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Learning Outcomes

As a result of this program, participants will be able to:

• Describe trends in the extant literature on triples
• Describe how the social and physical environment influences residents
• List strategies for reducing the negative effects of living in a triple
Overview

- Background
- Campus context
- Research approach
- Findings
- Implications for practice
Background

- Most of the research was conducted during the 70s and 80s
- Living in a triple influences spatial and social density
- Experience of students in triples varies by corridor length, floor level, and gender
- Two residents in a triple might form a coalition, thus isolating the third resident
Research Approach

- Identified students in triples
- Identified isolates
Measures

- Staff performance
- Floor climate
- Safety
- Floor empathy
- Floor community
- Personal development
## Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangement</strong></td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Roommate?</strong></td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not triple</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days in Triple</strong></td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not triple</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 7 days (less than 1 week)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 28 days (1 to 4 weeks)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 - 56 days (1 to 2 months)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 or more days (2 or more months)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: Percentages may not sum to 100, due to rounding error.
### Relative Effects and Factorial Analysis of Variance of Differences in Experiences by Room Type and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Relative Effects</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room Type</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Room Type x Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>F(df₁, df₂)</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Performance</td>
<td>.604 .433</td>
<td>.571 .453</td>
<td>1.71(1, 855) .192</td>
<td>13.00 &lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.01 .960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Climate</td>
<td>.533 .475</td>
<td>.545 .472</td>
<td>0.07(1, 755) .789</td>
<td>5.24 .022</td>
<td>2.51 .114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.604 .445</td>
<td>.604 .413</td>
<td>4.06(1, 807) .044</td>
<td>60.24 &lt;.001</td>
<td>4.89 .027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Empathy</td>
<td>.610 .447</td>
<td>.568 .436</td>
<td>0.34(1, 769) .559</td>
<td>40.97 &lt;.001</td>
<td>0.24 .625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Community</td>
<td>.598 .468</td>
<td>.574 .414</td>
<td>0.30(1, 816) .583</td>
<td>75.81 &lt;.001</td>
<td>0.32 .570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>.558 .468</td>
<td>.537 .470</td>
<td>0.30(1, 840) .587</td>
<td>4.96 .026</td>
<td>&lt;0.01 .967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Relative effects represent the degree to which respondents in one group score high or low on a dependent variable relative to the scores of all of the respondents. Higher values correspond to higher ratings. Statistical significance was set at the .05 level. Significant differences are in **bold**.
Results

Gender:
Gender difference for all measures with men rating their experience greater than women

Room Type:
Difference for safety with triples feeling less safe than doubles

Room Type by Gender:
Interaction for safety. Women in triples felt less safe.
### Relative Effects and Factorial Analysis of Variance of Differences in Experiences by Resident Type and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Relative Effects</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stand. Dyad Isolate</td>
<td>Resident Type Gender Res. Type x Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. F. M. F. M. F.</td>
<td>F(df1, df2) Sig. F Sig. F Sig. F Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Performance</td>
<td>.604 .433 .582 .485 .543 .384</td>
<td>7.27(2, 198) .002 8.37 .004 0.24 .727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Climate</td>
<td>.533 .475 .558 .506 .510 .397</td>
<td>3.28(1, 192) .054 5.92 .016 1.49 .229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.604 .445 .622 .419 .556 .400</td>
<td>3.14(1, 190) .060 34.10 &lt;.001 1.07 .329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Empathy</td>
<td>.610 .447 .567 .467 .571 .369</td>
<td>4.16(2, 198) .026 31.69 &lt;.001 2.87 .073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Community</td>
<td>.598 .468 .567 .482 .591 .269</td>
<td>11.93(2, 219) &lt;.001 61.97 &lt;.001 4.26 .023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>.558 .468 .534 .522 .544 .358</td>
<td>10.11(2, 213) &lt;.001 6.38 .012 2.44 .101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Relative effects represent the degree to which respondents in one group score high or low on a dependent variable relative to the scores of all of the respondents. Higher values correspond to higher ratings. Statistical significance was set at the .05 level. Significant differences are in **bold**.
Results

Differences emerge once one looks at the experience of isolates!

Resident Type:
Staff performance, floor empathy, floor community, and personal development

Room Type by Gender:
Interaction for floor community. Female isolates were less satisfied
Satisfaction

$\chi^2(2) = 0.49, \ p > .05$

Residential Satisfaction by Room Type

I am satisfied with my on-campus experience
Satisfaction

\[ \chi^2(2) = 1.40, \ p > .05 \]

I would recommend on-campus housing to new students
Satisfaction

χ²(2) = 14.11, p < .001,
Cramer’s V = .104

Residential Satisfaction by Room Type

Are you planning to return to on-campus housing next year?

Note: A = Anti-type (frequency is lower than expected);
T = Type (frequency is higher than expected).
Recommendations

- Support and engage students in triples
- Give students the option of choosing their roommates
- Improve floor community
- Support the social integration of women in triples
- Promote student learning
Other Recommendations

- Ensure proper social integration of all students
- Consider how to identify and support isolates
- Consider physical space – triple some rooms, not others
- Encourage staff to make meaningful connections with all residents
Other Strategies

What do you do on your campus to support triples?
Questions?

Thank you for coming!
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