles from Blacksburg. In a sense, it created an economic boom that the

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be taken into account, however, that annexation accounts for some of the suddenness of this rise in numbers.

TABLE 2-1      Population of Town and District - 1870-1960

Year	Blacksburg Town	Blacksburg District	Total Town & District Population	Percent of Total Popula- tion in Town
1870	*	*	3,565	*
1880	688	3,961	4,649	15
1890	*	*	3,769	*
1900	768	3,605	4,373	18
1910	875	4,114	4,989	17
1920	1,095	5,005	6,100	18
1930	1,406	5,438	6,844	20
1940	2,133	6,196	8,329	26
1950	3,352	10,052	13,404	25
1960	7,070	8,466	15,536	45

SOURCE: U. S. Census reports on Population, V.P.I. Library.

\*Figures were not separately returned.

county never experienced before. During its height of operation, it created more than 30,000 jobs directly and untold other jobs indirectly. It seemed, at that time, that Blacksburg would be able to remove the economic yoke of college dependency with this new spurt of economic opportunity. The boom was short-lived. The close of the war saw a drop in employment opportunities for many at the Arsenal. Since then, employment has dropped to 10,000. Without question, the Radford Arsenal is still and may continue to be the major source of income and employment in the area.

Though the War's end created many problems for various communities in the area, it did not affect Blacksburg as readily. With Veterans returning home and the "G. I. Bill" providing free education to all those accepting its benefits, college enrollment in most institutions doubled almost overnight. But by 1950 this, too, was short-lived as the nation and college returned to normalcy.

In 1951 two new industries were established in Blacksburg employing several hundred people from the area. Blacksburg was finally able to say it had a somewhat diversified economic base. A new prosperity was looked for and is still awaited. The College, however, still remains the dominant factor in the Town's economy.

## B. College Growth

The Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College began in 1872 with nothing but the inadequate Preston-Olin building and limited grounds; with a faculty of three or four members; with constant changes of administration, practically no support from the State and discouraging political interference; yet by 1891 there had been provided a barrack building for housing the students; two academic buildings of brick, with a few lecture rooms and a poorly equipped laboratory for chemistry, and a few offices; a building for the experiment station, used also for a horticultural building, with a small greenhouse attached; four houses for professors, with the old "Solitude" mansion refitted; a machine shop by the conversion of the old Preston-Olin building; a large frame structure for assemblies; and a smaller frame house used as a shop. The planning and laying out of the campus had been started, and an army officer had been secured as commandant and military instructor.<sup>2</sup>

From these humble beginnings, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (as it was later called) grew into the now comparatively large college with a student enrollment of over 5,000 and a faculty of almost 800. With more than 80 principal buildings, 60 structures of lesser importance, and 45 residences for faculty and other employees, the College has spread itself quite comfortably over its sprawling 2,300 acres, and is looking forward to filling in some of its green space with its building expansion program.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>E. A. Smyth, A Brief History of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute; 1872-1922, (V. P. I., Blacksburg, Virginia, 1922), p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>Bulletin of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1961-1962, (Blacksburg, Virginia), pp. 206-207.

The student enrollment since 1872 followed a rather sporadic trend with increases and decreases reflecting periods of prosperity and depression typical of the historical events of the first half of the century (See Table 2-2). The greatest increase (as well as the turning point of V. P. I. history) occurred, as could well be imagined, in 1946 after World War II. With the great influx of Veterans receiving "G. I. Bill of Rights" benefits, the enrollment swelled from a pre-war total of 3,382 to a maximum of 5,689 in 1949. By 1950, according to some college officials, the college sighed with relief when the enrollment of 3,801 indicated that "war surplus" education was over. It was time now to return to prewar normality. Yes, it was good to get rid of the surplus trailers cluttering the campus, and no longer to have Veterans with their wives and babies to contend with. It was certainly good to know that the married student was a temporary hallucination brought on by the havoc of war. But, was this really the end of the student marriage problem? Can a public institution avoid the responsibility of accommodating to a changing social phenomenon--the married student? Can the institution properly avoid the demand of the "war babies" who will be clamoring for room by 1963? Can the institution ignore the fact that 20 percent of its enrollment will consist of married students--and need adequate housing

**TABLE 2-2**      Enrollment by Years - Virginia Polytechnic  
Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia - 1872-1960

---

1872-73---132	1905-06--- 619	1937-38---2376	1948-49---5689
1873-74---197	1910-11--- 471	1938-39---2780	1949-50---4857
1874-75---222	1915-16--- 505	1939-40---3119	1950-51---3948
1875-76---255	1920-21--- 798	1940-41---3242	1951-52---3259
1876-77---224	1925-26---1205	1941-42---3382	1952-53---3215
1877-78---186	1930-31---1659	1942-43---3582	1953-54---3322
1878-79---160	1931-32---1810	1943-----1559	1954-55---3747
1879-80--- 50	1932-33---1817	1944----- 982	1955-56---4420
1880-81--- 78	1933-34---1561	1944-45--- 738	1956-57---4786
1890-91---150	1934-35---1694	1945-46---2331	1957-58---4604
1895-96---335	1935-36---1836	1946-47---4971	1958-59---4794
1900-01---386	1936-37---2115	1947-48---5458	1959-60---4908
			1960-61---5102

---

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.



facilities at least equal to single students? Where is the college going from here? These questions will be dealt with further along in this study.

### C. Married Student Trend

Prior to World War II, according to certain professional observers, it was almost unheard of to have a married student enrolled in an institution of higher learning. Not only was this condition unrealistic because of the economic pressures of the time but also because of the competitive pressure of limited enrollment for the fortunate few that were admitted to such institutions. In addition to the economic and physical limitations of such enrollment, the external social mores of the time frowned upon early marriage as tending to "corrupt our youth and institutions." It was almost as bad as having our favorite elementary school "marm" married during the performance of her duty to our children. It may seem odd, but this attitude still exists in many circles of our society.

Few people realized that the war had encouraged several new trends that were here to stay and were not just a passing "fad of the times." These trends taxed existing facilities of the institution as married student enrollment continued to increase. More and more returning soldiers

consummated their long postponed marriages. College officials and social scientists said it could not be done, but the "old" soldiers and their families trooped to classrooms all across our nation. The benevolent feeling of our institutions (and Federal subsidy) opened the doors to the new trend. The almost immediate result of the new institutional experience created a schism between acceptance and rejection by the institution of the married student trend. Many reasons have been offered for this contrasting attitude toward married students. In a recent study by the University of Illinois, the reasons stated for acceptance of the trend were:

1. The veterans returning with their wives and children showed the "kids" (non-veterans) that it could be done-- i. e., a man could be married and have children and still go to school.
2. Continuation of the draft means many students must wait two years if they do not get married in college, and two years is a long time in a young person's life.
3. Social relationships between young people are developing at an earlier age. Today it is common for the sixth and seventh grader to have a date; twenty or thirty years ago that would not happen until high school age.
4. The high level of prosperity has enabled parents to give financial assistance to their married sons and daughters. And there are many jobs on or about the campus to provide financial assistance when the parents cannot help.

5. An increasing number of students are entering graduate work, and it is common for a higher ratio of these students to be married.<sup>4</sup>

In some cases institutions felt that although married students were more serious students, on the other hand they also felt that they were less imaginative students.

But many institutions realized and accepted the new trend as a matter of fact as the war came to a close. As a result, a new problem emerged.

During the period of 15 years prior to World War II, there was virtually no residence hall construction on college and university campuses. Because of the influx of returning veterans after the war ended, low cost temporary housing, provided under the Lanham Act, was used to provide "homes" for returning service men who came back to college. This was emergency housing designed to provide minimum facilities.

The trouble with most of these "temporary" projects is the necessity for replacement after their useful period of service. Some institutions are finding temporary veterans' housing projects developing into permanent slums which are difficult to empty and raze without providing adequate housing of a permanent character.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>"Comments and Summary on Survey of Family Housing Facilities," National Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Colleges, Madison, Wisconsin, May 23, 1956. (Original not seen.)

<sup>5</sup>William M. Sharkan, "It's High Time for Permanent Housing for Married Students," College and University Business, Vol. 17 (August, 1954), pp. 37-39.

On the other hand, many colleges shared the attitude that the student marriage trend was a temporary one and that when the veterans graduated, the need to provide permanent housing facilities would decrease greatly. In 1956, ten years after the war, the percentage of married students enrolled in our institutions of higher learning was still slightly higher than 23 percent of the total school enrollment.<sup>6</sup> There is no sign, at present that this percentage has decreased to any great extent.

In a letter dated April 26, 1956, to Mr. Braham Muller, President of the Association of Married Students at V.P.I., Mr. N. B. Watts, Coordinator of Student Housing at North Carolina State College, wrote:

"N. C. State College is like V. P. I. and many other institutions in that it has inadequate housing facilities for married students. At the present time we have 294 temporary apartments. These are old army barracks which were converted into housing units in 1947. At that time we anticipated a need for married student housing for approximately five years. We now find that we will continue to have married students; and of the 1100 that we now have, only about half of them are veterans."

---

<sup>6</sup>College Housing BT 6-3, Part 1, A building types reference guide, Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects, (Washington, D. C., July-August, 1956), p. 105.

As a result of changes wrought by married veterans returning to our campuses, and because of greater preparation for careers demanded by our highly specialized society, more and more young people are marrying while in college. The old idea of postponing marriage until college work is completed is losing favor in our present college population.<sup>7</sup>

With the increasing emphasis upon graduate research and the need for graduate assistantships in order to alleviate the cost of more full-time faculty and reduce individual teaching loads, our institutions are beginning to realize that the majority of graduate students are married; and in order to attract them adequate housing facilities must be provided.

Thus, the postwar era of housing problems continued to envelop the colleges and communities. The married students were now competing with other "underprivileged" groups for the growing number of substandard housing facilities.

---

<sup>7</sup>Thomas Albert Kamstra, An Unpublished thesis, Married Student Housing - A Study on Environment and the Human Organism as a Guide Toward Low Income Housing for Married Students, (Virginia Polytechnic Institute Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, August, 1957), p. 9.

D. College Housing

"Even following the War the temporary units constructed under the emergency legislation of the Lanham Act failed to house the surge of married veterans, and so it was that rural blight established its firmest hold on the college town. . ."<sup>8</sup>

Another writer, underlining the inadequacies of "temporary" housing, states that the colleges and universities "have all been party to one of the greatest orgies of slum building that the country, and certainly the campuses, has ever seen. They built trailer towns, prefabricated cities. . .and the greatest conglomeration of architectural abortions and monstrosities since the days of Georgeanesque and Gothicistic building on the campuses."<sup>9</sup>

In realizing that college students were living ". . .in overcrowded rooms on campuses and in private homes, some in old and hazardous buildings, and others in temporary emergency housing. . ." the College Housing Program of 1950 (Housing Act of 1950, Title IV)

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

<sup>9</sup>Sharkan, op. cit., p. 37.

was organized to solve some of these problems.<sup>10</sup> The solution offered by the Housing Act was long term loans (40 years) at a low rate of interest (2.75%). Many colleges took advantage of this easy way of financing college building programs from the outset.<sup>11</sup>

"Loans are made for the construction of student, student-family and faculty housing, and for the improvement of inadequate facilities already in existence."<sup>12</sup>

The many colleges, by accepting the advantages of the federal housing program to help solve the acute college housing problem, recognized their responsibility to students and community alike.

An example of such acceptance of responsibility is illustrated by a programmed report for housing students at the University of Illinois.

David D. Henry, President, stated:

"The key to future growth of the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana is student housing. Unless a sustained program is begun at once, thousands of students will soon be turned away from Illinois simply because there is no place for them to live. In planning for the future it is assumed that the people of Illinois

---

<sup>10</sup>"The College Housing Program, The What and Why of Title IV, Agency, (September, 1952), p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>"Rush for 2-3/4% College Housing Loans May Soon Exhaust Easily Garnered Funds," Architectural Forum, Vol. 104, #4, (April, 1956), p. 13.

<sup>12</sup>The College Housing Program, op. cit., p. 4.

will expect their state university to admit eligible students and will want them to live in quarters that meet the minimum standards of safety, health, and study conditions. Campus living is a part of the educational experience of the student, and the university has a direct obligation to establish standards and maintain them. That more than three thousand students are living in quarters not meeting university standards, that hundreds of women students are turned away because of lack of living quarters, and that untold numbers are discouraged from even trying to attend the university because of reports of inadequate housing is a situation to be deplored. Its remedy should have a first priority upon our attention."<sup>13</sup>

Unfortunately, all schools have not followed the initiative steps and ensuing building program that now makes the University of Illinois one of the leading schools having a married student housing program. In a survey by the A. I. A. in 1956, it was found that only 46 percent of the schools had a clear cut policy for married student housing.<sup>14</sup> In contrast, 85% of all land-grant colleges in 1960 had a definite policy and program for married student housing.<sup>15</sup>

The problems which typify the plight of the married student and which resulted in concern by our government and community leaders as well as our institutions is best illustrated by the existing housing problem at V. P. I.

---

<sup>13</sup>"A Program for Housing Students at the University of Illinois," a report from the president of the University to the Board of Trustees, January 28, 1956. (Original not seen.)

<sup>14</sup>College Housing, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>15</sup>See Chapter V, "Analysis of Survey of College Housing Programs."



### III. THE EXISTING PROBLEM AT V. P. I.

The previous chapter discussed the generalized background of the development of the married student housing problem that greeted many institutions immediately after the War. The purpose of this chapter is to present the reader with the factual background of the married student housing problem as it has specifically developed here at V. P. I.

As in many institutions, both immediately after the War and at present, the increasing enrollment of married students had posed a problem of providing suitable housing facilities. The result was that the majority of the institutions realized and accepted the responsibility and proceeded to establish a definite housing program to meet the growing need.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, V. P. I. did not recognize or accept this problem as a matter of urgency.

The urgency of the problem was posed to the College Administration as early as 1955. In an article written in the Roanoke Times, February 6, 1955, entitled "Married Student Housing Poses Problem at Tech," the article stated: "A growing number of married students and

---

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter V, "Survey of College Housing Programs."

the problem of suitable housing for them have put the Administration at Virginia Tech behind the eight ball.

"Some of the married students want the College Administration to take some positive action looking to adequate housing for their counterparts of future years.

"But Dr. Newman makes it clear he is not disposed to ask the State's taxpayers anytime soon to build apartment-type quarters like these young couples believe are needed."

Dr. Newman, in justifying the latter statement, felt that ". . . single students. . . will continue to make up about 90 percent of the student body."

#### A. Enrollment

Actually, in the 1954-55 session of 3,747 students enrolled at V.P.I., there were 460 married students. The married student enrollment was approximately 12 percent of total enrollment as compared to Dr. Newman's "estimated" 10 percent. In the 1955-56 and 1956-57 sessions the married student enrollment increased to 19 percent.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Kamstra, op. cit., p. 23.

With the completion of new single student dormitories in 1958, which permitted an increase in total student enrollment, the percentage of married students enrolled in the 1959-60 session decreased to 18 percent. In the 1960-61 session, 840 married students represented 16 percent of total enrollment. Although married students have decreased as a percentage of total student enrollment, the absolute number has almost doubled since 1954 (Table 3-1). The average enrollment of married students in the past five years has been approximately 18 percent. Unquestionably, the facts have refuted Dr. Newman's "estimated" 10 percent enrollment figure.

In the Roanoke Times on February 16, 1955, the editorial section summed up the then existing problem.

"Between the policy of the College and the policy of the Town, the trailer-housed students, some of them with children, are in a predicament. Blacksburg is a small town. Opportunities to rent apartments and houses at rates the married students can afford are limited. It does not help allay the anxieties of these couples to suggest their needs can best be met by privately-built facilities. They will wait a long time for adequate housing at rents the majority of them can pay out of their limited budgets."

## B. Housing

The fact that the number of married students have been increasing is not of itself the major problem. The real problem is that there are more and more students competing for an already inadequate and limited supply of private rental housing. In addition to the limited supply, the majority of rental units, regardless of poor quality, are priced beyond the reach of the average married student income.<sup>3</sup>

From the 1950 Census, there were approximately 400 rental units, not counting trailers, in good repair in Blacksburg. If today, we have a demand for almost 840 units, and few large projects have been built since 1950, we can honestly see why only about 50 percent of the married students can find decent rental units. Particularly if they have to compete with single students for the same number of available rental units in the community, we can recognize the present situation.

According to the estimate of the increase in student enrollment prepared by the V.P.I. Office of Admissions in 1961, it is expected that the housing problem will continue to grow (Table 3-1).

---

<sup>3</sup>See Chapter IV for a more detailed analysis.

This problem is illustrated in a recent letter dated April 10, 1961, from Dr. Paul H. Farrier, Director of Admissions, to Dr. Louis A. Pardue, Vice President of the College.

"Several days ago Dr. Newman (President of the College) asked me to prepare a brief statement concerning the future enrollment of students and the need for dormitory facilities so that he might present these matters to the Capital Outlay Commission which will visit V. P. I. on April 11.

