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FOREWORD
Married students constitute a significant proportion of University of California students-one out of two graduate and one out of ten undergraduate students are married. Yet, little is known of the particular needs of married students and changes in this segment of the University population.

This paper, one of a series of occasional papers concerued with the social, economic, and physical effect of University campuses on their adjacent comminities, is concerned with measuring the changit, married student population at the University of Califormia--changes resulting from both earollment growth and alterrative life styles.

Th's study is intended to provide some bench marks for measuring (and forecasting) the population impact of married students and their families on University commities. As noted in the report, in the past seven years there has been a gradual decrease in the percentages of students who are marricd and a sharp decrease in the family size of these students. This knowledge should serve as an early warning system for those in campus comunities concerned with developing housing, and with planning for commurity facilities such as schools and child-care centers.

Despite changes in the married student population noted in this report, the changing community needs related to this changing student population have not been thoroughly investigated. For example, we do know that University married students have a greater need for day-care facilities than the average California family. Knowing more about our married students and their changing family sizes will help us be more responsive to meeting their needs in our campus/communities--this is one purpose of University community planning.
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1. Change in Enrollment and Number of Married Students, All Campuses, 1965-66 Through 1971-72.

This report investlgates changes in the married student population at the nine campuses of University of California during the period 1965-66 through 1971-72. The report includes information on marriage rates and the number of married students, the numier of married students whose spouses are also University of California students, the number of children and the average famly size of married students, and characteristics of married student familes living in University-owned housing.

When possiole, marriage rates and family sizes of University of California students are compared with these characteristics for the nation and the State of California to determine whether University of California students reflect national demographic characteristics or are in some ways unique.

As illustrated in the report, there are substantial differences between married students and the married population in general. Also, there are differences among the nine campuses of the University in the percentages uf students, by class standing, who are married and the percentages of the students who have children. Some of these changes have been projected for 1972-73 and 1973-74 insofar as the collected data permits. As a result of these changes the population impact of University students upon communities is constantly changing-and as the report illustrates, the change is a reduction in University-generated population.

Because the larger concern is more fully to understand Universitycommity relationships and the impact of the University on its comunities, the study has raised questions which need to be answered in further related studies. Among the most important are those questions which concern the relationship of married student spouses to the University and the "dual"
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This study is based on data obcained from the University of California's Student Housing and Transportation Surveys. The surveyg are conducted annually in the Winter quarter (January) registratira on all nine canpuses. Although response rates vary by class standfag and by campus, on average more than 80 percent of the University students respond to the survey questionnalre.

Under the auspices of the Uffice of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, these comr chensive surveys were begun on a University-wide basis in 1965-66, and repeated each year since. The survey includes fourteen questions, asflag for information on marital status, sex, number of children of married students, housing types, housing costs and transportation patterns - : Btudents. A facsimile of the survey cards used at three campuses in 1971 is shown as Appendix A.

This report analyses data obtained over a aeven-year period, 1965-66 through 1971-72, on only three of the survey questions: student academic status (lower division, upper division, graduate); student marital status (single or married); and, number of children of married students (one through four or more). Each of these three variables is separately cross tabulated with the other two variables for each individual campus, and for the entire University system as a whole.

Rather than utilize the original instruments for the tabulation of data, this report relies upon cross tabulations which are prepated zumediately following a completion of each year's survey. Thus, despite the capability of the raw data to provide considerable information about married students and their iamilies, there are aeveral important areas where the original data was
not retabulated. First, there are no estimates of the number of single-student parents. when initially tabulating survey results, all students were classified as either single or married--any student with children was classified as married; any student who was divorced, widowed, or :;eparated was excluded from the crosstabulation. Because of this system of programming the data display, it is not possible to ascertain how many single student parents are divorced, separated, or simply unwed and have children; nor is it possible to know how many unmarried student couples live together and have children.

A second data deficiency concerns data on age. The Student Housing and Transportation survey does not ask a student his age. However, from other studies it is possible to discern that marriage rates and the number of children per student family are directly related to a student's age--older students are more likely to be married and have children than younger students. Because the survey does collect information on a student's class standing, and because age increases with class standing, marriage rates are analyzed in this paper using class standing as a surrogate for age.

Finally, the survey questionnaire does not ask ethnic background. Thus, there is no way to know how many minority students are part of the married population, nor how such information compares with information on the general student population.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the Student Housing and Transportation Surveys have provided considerable data for analysis. Because the surveys are undertaken each year, there is available a body of data which allows for a comprehensive examination of changes within the six-year time period of this study.

## 1II. FIMDISGS

1. Aproximately one out of five tniversity of California students is married. However, between 1965-66 and 1971-72 married students have become a smaller percentage of the total student enrollment. In 1965-66, 21.9 percent of st:dents uere married; in 1971-72, 20.2 percent were married.
$\therefore$ The total number of arried students, on the University-wide basis, peared in 1969-70 at 22,960. Because enrollments have been increasing at a decreasing rate since that time and because the marriage rate generally has been declining, by 1971-72 both the absolute number (21,249) and percentage (20.2 percent) of married students had decreased from the peak year of $1969-70$. This decline can be expected to continue, because its causes--postponement of marriage, student couples living together, more experimentation with life styles--appear to be increasing, not decieasing.
2. Projections of married students prepared for 1972-73 and 1973-74 indicate that despite future enrollment increases both the number and percentage of married students fa the University can be anticipated to be smaller in the future.
3. In 1971-72, 10.4 percent of all married students had a spouse who was also a University of California student. This means that for every ten married students approximately nine married student households are generated.
4. The number of children of married students increased from 15,343 in 1965-66 to a peak of 16,870 in 1969-70 ard decreased to 14,100 in 1971-72. This means that the number of children of married students decreased at a rate faster than the decrease in number of married students.
5. In 1965-66 there were on average 100 children per 100 married students families; by $1971-72$ there were 74 children per 100 married student families--a decline of 26 percent ia six years.
6. The number of chiciten per sraduate family declined by nearl: 30 percent between 1965-60 and 1971-72, trom 1.11 ehildren per family to 0.79 children per family.
7. One reason the average number of children per family decreased between 1965-66 and 1971-72, was that the number and percentage of married students without children increased. This trenc was observable on all campuses. In 1965-66, 49.9 percent of married students families had no children; by 1971-72, 60.6 percent of married student families had no children. The number of families without children is considerably higher among the University married student population than among the general population. For example, in the United States in 1969 , only 34.5 percent of married women of age $20-24$ had no children.
8. On a University-wide basis, the percent of married student families with one child decreased slightly in the past six years. In 1965-66, 21.1 percent of all married students had one child; by $1971-72$, only 18.6 percent had one child. The proportion of one child families is significantly less among University married students than in the national population. National statistics show that in 1969 , 34 percent of married women age $20-24$ had one child-a rate nearly double that of the University married student population.
9. In comparison to the increasing percentage of student families without children and the nearly constane percentage of families with one child, there had been sizable decline between 1965-i6 and 1971-72 in the percentage of married student families with two, three or four or more children. On Univer-sity-wide basis, in $1965-66$, 15.8 percent of student families had two children, 8.5 percent had three children, and 4.7 percent had four or more children. By 1971-72, corresponding figures were 12.4 percent with two children, 4.9 percent with cnree children and 3.5 percent with four or more children.
10. The tact that compared to national ar. ulations, a higher petcentage of married student are childless and a lower percentage have one or more children indicates that there are two measureable differences between the Cniversity married student population and the general population--students postpone having children and because they postpone having children, they do not have as many children as the general population.
11. Families with children in University-owned housing have fewer children per family than married student families with children living in other housjing. Student families with children in University housing average 1.6 children per family. This compares with an average 1.9 children per family for student families with children living in privately owned and rented student housing.
12. University-owned housing accommodates a particular segment of the married student housing market: it accommodates a higher percentage of families with children than does the private student hcusing market; however, of the units occupied by families with children, the families have fewer children per family than those housed in the private market.
13. On University-wide basis, 22.7 percent of the children living in University-owned housing were one year of age or under; an additional 13.9 percent were two years old; 13.0 percent were three years old; 11.6 percent were four years old, and 7.7 percent were five years old. This means that more than twothirds of the children living in University-owned housing were five years of age or under and thus were not of school age. The remainder--one-third--were over six and were of school age. Of all children, 13.4 percent were aged seven to nine: 7.0 percent were aged ten to twelve, 2.7 percent were aged thirteen to fifteen and 0.9 percent were aged sixteen to eighteen; only 0.4 percent were over eighteen years of age.
14. At some campuses, San Diego and Santa Barbara for instance, the percentage of children living in University housing who were of school age was quite small--less than 20 percent. At other campuses, the percentage was greater. For instance, at Berkeley, 38 percent of the children of families living in University housing were of school age. At Santa Cruz, 42 percent of children living in University-owned housing were of school age.
i6. A majority of children living in University-owned housing are of primary rather than of secondar: school age. Un University-wide basis, of the approximate 940 school age children living in University housing, 600 (nearly two-thirds) are of primary school age and 340 (one-third) of secondary school age or over.
15. Children living in University-owned housing are much younger than other children living with their families in the State of California. Of the children living in University-owned housing, 69 percent were five years of age and under in 1970-71; while in the State of California in 1970, 31 percent of the children living with their families were five years of age and under.
16. Families living in University-owned housing add only one-third as many children to the school system as other California families. Among families living in University-owned housing there is an average of 0.28 children of school age per family, while among all families in the State of California, there is an average of 0.83 children of school age per family. The most important consequence of the above differences between University housed families and other families is that not as many schools are needed for children of University housed families: first, because University housed families have considerably fewer children, and second, because these children are not of school age.


#### Abstract

19. Although there are not as many children of school age per family in University housing as among other California families, it is clear there is a correspondingly greater need among University families for child and day care facilities than among other California families. Assuming that families with children five years of age or younger have greater need for either child or day care facilities, then, the University housed married student popuiation has almost twice as much need per family for these facilities as do other families in California. University of California student families living in University housing average 0.62 children five years of age or younger; the average family in the State of California has 0.37 children five years of age or younger.


