

A COMPARISON OF GRADE AVERAGES OF SINGLE AND  
MARRIED STUDENTS

by

Margo E. Hester

---

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS  
In the Graduate College  
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1960

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in their judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Margo E. Hester

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Donald S. Klaiss  
D. S. Klaiss  
Professor of Sociology

Sept. 20, 1960  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer thanks Dr. D. S. Klaiss, professor of sociology, for suggesting the problem and directing this thesis. She appreciates the cooperation of Mr. A. T. Grant, associate registrar, and the staff of the office of the registrar during the collection of the data. Also, she acknowledges the assistance of the librarians and of several other people who contributed directly or indirectly to this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	3
Trend toward College Marriage	
Scholarship of Students	
Summary	
III. METHOD OF STUDY . . . . .	22
General Method	
Procedure	
IV. DIVISIONS OF THE RESEARCH . . . . .	26
Introduction	
Education College	
Engineering College	
Senior Class	
V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY .	45
Conclusions	
Suggestions for Further Study	
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	50

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentages of Married Undergraduate Students at Twenty-two Colleges and Universities . . . .	11
2. Percentages of Married Students at Ten Colleges and Universities . . . . .	12
3. Percentages of Married Students Enrolled in Daytime Classes at the University of Arizona, First Semester, 1958-59 . . . . .	13
4. Senior Year and Cumulative Grade Averages, College of Education . . . . .	30
5. Cumulative Grade Averages, College of Engineering.	35
6. Junior and Senior Grade Averages, Senior Class . .	41
7. Summary of Mean Grades . . . . .	46
8. Numbers of Students Whose Senior Year Averages Are Above Their Averages for Previous Years . .	47

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study is to test the hypothesis that marriage has a positive effect on scholastic achievement of students attending college. According to some writers,<sup>1</sup> students usually attain higher grades after they marry than they did as single students. Because grades may tend to improve for most students as they become older and continue in college, it is difficult to determine any particular influence which marriage has on scholarship. Several studies have compared the scholastic achievement of married students with that of single students.<sup>2</sup> It is realized that other factors besides marital status may affect the grades of students, but only a few of these, such as scholastic aptitude, college classification, and age, can be considered in this study.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of testing the hypothesis that marriage has a positive effect on scholastic achievement is to

---

<sup>1</sup>Chapter II, pp. 13-14.

<sup>2</sup>Chapter II, pp. 13-15, 18-19.

determine whether the role expectations of married students, different from those of single students, influence the married students so that they excel in scholastic competition. Sociologically, marriage can be considered as a form of social interaction in which the statuses and roles of the participants are the principal elements.<sup>1</sup> The status, or place in the social structure, of married students carries corresponding expected behavior, or social roles. Attempts of married students to fulfill their role expectations possibly results in their scholastic superiority.

---

<sup>1</sup>Francis E. Merrill, Courtship and Marriage, (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1959), p. vii.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Trend toward College Marriage

In October, 1959, the number of students enrolled in colleges in the United States was approximately 3,340,000. Of these students, age fourteen to thirty-four, 24.5% were married. The Bureau of the Census classified 30.6% of the 2,187,000 male students and 12.7% of the 1,153,000 female students as "married, spouse present."<sup>1</sup>

Until the 1940's and, specifically, World War II, tradition considered marriage appropriate if it were an alternative to college attendance or if it followed college attendance. Very few people achieved the status of a spouse and of a college student at the same time. Many colleges would neither accept married people as students nor allow enrolled students to remain in college if they married. Parents, too, hesitated to continue financing the college education of a son or daughter who married; the students, then, left college in order to earn a living.

---

<sup>1</sup>U. S., Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, "School Enrollment: October 1959," Series P-20, No. 101 (May 22, 1960), p. 12.

Attitudes of college administrators changed when World War II and Korean War veterans became eligible for government-financed education. Regardless of the fact that many of these veterans were married when they enrolled in a college, or soon after, colleges welcomed them as students. As Christopherson, Vandiver, and Krueger explained, the veterans were accepted as college students for they increased the enrollment totals and also the amounts in the college treasuries, it was considered patriotic to accept veterans as students, and the academic records of the veterans were usually commendable.

According to these writers, the existing economic conditions and the manner in which marriage of college students was introduced favored the establishment of college marriage as a culture pattern.

There seems little doubt that college marriage emerged as a result of, or was facilitated by, a number of special conditions. The high level of prosperity, for example, which has enabled families to subsidize student marriages, also permitted marriage upon meager economic reserve but substantial future economic potential. The same condition facilitated the securing of part-time work by one or both members of the student marriage.

Another condition of considerable significance was the introduction of the pattern by a special group for whom institutional expectations were still in abeyance, and this in a time characterized by a kind of generalized 'war psychology,' when certain traditional behavior patterns and values were in a relative state of flux. The diffusion of this pattern to and the adoption of it by the nonveteran student, in retrospect, at least, seems

to have proceeded in a rapid and orderly manner.<sup>1</sup>

The trend toward college marriage is discussed in books, professional journals and popular magazines. Writers emphasize different phases of the subject: economic aspects, living arrangements, roles of husband and wife, "adjustment," social activities, children, and academic achievement. Many studies which investigate academic achievement of students declare that married students maintain higher grade averages and study more diligently than single students. Opinions vary, nevertheless, concerning the advisability of students marrying while, or before, attending college.

Opinions regarding marriage of college students.---In 1956, Kirkendall considered two questions regarding marriage of undergraduate students. First, he asked whether college marriages would decrease in number as government subsidies to veterans discontinued. Kirkendall calculated the percentages of married students enrolled at the University of Oregon according to fall quarter enrollment statistics from 1939 to 1956. Since World War II veterans began entering this university in the late 1940's, the percentages of married men and women students had risen until, in the fall of 1956, 21.1% of the men and 10.9% of the women students were married. Kirkendall concluded that college marriages were not dependent

---

<sup>1</sup>Victor A. Christopherson, Joseph S. Vandiver, and Marie N. Krueger, "The Married College Student, 1959," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (May, 1960), 122-23.

upon government financial aid; in fact, the proportion of married students appeared to increase, although fewer married students were receiving government-subsidized education.

Secondly, Kirkendall gave an affirmative answer to the question of whether it is possible for students to combine education and marriage successfully. He recognized that efforts of married students to finish college in the traditional four years and, concurrently, hold a full-time job might result in strain and tension, as well as poor quality of education. Although not specifically mentioning grades, he expressed the following opinion:

Neither is there any longer any debate as to the possibility of completing a college education even though married. Too many persons have done it successfully to leave any doubt. Not all who have tried have been successful, but so many have and have been so outstandingly successful that all doubts about the possibility of successfully combining marriage and a college education have disappeared.<sup>1</sup>

In another article published in 1956, Kirkendall argued that the trend toward combining college education with marriage was established. According to him, parents would become more and more willing to finance the education of a son or daughter who married before being graduated from college. Not only did Kirkendall find no particular reason for the tradition that students finish college before marrying,

---

<sup>1</sup>Lester Kirkendall, "Married Undergraduates on the Campus: an Appraisal," The Coordinator, V (December 1956), 54-55.

but also he mentioned that one result of marriage could be a "frame of mind" by which the person became a better student than before marriage.<sup>1</sup>

Contrasting with Kirkendall's view is that of Mead, who in a discussion published in July, 1960, discouraged marriage of undergraduate students. Traditionally, one requirement for the college students' way of life has been freedom from responsibilities. Mead explained, "Civilization, as we know it, was preceded by a prolongation of the learning period . . . in which young people, still protected and supported, were free to explore the past and dream of the future." Marriage, involving economic and family responsibilities, could mean "premature imprisonment of young people, before they have had a chance to explore their own minds and the minds of others."