"In the fall of 1960, V. P. I. registered slightly over 5100 students. Of this number 3315 were housed in the community of Blacksburg or in neighboring towns. An additional 150 qualified students could not be accepted because of lack of living facilities either on the campus or in the limited opportunities in the community.

"For the coming fall of 1961, we have an increased number of applications from new students and we can still house a total of only 3315 students, most of whom will be returning old students, a steadily increasing number. A conservative estimate now is that 400 Virginia students of acceptable qualification will have to be denied admission. Though there is an appropriation for dormitory space to care for an additional 550 students, there is substantial doubt that these facilities will be ready even by 1962. The result of this situation at the present time is that we are admitting fewer freshmen year after year at a time when the number of applications is increasing.

"A simple projection based on the ratio between students registered at V. P. I. and the college age population in Virginia indicated that we should have at least 7000 students registering in the fall of 1968. This estimate is conservative. Assuming that the community by that time may be able to take care of 2100 students, we shall need dormitory facilities on the campus to take care of 4900, an increase of nearly 1600 over the present maximum capacity."

**TABLE 3-1 Enrollment Projection - VPI**

<b>Year</b>	<b>I Fall</b>	<b>II Year(1)</b>	<b>III Year(2)</b>	<b>IV Dorm</b>	<b>V Town</b>	<b>VI Married Students (%)</b>
1950	3781*	3948*	3948*	2753*	1028*	760(20)*
1955	3984*	4420*	4420*	2753*	1231*	748(19)*
1960	5100*	5690	5729	3315*	1785*	840(16)*
1962	5430	6050	6195	3865	1565	1086(20)
1964	5980	6670	6660	3865	1900	1196(20)
1966	6530	7285	7125	4415	2000	1306(20)
1968	6985	7790	7595	4415	2100	1397(20)
1970	7345	8190	8060	4965	2200	1469(20)

**Notes: \*actual figures; others are estimates.**

**Column I** Fall quarter enrollment.

**Column II** Session enrollment, assuming we shall continue to admit the same percentage of the Virginia college age group as in 1960 (1.228%).

**Column III** Session enrollment, assuming our annual rate of increase will continue as from 1954 to 1960 (12.5%).

**Column IV** Students housed on campus if new dormitories are secured as projected.

**Column V** Students housed off campus assuming town facilities will increase as indicated.

---

**Column VI** Author's enrollment projection for married students - estimated.

---

October 11, 1960

**SOURCE: V. P. I. Office of Admissions.**

The problem of housing facilities for increasing student enrollment is thus clearly emphasized by the Administration. What has not been clarified, though inherent in the future enrollment statistics, is the future need for housing of married students. But the really meaningful information derived from Dr. Farrier's assessment of the student housing problem is the fact that, at present, the community at large houses more than 35 percent of the total school enrollment.

One can now see how the housing problem at V.P.I. has developed due to the increasing single and married student enrollment competing for the limited existing housing facilities.

From this situation, one can begin to realize that the existing housing crisis will continue to afflict Blacksburg. Needless to say, Blacksburg is even less equipped at present to provide such facilities than it was ever before.

The implications are that either the College or the Community must set forth realistic plans and programs to meet the impending crisis.

In the following chapter, an attempt is made to assess the adequacy of existing housing facilities for married students and to provide a factual basis for formulating a housing program should such a course of action be undertaken by either private initiative or by the Institute authorities.

#### IV. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY OF MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING

In attempting to determine and understand the extent and implications of the existing housing problem as it applies to married students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and to form a basis for any future action, a housing survey questionnaire was distributed to all married students enrolled at V.P.I. as of March, 1961.<sup>1</sup>

In this chapter will be found a summary of the more significant facts revealed by the tabulated results of the housing survey. The text material will attempt to present the general aspects of the housing accommodations analyzed. The tables included are those thought by the author to be most significant for the benefit of those who wish to make a more detailed study. Those tables that are considered of a supplementary nature have been included in the Appendix.

The results of the questionnaire will be discussed in three sections. The first section deals with the academic enrollment characteristics of the married student group. The second section deals with the characteristics of housing as occupied by the group. The third section deals with

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix F.



the housing preferences of the group and their ability to pay for housing needs.

A. Married Student Characteristics

Class and Age<sup>2</sup>

Of the 845 married students enrolled at V. P. I. in the Fall, 1960, the largest number of students, 288 (34.1%), was classified as seniors (Table 4-1). (Approximately 32 percent of all seniors are married.) The second largest, 252 (29.8%), was classified as graduate students. (Approximately 50 percent of all graduate students are married.) In the Fall of 1956, of the 808 married students enrolled only 160 were graduate students.<sup>3</sup> The present increase of graduate enrollment in this group is 60% over that of 1956. From Table 4-1, it can be seen that categorically by class, the percentage of married students increases directly with class standing. (See also Table A-1).

---

<sup>2</sup>The data discussed in this section was compiled from information provided by the V. P. I. Tabulating Department (unless otherwise noted).

<sup>3</sup>Dorothy C. Hulst, A Study of the Problems in Home making Practices of Wives of Students at V. P. I., Blacksburg, Virginia, an unpublished Master's thesis in Home Economics Education, (V. P. I. Library, June, 1957), p. 37.

The median age of this group is between the ages of 23 and 27 (Table 4-1). The number of graduate students in each age group appears to decrease as the age increases. A similar trend is apparent in the senior and junior classes, but not as markedly in the lower classes.

This trend in age-class enrollment indicates an increase in student marriage at a younger age as well as an increase of "older" students (age group 25 and over) who may have felt, after a lapse of years, the need for education beyond the high school level. Concurrently, a greater number of younger students (age group 21 - 27) have gone directly from undergraduate studies into graduate studies.

#### Veteran Status

The majority of the 845 married students enrolled during the 1960-61 school year were non-veterans. Specifically, 481 or 57.0 percent were non-veterans, as compared to 363 or 43.0 percent that were veterans (Table 4-2). It should be noted here that of those listed as veterans, there is no indication as to how many are actually receiving veteran's benefits. A comparative enrollment based on a sample survey of 30% (252) of married student enrollment in the winter quarter, 1960, indicated that 76 or 30.2 percent were receiving veteran's benefits.<sup>4</sup> In another survey made by the Association of Married Students

---

<sup>4</sup>Virginia Porter Tyler, Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Students' Wives at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, unpublished thesis, (V.P.I. Library, June, 1960), p. 49. (See also Table A-2.)

in 1957, 79 percent indicated that they were veterans (again not necessarily receiving veteran's benefits).<sup>5</sup> From the latter statistics, a definite trend can be noted in the decline of veteran married student enrollment. This trend is further substantiated by the declining number of veterans enrolled as Sophomores and Juniors as compared to Seniors and Graduate Students (Table 4-2).

### Curriculums

The curricular enrollment of married students indicates that a majority of the students (50.6 percent) was enrolled in the School of Engineering and Architecture. This school also had the largest senior and graduate class enrollment of the three major schools (Table 4-3). The School of Applied Science and Business Administration had the second largest enrollment with 31.5 percent of total married student enrollment, followed by the School of Agriculture with 17.9 percent.

Being that there is no comparative information available, little can be drawn from the latter statistics as to any specific trend in curricular enrollment. It may be surmised that with the national trend and emphasis upon engineering and science, a shifting of curricular

---

<sup>5</sup>Association of Married Students, "Results of Survey on Married Student Housing - 1957," Association File, V.P.I., Blacksburg, Virginia.

enrollment in these areas may be anticipated at V.P.I. in the future.

### Student Marriage

Based on the return of the student survey questionnaire, 60.8 percent married after entering school as compared to 39.2 percent that married prior to enrollment (Table 4-4). Of the same number of respondents, 36.6 percent were married less than two years as opposed to 30.5 percent that were married more than four years (Table 5-5). In a comparative study made in 1959-60, 29.3 percent were married less than two years and 36.6 percent were married more than four years.<sup>6</sup>

Approximately 26.7 percent of the husbands were married prior to the age of 21 as compared to 52.2 percent of the wives (Table 4-6). The present median age for husbands and wives is 25 (Table 4-7).

It appears, from the aforementioned figures, as well as from sociologists' observations, that the trend in student marriages at an earlier age will continue. This will tend to hold true for marriages occurring while attending school as well as prior to enrollment. Also,

---

<sup>6</sup>Tyler, op. cit., p. 28. (See also Table A-3.)

it may be noted that there is a distinct tendency for those who marry prior to enrollment to be older students who are not necessarily entering as veterans. It is not as true in the case of graduate students, who tend to be relatively younger in comparison (Table 4-1).

### Children

In examining the composition of the families of married students, approximately 49.6 percent had no children. Of those that had children, 34.2 percent had only one child, 11.2 percent had two children, 3.2 percent had three children, and 1.8 percent had four children (Table 4-8). The average family size was 2.78 persons. In the survey of married student wives in 1959-60, 47.0 percent of the families reporting had no children and 17.6 percent had more than one child, leaving 35.4 percent of the families with only one child. The average family size was 2.79 persons.<sup>7</sup>

It would appear, from comparison of the two studies, that little difference or variation exists in family size. When noting that the average family size in the U. S. is 3.46 persons per family, the married student family seems small in comparison. This small

---

<sup>7</sup>Tyler, op. cit., p. 29.

family size does not necessarily negate the fact that provision of facilities for children are still very important.

Considering the fact that only 18.6 percent of the children were over five years of age it is evident that most of the children of the married students are still young enough to share sleeping rooms with other members of the family (Table 4-9).

### Student Residency

According to the V. P. I. Tabulating Department, 92.8 percent of married students lived off campus in September, 1960.<sup>8</sup> Of those students living off campus, 80.6 percent lived in Blacksburg, 6.7 percent lived within 10 miles of Blacksburg, 3.2 percent lived between 10 and 25 miles of Blacksburg, and 9.5 percent lived more than 25 miles from Blacksburg.<sup>9</sup>

" . . . The definition by the College of living in this area: the married student living area extends from Roanoke to Marion."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>See Table A-4.

<sup>9</sup>Tyler, op. cit., p. 30 (See also Table A-5.)

<sup>10</sup>Kamstra, op. cit., p. 24.

"The college has no housing accommodations for married students. Rooms and apartments are available in private homes and several apartment houses in the town of Blacksburg. Some students also find living quarters in nearby communities."<sup>11</sup>

The latter statement by the college makes the former statistics understandable and only hints at the existing housing problem.

### Sources of Income

The largest single source of income for married student families was from employment. Approximately 31.7 percent of the married students were employed (Table 4-10). Of the wives of married students, approximately 57.8 percent were employed (Table 4-11). In the 1960 study, 39.7 percent of husbands were employed, of which 61.0 percent were employed on the V.P.I. campus and the rest employed elsewhere. Of the 57.1 percent of employed wives, 42.4 percent were employed on campus and the rest employed elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> In this present study, of the 57.8 percent employed wives, 62.4 percent were employed in Blacksburg (Table 4-12).<sup>13</sup> According to Table 4-13, occupations of employed

---

<sup>11</sup>"Information for Prospective Students," Bulletin of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1960, p. 18.

<sup>12</sup>Tyler, op. cit., p. 49. (See also Table A-2.)

<sup>13</sup>The place of employment was not specified.

wives included secretaries (51.8%), teachers (23.6%), nurses (17.2%), technicians (6.4%), and sales girls (1.0%).

Other sources of income of married students, according to the 1960 study, were husband's and wife's families, scholarships, veteran's benefits, and borrowed money.<sup>14</sup>

Of the total monthly income available, 52.6 percent of the families reporting indicated an income of less than \$300 per month (Table 4-13). In the study made by the Association of Married Students in 1957, 60.0 percent of families earned less than \$300 per month.<sup>15</sup> In a similar study made by the same group in 1955, the average income per month was \$233.

Unquestionably, monthly incomes have shown a definite increase over the past five-year period.

#### Income Expenditure Distribution

Based on the total monthly income available (Table 4-14) and information noted on the survey questionnaire, a detailed breakdown of

---

<sup>14</sup>Tyler, op. cit., p. 49. (See also Table A-2.)

<sup>15</sup>Association of Married Students, op. cit.



income expenditure distribution of married students was tabulated (Tables 4-15a through 4-15f).

The median expenditure for housing and utilities was 25 percent of total income available (Table 4-15a). The average expenditure was approximately 31.7 percent of total income. When considering the F.H.A. "rule of thumb" that income expenditure for housing and utilities should not exceed 20-25 percent of available income, it would appear that the present expenditure for housing and utilities by married students is relatively high, particularly if more than 66.0 percent of married student families pay more than 25% of income for such housing (Table 4-15a).

It is difficult or almost impossible to determine an adequate basis for rent-income ratio. The relationship between rent paid and overall housing expenditure varies with social norms as to what the average family does pay. Standards or norms are usually expressed in terms of what certain average socio-economic groups are paying or should be paying for housing.

In the 1950 Census, the Survey of Consumer Expenditures indicated that 18.7 percent of all families had an annual income between \$2000 and \$3000. In this group, the average housing expenditure was \$479 per year.

The ratio between income and expenditure was 18.0 percent. The survey also indicated a definite correlation between income and housing expenditure; as income decreases, housing cost increases.

The average annual income of married students, which was computed to be approximately \$2,800 per year (Table 4-14), could be compared with the aforementioned income group studied in the Census report. By comparing the average expenditure for housing by the student group (31.7 percent of total income) with that of the national standard in the same income group, it can be seen that married students pay an overly excessive amount for housing.

The next largest income expenditure was for food. Approximately 40 percent of those reporting spent between 20.0 and 30.0 percent of their income for food (Table 4-15b).

Approximately 73 percent of the married student group spent less than 10.0 percent of their income for clothes (Table 4-15c). The least expenditure by this group was for household furnishings, for which 56.0 percent of students indicated they spend no money at all, and 27.3 percent indicated they spend less than 10.0 percent of their monthly income (Table 4-15d). The expenditure for automobile and services was much higher, with 36.4 percent of married students spending between 15 and

19 percent of their income (Table 4-15e). The table on miscellaneous expenditures, which included medical bills, tuition, entertainment, savings, and others, showed that 36.4 percent of students spend between 10 and 14 percent of their income for such miscellaneous purposes (Table 4-15f).

TABLE 4-1 Married Students by Age and Class - Fall, 1960

Age	Fresh.	Soph.	Junior	Senior	Grad.	Part-Time	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 19	2	2	--	--	--	--	4	0.5	0.5
19-21	9	15	21	3	--	5	53	6.3	6.8
21-23	8	13	51	60	16	4	162	19.1	25.9
23-25	9	17	24	56	45	5	156	18.4	44.3
25-27*	--	9	44	53	47	2	155	18.2	62.5
27-29	2	8	18	56	29	2	115	13.6	76.1
29-31	1	5	3	31	27	3	70	8.3	84.4
31-33	1	--	2	10	22	2	37	4.4	88.8
33-35	--	1	4	5	22	1	33	3.9	92.7
More than 35	3	--	1	4	39	6	53	6.3	99.0
Unknown	--	--	1	--	5	1	7	1.0	100.0
Total	35	70	169	288	252	31	845	--	--
Percent	4.2	8.3	20.0	34.1	29.8	3.6	--	100.0	--

\*Median age group.

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.

**TABLE 4-2** Married Students Classified as Veterans and Non-Veterans, by Class - Fall, 1960

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Fresh.</u>	<u>Soph.</u>	<u>Junior</u>	<u>Senior</u>	<u>Grad.</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Veteran	11	32	70	146	98	6	363	43.0
Non-Veteran	24	38	98	142	154	25	481	57.0
No Status Given	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>100.0</b>

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.

TABLE 4-3 Married Student Enrollment by Curriculums and Class - Fall, 1960

Curricular School	Summary Enrollment										Total Percent
	Ph.D.	Grad.	Undergrad.	Grad.	P.T.	P.T.	M.S.	Senior	Junior	Soph.	
School of Applied Science and Business Administration	24	9	21	45	81	44	27	15	266	31.5	
School of Agriculture	15	9	7	58	27	17	15	3	151	17.9	
School of Engineering and Architecture	17	2	3	73	180	108	28	17	428	50.6	
Total	56	20	31	176	288	169	70	35	845	--	
Percent	6.6	2.4	3.7	20.8	34.1	20.0	8.3	4.1	--	100.0	

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.

TABLE 4-3a V. P. I. Married Student Enrollment by Curriculums and Class - Fall, 1960

Curriculums	School of Applied Science and Business Administration											Total Percent		
	Grad. Undergrad.			M.S.			Senior			Junior			Fresh.	Total
	Ph.D.	P.T.	P.T.	P.T.	Grad.	M.S.	Senior	Junior	Soph.	Soph.				
B. Ed.	0	1	0	0	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	15	5.6	
B. Ad.	0	1	3	7	39	39	25	17	8	8	100	37.5	37.5	
Biol.	5	0	1	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	21	7.9	7.9	
Pl. PP.	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.2	1.2	
G. Sc.	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	1.5	1.5	
Chem.	3	0	1	7	0	0	1	2	0	0	14	5.2	5.2	
I. A. Ed.	0	0	1	0	14	14	1	0	0	0	16	6.0	6.0	
D. Ed.	0	0	1	0	6	6	9	2	0	0	18	6.8	6.8	
Phys.	7	0	1	6	5	5	1	1	1	1	22	8.3	8.3	
Stat.	8	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	7.5	7.5	
Math.	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	0	1	1	13	4.9	4.9	
N. S. E.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.4	
Unc. S.	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	19	7.2	7.2	
Total	24	9	21	45	81	81	44	27	15	15	266	--	--	
Percent	9.0	3.4	7.9	16.9	30.4	30.4	16.6	10.2	5.6	5.6	--	100.0	100.0	

SOURCE: V. P. I. Tabulating Department.