## IV. MARRIAGE RATES

A. Number of Married Students, 1965-66 through 1971-72

Approximately one out of five University of California students is married. However, between 1965-66 and 1971-72 married students have become a smaller percentage of the total student enrollment. In 1965-66, 21.9 percent of students were married; in 1971-72, 20.2 percent were married.

This decrease in the percentage of married students is due to two measurable factors: changing academic mix among University students and changing marriage rates. Between 1965-66 and 1971-72 the number of undergraduates (lower-division and upper-division students) and their proportion as a part of the student body increased. As shown in Table 1 , the percentage of undergraduates grew from 68.1 percent of the entire student body in 1965-66 to 70.4 percent of the student body in 1971-72. The percentage of graduate students dropped accordingly from 31.9 percent to 29.6 percent. During this period undergraduate enrollment showed an increase of forty percent--from 53,181 to 74,119 students, while graduate enrollment increased by more than twenty-five percent--from 24,862 to 31,155 . (Complete enrollment tables for each year from 1965-66 through 1971-72, by campus, are contained in Appendix B, Tables B-1, B-2, and B-3.)

Because only one out of ten undergraduates is married while five out of ten graduates are married, the changing academic mix coupled with enrollment increases resulted in a lower percentage of married students in the total student body. This is illustrated in Chart 1.

Moreover, in addition to the above numerical changes in the student population, social and alternative life style changes among students have

TABLE 1
ENROLIMENT
All Campuses
1965-66 and 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 |  |  | 1971-72 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Under Graduate | Graduate | Total | Under Graduate | Graduate | Total |
| Berkeley | $\begin{aligned} & 16,286 \\ & (61.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,092 \\ & (38.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26,278 \\ (100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,236 \\ & (66.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,020 \\ (33.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27,256 \\ (100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 5,995 \\ (77.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,732 \\ (22.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,727 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,055 \\ (73.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,655 \\ (26.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13,710 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 1,394 \\ (91.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 134 \\ (8.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,528 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,035 \\ (77.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,484 \\ (22.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,519 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{aligned} & 16,352 \\ & (64.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,023 \\ (35.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25,375 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,753 \\ (62.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,984 \\ (37.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26,737 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| Riverside | $\begin{array}{r} 2,645 \\ (76.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 831 \\ (23.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,476 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,540 \\ (78.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,242 \\ (21.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,782 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 826 \\ (60.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 531 \\ (39.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,357 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,639 \\ (75.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,536 \\ (24.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,175 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 616 \\ (28.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,570 \\ (71.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,186 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 379 \\ (14.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,268 \\ (85.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,647 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\begin{array}{r} 8,429 \\ (89.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 949 \\ (10.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,378 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,578 \\ (86.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,661 \\ (13.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,239 \\ (100.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\begin{array}{r} 638 \\ (100.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{array}{r} 638 \\ (100.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,904 \\ (92.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 305 \\ (7.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,209 \\ (100.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide Total/Average | $\begin{aligned} & 53,181 \\ & (68.1 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,862 \\ & (31.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78,043 \\ (100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74,119 \\ & (70.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31,155 \\ & (29.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 105,274 \\ & (100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

Source: University of Californfa, Statistical Sumary of Students, Faculty and Staff. years indicated.

CHART I
CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER OF MARRIED STUDENTS
All Campuses
1965-66 Through 1971-72


## UNDERGRADUATES


graduates

further resulted in decreasing mariage rates. For example, in the past six years, marriage rates have changed for both undergraduates and graduates. As shown in Iable 2 and Appendix Tatile $B-4$, the marriage rate among undergraduates was 8.3 percent in $1965-66$; it peaked 10.0 percent in $1969-70$; it has been declining since--dropping to a level of 9.1 percent in 1971-72. Graduate student marriage rates, as shown in Table 2 and Appendix Table B-5, dropped from 50.8 percent of all graduate students in 1965-66 and in 1966-67, to 46.5 percent in 1971-72. Because over two-thirds of all married students are graduate students, the four percent absolute drop in the number of graduate students who are married has served to lower the percentage of married students in the student population.

While marriage rates--as measured in percentages of students married--have been consistently declining, the absolute number of married students also has peaked and is now declining. The level of this desline is shown in Table 2 and Appendix Table B-6. Despite increases in married student population through the late $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, which were noted by the total number of married students increasing from 17,068 in 1956-66 to a peak of 22,960 in 1969-70, there was a decline to 21,249 married students in 1971-72.

This decline can be expected to continue, because its causes-postponement of marriage, student couples living together, more experimentation with life styles--appear to be increasing, not decreasing.

It is interesting to note that the peak and then the decline in the number of married students occurred, despite considerable enrollment growth and increases in the number of married students at six campuses (Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barhara and Santa Cruz), because

TABLE 2
Married undergraduate and graduate students
All Campuses
1965-66 and 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 |  |  | 1971-72 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Under Graduate | Graduate | Total | Under Graduate | Graduate | Total |
| Berkeley | $\begin{aligned} & 1,520 \\ & (9.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,874 \\ (48.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6,394 \\ (24.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,676 \\ & (9.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,032 \\ (44.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,708 \\ (20.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 428 \\ (7.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 973 \\ (56.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,401 \\ (18.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 825 \\ (8.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,879 \\ (51.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,704 \\ (19.7) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \\ (7.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 76 \\ (57.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 173 \\ (11.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 498 \\ (9.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 738 \\ (49.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,236 \\ (19.0) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{aligned} & 1,336 \\ & (8.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,782 \\ (53.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,118 \\ (24.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,485 \\ & (8.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,653 \\ (46.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,138 \\ (23.0) \end{array}$ |
| Riverside | $\begin{array}{r} 320 \\ (12.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 481 \\ (57.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 801 \\ (23.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 703 \\ (15.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 693 \\ (55.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,396 \\ (24.1) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ (2.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 275 \\ (51.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 297 \\ (21.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 419 \\ (9.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 685 \\ (44.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,104 \\ (17.9) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 201 \\ (32.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 728 \\ (46.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 929 \\ (42.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ (19.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 907 \\ (40.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 980 \\ (37.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\begin{array}{r} 488 \\ (5.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 451 \\ (47.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 939 \\ (10.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 774 \\ (7.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 784 \\ (47.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,558 \\ (13.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (2.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (2.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 300 \\ (7.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125 \\ (41.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 425 \\ (10.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide Total/Average | $\begin{aligned} & 4,428 \\ & (8.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,640 \\ & (50.8 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,068 \\ & (21.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,753 \\ & (9.1 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,496 \\ & (46.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,249 \\ & (20.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

NOTE: Percents are the ratio of the number married to the number enrolled by class standing.

Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President--Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Surveys, years indicated.
of significant changes in married student populations at three campuses (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Francisco).

At these latter three campuses, changing enrollment mix and marriage rates combined with nearly level enrollments to produce a peak married student population in the period between 1967-68 and 1969-70. The decline from the peak year to 1971-72 in the number of married students at Berkeley (down 975 married students), and at Los Angeles (down 1,187 ) was not offset by increases at the other campuses. The net result is that although there were 4,181 more married students in 1971-72, than in 1965-66, there were 1,711 fewer married students at the University in 19? $1-72$ than there were in the peak year of 1969-70. This trend will be discussed later.

There are also significant variations in marriage rates among undergraduate students on each of the nine campuses. As illustrated in Table 2, in 1971-72, only 7.3 percent of the Santa Barbara and 7.7 percent of Santa Cruz undergraduate students were married, while 15.5 percent of the Riverside undergraduate students were married. (Although the San Francisco campus is shown as having the highest percentage of married undergraduates, this campus cannot be compared with the other campuses because, as a Medical Center, its 2,647 students differ from students at other campuses: specifically, all 616 undergraduates at San Francisco in 1971-72 were upper-division students.)

Among graduate students, there is even a wider range of marriage rates among the campuses. For example, as illustrated in Table 2, in 1970-71, only 41.0 percent of graduate students at Santa Cruz were married, while 55.8 percent of Riverside graduate students were married.

Further variation in marriage rates among the campuses can be attributed to different class mixes among undergraduates. As shown in Table 3 ,

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATES BY CLASS STANDING
All C unpuass 1965-66 and 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 |  | 1971-72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lower Division Undergraduates | Upper Division Undergraduates | Lower Division Undergraduates | Upper Division Undergraduates |
| Berke 1.ey | 39\% | 61\% | 38\% | 62\% |
| Davis | 59 | 41 | 40 | 60 |
| Irvine | 79 | 21 | 50 | 50 |
| Los Ange les | 46 | 54 | 41 | 59 |
| Riverside | 53 | 47 | 44 | 56 |
| San Diego | 91 | 9 | 51 | 49 |
| San Francisco | -- | 100 | -- | 100 |
| Santa Barbara | 60 | 40 | 43 | 57 |
| Santa Cruz | 82 | 18 | 47 | 53 |
| University-wide Average | 49\% | 51\% | 42\% | 58\% |

[^0]those campuses with high proportions of uppre division undergraduates to lowetdivision undergraduates are generally more likely to have high marriage rates than those campuses with high proportions of lower-divi.n. inde:.. a detes to upper-division undergraduates. For Instance, Berkeley and RIverside both have higher percentages of upper-division undergraduates than the other campuses and also have higher mariage rates among their undergraduates.

One final consideration in marriage rates differing among the campuses is that student bodies have different age distributions, regardiess of class standing, and older age structures generally indicate higher marriage rates.

The significance of the age factor contributing to differential marriage rates is shown in Table 4. Santa Barbara, in 1969-70, iad a younger undergraduate population than the other campuses; only 13 percent of Santa Barbara undergraduates were 21 years of age or over. By contrast, nearly half of Riverside undergraduates were 21 years of ige or over. This is reflected in a marriage rate in 1969-70 of 6.5 percent among Santa Barbara undergraduates compared with 17,4 percent at Riverside. Although specific correlation data is not available, the age factor can be assumed to explain the high marriage rates of Riverside undergraduates when compared with other campuses.