Although, Mead stated, it is not yet possible to determine the long range effects of undergraduate marriages, she named two "ominous trends." First, the couples "take little advantage of college as a broadening experience." They start having a family, depending on financial aid from parents, and "at thirty they are still immature and dependent, their future mortgaged . . . neither husband nor wife

---

<sup>1</sup>Lester Kirkendall, Too Young to Marry, Vol. CCXXXVI of New York Public Affairs Pamphlet (New York: New York Public Affairs Committee, 1956) 26.

realizing the promise that a different kind of undergraduate life might have enabled each to fulfill." The second, and more "tragic" trend, is that "the marriage is based on the boy's promise and the expendability of the girl." She goes to work in order to support her husband while he finishes school, but when he becomes independent, he leaves his wife.<sup>1</sup>

At Michigan State University, Landis canvassed the opinions of both married and single students toward college marriage. For his study published in 1948, 544 married couples filled out anonymous questionnaires and 600 single students answered questions regarding marriage of college students. When asked whether they would marry in college if they were able to start college over again as single students, two-thirds of the married men and three-fourths of the married women replied affirmatively. Single students were asked whether, if they found the right mate, they would marry while attending college; affirmative replies came from one-third of the single men and from not quite one-half of the single women.<sup>2</sup>

Various attitudes of groups of students and of individual students toward college marriages are apparent in

---

<sup>1</sup>Margaret Mead, "Is College Compatible With Marriage?" Clemson Alumni News, XIII (July, 1960), 8-10.

<sup>2</sup>J. T. Landis, "On the Campus," Survey Midmonthly, LXXXIV (January, 1948), 17.

other articles. The following list includes articles written by married students and by those studying college marriage.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeanne Kellar Beaty, "We Sweat Out Our Campus Marriage," Saturday Evening Post, April 14, 1956, 58ff; Christopherson, op. cit., p. 127; Jeanette Hansen, "How We Combine Education and Marriage," Journal of Home Economics, LI (November, 1959), 786-87; Rex Skidmore, Therese Smith, and Delbert Nye, "Characteristics of Married Veterans," Marriage and Family Living, XI (Summer, 1949), 104; Virginia M. Staudt, "Attitudes of College Students Toward Marriage and Related Problems: II Age, Educational, Familial, and Economic Factors in Marriage," Journal of Psychology, XXXIV (July, 1952), 106.

Prevalence of college marriages.--It has been stated that 24.5% of students age 14 to 34 who are enrolled in colleges of the United States are married. Of the students attending college full time, 12.5% are married; the proportion of married part-time college students is 58.3%. For those in the same age group, but not enrolled in college, the proportion of married people is 69.1%.<sup>1</sup> Comparing the marital status of students enrolled in college with that of people enrolled in neither college nor high school, the Bureau of the Census reported that, for ages 18 to 21, the percentage of married people in the latter category was nine times as large as the percentage of married college students.<sup>2</sup> Apparently, college students tend to marry later than people who do not attend college.

For an article on college marriage published in May, 1955, Life magazine surveyed twenty-two colleges and universities in the United States. The table on page 11 shows that coeducational colleges usually have a higher proportion of married students than non-coeducational colleges; also, colleges located in the Northeast have proportionately fewer married students than colleges in other sections of the United States. Neither the exact dates the statistics were collected

---

<sup>1</sup>U. S., Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

nor whether the enrollment totals used included part-time as well as full time students was stated in the article.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF MARRIED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS  
AT TWENTY-TWO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES<sup>a</sup>

College or University	Percentage of Married Students
Coeducational	
Cornell . . . . .	5.5
University of California at Los Angeles . . . . .	15.2
University of Georgia . . . . .	19.5
Indiana . . . . .	11.0
Middlebury . . . . .	1.6
University of Michigan . . . . .	9.6
University of North Carolina . . . . .	13.1
Pomona . . . . .	5.5
St. Louis . . . . .	7.9
Stanford . . . . . (estimated)	4.9
Swarthmore . . . . .	1.3
University of Wisconsin . . . . .	9.4
Non-coeducational	
Women's	
Bryn Mawr . . . . .	3.7
Radcliffe . . . . .	6.0
Scripps . . . . .	3.1
Smith . . . . .	1.0
Sweet Briar . . . . .	0.2
Men's	
Bowdoin . . . . .	3.2
Claremont . . . . .	12.2
Harvard . . . . .	2.1
Kenyon . . . . .	3.2
Trinity . . . . .	3.6

<sup>a</sup>Ernest Havemann, "To Love, Honor, Obey, and Study," Life, May 23, 1955, p. 156.

The following table lists percentages of married students at ten colleges or universities, according to five sources. The discrepancy of almost 20% between the percentages of married students at Cornell as reported by Life and by Parade may reflect different bases for calculations as well as different years for collection of the statistics.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES OF MARRIED STUDENTS AT  
TEN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

College or University	Percentage of Married Students
Antioch College . . . . .	(undergraduates) 10 <sup>a</sup>
Georgia Tech . . . . .	17
Michigan State . . . . .	24
Purdue . . . . .	15 <sup>b</sup>
Iowa State College . . . . .	25 <sup>c</sup>
Santa Barbara College . . . . .	10 to 20 <sup>d</sup>
Moravian College . . . . .	17
Texas University . . . . .	20
Cornell . . . . .	25
Wayne . . . . .	33 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>"Subsidized Marriage," Ladies' Home Journal, LXVI (December, 1949), p. 194.

<sup>b</sup>"The Married Student," Newsweek, March 4, 1957, p. 92.

<sup>c</sup>Everett M. Rogers, "Effect of Campus Marriages on Participation in College Life," College and University, XXXIII (Winter, 1958), 193.

<sup>d</sup>Joseph E. Lantagne, "Do Married Men Succeed in College? College Marriage Inventory," The Journal of School Health, XXIX (February, 1959), 83.

<sup>e</sup>Sid Ross and Ed Kiester, "College Marriages--Good or Bad?" Parade, June 5, 1960, p. 6.