TABLE 4-3b Married Student Enrollment by Curriculums and Class - Fall, 1960

Curriculums	School of Agriculture											
	Grad.		Undergrad.		Grad.		M.S.		Senior Junior Soph.		Total Percent	
	Ph.D.	P.T.	P.T.	P.T.	M.S.	Senior	Junior	Soph.	Fresh.			
G.Ag.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	2	1.3
Ag.Ec.	2	1	--	--	3	2	2	2	1	--	11	7.3
Ag.Ed.	--	--	--	--	2	5	5	3	1	--	11	7.3
Bio.N.	5	--	--	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	11	7.3
Agrn.	7	2	--	--	8	1	4	4	2	1	25	16.6
An.H.	--	2	--	--	4	4	4	--	4	2	16	10.6
Da.Sc.	--	--	--	--	4	3	3	--	--	--	7	4.6
Ento.	1	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	4	2.7
F.W.	--	--	--	--	5	6	6	1	--	--	12	7.9
H.Ec.	--	--	6	--	10	2	2	1	4	--	23	15.2
Hort.	--	--	--	--	4	2	2	2	--	--	8	5.3
Po.H.	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	1.3
Ru.So.	--	--	1	--	--	2	2	3	2	--	8	5.3
H.E.Ed.	--	1	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	6	4.0
Vo.Ed.	--	3	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	5	3.3
Total	15	9	7	7	58	27	17	15	3	3	151	--
Percent	9.9	5.9	4.6	4.6	38.5	17.9	11.3	9.9	2.0	2.0	--	100.0

SOURCE: V. P. I. Tabulating Department.



TABLE 4-3c Married Student Enrollment by Curriculums and Class - Fall, 1960

Curriculums	School of Engineering and Architecture										Total Percent		
	Grad. Undergrad.		M.S.		Senior		Junior		Soph.			Fresh.	Total
	Ph.D.	P.T.	P.T.	P.T.	Senior	Junior	Junior	Soph.	Soph.				
Ae.E.	--	--	--	15	8	6	2	1	32	7.5			
Arch.	--	1	2	5	5	3	--	--	11	2.6			
Ar.E.	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	5	1.2			
Geop.	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	2	0.5			
Cer.E.	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	2	0.5			
Ch.E.	5	--	3	8	3	3	--	1	20	4.7			
C.E.	--	1	9	20	15	5	5	2	52	12.1			
E.M.	7	--	9	4	1	--	--	--	21	4.9			
E.E.	--	--	7	29	29	8	8	3	97	22.6			
Ag.E.	--	1	--	5	5	2	--	--	8	1.9			
I.E.	--	--	2	23	5	1	1	1	33	7.7			
B.C.	--	--	--	2	2	6	1	2	11	2.6			
M.E.	--	--	8	35	29	10	10	6	88	20.5			
Met.E.	--	--	5	5	4	1	1	--	15	3.5			
Min.E.	--	--	--	5	5	2	--	1	8	1.9			
Geol.	5	--	6	4	2	2	--	--	17	3.9			
URPL	--	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	6	1.4			
Total	17	2	3	73	180	108	28	17	428	--			
Percent	3.9	0.5	0.7	17.1	42.1	25.2	6.6	3.9	--	100.0			

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.

**TABLE 4-4**      Occurrence of Marriage Before and After Entering School

<u>Occurrence of Marriage</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Before Entering School	63	39.2
After Entering School	98	60.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-5**      Years of Marriage

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1	8	5.0
1 - 2	51	31.6
2 - 3	28	17.4
3 - 4	25	15.5
4 - 5	16	10.0
More than 5	33	20.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-6**      Age at Marriage by Husband and Wife

<u>Age in Years</u>	<u>Husband</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Wife</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 19	4	2.5	22	13.7
19-21	39	24.2	62	38.5
21-23	65	40.4	56	34.8
23-25	30	18.7	13	8.0
25-27	14	8.6	7	4.4
27-29	4	2.5	1	0.6
29-31	5	3.1	--	--
More than 31	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-7**      Present Age of Married Students by Husband and Wife

<u>Age in Years</u>	<u>Husband</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Wife</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 19	--	--	3	1.9
19-21	3	1.9	14	8.6
21-23	39	24.2	48	29.8
23-25	31	19.3	44	27.4
25-27	39	24.2	25	15.6
27-29	23	14.3	13	8.0
29-31	11	6.8	6	3.7
31-33	6	3.7	4	2.5
33-35	3	1.9	1	0.6
More than 35	6	3.7	3	1.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-8**      Number of Children in Family

<u>Number of Children</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	80	49.6
1	55	34.2
2	18	11.2
3	5	3.2
4	3	1.8
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-9**      Number of Children by Age and Sex

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under 5	96	81.4	Male	62	52.6
Over 5	22	18.6	Female	56	47.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>118</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-10**      Number of Students Employed While Attending School

<u>Student</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed	51	31.7
Unemployed	110	68.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-11**      Number of Students With Employed Wives

<u>Wife</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Employed	93	57.8
Unemployed	68	42.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 4-12 Location of Employment of Wives

<u>Location</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Blacksburg	58	62.4
Elsewhere	35	37.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 4-13 Occupations of Employed Wives

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Secretary	48	51.8
Teacher	22	23.6
Nurse	16	17.2
Technician	6	6.4
Retail Sales	1	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-14**      Total Monthly Income Available

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Less than \$150	13	8.4	8.4
\$150-200	8	5.1	13.5
200-250	29	18.6	32.1
250-300	32	20.5	52.6
300-350	25	16.0	68.6
350-400	18	11.5	80.1
400-500	18	11.5	91.6
More than \$500	13	8.4	100.0
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>

**TABLE 4-15<sub>a</sub>**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Housing and  
Utilities

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
1- 9	2	1.4	1.4
10-14	8	5.4	6.8
15-19	18	12.2	19.0
20-24	22	15.0	34.0
25-29	40	27.2	61.2
30-34	17	11.6	72.8
35-39	20	13.6	86.4
40-49	20	13.6	100.0
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>--</b>

**TABLE 4-15b**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Food

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1- 9	9	6.1
10-14	16	10.9
15-19	31	21.1
20-24	33	22.5
25-29	26	17.7
30-34	13	8.8
35-39	13	8.8
40-49	6	4.1
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-15c**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Clothes

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1- 9	91	72.8
10-14	28	22.4
15-19	4	3.2
20-24	2	1.6
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-15d**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Household  
Furnishings

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	74	56.0
1- 9	36	27.3
10-14	16	12.1
15-19	3	2.3
20-24	3	2.3
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100.0</b>



**TABLE 4-15e**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Automobile and Services

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	7	5.0
1- 9	26	18.6
10-14	51	36.4
15-19	27	19.3
20-24	15	10.7
25-29	8	5.7
30-34	6	4.3
<hr/>		
Total Reporting	140	100.0

**TABLE 4-15f**      Income Expenditure Distribution - Miscellaneous\*

<u>Percent of Total Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	6	4.5
1- 9	8	5.9
10-14	29	21.5
15-19	7	5.2
20-24	16	11.9
25-29	14	10.2
30-34	20	14.9
35-39	9	6.7
40-49	13	9.6
50- /	13	9.6
<hr/>		
Total Reporting	135	100.0

\*Tuition, medical, entertainment, savings.

## B. Married Student Housing Characteristics

The vast differences among families dictate differences in the houses provided to meet their needs. The various factors which influence many of the characteristics of the housing supply, such as the size and location of the houses, their condition and facilities, whether they are owned or rented and the like, will be discussed in this section.

Housing markets are necessarily local, for it is at the community level where competition exists among different houses for a single buyer. Although this study deals primarily with rental housing, the concept remains the same.

In the following text, an attempt is made through the results of the survey questionnaire, to determine and describe the particular characteristics of housing of married students. Much verbal detail is limited and is replaced by the pertinent tables describing the results for those interested in greater detail.

### Occupancy

Among the 94 percent of married students that had their wives with them while attending school (Table 4-16), 58.0 percent had lived

off campus, as married students, for less than two years (Table 4-17). Approximately 28.0 percent lived off campus between two and four years; 14.0 percent lived off campus more than four years.

Of those living off campus, 45.3 percent occupied their present dwelling unit less than one year (Table 4-18). When considering that only 30.6 percent lived off campus for that same period (Table 4-17), it would appear that the 45.3 percent would include those that moved from other dwelling units that were occupied for a temporary period until better and/or less expensive housing was found. This seems to be substantiated by the fact that 26.0 percent lived in at least one other unit than that presently occupied, and 8.0 percent had lived in more than two other units before settling in their present location (Table 4-19). Of those who had moved, 64.7 percent occupied previous units less than one year (Table 4-20). (This would indicate a frequent amount of migration between units for short periods of occupancy.) Only 32 percent were planning to remain at the Institution (and thus occupy a dwelling unit) for more than two years, 30.4 percent were staying between one and two years, and almost 38 percent were leaving in less than one year (Table 4-21).

### Structure

The most characteristic type of structure in which dwelling units of married students are found is the converted one-family house of several small apartments. Although there are many non-converted "legitimate" apartment buildings such as the Win-Way Apartments and the Strickler Apartments, many of the multi-family structures are converted. Thirty percent of dwelling units are found in apartment buildings of this type (Table 4-22). (Another 3.1 percent lived in converted garage apartments.) The other two most important structure types are trailers (21.8 percent) and apartments in single family, owner-occupied residences (18.0 percent), which also have been converted for such use legally or otherwise. The foregoing three types account for more than 70 percent of all dwelling units.

### Tenure and Location

Of those that occupied dwelling units, 76.4 percent were renters while 23.6 percent owned their accommodations. Trailer ownership made up 92 percent of those who owned dwelling units (Table 22). The location of off-campus housing accommodations were predominantly located in Blacksburg. Only 15.6 percent were located elsewhere (Table 4-22). The study of location of the dwelling unit within the

structure revealed that 51.0 percent lived on either the ground floor or second floor, and 10.4 percent had basement apartments (Table 4-23).

#### Type of Rooms Occupied

All dwelling units that were reported had a kitchen and bathroom. Twenty-three and a half percent had a kitchen which included (or were large enough to include) a dinette area. Approximately 72 percent had a living-dining room combination as compared to 28.0 percent that had a completely separate living room. Only 14.4 percent had a separate dining room (Table 4-24). Approximately 45 percent had one bedroom, 50 percent had two bedrooms, and 5 percent had three bedrooms (Table 4-29).

Of those married students rating the adequacy of dwelling unit room sizes, 23.8 percent said that rooms were cramped, 65.3 percent were adequate, and 10.9 percent were spacious (Table 4-25).

Of the bathing facilities included in dwelling units 47.6 percent had bath facilities only, 47.0 percent had both bath and shower facilities, and 5.4 percent had shower facilities only (Table 4-26). Approximately 3.0 percent of bathing units were shared with one or more other families (Table 4-27). Seventy-eight percent said that the hot water supply was sufficient for daily use (Table 4-28).

### Size of Dwelling Unit

In approximately 95 percent of the cases, the dwelling units of married students are either one or two bedrooms in size (Table 4-29). Forty-five percent had one bedroom units, 50.3 percent had two bedroom units, and 4.6 percent had three bedroom units. In a study made in 1956, it was found that 57.0 percent of dwelling units were 3-1/2 rooms in size, and 23.0 percent were 4-1/2 rooms in size.<sup>16</sup> In the listing of dwelling units currently filed in the college housing office, 47.5 percent of all units are three room units, and 26.9 percent are four room units.<sup>17</sup>

### Room Furnishings

According to the survey, 51.0 percent of all occupied dwelling units were furnished. The majority of furnished units, 56.3 percent, were in one bedroom units; and the second, 42.4 percent, were in two bedroom units (Table 4-29). Thirty-one percent of all dwelling units were partially furnished (usually with only range and refrigerator).

---

<sup>16</sup>Kamstra, op. cit., p. 103.

<sup>17</sup>See Table A-6.

Within this group, 48.0 percent were one-bedroom units and 52.0 percent were completely unfurnished (no range or refrigerator). Approximately 70 percent of unfurnished apartments were in the two bedroom size.

In the 1956 study, 78 percent of dwelling units had a range and refrigerator, and 59 percent had furniture included in rent.<sup>18</sup>

### Furnished Units

Excluding the 39.7 percent of all furnished units in the \$20-\$40 rent category which consisted of primarily trailer type accommodations, 25.6 percent of furnished units were renting for \$60 and \$70 per month. Eighteen percent were renting for \$70 and \$80 per month. Almost 50.0 percent of the furnished apartments rented for more than \$60 per month (Table 4-29). Approximately 60 percent of the one-bedroom units rented between \$60 and \$80 per month, whereas only 25 percent of the two bedroom units rented between \$60 and \$80 per month.

In the listing of dwelling units currently filed in the college housing office, 57.0 percent of the furnished units rented between \$60 and \$80 per

---

<sup>18</sup>Kamstra, op. cit., p. 103.

month.<sup>19</sup> Of the unfurnished units, 18.8 percent rented for \$50-\$60, 33.3 percent rented for \$60-\$70, and 26.7 percent rented for \$70-\$80. Almost 93 percent of the unfurnished apartments rented for more than 50 dollars. Approximately 70 percent of such units were either three or four rooms in size.<sup>20</sup> According to Table 4-24, almost 78 percent of the unfurnished apartments rented for more than 50 dollars per month, of which 70 percent were in the four room size category (two bedrooms). According to the 1950 Housing Census, only 56.0 percent of all units were renting for more than 50 dollars per month, the median being \$50.49 for contract rent. The median gross monthly rent was \$55.82 which would include some furnishings and utilities.<sup>21</sup>

#### Utilities Provided

In the 1956 study 67 percent of units were provided with heat, 77 percent had cold water, 74 percent had hot water, and 28 percent were provided with electricity.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 103.



In comparison, this study indicated that 5.4 percent of dwelling units included heat, 31.3 percent included water, 35.4 percent included both heat and water, 6.8 percent included heat, water and electricity, and 21.1 percent included no utilities at all (Table 4-30).

Comparatively, 47.6 percent of married student units in 1961 included heat as part of rent cost; and in 1956, 67 percent of units were provided with heat. In both studies, the same percentage of units were provided with water. In the 1956 study, 28 percent of units included electricity as compared to only 6.8 percent in 1961.<sup>23</sup>

From all outward appearances, it seems as if not only has monthly rent increased since 1956 (median rent, furnished and unfurnished - \$60 per month; average rent, furnished - \$54 per month, unfurnished - \$58 per month)<sup>24</sup> but also that the number of units having utilities included in rental unit cost has decreased, with the renter getting less for the rent dollar. This is more readily seen in Table 4-31 where approximately 50 percent of all families spend more than twenty dollars per month for utilities.

---

<sup>23</sup>See Table A-7.

<sup>24</sup>Kamstra, op. cit.

### Other Facilities Provided

Of all units reporting, only 8.2 percent had a private garage. Approximately 60 percent had off-street parking facilities. Almost all units (97.2 percent) had a private entrance. Only one-third of dwelling units reported that they had either private or common automatic laundry facilities (Table 4-32).

### Condition of Accommodations

In the survey questionnaire, respondents were requested to rate the adequacy of dwelling unit furnishings, the condition of structure, and related housing services. The following is a summary of the results.

Of all dwelling units, either furnished or partially furnished, 50.0 percent felt that the condition of furnishings were good, 37.3 percent felt it was fair, and 12.7 percent felt it was poor (Table 4-33).

In Table 4-34, 37.0 percent felt that landlord's services were from fair to poor; 46.4 percent rated building maintenance from fair to poor. In general, the majority of all other categories listed were rated as good.

Table 4-35 summarizes the number of families satisfied with present dwelling unit. Of the 75.4 percent indicating satisfaction with present

unit, a number of students felt that they had to be satisfied with what they had, considering the fact that a better or larger unit would cost more (if any were available); and one unnamed married student remarked that, "After some of the other apartments I have seen, this 'trap' is a palace in comparison."<sup>25</sup>

According to Table 4-36, 16.7 percent of respondents indicated that their building may violate fire, health, or building codes, or be otherwise unsafe. Unless verified by inspection, little definite meaning can be arrived at. Several respondents indicated that converted buildings had only one entrance or exit and no fire escapes, in some cases for as many as 14 families in a single building. Others may appear unsafe because of faulty stairs, garbage in hallways, poor light and ventilation. Similarly, those that felt there were no violations may not know what a "violation" is or be conscious of it.

---

<sup>25</sup>For student comments see Appendix C.