In summary, data collected on the number of married students at each campus indicates that during the period 1965-66 through 1971-72 the total number of married students, on a University-wide basis, peaked in 1969-70. Because enrollments have been increasing at a decreasing rate since that time, and because the marriage rate generally has been declining, by 1971-72 both the absolute number and percentage of married students had decreased from the peak year of 1969-70.

## TABLE 4

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNLA UNDERGRADUATES OVER AGE 21 All Campuses <br> 1969-70

Percentage of Undergraduates 21 Years of Age and Over
Berkeley ..... $20 \%$
Davis ..... 37
Irvine ..... 43
Los Angeles ..... 42
Riverside ..... 48
San Diego ..... 46
Santa Barbara ..... 13
Santa Cruz ..... 36

[^1]B. Projections for 1972-73 and 1973-74

To illustrate how the two factors of changing enrollments and changing marriage rates will affect the absolute number of married students on the campuses, projections of married students have been prepared for 1972-73 and 1973-74. Enrollments used for these estimates were based upon University budget requests for general campus undergraduates and graduates and upon 10-year health science enrollment projections. Next, estimates of marriages rate factors for each campus were applied to enrollments to determine the approximate number of married students that can be anticipated at each campus.

Marriage rate factors were developed by averaging changes in marriage rates for undergraduates and graduate students for every year since 1965-66 in which a trend occurred after a year in which marriage rates changed by more than one-half percent-either up or down. Table 5 illustrates the time period weed to develop the projections and the projection factors applied.

Among undergraduates there generally has been consistent change in the marriage rates at all campuses since $1969-70$. At two campuses (Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara) the marriage rate has increased slightly; at the remaining seven campuses there has been a consistent decrease in undergraduate marriage rates. Among graduate students there has been an across-the-board decline in marriage rates among all campuses. At Los Angeles, this trend among graduate students has been observable since 1965-66, at Irvine since 1966-67, at Berkeley since 1967-68, at Davis and San Diego since 1968-69, and at Riverside and San Francisco since 1969-70. At Santa Barbara, there has been a fluctuation up and down in the graduate marriage rates over the past seven years.

Table 6 shows that, in contrast to University-wide enrollment increases projected to reach $11 \%, 565$ students by 1973-74, the total number of married

TABLE S
marRiace rates
All Campuses
1965-66 Through 1973-74

|  | ACTUAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rate of Change | PROJECTED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1969 66 | 1966-67 | 1967-58 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |  | 1972-73 | 1973-74 |
| undergraduate students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Berkeley | $9.3 \%$ | 9.47 | 9.4\% | 10.12 | $10.6 \%$ | 10.07 | 9.2\% | -0.7\% | 8.5\% | 7.8\% |
| Davis | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.2 | -0.3 | 7.9 | 7.6 |
| irvine | 7.0 | 7.9 | 13.5 | ! 5.7 | 11.6 | 8.3 | 9.9 | -* | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Los Angeles | 8.7 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 9.6 | 10.7 | 9.4 | 8.9 | -0.9 | 8.0 | 7.1 |
| Riverside | 12.1 | 12.6 | 13.4 | 16.0 | 17.4 | 17.1 | 15.5 | -1.0 | 14.5 | 13.5 |
| San Clego | 2.7 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.0 | -0.4 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| San Francisco | 32.6 | 22.2 | 18.2 | 17.1 | 21.4 | 21.1 | 19.2 | -1.1 | 18.1 | 17.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 | -0.2 | 7.1 | 6.9 |
| Santa Cruz | 2.5 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 6.8 | 7.7 | +0.5 | 8.2 | 8.7 |
| University-wide Average | 8.37 | 8.32 | 8.72 | 9.42 | 10.02 | 9.6\% | 9.1\% | -0.5\% | 8.6\% | 8.1\% |
| Undergraduate fintollment | ( 53.181) | ( 57,495) | ( 63,599) | ( 66.683 ) | $(71,403)$ | ( 73.823 ) | 74,119) |  | ( 78,278 | ( 81,955) |

graduate students

| Berkeley | 48.37 | 47.72 | 49.07 | 48.82 | 47.42 | 46.47 | 44.78 | -1.1\% | $43.6 \%$ | 42.57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davis | 56.2 | \$7.7 | 57.9 | 59.1 | 56.1 | 55.3 | 51.4 | -2.6 | 48.8 | 46.2 |
| Irvina | 57.0 | 63.9 | 62.0 | 58.3 | 57.3 | 56.0 | 49.7 | -2.8 | 46.9 | 44.1 |
| Loa Angeles | 53.0 | 52.4 | 51.8 | 50.7 | 49.0 | 47.7 | 46.6 | -1.1 | 45.5 | 44.4 |
| Riveraide | 57.9 | 58.0 | 58.1 | 59.2 | 60.4 | 58.9 | 55.8 | -2.3 | 53.5 | 51.2 |
| San Diago | 51.8 | S1. 2 | 51.7 | 53.2 | 48.3 | 47.8 | 44.6 | -2.9 | 41.7 | 38.8 |
| San Franciaco | 46.4 | 46.9 | 38.9 | 37.9 | 42.0 | 40.5 | 40.0 | -1.0 | 39.0 | 38.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 47.5 | 47.5 | 46.7 | 45.5 | 45.3 | 44.3 | 47.2 | --- | 47.2 | 47.2 |
| Santa Cruz | - | 61.9 | 52.5 | 49.3 | 49.6 | 44.3 | 41.0 | -2.8 | 38.2 | 35.8 |
| Univeraity-uide Average | 50.87 | 50.82 | $50.7 \%$ | $50.4 \%$ | 49.3\% | 48.27 | 46.5\% | -0.9\% | 45.6\% | 44.77. |
| Graduate Enrollment | 24,862 | 26,197 | 28,291 | 30,012 | 32,121 | 31,512 | 31,155 |  | 30,522 | 30,61 |

ALL STUDENTS

| Berke ley | 24.27 | 23.87 | $23.9 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ | 23.42 | $22.3 \%$ | 20.9\% | -0.8\% | 19.6\% | 18.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davia | 18.1 | 19.3 | 20.0 | 21.1 | 21.2 | 20.6 | 19.7 | -0.8 | 18.6 | 17.6 |
| Irvine | 11.3 | 15.6 | 21.7 | 28.0 | 24.3 | 19.6 | 19.0 | -3.0 | 18.1 | 17.7 |
| Loa Angelea | 24.1 | 24.2 | 24.2 | 24.1 | 24.8 | 23.9 | 23.0 | -0.9 | 21.1 | 19.0 |
| Riverside | 23.0 | 23.4 | 24.9 | 26.9 | 28.2 | 26.6 | 24.1 | -2.1 | 23.0 | 21.7 |
| San Diego | 21.9 | 22.3 | 19.6 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 19.8 | 17.9 | -1.4 | 16.9 | 16.0 |
| San Franclaco | 42.5 | 40.6 | 33.6 | 35.0 | 39.2 | 37.7 | 37.0 | -1.1 | 36.0 | 35.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 10.0 | 10.3 | 11.0 | 12.1 | 12.3 | 12.5 | 13.0 | +0.5 | 12.4 | 12.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 2.5 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 10.1 | +1.1 | 10.4 | 10.9 |
| University-ulde Average | 21.97 | 21.67 | 21.67 | 22.17 | 22.27 | 21.12 | 20.2\% |  | 18.8\% | 17.7\% |

Source: Univarsity of Califomia, Office of Assiatant Vice lreaident--phyaical planing, Student Housing and Tranaportation Surveys, yeaz: indicated.
students is expected to continue to drop in both 1972-73 and 1973-74. This decrease will be from 21,249 married students in $1971-72$, to 20,484 married students in 1972-73, and finally to 19,970 married students by 1973-74. In effect, the marriage rates among University of California students will have dropped from 20.2 percent of all students in 1971-72 to perhaps 18.6 percent in 1972-73 and to 17.7 percent in 1973-74. The all time high was 22,960 (22.2 percent) in i969-70.

Although there will be different trends at each campus, generally both the marriage rates and the number of married students will be declining. This is shown in Table 6. At three campuses-Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Riverside-- the absolute number of married students is expected to decrease by more than ten percent in the next two years. If the enrollment projections are correct, this would mean a continuing large decrease of nearly 700 married students at Berkeley (from 5,708 to 5,014), a drop of nearly 900 at Los Angeles (from 6,138 to 5,243), and a drop of 127 at Riverside (from 1,396 to 1,269 ).

At three campuses--Davis, San Francisco, and Santa Barbara--all projected to have moderate enrollment increases, the number of married students is expected to stay about the same through 1973-74. At Davis, the enrollment is projected to increase from 13,710 to 14,939 while the number of married students is projected to stay at approximately 2,600 to 2,700; at San Francisco, the enrollment is expected to increase from 2,647 to 2,838 while the number of married students is expected to stay nearly constant at about 1,000 . An enrollment increase from 12,239 to 12,600 students is projected at Santa Barbara while the number of married students will stay about 1,550 .
TOTAL ENROLIMENT AND MARRIED STUDENT ENROLLMENT FROJECTIONS

| Campus | 1971-72 ${ }^{1}$ (Actua1) |  |  | 1972-73 ${ }^{2}$ (Projected) |  |  | $\text { 1973-74 }{ }^{2} \text { (Projected) }$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Net Change } \\ & \text { 1971-72 to } \\ & 1973-74 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrol1ment | Married | Percent | Enrollment | Married | Percent | Enrollment | Married | Percent |  |
| Berke ley | 27,256 | 5,708 | 20.9\% | 27,525 | 5,382 | 19.6\% | 27,509 | 5,014 | 18.2\% | -694 |
| Davis | 13,710 | 2,704 | 19.7 | 14,133 | 2,623 | 18.6 | 14,939 | 2,627 | 17.5 | - 77 |
| Irvine | 6,519 | 1,236 | 19.0 | 7,442 | 1,349 | 18.1 | 8,189 | 1,451 | 17.7 | +215 |
| Los Angeles | 26,737 | 6,138 | 23.0 | 26,945 | 5,589 | 21.1 | 27,560 | 5,243 | 19.0 | -895 |
| Riverside | 5,782 | 1,396 | 24.1 | 5,769 | 1,329 | 23.0 | 5,847 | 1,269 | 21.7 | -127 |
| San Diego | 6,175 | 1,104 | 17.9 | 6,950 | 1,176 | 16.9 | 7,728 | 1,233 | 16.0 | +129 N |
| San Francisco | 2,647 | 980 | 37.0 | 2,759 | 992 | 36.0 | 2,838 | 973 | 35.0 | $+13$ |
| Santa Barbara | 12,239 | 1,558 | 13.0 | 12,485 | 1,548 | 12.4 | 12,600 | 1,554 | 12.3 | - 4 |
| Santa Cruz | 4,209 | 425 | 10.1 | 4,792 | 496 | 10.4 | 5,355 | 586 | 10.9 | +161 |
| University-wide | 105,274 | 21,249 | 20.2\% | 108,800 | 20,484 | 18.8\% | 112,565 | 19,970 | 17.7\% |  |