At the University of Arizona during first semester of 1958-59, 8882 students were enrolled in daytime classes. Of these students, 26% were married. Table 3 shows the distribution of the married students by class standing or college.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES OF MARRIED STUDENTS ENROLLED IN DAYTIME CLASSES  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, FIRST SEMESTER, 1958-59

Classification	Percentage of Married Students
All students enrolled in daytime classes . . . . .	26.0
Class	
Senior . . . . .	36.0
Junior . . . . .	25.0
Sophomore . . . . .	16.2
Freshman . . . . .	8.7
College	
Graduate . . . . .	60.2
Law . . . . .	59.8
Pharmacy . . . . .	36.2

Scholarship of Students

Several studies support the contention that married students make higher grades than single students. In 1947, Landis and Landis compared the high school with the college grades of 3,000 students. Their survey of eleven colleges showed that the men who were married in college had higher grade averages than the single men; in high school, the former group had had lower averages than the latter. The married women in college attained much higher grade averages than the single college women; in high school, the grades for these

two groups had been approximately the same. Explaining the superior scholastic achievement of the married college students, the Landises mention the possibility of selective factors determining which students marry, the more settled schedule, and less participation in time-consuming social activities for the married students.<sup>1</sup>

Lantagne's inventory, to which 70% of the married men attending Santa Barbara College responded, also indicates superior grade point averages subsequent to marriage. For the 274 cases collected during the two school years, 1955 to 1957, the mean improvement was from about 1.31 when the student married to above 1.78 when he answered the questionnaire. The typical student, twenty-five years old at the time of the questionnaire, had been married for three years. Most of the students had attended college for a while before they married. Although for 12% of the cases grade averages remained the same, and for 8% of the cases grades were admittedly lower, for the 80% majority grade point averages were higher after marriage.<sup>2</sup>

Classifying the 5315 undergraduate men at the University of Wisconsin as (1) married veterans, (2) single veterans, or (3) nonveterans, Riemer tabulated the grade averages for

---

<sup>1</sup>Judson T. Landis and Mary G. Landis, Building a Successful Marriage (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 180.

<sup>2</sup>Lantagne, op. cit., pp. 83-85.

each category during second semester of the 1945-46 school year. For this semester the married and the single veterans, 79% of the undergraduates, achieved higher averages than the nonveterans. The married veterans, 24% of the veterans, achieved higher averages than the single veterans. Of 147 married veterans living in trailer camps, 43% had children. Grade averages of the veterans who had children were higher than those of the others in the trailer camps who had no children.

Riemer comments on the disclosure that the married veterans attained higher scholastic averages than the single veterans. He ponders whether married nonveterans would be likely to excel when compared to single nonveterans or whether war experiences cause particular motivations in reference to scholarship. Also, he speculates on a possible relationship between age of students and academic success. From this study of scholarship at the University of Wisconsin and from his prewar study of student marriages at the University of Washington, Riemer concludes that married students may be a select group, perhaps more intelligent and more sure of their professional ambitions than single students.<sup>1</sup>

In 1949, members of a conference on college marriages at the University of Illinois outlined some influences of

---

<sup>1</sup>Svend Riemer, "Married Veterans are Good Students," Marriage and Family Living, IX (February, 1947), 11-12.

marriage on grades. The consensus of the conference members was that grade averages of married students generally surpass those of single students and that the married students with children achieve higher grades than those without children. In their estimation, the differential in grades reflected several influences: (1) the general results of college marriages, (2) a selective factor, the students who marry being especially mature, responsible, and serious-minded, (3) the motivation which marriage affords, (4) increase in time for married students to study, as they are no longer dating, (5) the husband's realizing the necessity for education, and (6) a limited education for the wife.<sup>1</sup>

According to both Riemer's study at the University of Wisconsin and the conference on college marriages at the University of Illinois, married students with children attain higher grades than those without children. During the summer of 1950, three years after Riemer's article was published, Christensen and Philbrick interviewed 346 married couples living in the student housing area at Purdue University. The couples were asked whether children were an aid or a disturbance to their marriage adjustment in college. Children aided in marriage adjustment according to two-fifths of the couples;

---

<sup>1</sup>Proceedings of Conference on Campus Marriages, Champaign, Illinois, The Young Men's Christian Association of the University of Illinois, May 5, 1949.

another two-fifths of the couples replied that presence or absence of children had no effect on adjustment; that children disturbed marriage adjustment for college students was the opinion of one-fifth of the respondents. Husbands and wives usually gave similar answers; however, wives tended to say that one child aids, but that two children disturb marriage adjustment in college.

Christensen and Philbrick also asked fathers whether children were an aid or a disturbance to successful accomplishment of college work. Almost two-fifths of the fathers thought that children were a disturbing influence; one-fourth of those asked replied that children were an aid; the others expressed no definite opinions. More of the fathers of one child stated that children aided, while fathers of two or more children tended to consider them as a disturbance to accomplishment of college work.

In both of these situations, the effect of children on marriage adjustment in college and the effect of children on successful accomplishment of college work, the college students reported that increase in number of children results in a corresponding increase in disturbing influence. The couples who ranked higher on a marriage adjustment scale were more likely to think of children as an aid to marital adjustment in college and to successfully accomplishing

college work.<sup>1</sup>

Contrasting with the opinions of the Purdue University students, that an increase in number of children results in increased disturbance to college work, are those of fifty law students and their wives, discussed by Reid. His survey, "Fifty Pre-Practice Partnerships: What Law Students Can Learn From Them," summarizes information collected during the school year 1958-59 from one hundred respondents and represents law schools in twenty-one states. The responses are tabulated and organized as a group; possible influences of such factors as classification in law school, grade average, and marriage adjustment are not specified.

The law students and their wives who stated that children disturbed studying did not think that either the number or the ages of the children necessarily affected the amount of the disturbance to the accomplishment of college work.<sup>2</sup>

Results of a study by Jensen and Clark tend to contradict the claim that married students' grades are superior to those of single students. In 1957 the researchers selected,

---

<sup>1</sup>Harold T. Christensen and Robert E. Philbrick, "Family Size as a Factor in Marital Adjustment of College Couples," American Sociological Review, XVII (June, 1952), 310-11.

<sup>2</sup>Dennis N. Reid, "Fifty Pre-Practice Partnerships: What Law Students Can Learn From Them," The Student Lawyer, V (June 1960), 7.

from the Brigham Young University class of graduating seniors, the thirty-six men who had been married throughout the four undergraduate years. By the criteria of age and ability, according to score on the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, these married students were matched with thirty-six single seniors. Although comparisons of cumulative grade averages for the two groups disclosed that the mean for the students who had been single throughout college was slightly higher, the difference was not statistically significant. A control group of one hundred students randomly chosen from the senior class had exactly the same mean grade average as did the thirty-six married students.<sup>1</sup>

Foreman compared levels of aspiration of married and single students in five different areas: academic achievement, vocational, marital, life goals, and material assets. For respondents to his questionnaire, Seattle Pacific College students provided the random sample which consisted of 75 married couples, 101 single women, and 109 single men. The study, completed in 1957, showed married men to have higher aspirations in life goals, vocational areas, and academic areas; single men sought material assets. Married women were

---

<sup>1</sup>Vern H. Jensen and Monroe H. Clark, "Married and Unmarried College Students: Achievement, Ability, and Personality," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (October, 1958), 123-25.