TABLE 4-16 Number of Students Having Their Wives With Them While Attending School

<u>Wives</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Staying with husband	150	94.0
Not staying with husband	11	6.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 4-17 Number of Years Living in Off-Campus Housing As A Married Student

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1	46	30.6
1 - 2	41	27.4
2 - 3	23	15.4
3 - 4	19	12.6
4 - 5	18	12.0
More than 5	3	2.0
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 4-18 Number of Years Occupying Present Dwelling Unit

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1	68	45.3
1 - 2	40	26.7
2 - 3	24	16.0
3 - 4	14	9.3
4 - 5	4	2.7
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-19**      Number of Previous Dwelling Units Occupied Other Than Present Unit

<u>Number of Dwelling Units</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	99	66.0
1	39	26.0
2	10	6.7
3	2	1.3
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-20**      Number of Years Occupying Previous Dwelling Unit

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1	33	64.7
1 - 2	16	31.4
2 - 3	2	3.9
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-21**      Number of Years Students Plan to Remain at Institution

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1	61	37.9
1 - 2	49	30.4
2 - 3	34	21.2
3 - 4	16	9.9
More than 4	1	0.6
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-22**      Type of Structure Occupied by Tenure and Location

Type Structure	Tenure		Location		Number	Percent
	Own	Rent	Blacks- burg	Else- where		
Single Family Residence	3	11	7	7	14	8.7
Apartment in Owner-Occupied Residence	--	29	24	5	29	18.0
Duplex or Attached House	--	20	18	2	20	12.4
Apartment Building	--	47	41	6	47	29.2
Trailer	35	--	30	5	35	21.8
Dormitory or Room	--	11	11	--	11	6.8
Garage Apartment	--	5	5	--	5	3.1
Total	38	123	136	25	161	--
Percent	23.6	76.4	84.4	15.6	--	100.0

**TABLE 4-23**      Location of Dwelling Unit Within Structure

Location	Number	Percent
Basement	15	10.4
Ground Floor	37	25.5
Second Floor	37	25.5
Third Floor	7	4.8
Other*	49	33.8
Total Reporting	145	100.0

\*Trailer Court, House, or Dormitory.

**TABLE 4-24**      Dwelling Units by Number and Type of Rooms Occupied

<u>Type of Room</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Kitchen	117	76.5
Kitchen w/Dinette	36	23.5
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Living-Dining Combination	43	28.0
Living Room	110	72.0
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Dining Room	22	14.4
No Dining Room	129	84.6
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-25**      Adequacy of Room Sizes

<u>Room Size</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Cramped	35	23.8
Adequate	96	65.3
Spacious	16	10.9
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-26**      Provision of Bathing Facilities in Dwelling Unit

<u>Facility Provided</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bath Only	70	47.6
Bath and Shower	69	47.0
Shower Only	8	5.4
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-27**      Sharing of Bathing Facilities

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Shared	4	2.7
Not Shared	143	97.3
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-28**      Adequacy of Hot Water Supply in Dwelling Unit

<u>Supply</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Sufficient	115	78.2
Insufficient	32	21.8
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>



TABLE 4-29

Distribution of Dwelling Units by Number of Bedrooms, Monthly Rent, and Extent of Furnishings

Monthly Rent		All Dwelling Units			Total	Percent
		Number of Bedrooms				
		One	Two	Three		
\$20-40	Furnished	9	21	1	31	39.7
40-50		1	--	--	1	1.3
50-60		7	1	--	8	10.2
60-70		16	4	--	20	25.6
70-80		10	4	--	14	18.0
80-90		1	2	--	3	3.9
90- /		--	1	--	1	1.3
<b>Total I</b>			<b>44</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78 (51.0%)</b>
<b>Percent</b>		<b>56.3</b>	<b>42.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>		<b>100.0</b>
\$20-40	Part Furnished	--	--	--	--	
40-50		--	--	--	--	
50-60		7	2	--	9	18.8
60-70		6	4	--	10	20.8
70-80		6	12	--	18	37.5
80-90		4	7	--	11	22.9
90- /		--	--	--	--	
<b>Total II</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>48 (31.0%)</b>	
<b>Percent</b>		<b>48.0</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>100.0</b>
\$20-40	Unfurnished	--	--	--	--	
40-50		--	2	4	6	22.2
50-60		2	3	1	6	22.2
60-70		--	7	--	7	26.0
70-80		--	5	--	5	18.5
80-90		--	--	1	1	3.7
90- /		--	2	--	2	7.4
<b>Total III</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27 (18.0%)</b>	
<b>Percent</b>		<b>7.4</b>	<b>70.4</b>	<b>22.2</b>		<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total Reporting</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>153 (100.0%)</b>	
<b>Percent</b>		<b>45.1</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>		<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 4-30 Utilities Provided in Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent	Heat	Water	Heat, Water & Electricity	No Utilities Furnished	Total	Percent
\$20-40	0	35	0	0	35	23.8
40-50	0	2	0	1	3	2.4
50-60	1	5	8	1	22	15.1
60-70	5	1	16	4	34	23.2
70-80	1	1	18	3	34	23.2
80-90	1	0	10	2	16	10.9
90- /	0	2	0	0	23	2.4
Total	8	46	52	10	147	--
Percent	5.4	31.3	35.4	6.8	21.1	100.0

TABLE 4-31 Monthly Expenditure for Utilities in Excess of Rent Paid

Monthly Cost for Utilities	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
\$ 1- 4	13	8.8	8.8
5- 9	26	17.6	26.4
10-14	31	21.0	47.4
15-19	22	14.8	62.2
20-24	26	17.6	79.8
25-29	14	9.5	89.3
30-39	12	8.3	97.6
40-49	3	2.4	100.0
Total Reporting	147	100.0	--

**TABLE 4-32      Other Facilities Included in Rent**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Garage</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8.2</b>
<b>Not Provided</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>91.8</b>
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Off-Street Parking</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>59.9</b>
<b>Not Provided</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>40.1</b>
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Private Entrance</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>97.2</b>
<b>Not Provided</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Laundry Facilities</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>32.6</b>
<b>Not Provided</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>67.4</b>
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-33** Condition of Furnishings Included in Dwelling Unit

Dwelling Unit	Condition			Total	Percent
	Good	Fair	Poor		
Furnished	41	25	12	78	51.0
Part-Furnished	22	22	4	48	31.3
Total	63	47	16	126	
Percent	50.0	37.3	12.7		
Unfurnished	--	--	--	27	17.7
Total Reporting				153	100.0

**TABLE 4-34** Physical Condition and Services of Dwelling Unit

Dwelling Unit	Percent		Percent		Percent		Total
	Good	Total Reporting	Fair	Total Reporting	Poor	Total Reporting	
Paint	85	62.5	39	28.6	12	8.9	136
Plaster	62	54.9	38	33.6	13	11.5	113
Heat	101	69.7	36	24.8	8	5.5	145
Lights and Wiring	94	65.8	38	26.5	11	7.7	143
Plumbing	100	69.0	39	26.9	6	4.1	145
Natural light and Ventilation	102	70.9	33	22.9	9	6.2	144
Floors	85	61.2	43	30.9	11	7.9	139
Stairways	55	57.9	33	34.7	7	7.4	95
Maintenance	75	53.6	44	31.4	21	15.0	140
Exterior Appearance	93	64.6	40	27.8	11	7.6	144
Neighborhood	100	70.0	33	23.0	10	7.0	143
Landlord Services	87	63.0	29	21.0	22	16.0	138

TABLE 4-35 Number of Students Satisfied with Present Dwelling Unit

<u>Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Satisfied	113	75.4
Dissatisfied	37	24.6
Total Reporting	150	100.0

TABLE 4-36 Number of Students Indicating Dwelling Unit May Violate Fire, Health, or Building Codes or Be Otherwise Unsafe

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Violation	25	16.7
No Violation	125	83.3
Total Reporting	150	100.0

### C. Married Student Housing Preferences

Any housing survey that is conducted to determine preferences of those seeking better housing accommodations is rarely conclusive of what people really want. The reason lies in the fact that at least 8 out of 10 families in the housing market reflect not only what they want, but a combination of what they wanted and what they found; and their memories of exactly what they had wanted are likely to have been impinged upon to some extent by the experience of living in and adapting to what they have.<sup>26</sup>

It should also be noted that peculiarities in any local housing market such as type of structures prevalent, existing standards, variety of choice, condition of dwelling units, and general flexibility of housing accommodations (particularly in the rental market) will strongly affect home seekers' choices. As was noted in Chapter IV, little choice or variety, especially in rental units (and prices) exists due to the limited rental housing inventory and the extent of prevalent housing demand.

---

<sup>26</sup>Edward T. Paxton, What People Want When They Buy a House, Housing and Home Finance Agency, (Washington, D. C., 1955), p. 11.

In the following text, the results of the survey questionnaire, as it pertains to married student housing preferences, will be presented. The pertinent tables are enclosed for those who wish to make a more detailed study.

### Type of Structure and Location

The most characteristic type of structure desired by married students was a duplex and/or attached house (Table 4-37). Almost thirty percent of respondents desired these accommodations. The other two most popular types of structures preferred were the single family house (rental), 28.5 percent, and the multi-family apartment building, 25.5 percent. It was interesting to note that only 4.9 percent desired accommodations in converted apartments in owner-occupied homes. According to Table 4-22 almost four times as many actually occupied dwelling units in such structures, as compared to those that desired them. Conversely, there were almost 2-1/2 times as many that desired duplex or row house apartments than those that actually lived in them.

Of those desiring a particular location (on-campus or off-campus) of dwelling unit, 78.3 percent preferred off-campus housing. Those that desired on-campus housing, the most popular accommodations

were: multi-family apartment buildings, 37.1 percent; duplex or attached house, 31.4 percent; and single family house (rental), 22.9 percent (Table 4-37).

The surprising number of students that preferred off-campus housing seems to indicate a feeling of the impossibility of campus housing ever to exist at V.P.I., and thus face "reality." It is unlikely that the same reaction toward housing location would exist if the college established a program of campus housing for married students and faculty.

#### Unit Size and Rent

Almost 60 percent of respondents preferred two bedroom units as compared to 23.6 percent who desired one bedroom units, and 16.8 percent who desired three bedroom units. Fifty percent of the respondents that selected one bedroom units were willing to pay from \$50-\$60 per month in rent. Another 37.0 percent were willing to pay from \$60-\$70 per month for the same size unit (Table 4-38). Similarly, 28.4 percent of those that preferred two bedroom units were willing to pay \$60-\$70 and 30.5 percent were willing to pay \$70-\$80 for a two bedroom unit. For three bedroom units, 40.7 percent were willing to pay from \$60-\$70 per month. As might be noted, the most popular unit rent ranged from \$60-\$70 per month and the most popular dwelling size was the two bedroom unit.



### Utilities and Rent

The most popular arrangement of utilities to be provided in unit rent was, as could be expected, a combination of heat, water, and electricity. This category accounted for 42.2 percent of respondents (Table 4-39). The second most popular combination of utilities was heat and water. More than 38 percent desired this category of utilities to be included in rental charges. Only 6.3 percent were willing to pay for all utilities in addition to contract rent of unit. Another 3.7 percent wanted only heat included, and 9.3 percent wanted only water included. The majority of respondents were willing to pay between \$50-\$70 per month for housing in each of the utility preference categories listed.

### Room Furnishings and Rent

In the question related to the amount of room furnishings that should be included in unit rental price, 42.9 percent wanted only range and refrigerator as standard equipment, another 42.2 percent wanted all rooms furnished as well, and only 14.9 percent felt that they did not want any furnishings provided (Table 4-40). Again, more than two-thirds of the respondents in each of the above categories were willing to pay from \$50-\$70 per month rent. Another twenty-five percent were willing to pay from \$70-\$80 for similar furnishings.

### Type of Rooms

Of those responding to the question related to types of rooms or room combinations and functions desired in dwelling unit of their preference, 25.0 percent wanted a living-dining room combination, and 75.0 percent wanted a separate living room (Table 4-41). Conversely, 62.8 percent wanted a kitchen-dinette combination as compared to 37.2 percent that wanted a separate kitchen only. What may be indicative of a popular trend or reality of extra cost, was that only 20.5 percent desired a separate dining room. Several respondents also indicated that they desired bulk storage space and a study den.

### Other Facilities and Services

In order of preference by number of respondents, 82.3 percent desired off-street parking facilities as compared to 22.2 percent that preferred a garage, and another 16.3 percent wanted a carport (some respondents checked more than one of the above); 60.0 percent desired laundry facilities (though not specifically stated, the author assumes it to mean some type of common laundry facilities); 60.0 percent wanted landscaped grounds; and, surprisingly, 30.7 percent wanted bus service to and from campus (Table 4-42). Another popular service, particularly for families with children, was a supervised nursery or play area. The

27.4 percent of all respondents requesting this feature actually represents more than fifty percent of those families with children.<sup>27</sup>

Of minor importance (in respect to marketability of rental units), 56.4 percent of respondents answering the question on preference of housing style preferred "modern" as compared to 26.2 percent that selected "traditional," and 17.4 percent had no housing style preference, (Table 4-43). The exterior construction material that was most popular was brick (Table 4-44).

#### Market Demand

Approximately two-thirds of all respondents were willing to move from present dwelling unit if a better unit were offered at a price they could afford (Table 4-45). In contrast, according to Table 4-35, three-fourths of the respondents were satisfied with their present dwelling unit. Part of the explanation for the latter discrepancy is indicated by the number of students that either were graduating this June, or had less than a year to stay at V. P. I.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>See Table 4-8.

<sup>28</sup>See Table 4-21.

As was noted previously, those that indicated preferences of housing facilities, based their preferences on monthly rent they were willing and able to pay now. To summarize, 33.0 percent were willing and able to pay from \$50-\$60 per month, 32.3 percent from \$60-\$70, 24.8 percent from \$70-\$80, 6.8 percent from \$80-\$90, and 3.1 percent more than \$90.

It is possible, in some cases, that those who stated they could afford a comparatively low cost rental unit may actually be able to afford a more expensive unit, or may actually be occupying a more expensive unit. On the other hand, there are those who are also willing to spend more of their income dollar for housing than they can afford. This is probably due to their present experience in what values they receive for their rent dollar. Thus, comparatively they may feel that a greater share of their income must be spent in order to have minimum adequate housing facilities in this area.

Either way, analysis of market demand, based on stated preferences and ability to pay, must be approached with caution. Those readers more familiar with market analysis will find the enclosed tables most helpful as a guide toward a better understanding of needs and potential demand for married student housing.

**TABLE 4-37**      Preference of Dwelling Unit by Type of Structure and Location

Dwelling Unit Preference By Type of Structure	Location				Total	Percent
	On-Campus	Per-cent	Off-Campus	Per-cent		
Single Family House Rental	8	22.9	38	30.2	46	28.5
Single Family House Purchase	1	2.9	6	4.8	7	4.4
Apartment- Owner Occupied Home	--	--	8	6.3	8	4.9
Duplex and/or Attached House	11	31.4	36	28.6	47	29.2
Multi-Family Apartment Building	13	37.1	28	22.2	41	25.5
Trailer	2	5.7	10	7.9	12	7.5
Total Reporting Percent	35 21.7	100.0 --	126 78.3	100.0 --	161 100.0	100.0 --

**TABLE 4-38** Preference of Dwelling Unit by Number of Bedrooms and Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent	Number of Bedrooms				Total	Percent
	One	Two	Three	Four		
\$50-60	19	27	7	--	53	33.0
60-70	14	27	11	--	52	32.3
70-80	4	29	7	--	40	24.8
80-90	1	10	--	--	11	6.8
90- /	--	2	2	1	5	3.1
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-39** Preference of Dwelling Unit by Utilities and Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent	Utilities					Total	Percent
	Heat	Water	Heat & Water	Water & Electricity	No Utilities Furnished		
\$50-60	2	7	18	23	3	53	33.0
60-70	2	4	22	20	4	52	32.3
70-80	1	3	18	16	2	40	24.8
80-90	1	1	4	4	1	11	6.8
90- /	--	--	--	5	--	5	3.1
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-40** Preference of Dwelling Unit by Room Furnishings and Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent	Room Furnishings			Total	Percent
	Range & Refrigerator Only	All Rooms Furnished	Completely Unfurnished		
\$50-60	20	23	10	53	33.0
60-70	23	25	4	52	32.3
70-80	18	14	8	40	24.8
80-90	5	4	2	11	6.8
90- /	3	2	--	5	3.1
Total Reporting	69	68	24	161	--
Percent	42.9	42.2	14.9	--	100.0

**TABLE 4-41** Preference of Type of Rooms in Dwelling Unit

Room Preference	Number	Percent
Living-Dining Combination	40	25.0
Living Room Only	121	75.0
Total Reporting	161	100.0
Kitchen w/Dinette	101	62.8
Kitchen Only	60	37.2
Total Reporting	161	100.0
Separate Dining Room	33	20.5
No Dining Room	128	79.5
Total Reporting	161	100.0

**TABLE 4-42**      Special Facilities and Services Desired with Dwelling Unit

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total Reporting</u>
Laundry Facilities	92	60.0
Common Nursery or Lounge	18	11.8
Garage	34	22.2
Carport	25	16.3
Off-Street Parking	126	82.3
Landscaped Grounds	92	60.0
Supervised Nursery or Play Area	42	27.4
Private Terrace or Balcony	41	26.8
Bus Service to Campus	47	30.7

**TABLE 4-43**      Preference of Housing Style

<u>Style</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Traditional	42	26.2
Modern	91	56.4
No Preference	28	17.4
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-44**      Preference of Exterior Construction Material

<u>Construction Material</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Wood	4	2.5
Brick	116	72.0
Stucco	3	1.9
Stone	9	5.6
No Preference	29	18.0
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>



**TABLE 4-45**      Number of Students Willing to Move from Present Dwelling Unit if Better Unit Were Offered at Price They Could Afford

<u>Willing To Move</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	96	59.6
No	65	40.4
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-46**      Summary of Monthly Rent Students Are Willing and Able to Pay for Dwelling Unit of Preference

<u>Monthly Rent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$ 50-60	53	33.0
60-70	52	32.3
70-80	40	24.8
80-90	11	6.8
90- /	5	3.1
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 4-47**      Placement of Responsibility for Providing Adequate Married Student Housing

<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
College	98	61.0
Private Developers	27	16.8
Married Students	5	3.1
College and Private Developers	24	14.8
College and Students	5	3.1
College, Developers, Students	2	1.2
<b>Total Reporting</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100.0</b>

D. Summary and Conclusion

It is the purpose of this section to summarize briefly the findings of the survey and to suggest some of the implications of the data.

