Michigan State University

From the SelectedWorks of Larry D. Long

June 16, 2013

Oh No – Not Triples! The Impact of Tripling on Residents

Larry D Long, Michigan State University
Paul Goldblatt, Michigan State University
Darlena Jones

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/lldlong/35/
Oh No – Not Triples!
The Impact of Tripling on Residents

Larry Long, Michigan State University, @LongLarryD
Paul Goldblatt, Michigan State University
Darlena Jones, Ph.D., EBI MAP-Works, @DarlenaJones
Impact of Tripling on Residents?

**Upsides?**

Planned Tripling...

**Forced Tripling...**

**Downsides?**
Prior Research in Tripling

- 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
Summary of National Research

2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
EBI MAP-Works Products
Benchmarking Assessments

Student Affairs
- Residence Life (Housing)
- College Union/Student Center
- Fraternity/Sorority
- First-Year Seminar Assessment
- Campus Diversity
- Academic Advising (NEW!)
- Recreation Services (NEW!)

Academic Affairs
- Nursing Education
- Management Education
- Engineering Education
- Teacher Education
2011-2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment

• **Assessment Stats**
  – 272 institutions from USA, Canada, Australia, and Qatar
  – 75% of institutions surveyed online (203 institutions)
  – 26% of institutions surveyed in fall (71 institutions)
  – Surveyed 672,000+ residents
  – Collected 324,000+ responses
    • Average response rate = 48%
    • Response Range 10% to 99%
Is Tripling Common?

Number of People in a Bedroom

- One, 23%
- Two, 63%
- Three, 8%
- Four+, 6%

25,430 residents in triples during 2011-2012 academic year!

Of those in Triples, class standings...

- First Yr, 68%
- So, 19%
- Jr, 10%
- Sr, 4%

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
The majority of institutions have few residents in triples...

But a sizable percentage of institutions have a lot of students in triples.

- No students in triples: 1%
- 1% to 5% of students in triples: 58%
- 6% to 10% of students in triples: 15%
- 10% to 20% of students in triples: 14%
- > 20% of students in triples: 12%
227 institutions (of the 270 participating institutions) reported their residence requirement...

- No Requirement, 2%
- First-Year, 39%
- Sophomore, 28%
- Junior, 27%
- Senior, 4%

Does residence requirement impact an institution's likelihood to triple?

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Residency Requirement vs. Tripling

Institutions without residency requirement are less likely to triple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No students in triples</th>
<th>1% to 5% of students in triples</th>
<th>6% to 10% of students in triples</th>
<th>10% to 20% of students in triples</th>
<th>&gt; 20% of students in triples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Res Requirement</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman / First-Year</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EBI gathered IPEDS data on 262 institutions (of the 270 participating institutions) regarding Institutional Size and Control.

Reference: 2012 IPEDS data
Institutional Size

More mid-large institutions have fewer residents in triples, but... They are also more likely to have a large number of triples. Interesting...

- 20k+ students: 0% 60% 24% 10% 6%
- 10k to 20k students: 1% 61% 4% 14% 21%
- 5k to 10k students: 0% 56% 16% 16% 12%
- < 5k students: 1% 45% 16% 27% 11%

- No students in triples
- 1% to 5% of students in triples
- 6% to 10% of students in triples
- 10% to 20% of students in triples
- > 20% of students in triples

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Institutional Control

Private institutions are more likely to place residents in triples

Private 0% 35% 11% 41% 13%

Public 0% 67% 18% 3% 11%

No students in triples 1% to 5% of students in triples
6% to 10% of students in triples 10% to 20% of students in triples
> 20% of students in triples

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Are there areas where residents in triples rate their experience higher than residents in singles?
Opportunities?

Do these results surprise you?

Largest difference

While the differences aren’t huge – it does prove that there is value in tripling…

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Participation in Hall Activities

How often do you participate in hall/apt programs/activities?

- Never or rarely, 40%
- Sometimes, 45%
- Often or very often, 15%

Positive peer pressure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never or rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often or very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triples</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents in triples are more likely to get involved.
Which areas should we focus on to improve experience for residents in triples?
Do these results surprise you?

How do we mitigate the effects of triples?

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Alcohol Use: Mixed Results?