more interested in their life goals; conversely, single women looked more for achievements in material assets, academic, marital, and vocational areas. In evaluating his study, Foreman concluded that the higher academic and other aspirations of married men were a consequence of marriage, not an antecedent condition.<sup>1</sup>

Many factors influence the scholastic achievement of students. At Jacksonville University, where one-third of the daytime students either are married or have home responsibilities and where four-fifths of the evening college students are married, Morton investigated the college performance of married and single students. The point of view of Morton's article, published in 1958, is that of college professors or administrators. Favoring the college performance of the married student, he cited these factors: stability, constructive motivation, diligence, sense of responsibility, maturity of thought, and ability to relate classroom material to life situations. Hindering the achievement of the married student, he listed several influences: preoccupation with his family, economic concerns, interest and responsibility in the community, frequent emergencies of illness or accidents, and taking trips. Results of Morton's interviews and questionnaires

---

<sup>1</sup>Clyde M. Foreman, "Levels of Aspiration and Marital Status on the College Campus," Dissertation Abstracts, XVII (University of Washington, 1957), 2082.

disclosed no sharp correlation between marital status and effective work in college. He found, instead, that "strong interaction" occurred between the home status of students and their college programs.<sup>1</sup>

### Summary

This chapter provides a description of the current trend toward marriage of students attending college, and it discusses several studies of scholarship of married students. Although conclusions of these studies give one the impression that marriage may influence the level of students' academic achievement, the precise effect and explanation of it is generally not clearly specified.

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard K. Morton, "College Training and the Married Student," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, XXXIV (December, 1958), 624-25.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD OF STUDY

#### General Method

The general method used to measure the effect of marriage on scholastic achievement is comparison of grade averages of married and single students. Grade averages are compared for the same students before and after their marriage and also for married and single students individually matched by scholastic aptitude test scores. Though the method was modified for the data available and for different aspects of the problem, one procedure was used throughout the study. A description of this procedure can consist of four parts: assumptions in study, selection of population, types of data, and treatment of data.

#### Procedure

A. Assumptions in study.--This study investigates the effect of marriage on scholarship of students considered to have approximately equal scholastic ability. The method of investigation is based upon three principal assumptions: (1) Grade averages provide a valid measure of scholastic achievement. (2) The criteria, such as aptitude test score, class, major subject, and age, for matching single and married

students are suitable and reliable. (3) The grade averages of the students are typical of those for married and single students who become seniors in college.

B. Selection of population.--Several factors influenced the choice of a population from which grade averages of students would be taken. It was immediately decided that the grade averages would be those of University of Arizona students. The population, tentatively, was expected to be selected from the total number of undergraduate students enrolled in daytime classes. Probably, too, the latest available grade averages would be preferred.

Three specific attributes were sought in the population. First, as the method of study was comparison of grades of married and single students, results would be more reliable if these students were as equally matched as possible. Secondly, in order to compare grade averages of students before and after their marriage, academic records of several semesters' study were needed. Thirdly, assuming that the number of married students would be fewer than the number of single students, a population with the highest possible number of married students should give a larger and, probably, more representative sample.

Of the populations considered, all married students compared with all single students or married students in a particular college compared with single students in the same

college or class, the senior class of 1958-59 appeared best to meet the above qualifications. The records for this class were available and nearly current. Since the married students automatically matched the single ones by classification, they should have similar schedules of study. Records of seniors, for as much as eight semesters, would be longer than those of any other undergraduate class. Also, as this class consisted of the older students, it probably would have more married students than the classes consisting of students less advanced in age and in college classification.

C. Types of data.--For this comparison of grade averages of married and single students, different types of data were used. Lists of students and their academic records came from the office of the registrar. The grade averages of the students were computed by multiplying the grade for each course by the number of units the course carried and then by dividing the sum of these products by the sum of the units of all courses taken during a given time. Final grades range from "1," superior, to "5," failure. For comparison of grades before and after marriage, knowledge of marriage dates was necessary; marriage dates were either on the student records kept in the alumni office or on cards filled out by the students and filed at the University press bureau. As a measure of scholastic aptitude, scores on the American Council on Education psychological examination, 1946 college

edition, were used. Total scores for the quantitative and linguistic parts of this test, available in the psychology department, were recorded in deciles. Decile scores range from "10," indicating high aptitude, to "1," indicating low scholastic aptitude.

D. Treatment of data.--The following chapter discusses specific variations in the treatment of data. Throughout the study, however, the senior class of 1958-59 was the population from which the married and single students were selected. Single students were matched with married students according to certain criteria, such as aptitude test score, college, major subject, age, and grade average for the first semester of the junior year. The study did not consider grades of students whose records showed them to be widowed or divorced or to be from countries other than the United States.

Results of these comparisons of grade averages are presented for the three divisions of the research and also are summarized for the study. For each of the three divisions, the results show the mean grade average for each group of married and of single students, the range of the grade averages, and the trends for the majority of students in each category. After these results are summarized, there is a statement of tentative conclusions.

## CHAPTER IV

### DIVISIONS OF THE RESEARCH

#### Introduction

A chronological survey of this study which attempts to illustrate the effect of marriage on scholarship will show the basis for dividing the student population into three categories. Although the general procedure used in the research was comparison of grade averages of married and single students of similar ability, the same major subject, and the same year in college, the method was modified to fit the data available.

From a list of over 1,000 seniors of 1958-59, the 344 who had begun college in the University of Arizona freshman class in 1954-55 were isolated. This group was taken for two reasons: (1) Grades of married seniors, presumably represented in this population, might be compared before and after the students married. (2) Scores on an aptitude test, required of beginning freshman, would serve as a standard for matching married and single students in scholastic potential.

Investigation of marital status for these 344 students disclosed that seventy, or about one-fifth, married by second semester of the senior year. Of these married students,

twenty-seven had married between May and September immediately before their senior year; eight had married before entering the University as freshmen. Because the education college had a majority, seventeen of the twenty-four married women, and the engineering college had the largest number, twelve of the forty-six married men, these two colleges appeared as categories suitable for comparison of grades of married and single students. In both of these colleges the number of married students whose grade averages could be compared with those of single students was fewer than anticipated. Either no aptitude test score was found for the married student or the student took very few courses in the senior year.

A third category compared grade averages of students before and after their marriage. This category was organized not only because the number of student grade averages in the former categories was small but also because, using a different approach, it might disclose new results. Forty-three students, fourteen women and twenty-nine men formed this category. These students, selected from a list of the 497 married seniors, had married between their junior and senior years and had been enrolled at the University of Arizona for both of these years.

The following sections will discuss these three divisions of the research: the sections will describe each part and tell the results of each.

Education College

A. Description.--For twenty seniors, women students in the college of education, senior year and cumulative grade averages were recorded in a comparison of scholastic achievement of married and single students. Ten single seniors were matched with ten married seniors by aptitude test score and major subject. Table 4 on page 30 shows the two grade averages for each student: (1) the senior year average, the mean grade for the two semesters of that year and (2) the cumulative average, the mean grade on all courses taken for credit at the University of Arizona. On this table, and on others, "M" designates a married student and "S," a single student.