Both small families and small dwellings are characteristic of married students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The fact that a large portion of the families have children only emphasizes the inadequacy of cramped quarters in converted structures and early postwar trailers where a large share of the families now live. Those who are familiar with this type of housing know of the many compromises with comfort and convenience which accompany the conversion of a single family house into a number of smaller apartments.

It does not appear to be a serious matter that meals must be eaten in the kitchen or living room, or even that the living room be used for sleeping. In fact, modern functional design in small homes and apartments characteristically provides for such duplication in use. However, for students, the unfortunate aspect of this way of living is that the study function cannot be adequately isolated.

There is no evidence of overcrowding of dwelling units by student families, although it is probable that cramped quarters are the rule.

As far as the data assembled by this survey indicates, one is not justified in concluding that the housing of married students is inadequate in terms of space and facilities, although it is quite likely that a large share of the dwelling units are inconvenient, and in some cases dilapidated. Furthermore, as suggested earlier, many of the qualitative characteristics of this class of housing are not reflected adequately in the tables; and it is probably that many of the couples, who have come from good families and who are used to better things in life, for a year or two are forced to put up with lower standards in housing even as they are forced to put up with lower standards in food, in clothing, in amusements, and in most of the other aspects of living.

On a comparative basis, the rents paid by married students are the highest in the community as well as being higher than similar units in neighboring communities. It appears that rents are high in relation to services received for the rent dollar. (It is thus apparent why many students have selected trailer accommodations in preference to paying such a high portion of their income for rent). Also, it is rather difficult to compare the rent level with that in other communities, since converted structures are not as common outside of college towns. However, on the basis of limited comparative data, it may be concluded that there are very few cities in the country where as little is received for the rent dollar.

The financial status of married students appears to be better than was anticipated, particularly in comparison to previous studies cited. The facts on income, however, must be interpreted in light of local costs of living, which are unusually high. There are undoubtedly a number of cases in which married students and their families are hard pressed, but it is unlikely that there are many cases where actual suffering is involved. The group earning less than \$200 per month is undoubtedly living in straitened circumstances. The group spending from \$250 to \$300 per month are getting along satisfactorily, while those above that level may live comfortably. The widespread ownership of cars, and their indicated cost, is suggestive of the latter income group, although in this part of the country car ownership is almost universal. In considering the sources of income, the importance of the wife's earnings is evident; and the apparent resourcefulness of wives in finding employment is admirable.

The financial burden of housing as expressed in the rent-income ratios does appear to be out of line with other groups of our population. In fact, considering the small families characteristic of married students, though tending to increase, it is quite likely that this group is no better off than the low-income labor group with their large families, prevalent in the outlying area of Blacksburg, who fall in the same income group.

The number of married students indicating willingness to move from existing quarters if there were somewhere to move only emphasizes the current shortage of comfortable dwelling units suitable for married students at a price they could afford. This situation could be relieved by the provision of new housing. It is quite likely that housing could be provided on a commercial basis at rents substantially equivalent to those now being paid, but with the advantage of providing attractive, well planned units without increasing the financial burden. If group housing for married students were to be financed under the same State-College arrangement used for the dormitories now under construction, or better still, under the 1950 college housing program of the H.H.F.A., adequate housing at a substantial saving could be provided for married students. It is apparent that the facts contained in this study would provide a sound foundation for planning any new housing for this group.

## V. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY OF COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAMS

It is not the scope of this chapter to go into any extensive discussion of the various aspects of the married student housing programs at other institutions. Although the major elements of this survey have been tabulated and enclosed in this section for those who may desire to make a more detailed analysis, the primary objective of this survey was to establish a case for the development of a housing program for married students at V. P. I.

The primary purpose of the survey was to illustrate how other institutions are solving the problem of providing adequate housing for married students.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the survey was to form a basis and guide for recommending steps toward establishing a housing program for married students at this institution.

Of the 53 percent of the 69 land grant institutions that responded to the survey questionnaire, more than 83 percent had a program for providing married student housing facilities on campus.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix G for sample questionnaire.

A. Financing

Of those reporting method of financing married student housing, 60 percent used H.H.F.A. loans, and 40 percent used income from public bond issues. (In the latter case, respondents did not note whether public bond issues were sponsored by H.H.F.A. or other agencies.)

The period of amortization varied from 20 years to 40 years. Approximately 60 percent had a 40-year period of amortization and 20 percent had a 30-year period of amortization.

The total cost of construction varied from \$2,000 to \$13,000 per dwelling unit. The median dwelling unit cost was \$8,000. Approximately 30 percent of the institutions spent between \$7,000 and \$8,999 per unit and 35 percent spent between \$9,000 and \$10,999 per unit.

Almost all the institutions having a married student housing program found that the project costs were self-liquidating and needed no further subsidation from other sources.

Of the 53 percent of the institutions reporting future married student housing expenditures, the average estimated expenditure per institution was 6-1/2 million dollars for the next decade.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>In some cases it was not noted by respondents as to whether future housing expenditure included both single and married student housing or just married student housing.

## B. Student Enrollment

The average number of married students as a percent of total enrollment was 18 percent.

In almost all the institutions reporting, the number of married students enrolling had been increasing. It was not noted by the respondent as to whether the increase reflected the percent of total enrollment or just in absolute numbers.

## C. Housing Facilities

There were an average of 4.7 married student families for each dwelling unit available on campus.

There were about as many furnished units as there were unfurnished units.

The type of bedroom units provided varied from efficiency apartments to three bedroom apartments. More than 90 percent of the institutions had both one bedroom and two bedroom units as compared to 43 percent that had efficiency units and 24 percent that had three bedroom units.

The size of units varied from 300 sq. ft. for efficiency units to over 800 sq. ft. for three bedroom units. The average size of the one



bedroom units was between 500-600 sq. ft., and of the two-bedroom units between 600-700 sq. ft.

Monthly rent varied from \$25 for an efficiency unit in temporary government surplus housing to \$130 for a three-bedroom unit in new permanent housing. As an example, at the University of North Carolina, the monthly rent for a one-bedroom unit was \$60, and for a two-bedroom unit \$70. In both type units, heat and water were included. Units were unfurnished.

Elsewhere, the utilities included in rent varied from only water to all utilities provided. It appears as if as many units had all or most utilities included as there were those that included only water.

Other than the temporary war surplus housing units, the most prominent materials of construction for permanent housing were brick veneer with concrete block, or frame construction.

Twenty percent of the institutions reported that they had constructed married student housing off-campus as well as on-campus.

Approximately 28 percent reported that the one-bedroom unit was the most popular as compared to 72 percent reporting the two-bedroom unit as the most popular.

D. Housing Policies and Programs

The majority of institutions reported that they had no specific housing policy for married students, only for single students. Married students could select housing locations of their choice. In all cases, though, institutions administered regulations affecting occupancy of institutionally provided housing.

Other than for single student housing, few institutions had standards for off-campus married student housing. In some cases institutions provided a listing of off-campus housing which they recommended as having adequate standards as well as those units (black list) that were not recommended. Again, only in a few cases were off-campus housing recommendations for married students regulated or enforced.

As previously mentioned, the majority of institutions reported definite programs for providing more on-campus housing facilities for married students in the next decade.

In all cases, the directors of student housing felt that the responsibility for providing married student housing belonged to the institution if private developers could not adequately meet the demand.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See also Appendix B (A comparison of married student housing at fifteen midwestern colleges and universities.).

### E. Selected Comments

In order to give a clearer picture of the answers obtained from the more subjective questions included in the survey, as well as to obtain a cross-section of attitudes of the respondents toward married student housing responsibility, the following selected comments and opinions are enclosed:

#### University of Wisconsin

"As with housing for all our students, the feeling here is that the responsibility must be a shared one.

"Since our married student units are reserved for graduate and professional students, and since they rent for substantially less than comparable privately owned facilities, they seem to encourage many top-caliber graduate students who are considering the University.

"The biggest problem toward providing adequate housing for married students is the cost factor, particularly when groups of single students compete for apartments on the private market. The result is inflated rental prices, far too high for most couples. So while new units are being built, many (units) will remain far out of reach of most married students."

#### University of Illinois

"Responsibility dependent on size of the community in which the institution is located.

"Institution benefits by the potential part-time and full-time staff in the ranks of the married students.

"Institution should follow the trend of the projected enrollment figures of married students."

Ohio State University

"I feel we have an obligation in this day and age when education means so much to individuals as well as the country for providing for its future. I also feel that married student housing is a must on a campus such as ours with a fine graduate, dental and medical school.

"I feel that economical housing adds security to a married student family which is transferred over into the College Community. Also good married housing attracts quality graduate students which strengthens the graduate college as well as teaching staff for the undergraduate colleges.

"There could be some more research carried on concerning the future need for University married housing. There needs to be more investigation concerning the procurement of money for construction. Architects might do more research concerning space conservation as well as the use of low cost construction materials."

Oklahoma State University

The responsibility for providing adequate housing for married students belongs to, "in our case, the institution, because the local community (23,000 population) cannot furnish sufficient private housing."

The institution benefits from a married housing program by

"reaching more young people desiring college training. Provides greater opportunity for graduate students and provides closer contact with married students and their problems."

"In metropolitan areas, institutional housing for married students may not be needed. In small communities it is

necessary to provide adequate housing for married students. With the increasing number of married students attending colleges and universities, more housing should be provided.

"The biggest problem is financing construction of a sufficient number of married housing units."

#### Iowa State University

"Our policy is to provide 50 percent of housing needed for married students.

"The institution benefits by the good public relations which result. Also, it gives a better selection of graduate students who serve as graduate assistants in teaching and research."

#### Utah State University

"Married students are more satisfied with an institution that provides housing for them. Economic pressure is partially relieved and social contacts encouraged to make their living more enjoyable."

#### University of Missouri

"Some students would be unable to attend the University for lack of housing.

"Institutions should attempt to furnish facilities not provided by private developers."

#### South Dakota State College

The institution, by providing married student facilities, ". . . ties the married student into feeling of belonging to the institution,

hence (there is) more loyalty to the school and more favorable publicity. "

"We are developing plans for better control of off-campus facilities. This is a minimum necessity as well as providing on-campus facilities.

"Recommend cooperation with local developers, also cooperation in improving existing off-campus facilities. "

### Washington State University

"Joint responsibility, college and private developers. However, if private developers do not perform, then the University should.

"I believe that any institution can now provide adequate housing if desired through H.H.F.A. "

### Michigan State University

The responsibility belongs to ". . . private developers, but if we had waited for that, we never would have had the number (of units) or quality we do have. Also, the rent would have been higher. "

Problems are ". . . high rent that has to be charged is a burden to many couples. Also, the more you do for them (married students) the more they expect--play areas, recreation facilities, medical care and medicine for the entire family, etc. "

University of Idaho

"It is my experience that where student families have the money to pay for it, there is no shortage of housing. This then becomes a financial problem, either give the students the money or donate at least a large part of the housing for them."

University of Maryland

The institution benefits because: "1) Students are more mature and get better grades. 2) Trend to get married earlier is permanent part of our new society. 3) Many jobs are held by student wives helping the University. 4) Graduate students need extra financial boost."

The problems are: "1) Not enough land close to University. 2) General feeling that it is too expensive and that you can take care of four non-married students as far as general cost to University for housing one married couple."

Recommend ". . . do as many colleges are doing, build now. Units should be built on or as near campus as possible, operated on a self-liquidating basis, and controlled solely by the university on a non-profit basis."

University of Georgia

"Graduate programs could not operate without married student housing. Also, many of the married students could not afford to continue their education without institutional housing."

TABLE 5-1  
Part I

A Comparison of What is Being Done in the Construction of New Married Student Housing at Thirty-seven Land-grant Colleges and Universities - March, 1961.

Institution	Bed-room Type	Unit SF	Unit No. of Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amortization	Yes	Future Housing Expenditure
U. of Florida	1	531	296 P	Conc. Blk., brick ven.,	\$6,145	Yes	\$54	40 yrs. HHFA	Yes	\$--
	2	682	589 T							
	3	791	885 tt	poured conc.						
Arkansas A&M	1	525	105 tt	Frame	3,500	No	30	40 HHFA	Yes	3,000,000
	2						35			
U. of Georgia	E	--	260 tt	Prefab., wood	5,000	No	25	--	Yes	500,000
	1						28			
	2						30			
U. of Maryland	E	--	104 tt	Wood	--	No	40 HW	None	Yes	--
	1				Govt. srpl.		43 HW	Govt. srpl.		
Texas A&M	E	--	778 tt	Asbestos	5,000	Yes	30*	30 bond	Yes	None
	1		T-P	Asbestos, brick, frame			38* & 65*			
Miss. State U.	1	540	252PF	Conc., brick	7,000	Yes	53	40 HHFA	Yes	5,000,000
	2	660	202 T		8,000		60			



Institution	Bed-room Type	Unit SF	Unit No. of Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amortization	Housing Cost	Liquida- tion of Housing Expen- diture
U. of North Carolina	1	500	308 T	Brick	--	--	60 HW	40	--	1,000,000
	2	600	222 P				70 HW	HHFA		
U. of Nevada	1	400	40	Brick, conc.	7,500	No	65	30	Yes	200,000
								HHFA		
Purdue U.	E	400	152	Brick, conc.	11,000-	Yes	73*	40	Yes	8,000,000
	1	520	48		13,000		87*	Bond		
	2	625	--				93*			
Rutgers U.	E	--	305 tt	Frame-25	10,000-	No	51-63	--	--	25,000,000*
	1			brick ven.			61-73	HHFA		
	2						71-83			
Penn. State	1	550	294 tt	Frame	10,000	No	73	40	Yes	20,000,000*
	2	675		brick ven.			83	HHFA		
Louisiana State U.	2	500-600	416	Block-conc.	6,900	No	68*	25-30	Yes	--

Institution	Bed-room Type	Unit SF	Unit No. of Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amortization	Liquidation of Housing Cost	Future Housing Expenditure
Auburn U.	1	508	241 P	Brick-conc.	--	Yes	60	40	Yes	--
	2	795	126 T				68	HHFA		
U. of Idaho	1	400	100	Block-conc.	9,000	Yes	73*	30 Bonds	Yes	--
Michigan State U.	1	500	1,940 tt	Brick-conc.	9,000-	Yes	75*	20	Yes	--
	2	600			10,000		81*	Bonds		
Washington State U.	E	360	524 tt	Frame	11,330	Yes	65 HW	40	Yes	2,000,000
	1	480				Yes	53-63*	HHFA		
	2	642				Yes	61-78*			
	3	810				Yes	66-85*			
Florida A&M	E	Min. of 700	50 tt	Gov't. srpl. temp.	--	No	31*	--	No	--
	1					Yes	37*			
	2					Yes	41*			
	3					Yes	44*			

Institution	Bed-room Type	Unit No. of Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amortization	Housing Cost	Liquida- tion of Housing Expen- diture
U. of Delaware	1	400	--	--	Yes	78-90*	--	--	--
	2	580			Yes	90-103*			
West Va. U.	E	300-400	T Brick -	10,000	Yes	80*	30	Yes	--
	1	500	4-9 story		Yes	105*	Bond		
	2	700	gov't bar-		No	115*			
	3	900	racks		No	130*			
South Dakota State College	1	377	Brick	7,090	No	68*	34	Yes	--
	2	--	govt. bar-		No	30	HHFA		
		150	racks						
U. of Arkansas	2	730	360	Conc. blk.	7,500	No	65*	40	Yes
								HHFA	--
U. of Missouri	1	530	360 tt	Conc. blk.	10,500	No	60	40	Yes
	2	670		brick ven.		No	67	Bonds	--
Iowa State U.	2	600	800 T	Wood	7,200	No	55-59	30	Sub.
			196 P					Bonds	18,000,000

Institution	Bed-room Type	Unit SF	Unit No. of Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amortization	Housing Cost	Liquidation of Housing Expenditure	Future Housing Expenditure
Utah State U.	1	524	304 T	War srpl.	10,000	No	30-36	40	Yes		690,000
	2	660	72 P	block, brick		No	65	HHFA			
Lincoln U.	E	--	--	--	--	--	35	--	--		3,000,000
	1						50				
	2						65				
	3						95				
M.I.T.	E	500	--	Reinforced	13,300	No	102*	40	--		3,000,000
	1	605		concrete			114*	HHFA			
	2	745					135*				
Oklahoma State	1	280	T590TP	Conc.-brick	9,000	Both	50*	25	Yes		3,600,000
	2	480	T	vener - steel			60-80*	Bonds			
	3	580	T	joists			55*				
Ohio State U.	E	--	400 P	--	7,000-	Yes	41*	40	Yes		--
	1	504	452 T	Masonry			46-80*	Bonds			
	2	800					52-90*				

Institution	Bed- room Type	SF	Unit No.	Units	Materials of Construction	Unit Cost	Furn'd	Monthly Rent	Amorti- zation	Housing Cost	Future Housing Expen- diture
U. of Minnesota	E	400	700	tt	Frame & slab	2,500	No	65*	35	Yes	4,000,000
	1	600						70*	HHFA		
	2	850						80*			
U. of Illinois	E	380	409	T	Conc.-brick	--	Yes	80	38	Yes	--
	1	560	311	P	veneer			85	Bonds		
	2	650						95			
U. of Wisconsin	1	400	276		Frame, brick	8,000	No	72*	38	Yes	7,000,000
	2	530	372		veneer			85*	HHFA		

E - efficiency apartment; 1 - one bedroom; 2 - two bedroom; 3 - three bedroom

\* - denotes utilities are furnished; HW - heat and water only

T - temporary; P - permanent; F - future; tt - total

SOURCE: This survey was prepared by Jack M. Kandel, graduate student, Urban and Regional Planning, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia, March, 1961.