Triples are more likely to abstain…
- 41%

… and more likely to drink often
- 39%
- 20%

Singles
- 39%
- 46%
- 15%

Triples are more likely to abstain… and more likely to drink often.

And, of those who drink…

Triples
- 30%
- 30%
- 40%

Singles
- 39%
- 30%
- 31%

Negative peer pressure?

Students in triples drink more.

Reference: 2012 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment
Quick Summary on National Results

Triples are not rare (couldn't resist image!)
- 14% of residents reside in triples/quads
- Nearly every institution triples.

Who triples?
- Mid-large and private institutions are more likely to triple more residents

Opportunities?
- Some areas (e.g., Personal and Diverse Interactions) are improved by tripling.
- Residents in triples are more likely to get involved.

Challenges?
- Most areas (e.g., Facilities, Room, Safety/Security) are lower among residents in triples.
- Alcohol use is greater.
Michigan State

Institutional Context
Michigan State University Housing Facts

- 24 residence halls, over 15,700 residents at start of 2011 – 2012 academic year
- Over 7,900 first-time freshman in halls
- MSU has a freshman live-on requirement
- Approximately 96% of first-time freshmen live on-campus
- Temporary tripling due to over-assignment
- Only first-year and transfer students were tripled
2011 – 2012 Floor Community Survey

- On-line survey sent to all on-campus residents
- Occurred late October – early November
- Utilized 7-point Likert scale for most questions but also included open-ended questions
- Students shared gender, race/ethnicity, status (domestic, international), class standing
- 7,874 respondents (51.5% response rate)
- Incentives offered for responses
2011 – 2012 Floor Community Survey

• Examined student perceptions in the following areas:
  – Floor Climate and Safety
  – Student Learning and Development
  – RA Feedback
  – Overall Residential Experience

• Provided information about students’ housing plans for following year

• Tool for evaluating RA and planning for rest of academic year
Is there a difference in the residential experience of students in doubles and triples?
Assessment Approach

- Secondary analysis of institutional data
- Identified students in triples
- Focused on the 5 buildings with the most triples

Assessment report available at: http://works.bepress.com/ldlong/31/
Sample Characteristics

Living Arrangement

- Double: 67%
- Triple: 33%

Dyad or Isolate?

- Dyad: 75%
- Isolate: 25%

33% of isolates lived with roommates who requested one another

1,303 respondents
Comparing Triples and Doubles

Experience of triples is comparable to experience of doubles.

Largest difference:
- Floor community
  - Triple: 5.25
  - Double: 5.05

Statistically significant:
- Safety
  - Triple: 6.13
  - Double: 6.20

Comparing Triples and Doubles

Experience of triples is comparable to experience of doubles.
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 effect for safety. Women in triples felt less safe.
Comparing Isolates, Dyads, and Doubles

Do these results surprise you?

Statistically significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>Double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor community</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor empathy</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor climate</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff performance</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 effect for floor community. Female isolates were less satisfied
What about satisfaction??
Satisfaction: Doubles vs. Triples

I am satisfied with my on-campus experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would recommend on-campus housing to new students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction: Isolates, Dyads, and Doubles

I am satisfied with my on-campus experience

- Isolate: 69% (Yes), 19% (Neutral), 12% (No)
- Dyad: 79% (Yes), 17% (Neutral), 5% (No)
- Double: 75% (Yes), 18% (Neutral), 7% (No)

Dyads were more satisfied

I would recommend on-campus housing to new students

- Isolate: 78% (Yes), 17% (Neutral), 6% (No)
- Dyad: 85% (Yes), 11% (Neutral), 3% (No)
- Double: 83% (Yes), 12% (Neutral), 5% (No)
Residential Retention

Percentage of respondents who returned to on-campus housing

- Double residents had a retention rate of 15.2%
- Dyad residents had a retention rate of 58.4%
- Isolate residents had a retention rate of 54.4%

Tripled residents were more likely to live on-campus for another year.
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
Additional Recommendations

- Manage resident expectations
- 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
• Good news: Among triples…
  • More participation
  • Personal interactions higher

• Not-so-good news: Among triples
  • Most satisfaction/learning metrics lower
  • Alcohol use mixed

• The “third” person (isolate) might feel left out
• Focus on building social integration among all students, especially women who change rooms
• Consider physical space when tripling

National Perspective

Institutional Perspective

What do you do on your campus to support triples?