B. Results.--The mean grades averages, the range of the grades, and the trend in grades for the majority of students serve as measures of scholastic achievement for the married and single seniors. The mean grade average for the senior year was higher for the married students, 1.5701, than for the single students, 1.8492. The range of the senior year averages was higher for the married students, 1.0000 to 2.0000, than for the single students, 1.5000 to 2.4000. The senior year average for six of the ten married students, compared with that for four of the ten single students, was above the mean for their group.

Because the married students in this category were single until their senior year, comparison of their senior

year average with their cumulative average indicates whether they achieved higher grades as married or as single students. With a similar comparison of grade averages for the single seniors, calculations can then show (1) the mean amount in each group by which the senior average is higher than the cumulative average and (2) the number of students in each group for whom the senior average is higher than the cumulative average. For both the married and the single seniors, the senior average tended to be the higher of the two averages. The mean difference between grades for the senior year and for the freshman through the senior year was greater for the married seniors, 0.4120 (from 1.9821 to 1.5701), than for the single seniors, 0.1662 (from 2.0154 to 1.8492). All ten married seniors and eight of the ten single seniors attained higher averages for the senior year than for the total of the four years. It was realized that the cumulative average for the four years overlapped with the senior year average; the former average was selected, instead of the average for the freshman through the junior year, because it was more readily available and because results would be similar in the comparison of either of these cumulative averages with the senior year average.

C. Summary.--Two statements can summarize the results of this survey of grades of ten married and ten single seniors in the college of education. For these married and single

TABLE 4

SENIOR YEAR AND CUMULATIVE GRADE AVERAGES  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Case	Decile of ACE	Major	Married Sr. Year		Single Sr. Year	
			Senior Average	Cumu- lative Average	Senior Average	Cumu- lative Average
M <sub>1</sub>	1	Special Ed.	1.3777	2.1041		
S <sub>1</sub>	1	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	1.8692	2.6080
M <sub>2</sub>	4	Elem. Ed.	2.1071	2.5444		
S <sub>2</sub>	4	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	1.6964	2.0650
M <sub>3</sub>	4	Kin. Pri. Ed.	1.4642	1.6185		
S <sub>3</sub>	4	El. & Kin. Pri.	. . . .	. . . .	1.8516	2.2857
M <sub>4</sub>	5	Elem. Ed.	1.8024	2.2566		
S <sub>4</sub>	5	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	2.4000	2.2330
M <sub>5</sub>	6	Special Ed.	1.4785	1.5703		
S <sub>5</sub>	6	English	. . . .	. . . .	1.5000	1.3785
M <sub>6</sub>	6	Elem. Ed.	1.2142 <sup>a</sup>	2.1680		
S <sub>6</sub>	6	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	2.0000 <sup>a</sup>	1.4250
M <sub>7</sub>	7	Elem. Ed.	1.4502	1.7435		
S <sub>7</sub>	7	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	1.8080	2.4000
M <sub>8</sub>	9	Elem. Ed.	1.6071	2.0168		
S <sub>8</sub>	9	Speech	. . . .	. . . .	1.3142	1.5227
M <sub>9</sub>	9	Kin. Pri. Ed.	2.2000 <sup>a</sup>	1.6875		
S <sub>9</sub>	9	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	1.9450	2.0461
M <sub>10</sub>	10	Elem. Ed.	1.0000 <sup>a</sup>	2.1111		
S <sub>10</sub>	10	Elem. Ed.	. . . .	. . . .	2.1071	2.1900
Total			15.7014	19.8208	18.4915	20.1540
Mean			1.5701	1.9821	1.8492	2.0154

<sup>a</sup>Average for first semester, only.

women students who were matched by aptitude test score and major subject, it was found that (1) the mean senior year average was higher for the married students than for the single students, and (2) the difference between the mean senior year average and the cumulative average was larger for the married seniors than for the single seniors, although for both groups the senior average was the higher of the two averages.

### Engineering College

A. Description.--For thirty-four seniors, men students in the college of engineering, cumulative grade averages were recorded in a second comparison of scholastic achievement, that of students who were single while they attended the University of Arizona with that of students who were married throughout the time they attended the University. Although students in this category include those who transferred to the University as well as those who entered as beginning freshmen, the cumulative average for each student represents from seven to ten semesters at the University of Arizona. The seventeen married students had been married from two months to three years before they entered the University; the mean length of the marriages was one year and ten months before enrollment at the University. The married students were matched with single students by aptitude test score and major subject. Cumulative averages of these engineering students are shown

by the table on pages 35-36.

B. Results.--The mean cumulative average for the single students, 2.5273, was higher by 0.0832 than that for the married students, 2.6105. The cumulative averages for the single students ranged from 1.7382 to 3.1538; for the married students the extreme grades were both higher and lower, 1.6666 to 3.3734. Seven of the seventeen single students and eight of the seventeen married students attained cumulative averages above the mean for their group.

To discern whether the averages of single students would be higher than those of the married students with whom they were matched in both the low and the high aptitude ranges, the two groups were subdivided into four groups. The divisions consisted of married and single students with aptitude test scores in deciles 2 through 5 and married and single students with scores in deciles 6 through 9. In both the low and the high decile ranges, the mean cumulative average was higher for the single students than for the married students, but more difference existed between the averages of married and single students in the low than in the high decile range. For the ten single students scoring in deciles 2 through 5 the mean cumulative average was 2.5474; for the corresponding married students the mean was 2.6878, the difference of 0.1404 favoring the single students. For the seven single students scoring in deciles 6 through 9 the mean cumulative average

was 2.4987; for the corresponding married students the mean was 2.5000, the difference of 0.0013 favoring the single students.

C. Summary. --From this survey of cumulative averages of seventeen married and seventeen single engineering students having similar aptitude test scores and major subjects, it became evident that (1) the mean cumulative average was slightly higher for the single men than for the married men, and (2) compared with married students with corresponding aptitude test scores, single students in both the low and the high range of aptitude test scores achieved the superior grades. Less difference did appear between the grades of the married and the single students who had the high aptitude test scores.

D. Comments. --The disclosure that the mean cumulative average for a group of single students was slightly higher than that for a matched group of married students is in accord with the results of Jensen and Clark's study of cumulative averages of married and single men at Brigham Young University. By matching the two groups by age and by ACE score, the writers attempted to prove that, other things being equal, married students would not necessarily attain better grades than single students.<sup>1</sup> Their results are contrary to those of, for

---

<sup>1</sup>Jensen and Clark, loc. cit.

instance, Riemer, whose comparisons of grades of all married and all single veterans for one semester at the University of Wisconsin showed that the married students had the higher averages.<sup>1</sup> Because the studies are conducted with different populations, on different bases, and at different times, it is hazardous to declare without qualification that research shows either married or single students to be the better scholars.

The second result of the survey, that differences in grade averages between the groups of married and of single students were less for those with high than with low scholastic aptitude, might warrant further investigation. Both the differential in the averages and the number of students represented were quite small; consequently a conclusion that in scholastic competition with their single counterparts married students with low scholastic aptitude have less chance of winning than those of high aptitude may hold only for this study.