Institution	Total Student Enrollment	Married Student Enrollment	Married Student Enrollment Percent	Married Student Enrollment Trend	Number of MS/DU Apartments	Most Popular Bedroom Apartment	Housing Policies or Standard	Housing Responsibility
West Va. U.	6,500	1,500	23.0	Inc.	4.0	1	No	C-D
South Dakota State College	2,988	500	16.7	Same	2.5	2	No	C-D
U. of Arkansas	5,862	1,287	22.0	Same	3.5	2	Yes	C
U. of Missouri	11,176	2,400	21.5	--	6.7	2	No	C-D
Iowa State U.	9,726	1,931	19.8	Same	1.9	2-	Yes	C
Utah State U.	5,428	833	15.3	Inc.	2.2	--	No	C-D
Lincoln U.	1,643	150	9.1	Inc.	--	1	Yes	C
M.I.T.	6,289	1,430	22.7	Inc.	--	--	No	C-D
Oklahoma State	10,854	3,006	27.6	Inc.	5.1	2	No	C
Ohio State U.	23,813	5,239	22.0	Inc.	9.4	2	No	C
U. of Minnesota	24,942	4,484	18.0	Inc.	6.4	2	Yes	C
U. of Illinois	21,955	4,463	20.3	Same	6.2	2	Yes	C-D
U. of Wisconsin	18,811	3,084	16.4	Inc.	4.7	2	No	C-D

The following institutions reported that they had no married student housing program at this time - March, 1961:

Virginia Polytechnic Institute	University of Hawaii
University of Puerto Rico	University of Connecticut
Delaware State University	Kentucky State University

C - college; D - private developers; MS/DU - married students per (available) dwelling unit

SOURCE: This survey was prepared by Jack M. Kandel, graduate student, Urban and Regional Planning, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia, March, 1961.

F. Conclusion

The results of this survey definitely indicate a recognition by other institutions of the trend toward earlier student marriages and the institution's responsibility toward providing adequate housing, either on or off campus, for this group.

The increasing number of married students enrolling at institutions of higher learning has brought both problems and benefits to the institution. But regardless of the reasons offered by the institutions for accepting the housing responsibility, whether for purely altruistic reasons or financial benefit and reputation, the fact remains that almost 85 percent of the institutions have or are planning a definite program for married student housing.



## VI. ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND LONG-RANGE BUILDING PROGRAMS AT V.P.I. - ENROLLMENT AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS

As in the preceding chapter on college housing programs at other institutions, V.P.I. too has a housing program. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine this program both in the light of the existing housing problem as discussed in Chapter III and to examine the validity and adequacy of its projection of student enrollment and resultant housing needs.

Based on a recent study of policies and long-range building programs by the College . . . , "A primary consideration in the future development of V.P.I. which will relate to the kind of facilities it will require is its expected future enrollment."<sup>1</sup>

"Within the institution itself many policies can affect the number of students to be admitted. Enrollments, for example, cannot be expected to exceed the capacity of available facilities. The amount of dormitory accommodations for students is an obvious limitation. Blacksburg is located away from large metropolitan centers in the state. If living accommodations are not provided, regardless of developments of the educational program, there will be a restriction on enrollments."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Engelhardt, Engelhardt, Leggett and Cornell, A Long-Range Building Program for Virginia Polytechnic Institute, (Blacksburg, Virginia, October, 1959), p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

Thus, according to the educational consultants retained by the institution in 1959, the limiting factor for expansion of the institute will be the living accommodations available for any increased enrollment. The projected enrollment, based on ". . . information from various approaches supports the conclusion that it is reasonable to use a target figure of 10,000 for a ten to fifteen year planning program for V. P. I. "<sup>3</sup>

In general, the goals and aims of the institution are to reach a university type level with greater emphasis on graduate work and research. As a result, the conservative estimate reached by the consultants, indicated a total undergraduate enrollment of 9,000 students, and graduate enrollment of 1,000 students by the year 1970-75.

In taking into account the proportion of the 10,000 students those who will be on the graduate level by assuming 10 percent, or 1,000 graduate students, the report further projects the need for accommodating the increased number of undergraduate students. The report states, ". . . if 90 percent of the students are housed on campus, new dormitories for about 5,000 students will be needed. . . "<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 114.

"This is a reasonable estimate because the village of Blacksburg is not equipped to house very many students. Some students among the increased enrollment may be those who will commute from a reasonable area surrounding Blacksburg."<sup>5</sup>

The most interesting fact brought out by the consultants in their report was that married students were not considered as a fact. As far as the report was concerned, which reflects the institution's policies, married students or their needs do not exist. For at no point were married students or their housing needs mentioned. To further emphasize this fact, a recent study by architects and campus planners, based on the aforementioned Engelhardt report, again did not mention or include any proposals for married student housing.<sup>6</sup> An exception to the latter statement was the fact that the words "Married Student Housing" were noted on the master plan proposed. This was indicated in an area known as Drapers Meadow, which is now being developed to provide 50 new rental units for married students by private developers.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>6</sup> The Administration of V.P.I., 1960 Directional Plan of Development for V.P.I., (Blacksburg, Virginia), Prepared for the Board of Visitors, 1960.

Other than the fact that married students do exist and presently make up more than 16 percent of the total school enrollment, there is no reason or possible excuse for eliminating the group from any discussion in the aforementioned plans.

In assuming that the school enrollment will reach 10,000 by the year 1970-75, what portion of that enrollment will consist of married students, assuming all necessary housing facilities were provided either by the institution or private developers?

From one approach, using the 10 percent of total enrollment figure used by the consultants as representing the percentage of graduate students to be enrolled (which is felt to be unreasonably conservative), it has been pointed out and proven at other institutions that the majority of graduate students are married.<sup>7</sup> Presently, 50 percent of all graduate students at V.P.I. are married. The number of undergraduate married students presently consists of 10 percent of all undergraduate students.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, a conservative estimate of married student enrollment, based on existing trends, would be a minimum of 18 to 20 percent of

---

<sup>7</sup> See Chapter V.

<sup>8</sup> See Table 4-1.

total student enrollment. Thus, even the tenuous assumption that 90 percent of all undergraduate students will be housed on campus and in dormitories is fallacious and misleading in any attempt to plan a building budget for this purpose.

Another approach to projecting the number of married students that may be enrolled at the institution could be based on past enrollment trends. At V.P.I., the number of married students has varied between 16 and 20 percent of total enrollment in the past five year period.<sup>9</sup> As was pointed out in Chapter III, the average enrollment was 18 percent. Thus, with the trend toward increasing student marriages, it is fair to assume that the number of married students will be at least 20 percent of total enrollment during the period of the school's expansion toward its 10,000 student goal.

If this be the case, then by 1970-75 there will be a need for a total of 2,000 dwelling units for married students alone. Presently, it is estimated that there are approximately 650 rental units (both dilapidated and non-dilapidated) available in the community.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, at least 1350 new rental units will have to be provided somewhere

---

<sup>9</sup> See Table 3-1.

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, Advance Table - 1960 Housing Characteristics.

and by someone by 1970-75. As was pointed out many of the existing units, such as postwar surplus trailers and dilapidated converted structures, would have to be replaced. In addition, the number of existing border-line structures will be ready for replacement by 1970-75. Thus an additional 150 units, or a total of 1500 new rental housing units, will be needed by 1970-75.

Unquestionably, if these needs are not met, enrollments cannot be expected to exceed available accommodations. The limitation on college growth is quite evident. In spite of some of the attitudes indicated by several of the college administrators toward this problem of housing for married students, action by the College and State must be taken to meet the impending crisis.<sup>11</sup>

The implications are quite apparent that the College must set forth realistic plans and programs to meet the impending crisis. Private developers, thus far, have not met this need.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix D - Comments of College Administration.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Conclusion

By this time, it should be quite apparent to the reader that a problem exists beyond the factual housing problem that has been previously discussed. This added problem is the lack of acceptance by any party or parties, of the responsibility for providing adequate facilities for the minority of married students. Although, traditionally, the College has depended upon the community to absorb its excess student enrollment, neither the college nor the community has made any plans toward providing new housing facilities for married students. Although the problem has been recognized, little has been done about solving it.

As has been mentioned, the proposed new married student housing project, sponsored by private developers, will help alleviate part of the existing housing need. Unfortunately, the rental rates proposed will still be higher than most students can afford.<sup>1</sup>

Married students are a particular breed of individuals. Their housing needs cannot be met without adequate understanding of their

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter IV, "Survey of Married Student Housing," Table 4-14.

particular problem. The economic plight of the married student is a problem of low income groups the world over. Low income groups may desire improvement, but cannot pay for it; then, by the natural economics of speculative housing, they are not capable of demanding better housing.

It is at this time that the question previously stated becomes of apparent importance. How and by whom will the responsibility for providing adequate housing for this group be met?

It should be evident after being introduced to our country's married student housing problem, particularly as it has developed at V. P. I., that the question of housing is a two-fold responsibility. It is the responsibility of the college to see that students are housed properly; it is the responsibility of the Town of Blacksburg as well as the County to see that only decent housing is provided.

Unquestionably, the provision of adequate housing for this group, at a reasonable cost, must be met. The community at large or private developers cannot be relied upon to meet this need alone. As was stated in the editorial section of the Roanoke Times, February 16, 1955:



"Essentially, . . . housing provision for married students is a problem of the college and the State government. If the college is to continue to admit them, there is an obligation to think of their welfare. The needs call for long-range planning and they should engage the serious attention of the commission reviewing capital needs of State institutions and agencies."

Thus, any long-range plan for development by the college must be arrived at realistically and cooperatively with the Town in order to avoid the pitfalls of misguided or misplanned growth and development.

## B. Recommendations

### Aims and Needs

One of the major aspects of planning permanent housing facilities for married students is the assessment of needs. Because of this factor, a planning committee should be established which would include representatives of the college administration, the chief business officer, Town officials, an architect, members of the faculty, and several married students.

The primary purpose of the committee should be the determination of a housing policy based on aims and needs of both the college and community. From this policy a comprehensive plan for college housing development should be formulated. The use of this study as a guide

could be helpful as a beginning. The plan should also be integrated with a comprehensive plan for community development based on anticipated growth and needs. A comprehensive study of the area surrounding Blacksburg could possibly give direction to better formation of subdivisions, neighborhoods, and improved housing inspection and regulation standards. Most of all, it might also result in an awakening of interest in the people of Blacksburg to the planned development of the area. In effect, it may avoid the naive comments thoughtlessly made by certain townspeople.<sup>2</sup>

In essence, there must be established some ideas of the aims for college student housing --married, single, or graduate.

Recommendations:

- "1. Provide the best housing possible at the lowest cost possible.
2. Best study conditions possible to encourage scholarship.
3. Maximum opportunity for recreation, relaxation, and use of leisure time--help to develop good mental and physical health.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix E, "Comments of Townspeople."

4. Provide maximum opportunity for association with other residents to learn how to live with others.
5. To provide every opportunity for the development of individual abilities through activities and student government --to learn by doing.
6. Provide opportunity to learn and practice good citizenship and develop the perspective of right and wrong for everyday living.
7. Provide opportunity for additional stimulation in thinking and acting through opportunities for leadership, debate, and friendly discussions and arguments."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, a program for college housing should be adopted that will deal with the students as individuals who must work within creative living quarters that will promote the maximum opportunity for student growth in citizenship, group and community living. Each group housed needs to learn self-government, self-direction and self-discipline.

A comprehensive college housing program issued as a direct result of this study would reassure the residents of the State of Virginia that this institution is planning to do more than just provide shelter for its students.

---

<sup>3</sup> College Housing BT 6-3, "A Building Type reference guide," Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects, (Washington, D. C., July-August, 1956), p. 106.

In order to accomplish its aims, the college must establish a basic policy for married student housing accommodations. A valid policy would be that the college should aim to provide 50 percent of the permanent housing needs for this group on-campus, and 50 percent to be provided through establishing an off-campus housing program in cooperation with town officials.

#### Off-Campus Housing Program

A program of off-campus housing must consider the intricate relationships between the college, student, and community.

"In general, the physical presence of a permanent institution determines the general nature of use of the surrounding privately owned land. In other words, the land surrounding most campuses is improved in accordance with the existing or anticipated business needs created by the campus itself."<sup>4</sup>

It would seem logical, then, that the institution--if for no other reason than its own self-interest--should participate affirmatively in guiding the orderly and economically intelligent development of the land surrounding it, unless it is willing to accept in the long future of its probable growth the existence of high priced slums.

---

<sup>4</sup> Carl B. Opp, "Colleges Look to Outer Space," College and University Business, Vol. 29, No. 6, December, 1960, p. 24.

Recommendations:

1. The institution's total housing program should include off-campus housing as an integral part of its operation and the established interests of such housing should receive full and fair consideration in all institutional planning.
2. The institution can candidly admit it expects the landlords to make a reasonable profit on their investments but also can insist on good quality and proper management.
3. The off-campus housing program must be a continuing program that is an integral part of the institution's operating policy; otherwise, two negative results may follow, either simultaneously or consecutively: a.) Investments will be made by persons willing to take long chances for quick profits, and this will result in marginal, ill planned housing and continuous hassling over zoning changes; b.) Malpractices of various types will creep in, creating continuing problems for the institution and its students.
4. Basic standards of conduct must apply uniformly to all students--on and off campus, and the institution must take an active interest in seeing that these standards are observed.
5. Students should be allowed maximum freedom of choice in making their rental arrangements in private housing. The institution should guide, assist, advise and counsel; but it should not dictate.
6. The institution should list and refer (or recommend) facilities it has inspected and found acceptable. If circumstances necessitate referral to housing that has not been inspected, the situation should be made clear to the student. Thus, written standards for safety, sanitation, quality, and management eventually will have to be set up at some point in the program.

7. Adequate personnel, adequately prepared and adequately paid, must be provided for the program if it is to be a true program and not a mere classified advertising or listing service. This requires a professional staff knowledgeable of real estate economics and management procedures as well as good public relations.<sup>5</sup>

Basically, the premises and problems of real estate economics in a free enterprise system must be recognized by the institution and the differences inherent between non-profit institutional housing and profit seeking private housing must be accepted and resolved. Thus, in all instances the institution cannot rely solely on private developers to provide the essential services required at economical rents that students can afford. Of necessity self-preservation, as well as preservation of qualified students, requires the institution to couple its off-campus housing program with non-profit institutional housing. An off-campus program is only a stop-gap program and in essence is not the complete answer to the problem to be confronted. However, planned and professional attention to off-campus housing should bring worthwhile returns in better service for its students and better relationship with the community than now exists.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 25.

College Housing Program

As was pointed out in Kamstra's study, housing provided by private developers is unprofitable to build if built according to what students can afford. Also, the average landlord now renting one or two units has increased his own living standard to an extent of being greatly aided by the rental income students provide; so he cannot afford to lower his rent. Furthermore, many townspeople built their own residences on the premise that renting their converted basement apartments to students will help amortize their own debts.<sup>6</sup>

Since financial reports on Private housing investments show that a reasonable housing profit cannot be made at the rents students are capable of paying, it is up to the college to provide this required shelter. It has been illustrated that:

1. Private developers have high cost for even economically designed units.
2. The failure of private investment to build units due to high costs and low rental, has caused a lack of new housing units.