Sources:

[^2]Jnly at three campuses, all with substantial enrollment increases, can the number of married students be expected to grow considerably over the next two years. At Irvine, the enrollment is expected to increase from 6,519 to 8,189 , while the married students are expected to increase from 1,236 to 1,451. At San Diego, the enrollment is expected to increase from 6,175 to 7,728 and the number of married students is expected to increase from 1,104 to 1,233. At Santa Cruz, the campus is expected to grow from 4,209 to 5,355 while the married student population is expected to increase from 425 to 586.

Despite these differing changes among the campuses, the overriding factor is clear--married student enrollment at the University of California has peaked and, despite future enrollment increases, both the number and percentage of married students in the University will become smaller in the future.

It is common for married students at the University of California to have spouses who also are University students. The number of student spouses has important implications when measuring the community population impact of students in the Unversity. If one were to ignore the question of how many students were married to other students, the result would be an overstatement of the number of student population on the campus community when assessing actual demand for housing, day care, and schools.

At the University of California, this "dual" student-married relationship is considerable. For example, in 1971-72, approximately one out of ten married students had a spouse who was also a student.

In contrast to changing marriage rates, the percentage of students with student spouses has been relatively constant. As shown in Table 7 , in 1965-66, 10.0 percent of the married students had spouses who were also students; from 1966-67 through 1970-71 this percentage varied between 11.1 and 11.7 percent; by $1971-72$, the percentage was 10.4 percent. This means that for every ten married students, approximatley nine married student households are generated.

In absolute numbers, the consistency in the percentage of students with student spouses, coupled with an increase in the number of married students, has resulted in a slight increase in the actual number of student spouses. As shown in Table 7, in 1965-66, on a University-wide basis there were 1,714 students with spouses who are also students; a peak at 2,609 was reached in $1970-71$; by $1971-72$ the number had dropped to 2,218 , reflecting the decrease in the number of married students.

In contrast to marriage rates, which have been decreasing on all campuses, the percentage of married students with spouses who also students

TABLE 7
MARRIED STUDENTS WITH SPOUSES WHO ALSO ARE STUDENTS
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | $\begin{gathered} 793 \\ (12.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 858 \\ (13.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 935 \\ (14.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 890 \\ (13.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 882 \\ (13.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 943 \\ (15.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 742 \\ (13.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 147 \\ (10.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 208 \\ (12.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 257 \\ (13.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 301 \\ (12.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 310 \\ (11.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 305 \\ (11.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 292 \\ (10.8) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ (3.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ (9.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 46 \\ (7.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 126 \\ (11.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105 \\ (8.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 137 \\ (12.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108 \\ (8.7) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{array}{r} 464 \\ (7.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 503 \\ (8.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 579 \\ (8.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 571 \\ (8.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 661 \\ (9.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 591 \\ (8.9 .) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 496 \\ (8.1) \end{array}$ |
| Riverside | $\begin{array}{r} 77 \\ (9.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 76 \\ (8.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 93 \\ (9.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 133 \\ (11.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 165 \\ (11.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 175 \\ (11.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 142 \\ (10.2) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ (5.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 51 \\ (10.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \\ (10.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ (11.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96 \\ (9.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 121 \\ (10.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108 \\ (9.8) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ (7.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 107 \\ (11.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \\ (7.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \\ (6.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 68 \\ (7.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 59 \\ (6.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 57 \\ (5.8) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\begin{array}{r} 136 \\ (14.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 173 \\ (15.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 178 \\ (13.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 232 \\ (15.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 236 \\ (14.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 238 \\ (14.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 225 \\ (14.4) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ (6.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ -(4.9)^{4} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ (11.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28 \\ (15.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ (10.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ (11.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \\ (11.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide Average | $\begin{gathered} 1,714 \\ (10.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,012 \\ (11.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,224 \\ (11.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,426 \\ (11.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,547 \\ (11.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,609 \\ (11.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,218 \\ (10.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

[^3]has remained rather consistent at each campus, although the percentage is different from campus to campus. Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Francisco have the smallest percentages of spousema-student. During the past five years the range at Irvine has been from 7.7 percent to 12.1 percent, at Los Angeles from 8.1 percent to 9.0 percent, and at San Francisco from 5.8 to 7.9 percent. Davis, Riverside, and San Diego have a percentage of spouses who also are students which approximates the average of all campuses. At Davis, since $1967-68$, the range has been from 10.8 percent to 13.0 percent; at Riverside, from 9.2 percent to 11.5 percent; and at San Diego, from 9.8 percent from 11.3 percent. Berkeley, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz have the highest percentages of married students with spouses who are also students, and in effect ;ould generate the fewest number of married student households per 100 married students. At Berkeley, since $1967-68$, the range has been from 13.0 to 15.1 percent, at Santa Barbara from 13.7 to 15.7 percent, and at Santa Cruz from 11.1 to 15.8 percent.

A thorough investigation of the reasons for the variance in spouse-a-student among the campuses is not possible from the data available. However, the absence of notable change in these percentages, when contrasted to the decreasing rates of marriage, leads to some speculation as to why the spouse-a-student rate remains constant and may be expected to increase. Two explanations seem probable: current social trends suggest that the "spouse-a-student" are women rather than men who wish to expand their job opportunities by furthering their education. If this is a reason for a growing number of married students whose spouses are also students, it is a tendency that is not likely to reverse itself.

Second, the present decline in the number of student families with children, and the resulting reduction in both financial and parental
responsibilities, may encourage families where both spouses are students. In any event, one may postulate that despite the drop from 1970-71 to 1971-72, the percentage of students with student spouses will probably not decrease below one-in-ten.
VI. FAMILY SIZE
A. Number of Children of Married Students

As indicated earlier, the number of married students at the University of California increased from 17,068 in $1965-66$, to a peak of 22,960 in 1969-70 and has since decreased 21,249 in 1971-72. During this same period, the number of children of married students also changed considerably. The number of children increased from 15,343 in 1965-66, to a peak of 16,870 in 1969-70, and has now decreased to 14,100 in 1971-72.

This University-wide trend, which shows that the number of children of married students decreasing at a rate faster than the decreasing marriage rate, is the result of quite different trends among the campuses.

As illustrated in Table 8, between 1965-66 and 1971-72, at three campuses with slight enrollment increases--Berkeley, Los Angeles and San Francisco--there have been significant decreases in the number of children of married students; at five campuses with considerable enrollment increasesDavis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego and Santa Cruz--there has been a considerable increase in the number of children of married students; and at one campus with considerable enrollment changes--Santa Barbara--there has been only a slight increase in the number of children of married students.

Between 1965-66 and 1971-72, the number of children of married students at Berkeley dropped by 1,661 , from 5,013 to 3,352 ; at Los Angeles by 1,423 , from 6,100 to 4,677; and at San Francisco, by 157, from 790 to 633.

Although comparable data is not available at Los Angeles or San Francisco, earlier data for Berkeley indicates that the number of children of married students actually peaked in Berkeley in 1963-64. In 1960-61, Berkeley had approximately 5,150 children of married students; by 1963-64, it had risen

TABLE 8

## CHILDREN OF MARRIED STUDENTS <br> All Campusas <br> 1965-66 to 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | 5,013 | 4,520 | 4,593 | 4,422 | 4,450 | 4,136 | 3,352 |
| Davis | 1,294 | 1,428 | 1,432 | 1,580 | 1,844 | 1,743 | 1,712 |
| Irvine | 256 | 344 | 594 | 912 | 1,082 | 845 | 819 |
| Los Angeles | 6,100 | 6,091 | 5,806 | 5,842 | 5,758 | 4,882 | 4,677 |
| Riverside | 873 | 888 | 1,012 | 1,035 | 1,262 | 1,279 | 1,118 |
| San Diego | 239 | 385 | 434 | 504 | 659 | 733 | 670 |
| San Francisco | 775 | 790 | 642 | 546 | 711 | 705 | 633 |
| Santa Barbara | 769 | 813 | 949 | 907 | 984 | 979 | 853 |
| Santa Cruz | 24 | 74 | 105 | 83 | 120 | 207 | 266 |
| University-wide | 15,343 | 15,333 | 15,467 | 15,831 | 16,870 | 15,509 | 14,100 |

[^4]to a peak of 5,600 . In comparison, in 1971-7?, the number of children of married students at Berkeley has dropped to 3,352.

As at the Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Francisco campuses, a similar but less dramatic pattern has also occurred at Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Bardara.

At Davis, there wece 1,294 children of married student in 1965-66, reaching a peak of 1,844 in 1969-70 and dropping to 1,712 by 1971-72. At Irvine, the rapid growth of the campus was accompained by an increase in the number of children from 256 in 1965-66, to 1,082 in 1969-70, but dropping to 819 in 1971-72. At Riverside, the increase and peak occurred during a later time-frame than at other campuses. In 1965-66, there were 873 children of married students at Riverside; the peak occurred in 1970-71 wicn 1,279 children; it decreased to 1,118 in 1971-72. San Diego followed a pattern similar to Riverside with 239 children in 1965-66, increasing to a peak of 733 in 1970-71, and then decreasing to 633 in 1971-72. At Santa Barbara, the number of children of married students has remained much more consistent than at other campuses. In $1965-66$, there were $76^{\circ}$ children of married students at Santa Barbara. The peak was reached in $1969-70$ with 984 children, and decreased to 853 by 1971-72.