---

<sup>1</sup>Riemer, loc. cit.

TABLE 5

CUMULATIVE GRADE AVERAGES  
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Case	ACE Decile	Major	Cumulative Grade Average	
			Married	Single
M <sub>1</sub>	2	Mech. Eng.	3.3734	
S <sub>1</sub>	2	Civil Eng.	. . .	2.7876
M <sub>2</sub>	2	Mech. Eng.	2.1678	
S <sub>2</sub>	2	Elec. Eng.	. . .	2.8055
M <sub>3</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	2.6950	
S <sub>3</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.7500
M <sub>4</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	3.0476	
S <sub>4</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	. . .	1.7515
M <sub>5</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	2.6783	
S <sub>5</sub>	3	Mech. Eng.	. . .	3.1538
M <sub>6</sub>	4	Elec. Eng.	1.6666	
S <sub>6</sub>	3	Elec. Eng.	. . .	2.0753
M <sub>7</sub>	4	Mech. Eng.	3.2773	
S <sub>7</sub>	4	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.8383
M <sub>8</sub>	4	Civil Eng.	3.0844	
S <sub>8</sub>	4	Mech. Eng.	. . .	3.0709
M <sub>9</sub>	4	Mech. Eng.	2.5472	
S <sub>9</sub>	4	Mech. Eng.	. . .	1.7382
M <sub>10</sub>	5	Elec. Eng.	2.3404	
S <sub>10</sub>	5	Elec. Eng.	. . .	2.5029
M <sub>11</sub>	6	Mech. Eng.	2.0779	
S <sub>11</sub>	6	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.0124
M <sub>12</sub>	6	Mech. Eng.	2.1532	
S <sub>12</sub>	7	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.9071

TABLE 5--Continued

Case	ACE Decile	Major	Cumulative Grade Average	
			Married	Single
M <sub>13</sub>	7	Mech. Eng.	3.1005	
S <sub>13</sub>	7	Mech. Eng.	. . .	3.0724
M <sub>14</sub>	8	Mech. Eng.	2.0000	
S <sub>14</sub>	8	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.6474
M <sub>15</sub>	8	Mech. Eng.	2.7062	
S <sub>15</sub>	8	Elec. Eng.	. . .	2.0000
M <sub>16</sub>	9	Mech. Eng.	3.3493	
S <sub>16</sub>	9	Elec. Eng.	. . .	2.8159
M <sub>17</sub>	9	Mech. Eng.	2.1145	
S <sub>17</sub>	9	Mech. Eng.	. . .	2.0357
Total			44.3796	42.9649
Mean			2.6105	2.5273

## Senior Class

A. Description.--For eighty-six seniors, students in seven colleges of the University of Arizona, junior year and senior year grade averages were recorded in a third comparison of scholastic achievement, that of the year before and the year after marriage. Grade averages of forty-three students who were single during the junior year but married throughout the senior year illustrate their scholarship for the two semesters before and the two semesters after marriage. Grade averages of the other forty-three students who were single during the junior and the senior year indicate usual changes in grades for single students between these years. By comparing the changes in grades in each group of students and between the two groups, one can evaluate the trends. The groups of married and single students were matched by sex, college, major subject, grade average for first semester of the junior year, and age at the end of the senior year. For the students Table 6 on pages 41-44 shows the mean grades for each year, calculated from the two semester averages of the year.

B. Results.--Though grades for both groups of students became higher, the mean change in grade averages from the junior to the senior year was slightly larger for the students who were single during both years than for those who were married throughout the senior year. The mean difference in grades between the junior and the senior year was for the

married seniors, 0.2668 (from 2.3443 to 2.0775), and for the single seniors, 0.2825 (from 2.4456 to 2.1631). Investigation showed that the changes in grade averages between the junior and the senior year were larger for the married women and the single men seniors than for the single women and the married men seniors. The mean differences in grades for the two years were for the married women seniors, 0.3342 (from 2.0349 to 1.7007), and for the single women seniors, 0.1749 (from 2.1218 to 1.9469). For the married men the difference in grades between the two years was 0.2343 (from 2.4937 to 2.2594), and for the single men seniors it was 0.3345 (from 2.6019 to 2.2674).

Considering both the junior and the senior year averages, the range of the grades was higher for the group which married than for the group which was single. Grades for the students who were married throughout the senior year ranged from 1.000 to 4.000; the range for the single students was from 1.1934 to 4.1666.

Grade averages of a majority of students in both groups were higher for the senior year than for the junior year, but for a larger proportion of the married seniors the grades for this year were higher. Of the forty-three married seniors, thirty-two had higher averages for the senior than for the junior year; of the forty-three single seniors, twenty-eight had higher averages for the senior year.

Investigating majority trends for the men and the women students separately, twenty of the twenty-nine married men and twenty-one of the twenty-nine single men had higher averages for the senior year. Twelve of the fourteen married women and seven of the fourteen single women had higher averages for the senior year than for the junior year.

C. Summary.--In this comparison of junior year grades with senior year grades for forty-three single and for forty-three married seniors of 1958-59, an effort was made to match single seniors with married seniors of the same college, major subject, sex, grade average for first semester of the junior year, and age. A survey of the grade averages indicated that (1) although grades for both the married and the single seniors were higher for the senior than for the junior year, the positive change was larger for the group which was single during the two school years, and (2) in each division, single versus married men seniors and single versus married women seniors, grades of the single men and of the married women showed the larger positive change between the two years.

D. Comments.--Realizing the difference in population, basis, and time involved in this study and in Lantagne's study of grades of men before and after marriage, one can compare two of the results. Lantagne, whose article is summarized on page 14, and this study agree that grades for 70 to 80% of men

students became higher after than before their marriage.

Lantagne also states, "Grade point averages of married men are higher and continue to improve over those of men that remain single while in college."<sup>1</sup> This study compared differences between grade averages for the junior and the senior year. The grades of the juniors who remained single improved more than those of the juniors who married before the senior year. Lantagne, like Riemer, may have been considering all married men versus all single men instead of a matched group of married and single students.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lantagne, op. cit., p. 91.