---

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Albert Kamstra, An unpublished thesis, Married Student Housing, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1957.

3. The College Housing Loan Program of H.H.F.A., or equal State support, is the only economical method of providing good housing for low income married students.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, based on the comparative results of Chapter V, "Analysis of Survey of College Housing Programs," almost all college housing programs on campus used H.H.F.A. low interest loans and found them all self-liquidating.

Thus, if the college is to continue to grow, it must provide adequate housing facilities for both married and single students.

The institution should plan on an ultimate demand for 1500 new units in addition to those already existing in the community. If the school's policy is to provide 50 percent of all new married student housing units, it should plan on a building program for 750 new campus units by the year 1975. Any institution today can provide low cost adequate housing for married students through H.H.F.A.

In planning the new permanent housing facilities, college officials should consider providing, in addition to cooking and sleeping facilities,

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 54.



adequate play space for children. Family privacy is an important consideration. Space for working, adequate lighting, "peace and quiet," laundry facilities, and proximity to shopping centers and academic buildings are all important things that must be considered.

It is hoped that the previous survey study of married students' housing preferences could serve as a guide toward instigating future college housing facilities.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Beyer, Glenn H., Housing: A Factual Analysis, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958
- Fitch, Marston J., American Building, The Forces That Shape It, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948.
- Gallion, Arthur B., The Urban Pattern, D. Van Nostrand Company, Princeton, New Jersey, 1950.
- Hallenbeck, Wilbur C., American Urban Communities, New York: Harber and Brothers, 1951.
- Ratcliff, Richard U., Urban Land Economics, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949.
- Thompson, Warren S., Population Problems, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- "Campus Housing: Contemporary Version", Housing for Single and Married Students at Purdue University. Architectural Record, Vol. 120 (August 1956), 196-200.
- "College Housing BT 6-3", A Building Types Reference Guide, Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects, The Octagon. Washington, D. C., July-August, 1956, pp. 99-107.
- "College Housing BT 6-4", Parts 2 and 3, A Building Types Reference Guide, Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects, The Octagon. Washington, D. C., September-October, 1956, pp. 131-146.
- "College Housing BT 6-5", Part 4, A Building Types Reference Guide, Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects, The Octagon. Washington, D. C., November-December, 1956, pp. 163-174.

- "College and University Residence Facilities Constructed, 1950-1958." An Analysis of the Amount and Quality of Single Student Sorority-Fraternity and Married Student Residence Facilities. American School and University, 1959, 165-94.
- Decker, G. C., "College Housing Program to Operate on a Contingency Basis", Higher Education, Vol. 15, (October, 1958), 37-39.
- Decker, G. C. and Rork, J. B., "College Housing Situation: December 1954," Higher Education, Vol. 11 (January 1955), 64-66.
- Frank, L. K., "Housing for Married Students", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 49 (May 1957), 367-8.
- "The Housing Problem at Tech", Editorial, The Roanoke Times, Morning, February 16, 1955, p. A-6.
- "Housing, University of Kentucky," Architectural Record, Vol. 119, #4 (January, 1956), p. 306.
- Jones, Robert M., "Married Student Housing at Arkansas Combines Beauty With Comfort," College and University Business, Vol. 29 (March, 1960).
- Jones, W. R., "Affective Tolerance and Typical Problems of Married and Unmarried College Students", Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 37 (October 1958), 126-8.
- Long, J. D. and Weiner, A. M., "Financing of College and University Housing," American Council on Education, Summary Paper, 1957.
- "Married Student Housing Poses Problem at Tech," Newspaper Article, The Roanoke Times, February 6, 1955, p. 13.
- Mueller, K. H., "Married Student on the Campus," College and University, Vol. 35, No. 2, (Winter, 1960), 29-31.
- Opp, Carl B., "Colleges Look to Outer Space", College and University Business, Vol. 29, No. 6 (December 1960) pp. 23-27.
- Pickard, E. W., "College After Marriage," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52 (December 1960), 850-51.

"Rush for 2 3/4% College Housing Loans May Soon Exhaust Easily Garnered Funds," Architectural Forum, Vol. 104, #4 (April 1956), p. 13.

Sharkan, William M., "It's High Time for Permanent Housing for Married Students," College and University Business, Vol. 17, No. 2 (August 1954), pp. 37-39.

Shiel, F. C., "University of Michigan's Married Student Housing Project", American School and University, 1958, 331-36.

Smith, J. R., "Low Cost Housing for Married Students at Ferris Institute", American School and University, 1957, 367-68.

Van Zwoll, J. A., "Policy and College Housing", Higher Education, Vol. 13 (March 1957), 134-37.

Williamson, E. G., "Students Live Off Campus", Educational Record, Vol. 37 (July 1956), 216-23.

#### REPORTS

A Program for Housing Students at the University of Illinois, A Report from the President of the University to the Board of Trustees, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, January 28, 1956.

A Short-Term Forecast of the Housing Market, Jacksonville, Florida, United States Department of Commerce, HHFA, Washington, June, 1953.

1950 Census of Housing, United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Vol. I, General Characteristics, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1952.

The College Housing Program, The What and Why of Title IV, Housing Act of 1950, Pamphlet U. S. III, HHFA, Washington, United States Department of Commerce, September 1952.

Directional Plan of Development for Virginia Polytechnic Institute -- 1960, Report to the Board of Visitors, the Administration of V.P.I., Blacksburg, Virginia, 1960.

Engelhardt, Engelhardt, Legget and Cornell, A Long-Range Building Program for Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Administration of V.P.I., October, 1959.

Housing Market Analysis, Summary, Technical Report No. 6-S, Maryland State Planning Department, Baltimore, Maryland, November, 1960.

Information for Prospective Students, Bulletin of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Vol. LIII, No. II (September, 1960), Blacksburg, Virginia.

Jones, Robert M., A Comparison of What's Being Done in Construction of New Married Student Housing at Fifteen Midwestern Colleges and Universities, University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas, November, 1955.

Paxton, Edward T., What People Want When They Buy a House, United States Department of Commerce, HHFA, Washington, 1955.

Planning the Home for Occupancy, By The American Public Health Association, Committee on the Hygiene of Housing, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1950.

Planning the Neighborhood, By The American Public Health Association, Committee on the Hygiene of Housing, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1960.

Population and Housing Characteristics: 1960, Advance Table for Blacksburg, Virginia, United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, May, 1961.

Rapkin, C., Winnick, L., and Blank, D., Housing Market Analysis, A Study of Theory and Methods, United States Department of Commerce, HHFA, Washington, December, 1953.

#### UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Bock, George Alvin, A Study of the Development of Permanent Housing for Married Students as a Basis for the Design of Such a Project at the University of Virginia, Unpublished Thesis, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1955.

Hulst, Dorothy C., A Study of the Problems in Home Making Practices of Wives of Students at V.P.I., Blacksburg, Virginia, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Home Economics Education, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1957.

- Kamstra, Albert T., Married Student Housing -- A Study on Environment and The Human Organism as a Guide Toward Low Income Housing for Married Students, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Architecture, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1958.
- Rulz, Antonio L., A Study to Evaluate some Factors That Have Influenced the Growth of Blacksburg, Virginia, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Business Administration, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1952.
- Smyth, E. A., A Brief History of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1872-1922, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1922.
- Tyler, Virginia P., Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Student's Wives at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Home Economics Education, V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1960.

**APPENDIX - A**

**Supplementary Tables**



**TABLE A-1** Classes in Which Married Men Students Were Enrolled in the Winter Quarter, 1960\*

Class	Married Men Students	
	Number	Percent
Freshman	9	3.6
Sophomore	22	8.7
Junior	55	21.8
Senior	111	44.1
Graduate Student	55	21.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE A-2** Sources of Income of Married Students\*

Sources	Students	
	Number	Percent
Husband's Family	52	20.6
Wife's Family	21	8.3
Husband Employed:	100	39.7
On V. P. I. Campus	61	24.2
Elsewhere	39	15.5
Wife Employed:	144	57.1
On V. P. I. Campus	61	24.2
Elsewhere	83	32.9
Scholarships	22	8.7
Veteran's Benefits	76	30.2
Borrowed Money	34	13.5

\*SOURCE: Virginia Porter Tyler, unpublished thesis, "Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Student's Wives at Virginia Polytechnic Institute," V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, June, 1960, pp. 32 and 49.

**TABLE A-3**      Years of Marriage According to the Age of Wives and Husbands

Age in Years	Number	Years of Marriage				
		Less than 1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4 or more
<u>Wives</u>						
18-20	30	8	14	5	2	1
21-23	103	16	29	25	22	11
24-26	72	--	4	16	10	42
27-29	30	1	--	3	1	25
30-32	9	--	1	--	1	7
Over 32	5	--	--	--	--	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>91</b>
<u>Husbands</u>						
18-20	5	1	--	3	1	--
21-23	79	16	34	11	11	7
24-26	83	7	11	21	17	27
27-29	59	1	3	12	7	36
30-32	8	--	--	1	1	6
Over 32	15	--	--	1	--	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>91</b>

SOURCE: Virginia Porter Tyler, unpublished thesis, "Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Student's Wives at Virginia Polytechnic Institute," V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, June, 1960, p. 28.

TABLE A-4 Married Students Living On and Off Campus, by Class - Fall, 1960

Housing Location	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Part-Time	Total	Percent
On Campus	3	8	26	21	3	--	61	7.2
Off Campus	32	62	143	267	249	31	784	92.8
Total	35	70	169	288	252	31	845	
Percent	4.2	8.3	20.0	34.1	29.8	3.6		100.0

SOURCE: V.P.I. Tabulating Department.

**TABLE A-5**      Students' Wives According to Proximity of Residence to Virginia Polytechnic Institute

<u>Distance From Campus</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
In Blacksburg	203	80.6
Not in Blacksburg, but within 10 miles of Blacksburg	17	6.7
Not within 10 miles of Blacksburg, but within 25 miles of Blacksburg	8	3.2
Not within 25 miles of Blacksburg, but within 50 miles of Blacksburg	16	6.3
More than 50 miles from Blacksburg	8	3.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**SOURCE:** Virginia Porter Tyler, unpublished thesis, "Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Student's Wives at Virginia Polytechnic Institute," V.P.I. Library, Blacksburg, Virginia, June, 1960, p. 30.

**TABLE A-6** Inventory of Dwelling Units for Rent by Monthly Rent, Number of Rooms, and Furnishings

	Monthly Rent	Number of Rooms						Total	Percent
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six		
Furnished	Less than \$50	1	16	9	1	--	--	27	13.6
	\$50-60	--	7	23	4	--	--	34	17.1
	60-70	--	4	41	16	1	--	62	31.1
	70-80	--	1	30	14	7	--	52	26.2
	80-90	--	1	10	8	1	--	20	10.0
	More than \$90	--	--	1	--	2	1	4	2.0
	<b>Total I</b>		1	29	114	43	11	1	199(54.7%)
<b>Percent I</b>		0.5	14.6	57.3	21.6	5.5	0.5	--	100.0
Unfurnished	Less than \$50	--	2	9	3	--	--	14	8.5
	\$50-60	--	3	12	14	1	1	31	18.8
	60-70	--	1	26	12	14	2	55	33.3
	70-80	--	1	11	23	7	2	44	26.7
	80-90	--	--	1	3	12	3	19	11.5
	More than \$90	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	1.2
	<b>Total II</b>		--	7	59	55	34	10	165(45.3%)
<b>Percent II</b>		--	4.3	35.8	33.3	20.6	6.0	--	100.0
<b>Total I - II</b>		1	36	173	98	45	11	364(100.0%)	--
<b>Percent I - II</b>		0.3	9.9	47.5	26.9	12.4	3.0	--	100.0

SOURCE: Compiled from Current listing of housing available filed in College Housing Director's Office - March, 1961.

**TABLE A-7**      Inventory of Dwelling Units by Utilities Provided\*

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Heat	25	6.9
Water	49	13.4
Heat and Water	154	42.3
Heat, Water, Electricity	62	17.0
None Provided	74	20.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE A-8**      Heating System and Type Fuel Used\*

<u>Heating System</u>	<u>Fuel</u>				<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	<u>Gas</u>	<u>Electricity</u>	<u>Coal</u>	<u>Oil</u>		
Radiator	0	0	27	23	50	34.0
Forced Air	2	0	5	50	57	38.8
Baseboard	0	1	1	16	18	12.2
Radiant Elec.	0	2	0	0	2	1.4
Room Heater	3	0	0	7	10	6.8
Floor Furnace	0	0	0	10	10	6.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*SOURCE: Compiled from current listing of housing available filed in College Housing Director's Office - March, 1961.

**APPENDIX - B**

**A comparison of what is being done in the construction of new married student housing at fifteen midwestern colleges and universities.**

A Comparison of what is being done in the construction of new Married Student Housing at fifteen midwestern colleges and universities.

This survey included questions and answers, in addition to floor plans, type of construction, and average costs.

It was prepared by the Division of Student Affairs, Robert M. Jones, Assistant Dean and Supervisor of Housing, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, November, 1955.

College	Type	Unit SF	# of units	Materials	Cost	Furnished	Rent	Amortization
Central Michigan	1	438	40	block & brick no plaster	\$9000	yes, plus washer & dryer (Herman Miller)	\$55*	25 yrs
	2	550	8				\$60*	
Baylor	1	600	-	brick & concrete	\$6000	Both	-	40 yrs
Kansas State	1	500	-	wood & brick veneer	\$8300	yes	\$62.50*	30 yrs
	2	600	-				\$67.50*	
Michigan State	1	504	456	wood & brick veneer, carpeted	\$8000	yes	\$69* \$75*	-
Univ. of Wisconsin	1	460	24	wood & brick veneer	\$7700	no	\$-	30 yrs
	2	574	24					
Oklahoma A&M	2	not built yet so no costs.						
Univ. of Colorado	1	610	393 (old units)	brick, steel joints	\$9722	no	\$60*	40 yrs



College	Type	Unit SF	# of units	Materials	Cost	Furnished	Rent	Amortization
Univ. of Colorado	2	770	no number of new				\$80	
Univ. of Kentucky	E	405	330	reinf. conc.	\$9500	minimum furnishings	-	40 yrs
	1	540	180 planned					
Purdue	E	405	152	brick, stone, steel	\$6500 & \$12,500	no complete	\$65* \$75*	40 yrs
	1	no SF	48					
Univ. of Miss.	1	550	300	reinf. conc. & brick	\$7000	no	\$52.50	40 yrs
Indiana Univ.	E	500	238	limestone	\$11,000	yes	-	38 yrs
	1		144 - more planned					
Univ. of Michigan	E	415	296	wood & brick veneer	\$11,000	yes	\$75*	30 yrs
	1	615	in demand				\$85*	
	2	705	in demand				\$100*	
Arkansas Poly.	E	280	24	masonry outside plywood inside	\$7000	yes	\$35*	40 yrs
Univ. of Wyoming	1	565	88	conc. block	\$5749	yes	\$40	20 1/2 yrs
Cornell	1	560	96	limestone, brick veneer, block	\$8600	no	\$65	35 yrs
	2	755					\$80	

E - efficiency apartment, 1 - one bedroom, 2 - two bedroom, and \* denotes utilities are furnished.

**Notes:**

Univ. of Wyoming - Loan 2% bond for entire contract.

Cornell - 3 and 3/4% interest borrowing on own endowment fund.

**General opinions:**

1. Most prefer one and two bedroom over efficiency.
2. Demand is divided evenly for one and two bedrooms.
3. Majority for furnished units, with no furnishings for the second bedroom.

**APPENDIX - C**

**Comments of Married Students**

C. Comments of Married Students

The following are several letters written by married students in response to the survey questionnaire.

1. Since there has been no housing provided for married students prior to this time, various townspeople have taken it on themselves to provide a few desirable dwellings for them, while at the same time providing themselves with quite a bit of additional income. If suddenly the college decided to provide student housing, these people would lose a considerable amount of their income, in some cases, probably the largest percentage of income. This is, of course, from the standpoint of the landlord.

From the other side of the fence, we have the low-income student and his family. As this is one of the less expensive colleges in Virginia (or even on the East Coast), it is reasonable to assume that a large percentage of these students have to earn their own daily bread, without help from parents or other benefactors. We probably are prosperous compared to some of these students, what with a working wife, veteran husband, and no children. These three conditions enable us to pay the \$80 a month rent for a decent environment a slight degree easier than those families with perhaps two children, wife unemployed or paying a baby sitter, and husband with no G. I. benefits. Some of these families have no automobile, and have to walk quite a distance to classes. After staying up late studying, it would be no picnic to hike a mile or more to an 8:00 class, home at noon, and back in the afternoon for perhaps another class or lab.

It would be our suggestion, if the land could be acquired, to build a few units (sponsored by the campus) close to the campus, for a trial period. It would not seem advantageous to go on to a full-scale development without first being tested. Families to be considered for these apartments might be selected according to income, or lack of income, not by scholastic standing.