Four factors determine changes in absolute number of children of married students-manges in the number of students enrolled, changes in the indergraduate-graduate mix, changes in the marriage rate, and changes in the number of childiren per family.

The two measureable factors which most directly affect the number of children of married students are changes in enrollment and changes in the number of children per family. As was illustrated in Table l, at Berkeley,
L.os Angeles and an francisco, enrullment krowth was not sifnificant. Consequently, decreases in the number of children per family at these campuses resulted in a lower number of children of married students. At the other six campuses--Davis, [rvine, RIverside, San Dlego, Santa garbara and Santa Cruz--there were sizeable increases in student enrollments. Although the number of children per family decreased at these campuses also, the changes were not large enough to be offset by enrollment increases. Consequently, five of these six campuses showed Increases and then slight decreases in the number of children of married students between 1965-66 and 1971-72. Only at Santa Cruz has the number of children of married students shown a sizeable increase.
B. Average Number of Children per Family

In the United States, the trend toward smaller family size during the 1960 's has been well documented. Among married women in the United States ages 20-24 (the age of many student wives), the number of children born decreased from 144 per 100 married women in the year 1960 to 110 in 1969. ${ }^{1}$

There has been a similar decrease in the average number of children per 100 married student families at the University of California. In 1965-66, there were, on average, 100 children per 100 married student families; by 1971-72, there were 74 children per 100 married student families-a decline of 26 percent in six years.

A comparison of the average number of children per family of University married students to U.S. families shows that University students

[^5]have slighty smaller family sizes than similar age populations of the country as a whole. As of March 1970, national figures showed that husband-wife families, when the husband was 25 years of age or under, averaged 0.9 children per family. ${ }^{2}$ At the University of California, in Spring 1970, student families averaged 0.83 children; this since has decreased to 0.74 in 1971-72.

The average family size of University of California student familles shown in Table 9 and in appendix Tables B-7, B-8, and B-9 is based upon two factors: first, the number of children of married students--shown in Table 8 , and secondly, the number of families created by University of California married students (this is the total number of married students less the number of students who have a spouse who is also a student). Inherent in this method of calculating the average number of children per family, is the supposition that families where both spouses are University students are childless. Because the data does not allow for checking of this hypothesis, it is conceivable that there may be some overstatement in the average family size.

What is most noticeable in Table 9 and Appendix Tables B-7, B-8, and B-9 is that the most significant change has occurred in graduate student family size. Whereas undergraduate family size declined by roughly ten percent, from 0.74 children per family in $1965-66$ to 0.66 in 1971-72, average graduate family size declfned by nearly thirty percent, from 1.11 children per family in 1965-66 to 0.79 in 1971-72. Furthermore, whereas graduate families in 1965-66 averaged 0.37 more children per family than undergraduates families, by 1971-72 the difference was only 0.08 more children. Thus, undergraduate and graduate family sizes have almost become identical.

[^6]TABLE 9

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY
Al1 Campuses
1965-66 and 1971-72

| 1965-66 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Under <br> Graduate |  |  |


| 1971-72 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unde: |  |  |
| Graduate Graduate Total |  |  |


| Berkeley | . 60 | . 99 | . 89 | . 63 | . 70 | . 67 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davis | . 68 | 1.18 | 1.03 | . 59 | . 76 | . 71 |
| Irvine | 1.67 | 1.27 | 1.53 | . 63 | . 81 | . 73 |
| Los Angeles | . 77 | 1.19 | 1.08 | . 70 | . 88 | . 83 |
| Riverside | 1.04 | 1.31 | 1.20 | . 76 | 1.02 | . 89 |
| San Diego | . 90 | . 85 | . 85 | . 71 | . 64 | .67 |
| San Francisco | . 61 | 1.25 | . 91 | . 36 | . 72 | . 69 |
| Santa Barbara | . 77 | 1.12 | . 96 | . 61 | . 68 | . 64 |
| Santa Cruz | . 1.60 | - | 1.60 | . 78 | . 54 | . 71 |
| University-wide Average | . 74 | 1.11 | 1.00 | . 66 | . 79 | . 74 |

Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President--Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Surveys, years indicated.

The small decline in undergraduate family size, noted on all campuses, was most noticable at the newer campuses--Irvine, San Diego and Santa Cruz. Because there were so few married undergraduate students at these campuses in 1965-66, it is possible that those few families were not entirely representative of all undergraduate families for all campuses.

The same obsfrvation does not hold true for graduate students. The considerable decline in average family size occurred on all campuses, with a thirty percent decline being the typical loss. Despite a similar decline, Riverside continues to hold the distinction of having the highest average family size among graduate students. This rate was 1.31 in 1965-66, dropping to 1.02 in $1971-72--a$ rate twenty percent above the average of all nine campuses.

In summary, there have been considerable decreases in the average family size of currently married students--a decline of twenty-six percent in the period 1965-66 through 1971-72. Because graduate families decreased in size by nearly thirty percent during this period, by 1971-72, both undergraduate and graduate families averaged almost the same number of children per family-0.66 for undergraduates and 0.74 for graduates.

## C. Distribution of the Number of Children by Family

One reason the average number of children per family decreased between 1965-66 and 197J.-72, was that the number and percentage of married students without children increased. This trend was observable on all campuses.

As indicated in Table 10, on a University-wide basis in 1965-66, five out of ten married students had no children; by 1971-72 this had changed by twenty percent, as six out of ten married student families had no children. The number of families without children is considerably higher among University
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[^7]married students than among the general population. For example, in the United States, in 1969, only 34.5 percent of married women age $20-24$ had no children, ${ }^{3}$ whereas, among the University married student population, 60.6 percent of married student families had no children.

Between 1965-66 and 1971-72, the percent of married student families without children increased on every campus, with the increase at some campuses more significant than at others. For example, at Irvine and Santa Cruz, the percent of childless couples has nearly doubled in the past six years. In 1965-66, 33.3 percent of married students at Irvine and 35.0 at Santa Cruz were childless; by 1971-72 this percentage had increased to 61.2 percent at Irvine and 61.6 percent at Santa Cruz.

In contrast to the large increase in the percent of couples without children at Irvine and Santa Cruz, the percent of married student families without children at Berkeley and San Diego increased from approximately fifty-three percent to sixty-two percent; at Davis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, the percent of couples without children grew from approximately fifty percent to sixty-one percent; at Riverside, from forty-two percent to fifty-five percent; and at Santa Barbara, from forty-six to sixty-five percent. With the exception of Los Angeles and Riverside, more than sixty percent of married students on all campuses have no children.

As a result of the increase in the number of families without children, the number of families with children has also changed. It is interesting that this change was not reflected in single child families, but

[^8]was reflected most in families with two or more children, which showed considerable decrease.

On a University-wide basis, the percent of married student families with one child decreased slightly between 1965-66 and 1971-72. In 1965-66, 21.1 percent of all married students had one child; by $1971-72$ only 18.6 percent had one child. The proportion of one-child families is significantly less among University married students than in the national population. National statistics show that in 1969 , thirty-four percent of married women, aged 20-24, had one child ${ }^{4}-$ a rate nearly double that of the University married student population.

The decrease in one-child families has been reflected on all campuses. At four campuses--Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles and San Diego--the percent of couples with one child has decreased by less than two percent in the last six years. In contrast, at Irvine, Riverside and Santa Barbara the percent of families with one child changed considerably--dropping six percent at Irvine, three percent at Riverside, and thirteen percent at Santa Barbara. At San Francisco, the percent of married students with one child decreased by four percent. At Santa Cruz an increase of five percent in the number of married students with one child was noted. The range in the number of families with one child in 1971-72 has increased from 16.6 percent at Irvine to 21.1 percent at San Diego.

[^9]By comparison to the increasing percentage of student families without children, and the nearly constant percentage of families with one child, there has been a sizable decline between 1965-66 and 1971-72 in the percentage of married student families with two, three, or four or more children. On a University-wide basis, in 1965-66, 15.8 percent of student families had two children, 8.5 percent had three children and 4.7 percent had four or more children. By 1971-72, corresponding figures were 12.4 percent with two children, 4.9 percent with three children, and 3.5 percent with four or more children. This is equivalent to a thirty percent decrease in student familles with two or more children from a high of 29.0 percent of all families in $1965-66$, to only 20.8 percent of all student families in 1971-72.

While the national population still has larger families than University students, a similar downard trend in family size distrioution is also observable. Among women aged $20-24$ in the United States in 1960 , twentysix percent had two children, eleven percent had three children, and six percent had four or more children. By 1969 , corresponding national figures indicated that twenty-one percent of families had two chfldren, seven percent had three children, and three percent had four or more children. This resulted In a thirty percent decrease in multi-child size families from forty-three percent in 1960, to thirty-one percent in $1970 .{ }^{5}$

The fact that compared to national populations, a higher percentage of married students are childless and a lower percentage have one or more

[^10]children Indicates two measurable differences between the University married student population and the general population--students postpone having children and partly because they postpone having children, they do not have as many children as the general population.
A. Background

Of the 21,249 married students attending the University in 1971-72, approximately one out of five lived in University-owned housing. To house these students, the University owns 3,745 on-or-near-campus apartment units. (In 1972, 300 additional units are scheduled for occupancy, with future projects in the planning stage.)

In the Fall Quarter 1971, a survey questionnarie was sent from the Office of the Assistant Vice President--Physical Planning to the Housing Office on each campus. This questionnarie requested information on the number of families-with-children living in University-owned housing and the ages of their children. This information collected from eight campuses is analyzed in the section that follows. Included is a comparison of family size among families living in University-owned housing, other student families in privately-owned housing, and other families in the State of Calfornia. The section concludes with a discussion of the number of school-age children living in University-owned housing.