TABLE 6

## JUNIOR AND SENIOR YEAR GRADE AVERAGES, SENIOR CLASS

College and Major	Case	Age	1st Semester Jr. Year Average	Junior Year Average	Senior Year Average
Women					
Agriculture					
Home Ec. Ed.	M <sub>1</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.4666	2.2333	1.9182
Home Ec. Ed.	S <sub>1</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.7647	2.7674	1.6562
Home Ec. Ed.	M <sub>2</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.2777	1.2270	1.0000
Home Ec. Ed.	S <sub>2</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.8823	1.8412	1.4436
Bus. & Pub. Adm.					
Gen. Business	M <sub>3</sub>	22	3.8125	3.5625	2.9000
Gen. Business	S <sub>3</sub>	22	3.2000	3.0375	2.6000
Personnel Mgmt.	M <sub>4</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.1333	3.1083	2.6250
Personnel Mgmt.	S <sub>4</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.8235	2.9502	3.0000
Education					
Elem. Ed.	M <sub>5</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.5294	1.6176	1.0000
Elem. Ed.	S <sub>5</sub>	22	1.8235	1.7642	1.9450
Elem. Ed.	M <sub>6</sub>	23	2.8823	2.7352	1.8315
Elem. Ed.	S <sub>6</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.5000	2.4558	2.2849
Elem. Ed.	M <sub>7</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.3750	1.4952	1.4502
Elem. Ed.	S <sub>7</sub>	21	1.3529	1.3640	1.5520
Elem. Ed.	M <sub>8</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.3125	2.2500	1.6071
Elem. Ed.	S <sub>8</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.3529	2.1470	2.1642
Elem. Ed.	M <sub>9</sub>	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.4117	1.5808	1.0000
Elem. Ed.	S <sub>9</sub>	21	1.1764	1.4215	1.5357
Kin. Pri. Ed.	M <sub>10</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.3125	1.2562	1.4642
Kin. Pri. Ed.	S <sub>10</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.1764	1.4411	2.2142
Speech	M <sub>11</sub>	22	1.6470	1.4900	1.4786
Speech	S <sub>11</sub>	22	1.5625	1.7224	1.3142

TABLE 6--Continued

College and Major	Case	Age	1st Semester Jr. Year Average	Junior Year Average	Senior Year Average
Education					
Special Ed.	M <sub>12</sub>	22	2.0625	1.7450	1.3778
Special Ed.	S <sub>12</sub>	22½	3.0714	2.4940	1.7750
Fine Arts					
Art Ed.	M <sub>13</sub>	22	1.8823	1.8358	1.9816
Art Ed.	S <sub>13</sub>	22	2.3333	1.9902	2.0044
Liberal Arts					
Journalism	M <sub>14</sub>	22	2.7058	2.3529	2.1764
Journalism	S <sub>14</sub>	21	2.2666	2.3098	1.7678
Men					
Agriculture					
Agr. Economics	M <sub>1</sub>	22½	3.3750	3.3051	2.1824
Agr. Economics	S <sub>1</sub>	22½	1.5000	1.7500	1.8166
Agr. Economics	M <sub>2</sub>	23	2.8888	2.9110	2.8084
General Agr.	S <sub>2</sub>	21½	2.6666	2.5833	2.4105
Bus. & Public Adm.					
Business Ed.	M <sub>3</sub>	26	2.8125	2.9356	3.1050
General Bus.	S <sub>3</sub>	23½	2.7692	2.9140	2.4154
General Bus.	M <sub>4</sub>	22	2.2000	1.9750	1.6580
General Bus.	S <sub>4</sub>	21½	2.3333	2.7500	3.1762
General Bus.	M <sub>5</sub>	22	3.6875	3.2723	2.5625
General Bus.	S <sub>5</sub>	20½	3.4615	3.4676	2.5294
General Bus.	M <sub>6</sub>	24½	4.0000	4.0000	3.2770
General Bus.	S <sub>6</sub>	23	3.8333	3.1666	2.4166
Education					
Recreation	M <sub>7</sub>	23	3.7777	3.4797	3.6622
L.A., Gen. Studies	S <sub>7</sub>	21½	3.2142	2.9012	2.8611

TABLE 6--Continued

College and Major	Case	Age	1st Semester Jr. Year Average	Junior Year Average	Senior Year Average
Engineering					
Civil Eng.	M <sub>8</sub>	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.7500	2.8125	2.1404
Civil Eng.	S <sub>8</sub>	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.6666	2.3690	1.9642
Civil Eng.	M <sub>9</sub>	23	3.0714	3.1071	3.3547
Civil Eng.	S <sub>9</sub>	24	3.2666	3.1333	2.8235
Civil Eng.	M <sub>10</sub>	24	2.1873	1.7701	1.3470
Civil Eng.	S <sub>10</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.6470	2.8235	2.8235
Civil Eng.	M <sub>11</sub>	23	2.1666	2.1421	1.8284
Civil Eng.	S <sub>11</sub>	24	1.8461	2.2802	3.1785
Elec. Eng.	M <sub>12</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.2142	3.2737	2.4338
Elec. Eng.	S <sub>12</sub>	21	2.9444	2.8610	2.3990
Elec. Eng.	M <sub>13</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.3333	1.2292	1.4754
Elec. Eng.	S <sub>13</sub>	22	1.2777	1.2500	1.1934
Mech. Eng.	M <sub>14</sub>	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.5000	3.6875	2.0125
Mech. Eng.	S <sub>14</sub>	25	3.6470	3.7235	2.5026
Mech. Eng.	M <sub>15</sub>	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.0000	2.5938	2.9112
Mech. Eng.	S <sub>15</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.6666	2.7083	1.8364
Mech. Eng.	M <sub>16</sub>	23	2.0625	2.4756	2.6496
Mech. Eng.	S <sub>16</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.2500	2.4583	2.0411
Fine Arts					
Music Ed.	M <sub>17</sub>	23	2.1111	2.0556	1.5000
Music Ed.	S <sub>17</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.5000	2.2500	1.6250
Speech Cor.	M <sub>18</sub>	22	2.0000	1.6000	1.5166
Speech	S <sub>18</sub>	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.1538	2.3582	1.9706
Liberal Arts					
English	M <sub>19</sub>	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.0769	3.0884	2.7666
English	S <sub>19</sub>	22	3.2307	3.1154	2.2250

TABLE 6--Continued

College and Major	Case	Age	1st Semester Jr. Year Average	Junior Year Average	Senior Year Average
Liberal Arts					
Gen. Studies	M <sub>20</sub>	21½	2.0000	2.1333	2.1250
Gen. Studies	S <sub>20</sub>	22	1.6875	1.5790	1.8326
History	M <sub>21</sub>	23	3.5000	2.9166	2.5941
History	S <sub>21</sub>	24½	3.3636	2.5484	1.7500
History	M <sub>22</sub>	22	2.1176	2.2532	1.9372
History	S <sub>22</sub>	23½	2.1333	2.4490	2.2294
Mathematics	M <sub>23</sub>	21½	1.2500	1.2614	1.0000
Mathematics	S <sub>23</sub>	22	2.7000	2.4083	2.6979
Physics	M <sub>24</sub>	28	2.6875	2.8438	4.0357
Physics	S <sub>24</sub>	24	3.2500	3.0138	2.6666
Sociology	M <sub>25</sub>	21½	2.1428	2.1008	1.6490
Sociology	S <sub>25</sub>	21½	4.8333	4.1666	2.5992
Mines					
Metal. Eng.	M <sub>26</sub>	22	2.6842	2.1362	1.7301
Metal. Eng.	S <sub>26</sub>	21½	2.3529	2.2598	2.2598
Min. Eng.	M <sub>27</sub>	21½	1.1111	1.1746	1.0500
Min. Eng.	S <sub>27</sub>	22	1.4210	1.5914	1.6121
Min. Eng.	M <sub>28</sub>	27	1.8000	1.7500	2.0062
Min. Eng.	S <sub>28</sub>	29	2.5000	2.3382	1.9563
Min. Eng.	M <sub>29</sub>	25	2.1176	2.0338	2.2053
Min. Eng.	S <sub>29</sub>	25½	2.2777	2.2388	1.9442

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

#### Conclusions

From the exact results of the research shown by Tables 7 and 8, one can draw conclusions for this study. Parts 1 and 2 of Table 7 list mean grade averages for groups of students with similar scholastic aptitude and courses of study; it is evident that: (1) women who marry immediately before their senior year attain higher grade averages for that year than do single women, and (2) cumulative averages of single men are slightly higher than those of married men. For students taking similar courses, parts 1 and 3 of this table show that: (3) in comparison with senior year grades of single men and women, senior year grades are lower for the men, but higher for the women who marry just before the senior year. Table 8 lists the number of students in particular groups for whom grades are higher for the senior year than for other years. It shows that: (4) compared with an equal number of single men and women, fewer married men and more married women attain higher grades for the year after marriage than they had before marriage. Grades for a majority of both married and single students become higher as the students continue in college.