2. It has been our experience, having attended two universities prior to coming to V.P.I., that universities as large as this one generally furnish housing for married students. The need for such housing seems particularly acute here, since the town itself is so small. Of course, we realize that a goodly portion of the town's income comes from the rental of rooms and apartments by private individuals, but we're selfish enough to totally disregard their welfare. Compared to the apartments of many of our friends ours is exceptionally nice. The rent was at first \$85 per month and fuel was costing \$25 per month which was more than we could afford. Because of this we had planned to move last month, but our landlady lowered the rent to \$75, which is still more than we can afford, but we can find no other place that fits our needs, i.e. two bedrooms and furnished. The rent will be raised again during the summer when there are no fuel bills.

If it were impossible for the school to provide housing for married students, we feel minimum housing standards should be required of those renting to students. While we have no complaints about our own apartment, we have seen too many instances of students living in sub-standard housing not to become somewhat indignant. Most of the married students here seem to feel they are being taken advantage of by the town. We do not know what responsibility the school should bear for this situation, but since it is unrealistic to expect the town to do anything to remedy it, greedy as it is, it is our hope that V.P.I. will find some means for enforcing minimum housing standards.

**APPENDIX - D**

**Comments of College Administration**

D. Comments of College Administration

The following is quoted from personal interviews with prominent V. P. I. officials.

Married students who cannot afford to pay for community housing facilities should not be married and going to school.

Students should not be married anyway.

The cost of providing an apartment for one married student couple could pay for at least five single students.

Until we have enough dormitory space for single students, we can not consider married student housing.

The Board of Visitors will not consider any such expenditure.

From past experience with campus trailers after the war there is no rational reason why we would want to go through the problem again.

It is too expensive to maintain and administer married student housing.

We would not tolerate the extra-marital relationships that went on in those trailers.

We could not use federal loans to pay for married student housing because of the integration problem.

It is the responsibility of the community and private developers to meet the demands for new housing.

Student marriages are only a fad and will not be as prominent in the future.

The problem is solved. The 50 new units that will be built on Drapers Meadow by private developers will be adequate. After all, they said they can expand if necessary to a maximum of 150 units.

**APPENDIX - E**  
**Comments of Townspeople**



E. Comments of Townspeople

The following is quoted from personal interviews with prominent citizens and officials of Blacksburg in response toward the married student housing problems.

It is the responsibility of the college. They (the college) don't worry about our problems so why should we worry about their problems.

If we built rental housing, we would have to charge more than the students can afford.

There is no profit in married student housing.

They (the married students) are more trouble than they're worth.

I don't see that there is a housing problem.

After all, renters don't pay taxes.

Don't you think that building new housing for married students by the college will deprive many of the citizens from their source of income?

People in this town are against negroes, trailers, and changing times.

The Town can not afford to do anything about the problem. We can't afford to repave our streets.

I didn't know that people actually lived under such housing conditions.

Students are too transient. It would cost more to maintain the buildings and besides they're only seasonal trade.

Married students are too destructive. They don't deserve better furnishings.

The reason that the school won't build new housing facilities is because the school's business manager has a vested interest.

What happened to the development corporation that was going to build student housing?

I think that if there were enough people foresighted enough to build an apartment in their basement when they bought their house like I did, there would be no housing problem.

Married students have too many children. After this bond issue taxes will be high enough. Why should I pay for their children going to school?

If they're willing to pay the price, there is enough decent housing available in town.

If private developers want to build, good luck to them.

There is not enough "loose" money floating around town.

College students create a traffic problem.

The college can best afford it.

**APPENDIX - F**

**Questionnaire: Survey of Married Student Housing**

February 23, 1961

- 155 -

Dear Married Student,

Enclosed is a questionnaire to be filled out by all married students at V.P.I. Its purpose is to determine the problems and needs of housing for married students and what could possibly be done to alleviate these problems.

We all know that little has been done in the past to create a better living environment or standard for housing married students. With this questionnaire, it is hoped that the facts and opinions voiced in this study, a guide can be established, for both the college administration and private developers, that will aim at providing better housing facilities in the very near future.

It is the responsibility of all married students to be cognisant of this problem and try their utmost to help find a solution. This questionnaire is a means to a solution.

It is of utmost importance that all questionnaires be returned by Monday, March 6, 1961, in order to have a valid basis for determining future policies and actions by the school and private developers. Your support is requested by completing this questionnaire and returning it by the due date to Box 4403, V.P.I.

Your cooperation and support is fully appreciated.

Thank You,

The Association of Married Students  
and  
The Office of Student Housing-V.P.I.  
J. E. Hardy, Director

(JMK)

- 156 -  
**HOUSING SURVEY OF MARRIED STUDENTS**  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
 March, 1951

**I. Married Student Characteristics**

1. How many years are you married \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 2. Did you marry after entering school? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
3. How old were you when you married: \_\_\_\_\_ Wife \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is your present age? \_\_\_\_\_ Wife \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 5. Do you have children? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
6. If yes, number of children (List sex and age below) *is that a habit or when you are young*

	Sex	Age
(1)	_____	_____
(2)	_____	_____
(3)	_____	_____
(4)	_____	_____
(5)	_____	_____
more _____		
7. Is your wife staying with you now? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
8. If not, please state why. \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 9. Are you employed while at school? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 10. Is your wife employed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
11. If so, in what occupation \_\_\_\_\_, place of employment \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 12. Where does your income come from? (Fill-in appropriate spaces)
 

a. Husband:	1. Veterans benefits-	\$ _____	per month
	2. Employment-	\$ _____	per month
	3. Parents-	\$ _____	per month
	4. Savings-	\$ _____	per month
	5. Other source (list)	\$ _____	per month
b. Wife:	1. Employment-	\$ _____	per month
	2. Parents-	\$ _____	per month
	3. Other source (list)	\$ _____	per month
	Total-	\$ _____	per month
- ✓ 13. How do you spend your income? (% percent distribution of monthly income)
 

a. Housing & utilities	_____	%
b. Food	_____	%
c. Clothes	_____	%
d. Household furnishings	_____	%
e. Automobile & services	_____	%
f. Other (list)	_____	%
Total		100 %

**II. Housing Characteristics**

**A. Tenure**

1. Do you rent or own present housing unit? \_\_\_\_\_
2. If you rent-
  - a. Do you have a lease? \_\_\_\_\_ For how long? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Do you rent for 9 months and leave for the summer or rent for the entire 12 months of the year? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. What is your present rent per month? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How much longer do you plan to stay at V.P.I.? \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Location of Dwelling**

- Do you reside in-
1. Blacksburg \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Elsewhere (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  3. If other than Blacksburg, please state why you do not reside in Blacksburg. \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Type Dwelling Occupied (Check one)**

1. Single family residence \_\_\_\_\_
2. Apartment in owner occupied residence \_\_\_\_\_
3. Duplex or attached house \_\_\_\_\_
4. Apartment building (3 or more families) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Trailer \_\_\_\_\_
6. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Location of Rental Unit (Check one)**

1. Basement \_\_\_\_\_
4. Second floor \_\_\_\_\_

E. Number and Type of Rooms

Please check those rooms and/or room combinations that apply to your dwelling unit and add total number of rooms other than bathroom.

- Room Count - ( )      Number of Rooms
1. Kitchen (1) \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Kitchen with dinette (1 1/2) \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Dining Room (1) \_\_\_\_\_
  4. Living-dining Combo (1 1/2) \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Living Room (1) \_\_\_\_\_
  6. Bedroom (how many; each) \_\_\_\_\_
  7. Is your bathroom
    - a. Private \_\_\_\_\_ or Shared \_\_\_\_\_
    - b. Bath \_\_\_\_\_ or Shower & bath \_\_\_\_\_

*Σ 4 rooms  
and 1 bathroom*

3. Do you feel that room sizes are:

- a. Cramped \_\_\_\_\_ b. Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ c. Spacious \_\_\_\_\_

G. Equipment & Utilities

1. Is your unit furnished \_\_\_\_\_; partially furnished \_\_\_\_\_; unfurnished (no range or refrigerator) \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If partially furnished to what extent \_\_\_\_\_

3. Do you consider furnishings in good, fair or poor condition - \_\_\_\_\_

4. What utilities are provided in rent

- a. Heat \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Water \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. Electricity \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. Non-provided \_\_\_\_\_

*Garbage  
Sewage*

5. What type fuel is used in heating system

- a. Oil \_\_\_\_\_ b. Coal \_\_\_\_\_ c. Electricity \_\_\_\_\_ d. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (specify if other)

6. What type heating system do you have

- a. Radiator (water or steam) \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Hot air ducts \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. Baseboard heating \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Radiant electric heating panels (floor or ceiling) \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. Individual room heaters \_\_\_\_\_  
 f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you have sufficient hot water for all your needs \_\_\_\_\_

8. What is your total monthly expenditure for utilities \_\_\_\_\_

9. What features do you have other than above

- a. Garage \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Off-street parking area \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. Private entrance \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Laundry & dryer room \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

*a/c*

*overall have added  
much more to  
unit*

H. Condition of Unit (personal rating)

	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Paint	_____	_____	_____
2. Plaster	_____	_____	_____
3. Heat	_____	_____	_____
4. Lights & wiring	_____	_____	_____
5. Plumbing	_____	_____	_____
6. Light & ventilation (windows)	_____	_____	_____
7. Floors	_____	_____	_____
8. Stairways	_____	_____	_____
9. Maintenance	_____	_____	_____
10. Exterior appearance	_____	_____	_____
11. Surrounding neighborhood	_____	_____	_____
12. Landlords services	_____	_____	_____

*if any part of room  
is not habitable or deteriorated to  
such extent of being  
unfit for occupancy*

III. Housing Trends & Preferences

A. Dwelling Occupancy

1. Since being married and attending school, how long have you lived off-campus \_\_\_\_\_
2. How long have you occupied your present unit \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many other units have you occupied since being a married student at V.P.I. \_\_\_\_\_
4. How long did you occupy those units \_\_\_\_\_
5. Why did you move from previous residence at V.P.I. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Are you satisfied with present unit \_\_\_\_\_
7. If not, please list reasons why \_\_\_\_\_

B. Housing preferences

If you were looking for another dwelling while attending V.P.I., what would you be looking for?

1. Type dwelling (check one)

- a. Single family house .. rental..... \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Single family house...purchase..... \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Apartment in owner-occupied home..... \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Duplex and or attached house..... \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Apartment building (2 or more families).... \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Trailer..... \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Other (specify)..... \_\_\_\_\_

2. Location of dwelling

- a. On-campus..... \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Near-campus in Blacksburg.. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Elsewhere (specify)..... \_\_\_\_\_

3. House style (check one)

- a. Traditional \_\_\_\_\_, b. Modern \_\_\_\_\_, c. Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Exterior construction material (check one)

- a. Wood \_\_\_\_\_ d. Stone \_\_\_\_\_
- bb. Brick \_\_\_\_\_ e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Stucco \_\_\_\_\_

5. Number & kind of rooms: (#)-room count

- a. Bedrooms (1,2,3, or more)... \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Separate dining room (1).... \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Living-dining combo (1 1/2). \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Living room (1)..... \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Kitchen & dinette (1 1/2)... \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Kitchen only (1)..... \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Bathroom (2)
- Check one a. With Bath only \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Bath & Shower \_\_\_\_\_
- h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Room Furnishings to be included in rent

- a. Range & refrigerator only.. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. All rooms furnished..... \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Living room only..... \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Bedroom only..... \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Other (specify).. \_\_\_\_\_
- f. None at all..... \_\_\_\_\_

7. Utilities to be included in rent

- a. Heat..... \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Water..... \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Electricity..... \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Other (specify).... \_\_\_\_\_

8. Special facilities & services desired

- ✓ a. Common laundry & dryer room..... \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Common nursery-meeting room or lounge..... \_\_\_\_\_ *Sauna*
- ✓ c. Garage..... \_\_\_\_\_ *Swimming*
- d. Carport..... \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ e. Off-street parking area..... \_\_\_\_\_ *Tennis*
- f. Landscaped walks and grounds..... \_\_\_\_\_
- g. Supervised nursery & play area..... \_\_\_\_\_ *Cricketing*
- h. Private terrace or balcony..... \_\_\_\_\_ *Hickory*
- ✓ i. Bus service to & from campus..... \_\_\_\_\_ *garage*
- ✓ j. Other (specify)..... \_\_\_\_\_

C. Housing Demand

- 1. Would you be interested and willing to move to a different rental unit if you could find one to your liking \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ 2. How much rent could you now pay for a unit of your preference (check one)
  - a. \$50 - \$60 \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. 30 - 70 \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. 70 - 90 \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. 90 - 90 \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. 90 - or more \_\_\_\_\_

IV. Student Comments & Opinions (Use reverse side if necessary)

- ✓ A. Do you feel that the responsibility for providing adequate housing for married students belongs to: 1. The College \_\_\_\_\_, 2. Private developers, \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Students themselves \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ B. What role should the college play in providing:
  - 1. Married student housing \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2. Minimum standards for private housing \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3. Housing location \_\_\_\_\_
- ✓ C. What is your impression of the housing problem for married students What should be done By whom \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX - G**

**Questionnaire: Survey of College Housing Programs**



Housing for Married Students  
A Survey of College Housing Programs

1. Do you at present have a college housing program for married students?
  - a. On-campus \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Off-campus \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does the latter program include future housing facilities? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many such housing units do you at present have? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many married students are at present enrolled in your school? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the total school enrollment? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you have a breakdown of married students by class? \_\_\_\_ If so would you please list below.
  - a. Freshman \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Junior \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Senior \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Graduate (all) \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you find that over the years that married student enrollment is:
  - a. Increasing? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Decreasing? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Remains the same? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Do you have policies specifying that students may live only in housing approved by the institution? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Do you have written standards for safety, sanitation, quality and management for off-campus housing facilities? \_\_\_\_\_
10. How do you finance married student housing? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you found it self-liquidating and/or profitable or is there a loss in financing such facilities? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. What is the average rent for -
  - a. Efficiency apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. One-Bedroom apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Two-Bedroom apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Three-Bedroom apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
16. How many square feet for each type apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
17. Are the apartments furnished or unfurnished? \_\_\_\_\_
18. Do you include utilities? \_\_\_\_\_
19. What is the most popular type apartment? \_\_\_\_\_
20. What is the basic material and type of construction? \_\_\_\_\_
21. Do you feel that providing adequate housing for married students is the responsibility of the institution or private developers? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
22. Do you feel that the institution benefits in any way by providing married students facilities? How? Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
23. What do you feel could and should be done about providing adequate housing facilities for married students? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
24. What do you feel are the biggest problems toward providing adequate housing for married students? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
25. Do you have any personal opinions or suggestions toward alleviating these problems? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Use separate paper if necessary to complete answers)

Dear Sir:

I have enclosed, for your convenience, a self-addressed envelope. Upon completion of this questionnaire, would you kindly forward, with any other related literature to:

Mr. Jack M. Kandel  
P. O. 4408  
Va. Tech Station  
Blacksburg, Virginia

Thank you

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

A THESIS ABSTRACT by Jack M. Kandel in candidacy for the degree of  
Master of Science in Urban and Regional Planning

**HOUSING FOR MARRIED STUDENTS: A Basis For a Positive Program  
at Virginia Polytechnic Institute**

The major objective of this study was to provide a factual basis for  
formulating a married student housing program should such a course of action  
be undertaken by either private initiative or by the Institute's authorities.

In attempting to accomplish this objective, the author set out to  
determine the extent of the existing housing problem as related to student and  
college growth as well as its implications for future housing needs.

The determination was based on both the analysis of a survey  
questionnaire of distributed to all married students and the analysis of V.P.I.'s  
recent study on A Long-Range Building Program prepared for the Board of Visitors  
in 1959.

The results indicated that in addition to the lack of adequate housing  
facilities and its burdensome cost to married students, little consideration had  
been given, by either the College or community, to the problems and needs of  
this group as well as its limiting effects upon College and community growth.

The obvious implication was that student enrollment could not exceed  
available accommodations. Although the College, in the past, has been dependent

upon the community to absorb its excess enrollment (to the extent of 35 percent of total enrollment), neither the College nor the community have made any realistic plans to avert the impending housing crisis.

Based on an estimated married student enrollment of 20 percent of a total enrollment of 10,000 students by 1970-1975, there will be an additional need of 1500 new married student dwelling units. With the problem thus established, the question that immediately arose was: To whom and to what extent does the responsibility for providing adequate housing facilities for the institutional population belong?

In part, this was answered by the student survey. But in order to establish a comparative and factual basis for determining housing responsibility, as well as to formulate a guide for recommending a positive housing program at V.P.I., a survey of college housing programs was initiated by the author.

The results of this survey indicated that at least 85 percent of the land-grant colleges had a positive program for married student housing. In addition, almost all the institutions felt that the . . . "institution should attempt to furnish facilities not provided by private developers".

Thus, by evaluating, from different approaches, the housing problems, policies, and programs of both V.P.I. and at other institutions, a guide toward

developing a married student housing program was formulated.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack M. Kandel