## B. Family Size

Because the University is a large supplier of married student housing, it was of interest to compare characteristics of student families-with-children living in University-owned housing to married student families-with-children living in privately-owned student housing. Table 11 shows that in 1971-72, on a University-wide basis, more student families living in University housing have children ( 61 percent) than do University married students living in privately-owned housing (39 percent). At some campuses, such as Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Cruz, the University houses a substantially greater percentage of married students with children ( 57 percent to 70 percent)

FFultext Provided tv ERC

TABLE 11

## MARRIED STUDENT FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN Selected Campuses <br> 1971-72

Families With Children
In University-owned
Housing

| Berke ley | $70 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Davis | 57 | 39 |
| Irvine | 44 | 39 |
| Los Angeles | 66 | 42 |
| Riverside | -- | 45 |
| San Diego | 51 | 39 |
| San Francisco | 47 | 38 |
| Santa Barbara | 44 | 35 |
| Santa Cruz | 58 | 38 |
| University-wide Average | $61 \%$ | $39 \%$ |

## Sources:

${ }^{\text {a Based on }}$ data from University of California Housing Offices, Fall Quarter, 1971.
buniversity of California, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, Winter Quarter, 1972.
when compared to privately owned student housing ( 37 percent to 42 percent); at other campuses, such as Irvine, San Francisco and Santa Barbara, there is not as much difference between the percentage of families-with-children living In University-owned housing (44 percent to 47 percent) and students living in other housing (35 percent to 39 percent).

Much of the reason for the disproportion at those campuses where the University provides housing for a greater percent of families-with-children is explained by the size mix of apartment units provided in University-owned apartment units--twenty-seven percent are one-bedroom units, sixty-eight percent two-bedroom, and only five percent three-bedroom. Of the 21,249 married students, sixty-one percent are childless and would probably prefer to rent one-bedroom units; nineteen percent have one child and would probably prefer to rent twobedroom units; and twenty percent have two or more children and would probably prefer to rent units with two or more bedrooms.

Consistent with the above comparison of mix of housing units with average family sizes, University-owned housing, on average, provides housing for families with more children per apartment unit than does the private student housing market. Table 12 shows that of all University housing there is an average 0.9 children per apartment units, while in privately-owned housing there is an average of 0.7 children per unit.

However, because more than one-third of the University apartment units are occupied by families-without-children, it is necessary to look only at the units housing families with children to obtain a measure of actual family size of families with children. In this calculation, shown in Table 13, families-withchildren in University-owned housing have fewer children per family than student families-with-children living in other housing. As illustrated in Table 13,

TABLE 12

## AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY

Selected Campuses
1971-72

## University-owned

Housing a
All Housing ${ }^{b}$

| Berkeley | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Davis | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Irvine | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Los Angeles | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| Riverside | $-=$ | 0.9 |
| San Diego | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| San Francisco | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Santa Barbara | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Santa Cruz | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| University-wide Average | 0.9 | 0.7 |

## Sources:

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Based on data from University of California Housing offices, Fall Quarter, 1971.
$b_{\text {University }}$ of California, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, Winter Quarter, 1972.
table 13
average number of children per family with children Selected Campuses


|  | AVERAGE | NUMBER OF | TABLE 13 <br> CHILDREN PER FAM elected Campuses 1971-72 | LY WITH CHI | LDREN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | University-o | wned Housin | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | All Hou | ing $^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| Number of Families | Number of Families with Children | Number of Children | Average Number of Children per Family | Number of Families | Number of Families with Children | Number of Children | Average Number of Children per Family |
| 1,020 ${ }^{1}$ | 710 | 1,050 | 1.5 | 4,970 | 1,860 | 3,350 | 1.8 |
| 470 | 270 | 410 | 1.5 | 2,410 | 940 | 1,710 | 1.8 |
| 250 | 110 | 170 | 1.5 | 1,130 | 440 | 820 | 1.9 |
| 640 | 420 | 710 | 1.7 | 5,640 | 2,360 | 4,680 | 2.0 |
| -* | -- NOT | AVAILABLE | -- | 1,250 | 570 | 1,120 | 2.0 |
| 360 | $140^{2}$ | 280 | 1.3 | 1,000 | 390 | 670 | 1.7 |
| 170 | 80 | 120 | 1.5 | 920 | 350 | 630 | 1.8 |
| 250 | 110 | 160 | 1.4 | 1,330 | 470 | 850 | 1.8 |
| 120 | 70 | 120 | 1.7 | 380 | 150 | 270 | 1.8 |
| 3,280 | 1,910 | 3,020 | 1.6 | 19,030 | 7,530 | 14,100 | 1.9 |

NOTES:
$1_{\text {Numbers }}$ rounded to the nearest $10 ' s$ digit.
${ }^{2}$ Data derived by applying University-wide percentages.
Sources:
$a_{\text {Based }}$ on data from University of California Housing Offices, Fall Quarter 1971.
student families-with-rhildren in University housing, average 1.6 children per
family. This compares with an average 1.9 children per family for student families-with-children in privately-owned and rented student housing. Due to the lack of three-bedroom units in the Unfversfty apartments, many student families with two or more children must rent privately-owned houses or apartments which are larger than those of the University.

In summary, these comparisons indicate that University-owned housing accommodates a particular segment of the married student housing market: it accommodates a higher percentage of families with children than does the private student housing market; however, of the units occupied by families with children, the families have fewer children per family than those housed in the private market.

## C. Age Distribution of Children

Table 14 provides a description of the age distribution of children living in University-owned housiag both by year from under one year through six years, and by groups-of-years from seven through eighteen years and over. On a University-wide basis, 22.7 percent of 3,020 children living in Univer-sity-owned housing were one year of age or under in 1971-72; an additional 13.9 percent were two years old, 13.0 percent were three, 11.6 percent were four, and 7.7 percent were five. This means that more than two-thirds of the children living in University-owned housing were five years of age or under and thus were not of school age. The remainder-one-third--vere over six and were of school age. Of all children, 13,4 percent were aged seven to nine, 7.0 percent were aged ten to twelve, 2.7 percent were aged thirteen to fifteen, and 0.9 percent aged sixteen to eighteen. Only 0.4 percent were over eighteen years of age.
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN LIVING IN UNIVERSITY-OWNED HOUSING

Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
Los Angeles
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbura
Santa Cruz
TOTAL/AVERAGE

NOTE: Numbers rounded to nearest 10 's digit
Sources:
$a_{\text {Based }}$ on data from University of California Housing Offices, Fall Quarter, 1971.
buniversity of California, Studeat Housing and Transportation Survey, Winter Quarter, 1972.

At some campuses, San Diego and Santa Barbara for instance, the percentage of children living in University housing who were of school age was quite small--less than twenty percent. At other campuses, the percentage was greater. For example, at Berkeley, of the 1,050 children of families living in University housing, thirty-eight percent (or approximately 400 children) were of school age-- 370 who lived in University Village in the City of Albany and 30 in the Smyth-Fernwald complex in the City of Berkeley. At Santa Cruz, forty-two percent of the 120 children in University-owned housing were of school age.

A further review of the age distribution of those children of school age in University housing (Table 15) shows that a majority of the children are of primary, rather than of secondary, school age. On a University-wide basis, of the approximate 940 school age children living in University housing, 600 (nearly two-thirds) would be of primary school age and 340 (one-third) of secondary school age or older.

As shown in Table 15 , the number and percent of children in University housing who are five years old or less is considerable-ranging from 53 percent of all children at San Francisco and 58 percent at Santa Cruz to 79 percent at San Diego and 81 percent at Santa Barbara. This factor occurs because University married students are on the average younger than other normal childbearing populations. They also have fewer children and younger children than other parents.

A review of Table 16 indicates the children of those living in University-owned housing are much younger than those of othe: families in the State. Of the children in University-owned housing, 69 percent were five years of age and under in 1970-71; while in the State of California in 1970, 31 percent of the children were und $\epsilon$ r five years of age and under.

TABLE 15

## FAMILIES, CHILDREN, AND CHILDREN OF SCHOOL AGE LIVING IN UNIVERSITY-OWNED HOUSING <br> Selected Campuses <br> 1971-72

|  | Total <br> Number of <br> Families | Total <br> Number of Children | Number of Ch <br> Five Years and Under | ldren by Age Six Years and OIder (School Age) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { School Ages } \\ & \text { Six Years } \\ & \hline \text { Primary } \\ & \text { School Age } \end{aligned}$ | of Children <br> and older <br> Secondary <br> School Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | 1,020 | 1,050 | $\begin{gathered} 650 \\ (62 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 400 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 230 \\ (58 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 170 \\ (42 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Davis | 470 | 410 | $\begin{gathered} 300 \\ (73 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110 \\ (27 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ (82 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (18 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Irvine | 250 | 170 | $\begin{gathered} 120 \\ (71 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (29 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (60 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Los Angeles | 640 | 710 | $\begin{gathered} 500 \\ (70 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 210 \\ (30 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 140 \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| San Diego | 360 | 280 | $\begin{gathered} 220 \\ (79 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (21 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| San Francisco | 170 | 120 | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ (53 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Santa Barbara | 250 | 160 | $\begin{gathered} 130 \\ (81 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (33 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Santa Cruz | 120 | 120 | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ (58 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (42 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (60 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (40 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| University-wide Total/Average | 3,280 | 3,020 | $\begin{gathered} 2,080 \\ (69 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 940 \\ (31 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 600 \\ (64 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 340 \\ (36 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

NOTE: Numbers rounded to nearest $10^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ digit.

## Sources:

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Based on data from University of California Housing offices, Fall Quarter, 1971.
$b_{\text {University }}$ of California, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, Winter Quarter, 1972.