TABLE 7

## SUMMARY OF MEAN GRADES

Category	No. of M or S Stu- dents	Married	Single	Difference for	
				Married	Single
1. Education College					
Sr. yr. average	10	1.5701	1.8492	0.2791	. . .
Dif. in sr.- cumulative av.	10	0.4120	0.1662	0.2458	. . .
2. Eng. College					
Cumulative av.	17	2.6105	2.5273	. . .	0.0832
Cumulative av. decile 2-5	10	2.6878	2.5474	. . .	0.1404
Cumulative av. decile 6-9	7	2.5000	2.4987	. . .	0.0013
3. Senior Class					
Dif. in jr.-sr. year grade av.					
a. men and women	43	0.2668	0.2825	. . .	0.0157
b. women	14	0.3342	0.1749	0.1593	. . .
c. men	29	0.2343	0.3345	. . .	0.1002

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHOSE SENIOR YEAR GRADE AVERAGES  
ARE ABOVE THEIR AVERAGES FOR PREVIOUS YEARS

Category	Possible Total for M or S	M	S	Total for M & S	No. of Students in Sample
Education College Cu.-sr. average	10	10	8	18	20
Senior Class					
Jr.-sr. for all	43	32	28	60	86
Jr.-sr. women	14	12	7	19	28
Jr.-sr. men	29	20	21	41	58

#### Suggestions for Further Study

Conclusions of this study of the effect of marriage on scholastic achievement indicate that marriage has a positive effect on the grades of women and a slightly negative effect on the grades of men. Unless these conclusions can be supported by other studies, they should be considered as tentative, true only for this particular study. This limitation on the validity of the conclusions is necessary for two reasons: (1) other influences besides marital status, likely affected the grade averages, although they were not accounted for in this study, and (2) because the population considered was a selected group, not a random sample, the differential found in the grade averages can indicate only a trend. Had the

population consisted of a random selection of married and single students, one could have determined whether or not differences in grade averages were statistically significant.

Developments in this study suggested other feasible approaches to the subject of scholarship of married students. First, a longer survey of students' grades, possibly for two years before and two years after marriage, might prove useful. In the present study comparing senior year averages, one-third of the married women in the education college finished in one semester; one-third of the married men in the senior class had not finished by the end of the two semesters, although all of the single men had been graduated by that time. If there is a trend, as was indicated in the fourth conclusion of this study, for students to have higher grades as they continue in college, perhaps the results are biased in favor of the married women and against the married men.

The case study method might be used also to investigate reasons for the differential in grades between married and single students and between married men and women students. Field interviews with students should disclose other factors besides marital status, such as part or full-time employment and non-academic interests, which affect the grades of students.

Although this study showed no consistent positive correlation between ACE score and grade average, another

approach to this subject would be to determine whether marriage has a different effect on students' grades, depending upon their scholastic aptitudes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Landis, Judson T., and Landis, Mary G. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Merrill, Francis E. Courtship and Marriage. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1959.

### ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Beaty, Jeanne Kellar. "We Sweat Out Our Campus Marriage," Saturday Evening Post, April 14, 1956. 58-81.
- Christensen, Harold T., and Philbrick, Robert E. "Family Size as a Factor in Marital Adjustments of College Couples," American Sociological Review, XVII (June, 1952), 306-12.
- Christopherson, Victor A., Vandiver, Joseph S., and Krueger, Marie N. "The Married College Student, 1959," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (May, 1960), 122-28.
- Foreman, Clyde M. "Levels of Aspiration and Marital Status on the College Campus," Dissertation Abstracts, XVII (University of Washington, 1957) 2082
- Hansen, Jeanette. "How We Combine Education and Marriage," Journal of Home Economics, LI (November, 1959), 786-87.
- Havemann, Ernest, "To Love, Honor, Obey, and Study," Life, May 23, 1955, 152-66.
- Jensen, Vern H., and Clark, Monroe H. "Married and Unmarried College Students: Achievement, Ability, and Personality," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (October, 1958), 123-25.

- Kirkendall, Lester. "Married Undergraduates on the Campus: An Appraisal," *The Coordinator*, V (December, 1956), 54-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Too Young to Marry*, Vol. CCXXXVI of New York Public Affairs Pamphlet. New York Public Affairs Committee, 1956.
- Landis, Judson T. "On the Campus," *Survey Midmonthly*, LXXXIV (January, 1948), 17-19.
- Lantagne, Joseph E. "Do Married Men Succeed in College? College Marriage Inventory," *The Journal of School Health*, XXIX (February, 1959) 81-91.
- "The Married Student," *Newsweek*, March 4, 1957, p. 92.
- Mead, Margaret. "Is College Compatible With Marriage?" *Clemson Alumni News*, XIII (July, 1960), 8-10.
- Morton, Richard K. "College Training and the Married Student," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, XXXIV (December, 1958), 624-27.
- Proceedings of Conference on Campus Marriages, Champaign, Illinois, The Young Men's Christian Association of the University of Illinois, May 5, 1949.
- Reid, Dennis N. "Fifty Pre-Practice Partnerships: What Law Students Can Learn From Them," *The Student Lawyer*, V (June, 1960), 7-23.
- Riemer, Svend. "Married Veterans Are Good Students," *Marriage and Family Living*, IX (February, 1947), 11-12.
- Rogers, Everett M. "Effect of Campus Marriages on Participation in College Life," *College and University*, XXXIII (Winter, 1958), 193-199.
- Ross, Sid, and Kiester, Ed. "College Marriages - Good or Bad?" *Parade*, June 5, 1960. pp. 6-7.
- Skidmore, Rex, Smith, Therese, and Nye, Delbert. "Characteristics of Married Veterans," *Marriage and Family Living*, XI (Summer, 1949), 102-104.
- Staudt, Virginia M. "Attitudes of College Students Toward Marriage and Related Problems: II Age, Educational, Familial, and Economic Factors in Marriage," *Journal of Psychology*, XXXIV (July, 1952), 95-106.

"Subsidized Marriage," Ladies' Home Journal, LXVI (December, 1949), 58-196.

U. S., Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, "School Enrollment: October, 1959," Series P-20, No. 101 (May 22, 1960).