## TABLE 16 <br> CHILDREN PER FAMILY BY AGE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNLA AND STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1971-72

|  | Number of Children by Age |  | School Ages of Children Six Years or Older |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of |  | Six Years | Primary | Secondary |
| Children | Five Years | and Older | School | School |
| Per Family | and Under | (School Age) | Age | Age |

Number of Children per Family

| All Families |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| University-owned <br> Housing | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| State of California | $(100 \%)$ | 0.62 | 0.28 | 0.18 | 0.10 |
|  | $(100 \%)$ | $(31 \%)$ | $(64 \%)$ | $(36 \%)$ |  |

[^11]Combining data on number of children, by age, per family, it is possible to calculate about how many children per family in University housing need schools compared with other families in California. This calculation, also shown in Table 16 , reveals that families living in University-owned housing add only one-third as many children to the school systems as other California families. As illustrated, of familes living in University-owned housing there is an average of 0.28 children of school age per family, while among all families in the State there is an average of 0.83 children of school age per family-a considerable difference.

In addition, of the twenty-eight children per 100 average families living in the University housing and added to the school system, eighteen of the children would be in primary grades and ten would be in secondary grades or above. By comparison, of the eighty-three children of school age per 100 average California families, twenty-five would be of primary grade age and fifty-eight of secondary grade age or above. Stated another way, among the school age children living in University housing, sixty-four percent were of primary school age. By contrast, only thirty percent of children of school age in the State were of primary school age.

Although it has been demonstrated that there are not as many children of school age per family in University housing as among other California families, it can also be shown that there is a correspondingly greater need among University families for chiid and day care facilities than among other California families. As illustrated in Table 16 , of the children of families in University housing, sixty-nine percent are five years of age or younger, while in California families in general, thirty-one percent of children are five years of age or younger. When the number of children per family is multiplied by the percentage of children under five years of age, it is possible to calculate the number of
children potentially needing childcare facilities per family. As illustrated in Table 16, this calculation reveals that families living in University-owned housIng have 0.62 children five years of age or younger, while in general, families of the State of California have 0.37 children ifve years of age or younger. This means that families living in University-owned housing have nearly twice as much potential need for childcare facilities as do other families in the State.

Table 17 shows that of the eight campuses for which data was available, a majority of children living in University-owned housing are under five years of age. At two campuses--San Diego and Santa Barbara--as many as efghty percent of all children of students living in University housing are five years of age or younger, while at three campuses--San Francisco, Santa Cruz and Berkeley-the percent of children five years of age or younger is approximately sixty percent or slightly less. At the remainder of the campuses, about seventy percent of children of students living in University housing are five years of age or younger. In conclusion, at all of the eight campuses, the number of children five years of age or younger per family for students living in University-owned housing is greater than among State of California families.

Assuming that children five years of age and under would have greatest need for either child or day care facilities, the University housed married student population has almost twice as much need per family for these facilities as do other families in California.

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF CHILDREN FTVE YEARS OF AGE AND UNDER LIVING IN UNIVERSITY-OWNED HOUSING Selected Campuses

1971-72

|  | Children Five <br> Years of Age and <br> Under | Percent of Aii <br> Children in <br> University owned <br> Housing |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | 650 | $62 \%$ |
| Davis | 300 | $73 \%$ |
| Irvine | 120 | $71 \%$ |
| Los Angeles | 500 | $70 \%$ |
| San Dlego | $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ | $79 \%$ |
| San Francisco | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $53 \%$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ | $81 \%$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $58 \%$ |
| University-wide Total/Average | 2,080 | $69 \%$ |

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

## HOUSING AND TRANSPORTA'2ION SURVEY CARDS WINTER QUARTER 1971



BERKELEY CAMPUS

 DAVIS, IRVIAE, LOS ANGELES, RIVERSIDE, SAN DIECO, AND SAFTA CRUZ CAMPUSES


SANTA BARBARA CAAPUS

APPENDIX B
TABLE 1
UNDERGRADUATE ENROLIMENT
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72

|  | $1965-66$ | $1966-67$ | $1967-68$ | $1968-69$ | $1969-70$ | $1970-71$ | $1971-72$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Berkeley | 16,286 | 16,314 | 17,704 | 17,877 | 18,130 | 18,469 | 18,236 |
| nayis | 5,995 | 6,769 | 7,461 | 8,339 | 9,093 | 9,660 | 10,055 |
| Irvine | 1,394 | 1,919 | 2,300 | 2,854 | 3,595 | 4,743 | 5,035 |
| Los Angeles | 16,352 | 16,859 | 18,366 | 18,394 | 18,749 | 17,306 | 16,753 |
| Riverside | 2,645 | 2,844 | 2,995 | 3,314 | 3,884 | 4,428 | 4,540 |
| San Diego | 826 | 1,413 | 2,044 | 2,615 | 3,411 | 4,174 | 4,639 |
| San Francisco | 616 | 561 | 593 | 339 | 334 | 365 | 379 |
| Santa Barbara | 8,429 | 9,569 | 10,286 | 10,487 | 11,269 | 11,232 | 10,578 |
| Santa Cruz | 638 | 1,247 | 1,850 | 2,464 | 2,938 | 3,446 | 3,904 |
| University-wide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 53,181 | 57,495 | 63,599 | 66,683 | 71,403 | 73,823 | 74,119 |

Source: University of Californie, Statistical Summary of Students, Faculty and Staff, years indicated.
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TABLE 2
GRADUATE ENROLLMENT
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72

|  | 1965-66 | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | 10,092 | 9,835 | 10,253 | 9,831 | 9,716 | 9,417 | 9,020 |
| Davis | 1,732 | 2,150 | 2,457 | 2,824 | 3,227 | 3,271 | 3,655 |
| Irvine | 134 | 304 | 465 | 1,156 | 1,391 | 1,316 | 1,484 |
| Los Angeles | 9,023 | 9,242 | 9,880 | 10,063 | 10,846 | 10,487 | 9,984 |
| Riverside | 831 | 881 | 1,039 | 1,132 | 1,299 | 1,289 | 1,242 |
| San Diego | 531 | 846 | 944 | 1,111 | 1,353 | 1,502 | 1,536 |
| San Francisco | 1,570 | 1,649 | 1,702 | 2,066 | 2,150 | 2,186 | 2,268 |
| Santa Barbara | 949 | 1,264 | 1,490 | 1,733 | 1,985 | 1,777 | 1,661 |
| Santa Cruz | $\cdots$ | 26 | -61 | 96 | 154 | 267 | 305 |
| University-wide Total | 24,862 | 26,197 | 28,291 | 30,012 | 32,121 | 31,512 | 3.,155 |
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TABLE 3
TOTAL ENROLIMENT
1965-66 to 1971-72

|  | $1965-66$ | $1966-67$ | $1967-68$ | $1968-69$ | $1969-70$ | $1970-71$ | $1971-72$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Berkeley | 26,378 | 26,149 | 27,957 | 27,708 | 27,846 | 27,886 | 27,256 |
| Divis | 7,727 | 8,919 | 9.918 | 11,163 | 12,320 | 12,931 | 13,710 |
| Irvine | 1,528 | 2,223 | 2,765 | 4,010 | 4,986 | 6,059 | 6,519 |
| Los Angeles | 25,375 | 26,101 | 28,246 | 28,457 | 29,595 | 27,793 | 26,737 |
| Riverside | 3,476 | 3,725 | 4,034 | 4,446 | 5,183 | 5,717 | 5,782 |
| San Diego | 1,357 | 2,259 | 2,983 | 3,726 | 4,764 | 5,676 | 6,175 |
| San Francisco | 2,186 | 2,210 | 2,295 | 2,405 | 2,484 | 2,551 | 2,647 |
| Santa Barbara | 9,378 | 10,833 | 11,776 | 12,220 | 13,254 | 13,009 | 12,239 |
| Santa Cruz | $\mathbf{6 n 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 7 3}$ | 1,911 | 2,560 | 3,092 | 3,713 | 4,209 |
| University-wide | 78,043 | 83,692 | 91,890 | 96,695 | 103,524 | 105,335 | 105,274 |

[^12]
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TABLE 4

MARRIED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

|  | 1965-66 | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley | $\begin{aligned} & 1,520 \\ & (9.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,535 \\ & (9.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,659 \\ & (9.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,798 \\ (10.1 .) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,917 \\ (10.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,856 \\ (10.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,676 \\ & (9.2) \end{aligned}$ |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 428 \\ (7.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 481 \\ (7.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 558 \\ (7.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} i 84 \\ (3.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 802 \\ (8.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 861 \\ (8.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 825 \\ (8.2) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \\ (7.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 152 \\ (7.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 311 \\ (13.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 449 \\ (15.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 417 \\ (11.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 395 \\ (8.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 498 \\ (9.9) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{array}{r} 1,336 \\ \cdots(8.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,478 \\ & (8.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,710 \\ -\quad(9,3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,759 \\ (9.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,010 \\ -(10.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,632 \\ & (9.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,485 \\ & (8.9) \end{aligned}$ |
| Riveraide | $\begin{array}{r} 320 \\ (12.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 359 \\ (12.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \% \\ (13.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 528 \\ (16.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 676 \\ (17.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 759 \\ (17.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 703 \\ (15.5) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ (2.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70 \\ (5.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99 \\ (4.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 180 \\ (6.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 331 \\ (9.7! \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 406 \\ (9.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 419 \\ (9.0) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 201 \\ (32.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125 \\ (22.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108 \\ (18.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \\ (17.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 71 \\ (21.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77 \\ (21.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ (19.2) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbare | $\begin{array}{r} 488 \\ (5.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 516 \\ (5.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 603 \\ (5.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 688 \\ (6.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 736 \\ (6.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 844 \\ (7.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 774 \\ (7.3) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (2.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 66 \\ (5.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 103 \\ (5.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 130 \\ (5.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 157 \\ (5.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 233 \\ (6.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 300 \\ (7.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide Total | $\begin{aligned} & 4,428 \\ & (8.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,782 \\ & (8.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,553 \\ & (8.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,274 \\ & (9.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,117 \\ (10.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,063 \\ & (9.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,753 \\ & (9.1) \end{aligned}$ |

NOTE: Number in parenthesis indicatea number of undergraduates who are married as a percentage of enrolled undergraduates.
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Source: } \text { University of California, } \begin{aligned} \text { Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical }\end{aligned} \\ & \\ & \underline{\text { Plannina, Student Housing ard Transportation Survey, years indicated. }}\end{aligned}$
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TABLE 5
MARRIED GRADUATE STUDENTS
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72

$$
\begin{array}{lllllll}
1965-66 & 1966-67 & 1967-68 & 1968-69 & 1969-70 & 1970-71 & 1971-72
\end{array}
$$

| Berkeley | $\begin{gathered} 4,874 \\ (48.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,691 \\ (47.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,024 \\ (49.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,798 \\ (48.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,605 \\ (47.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,369 \\ (46.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,032 \\ (44.7) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 973 \\ (56.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,241 \\ (57.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,423 \\ (57.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,669 \\ (59.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,810 \\ (56,1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,809 \\ (55,3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,879 \\ (51.4) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 76 \\ (57.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 194 \\ (63.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 288 \\ (62.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 674 \\ (58.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 797 \\ (57.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 737 \\ (56.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 738 \\ (49.7) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{gathered} 4,782 \\ (-53, v) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,843 \\ \{52,4\} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,118 \\ -(548) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,101 \\ (50.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,315 \\ -49,0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,002 \\ (41,7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,653 \\ (46,6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Riverside | $\begin{array}{r} 481 \\ (57.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 511 \\ (58.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 604 \\ (58.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 670 \\ (59.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 785 \\ (48.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 759 \\ (47.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 693 \\ (55.8) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 275 \\ (51.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 433 \\ (51.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 488 \\ (51.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 59! \\ (53.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 653 \\ <48.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 718 \\ (47.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 685 \\ (44.6) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 728 \\ (46.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 773 \\ (46.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 662 \\ (38.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 783 \\ (37.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 903 \\ (42.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 885 \\ (40.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 907 \\ (40.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\begin{array}{r} 451 \\ (47.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 600 \\ (47.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 696 \\ (46.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 789 \\ (45.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 899 \\ (45.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 787 \\ (44.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 784 \\ (47.2) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz |  | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (61,9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ (52.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47 \\ (45,5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 76 \\ (45,3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 118 \\ (44,3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125 \\ (41.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide Total | $\begin{aligned} & 12,640 \\ & (50.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \epsilon, 197 \\ & (50.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,335 \\ & (50.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.122 \\ & (50.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,843 \\ & (49.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,184 \\ & (48.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,496 \\ & (46.5) \end{aligned}$ |

NOTE: Number in parenthesis indicates number of graduates who are married as a percentage of enrolled graduates.

Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical
Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, years indicated.
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TABLE 6
MARRIED STUDENTS
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72
1965-66 1966 -67 $1967-68 \quad 1968-69 \quad 1960-70 \quad 1970-71 \quad 1971-72$

| Berkeley | $\begin{array}{r} 6,394 \\ (24.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,226 \\ (23.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,683 \\ (23.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,596 \\ (23.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,522 \\ (23.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,225 \\ (22.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,708 \\ (20.9) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davis | $\begin{array}{r} 1,401 \\ (18.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,722 \\ (19.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,981 \\ (20.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,353 \\ (21.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,612 \\ (21.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,670 \\ (20.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,704 \\ (19.7) \end{array}$ |
| Irvine | $\begin{array}{r} 173 \\ (11.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 346 \\ (15.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 599 \\ (21.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,123 \\ (28.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,214 \\ (24.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,132 \\ (19.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,236 \\ (19.0) \end{array}$ |
| Los Angeles | $\begin{array}{r} 6,118 \\ (24.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,321 \\ (24.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,828 \\ (24.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,860 \\ (24.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,325 \\ (24.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,634 \\ (23.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,138 \\ (23.0) \end{array}$ |
| Riverside | $\begin{array}{r} 801 \\ (23.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 870 \\ (23.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,006 \\ (24.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,198 \\ (26.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,461 \\ (28.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,518 \\ (26.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,396 \\ (24.1) \end{array}$ |
| San Diego | $\begin{array}{r} 297 \\ (\angle 1.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 503 \\ (22.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 587 \\ (19.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 771 \\ (20.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 984 \\ (20.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,124 \\ (19.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,104 \\ (17.9) \end{array}$ |
| San Francisco | $\begin{array}{r} 929 \\ (42.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 898 \\ (40.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 770 \\ (33.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 841 \\ (35.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 974 \\ (39.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 962 \\ (37.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 980 \\ (37.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Barbara | $\begin{array}{r} 939 \\ (10.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,116 \\ (10.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,299 \\ (11.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,477 \\ (12.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,635 \\ (12.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,631 \\ (12.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,558 \\ (13.0) \end{array}$ |
| Santa Cruz | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (2.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 82 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 135 \\ (7.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 177 \\ -6.91 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 233 \\ (75) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 351 \\ (9.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 425 \\ (10.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| University-wide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\begin{aligned} & 17,068 \\ & (21.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,084 \\ & (21.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 139 ; 988 \\ (21.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -21,396 \\ (22.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2224960 \\ (22.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2224247 \\ (21.1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,249 \\ & (20.2) \end{aligned}$ |

NOTE: Number in parenthesis indicates number of married students as a percentage of all enrolled students.

Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, years indicated.
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TABLE 7
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER UNDERGRADUATE FAMILY
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72
1965-66 1966-67 1967-68 1968-69 1969-70 1970-71 1971-72

| Berkeley | .60 | .62 | .59 | .57 | .65 | .68 | .63 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Davia | .68 | .66 | .52 | .52 | .62 | .54 | .59 |
| Irvine | 1.67 | 1.06 | .97 | .86 | .80 | .59 | .63 |
| Los Angeles | .77 | .72 | .69 | .67 | .59 | .65 | .70 |
| Riverside | 1.04 | .88 | .93 | .85 | .78 | .83 | .76 |
| San Diego | .90 | .60 | .85 | .87 | .68 | .70 | .71 |
| San Francisco | .61 | .64 | .78 | .59 | .76 | .57 | .36 |
| Santa Barbara | .77 | .74 | .64 | .64 | .62 | .55 | .61 |
| Santa Cruz | 1.60 | .97 | .95 | .53 | .56 | -.74 | .78 |

[^13]APPENDIX B
table 8
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHIIDREN PER GRADUATE FAMILY
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72
1965-66 1966-67 1967-68 $1968-69 \quad 1969-70 \quad 1970-71 \quad 1971-72$

| Berkeley | .99 | .92 | .88 | .87 | .86 | .84 | .70 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Davis | 1.18 | 1.06 | .96 | .88 | .90 | .83 | .76 |
| Irvine | 1.27 | 1.15 | 1.19 | .95 | .93 | .88 | .81 |
| Los Angeles | 1.19 | 1.16 | 1.09 | 1.05 | .97 | .87 | .88 |
| Riverside | 1.31 | 1.26 | 1.22 | 1.09 | 1.16 | 1.07 | 1.02 |
| San Diego | .85 | .90 | .81 | .70 | .78 | .75 | .64 |
| San Franclaco | 1.25 | 1.07 | .75 | .71 | .79 | .69 | .72 |
| Santa Barbara | 1.12 | .95 | .93 | .81 | .77 | .76 | .68 |
| Santa Cruz | .-- | .87 | .62 | .65 | .61 | .53 | .54 |
| Universitymide Avg. 1.11 | 1.05 | .98 | .93 | .91 | .84 | .79 |  |
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TABLE 9
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY
All Campuses
1965-66 to 1971-72

1965-66 1966-67 1967-68 1968-69 1969-70 1970-71 1971-72

| Berkeley | .90 | .84 | .80 | .77 | .79 | .78 | .67 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Davis | 1.03 | .94 | .83 | .77 | .80 | .74 | .71 |
| Irvine | 1.53 | 1.10 | 1.07 | .91 | .98 | .85 | .73 |
| Los Angeles | 1.08 | 1.05 | .93 | .93 | .86 | .81 | .83 |
| Riverside | 1.21 | 1.12 | 1.11 | .97 | .97 | .95 | .89 |
| San Diego | .85 | .85 | .82 | .74 | .74 | .73 | .67 |
| San Francisco | .91 | 1.00 | .91 | .70 | .78 | .78 | .69 |
| Santa Barbara | .96 | .86 | .76 | .73 | .70 | .70 | .64 |
| Santa Cruz | 1.60 | . .95 | .88 | .56 | .57 | .67 | .71 |
| University-wide Avg. 1.00 | .95 | .88 | .84 | .83 | .79 | .74 |  |

[^15]
[^0]:    Source: University of California, Statistical Sumary of Students, Faculty and Staff, years indicated.

[^1]:    Source:
    Based on data collected by the State Department of Finance, Population Research Division, State of California

[^2]:    University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President--Physicai Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, 1971-72.
    ${ }^{2}$ General campus enrollments are based upon projection by the office of the Vice Presidentomplanning, Office of Analytical Studies, dated July 6, 1972; Health Sciences projections are based upon the University of California Planning for the Health Sciences, 1970 through 1980, dated January 30, 1970.

[^3]:    Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President--Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Surveys, years indicated.

[^4]:    Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Surveys, years indicated.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P. 23, No. 36: "Fertility Indicatior: 197C." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

[^6]:    ${ }^{2}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current population Reports, Series P-20, No. 218: "Household and Family Characteristics: Match 1970." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 23, 1971.
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[^8]:    ${ }^{3}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series p-23, No. 36: "Fertility Indicators: 1970." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

[^9]:    ${ }^{4}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 36: "Fertility Indicators: 1970." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

[^10]:    ${ }^{5}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 218: "Household and Family Characteristics: March, 1970." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 23, 1971.

[^11]:    Sources:
    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Based on data from University of California Housing Officas, Fall Quarter, 1971.
    ${ }^{b}$ U.S. Census of Population: General Population Characteristics, Bureau of the Census, October 1971 Final Report PC (1) - B6, California,
    ${ }^{\text {C }}$ State of California, Department of Finance, Population Research Division.

[^12]:    Source: University of California, Statistical Summary of Students, Faculty and Staff, years indicated.

[^13]:    Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, years indicated.

[^14]:    Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, years indicated.

[^15]:    Source: University of California, Office of the Assistant Vice President-Physical Planning, Student Housing and Transportation Survey, years indicated.

