

Samuel Kai Wah Chu · Kevin Kin Man Yue ·  
Christina Wai-Mui Yu · Elaine Suk Ching Liu ·  
Chun Chau Sze · Kevin Conn · Elsie Ong ·  
Michelle Wing-tung Cheng · Jingyuan Fu ·  
Shida Hou *Editors*

# Evolving Landscape of Residential Education

Enhancing Students' Learning in  
University Residential Halls

# Evolving Landscape of Residential Education

Samuel Kai Wah Chu · Kevin Kin Man Yue ·  
Christina Wai-Mui Yu · Elaine Suk Ching Liu ·  
Chun Chau Sze · Kevin Conn · Elsie Ong ·  
Michelle Wing-tung Cheng · Jingyuan Fu ·  
Shida Hou  
Editors

# Evolving Landscape of Residential Education

Enhancing Students' Learning in University  
Residential Halls



Springer

*Editors*

Samuel Kai Wah Chu  
University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Christina Wai-Mui Yu   
Department of Social Sciences  
Education University of Hong Kong  
Tai Po, Hong Kong

Chun Chau Sze   
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
Singapore, Singapore

Elsie Ong   
University of Northampton  
Northampton, UK

Jingyuan Fu   
Faculty of Education  
University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Kevin Kin Man Yue   
The School of Chinese Medicine  
Hong Kong Baptist University  
Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong

Elaine Suk Ching Liu   
City University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Kevin Conn  
New York University  
New York, NY, USA

Michelle Wing-tung Cheng  
Education University of Hong Kong  
Tai Po, Hong Kong

Shida Hou   
Guanghua School of Stomatology  
Sun Yat-sen University  
Guangzhou, China

ISBN 978-981-16-8905-5      ISBN 978-981-16-8906-2 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8906-2>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.  
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721,  
Singapore

# Contents

## Part I Introduction

1 A Review of Current University Residential Settings ..... 3  
Michelle Wing-tung Cheng and Samuel Kai Wah Chu

## Part II Models and Outcomes

2 A New Theoretical Model Through Which to Examine  
Student Residence Life Outcomes ..... 15  
Michelle Wing-tung Cheng

3 Residential Education in the US ..... 25  
Kevin Conn

## Part III Current Programmes and Case Studies

4 Optimising Students' Learning in Residential Halls:  
A Case Study of How to Connect Hall Life Education  
with Community Service ..... 37  
Elaine Suk Ching Liu

5 Care Across Borders Through Hall Life Education  
Programmes: Case Studies from Hong Kong Baptist University ... 49  
Kevin Kin Man Yue

6 Deeper Experiential Engagement Projects (DEEP)  
in Residential Halls: Equipping for the Future ..... 63  
Chun Chau Sze

## Part IV Students' Voices

7 Attaining Graduate Attributes Through Hall Life Education:  
Perspectives of Local and Non-local Residents ..... 77  
Kevin Kin Man Yue

<b>8</b>	<b>ASK: An Undergraduate's Growth Through International Residential Education Experience .....</b>	<b>85</b>
	Rosetta Wai-Chung Law and Christina Wai-Mui Yu	
<b>9</b>	<b>A Comparison Between HKU Residential Life and Residential Life in the US .....</b>	<b>101</b>
	Kevin Conn and Katie Ling	
<b>10</b>	<b>Introducing Financial Literacy to Residential Colleges' General Education: A Systematic Review .....</b>	<b>111</b>
	Jingyuan Fu, Shida Hou, and Christina Wai-Mui Yu	

## **Part V Ongoing Research and Implications**

<b>11</b>	<b>Comparison of How Residential Hall Experience Impacts Hong Kong University Students' Development .....</b>	<b>131</b>
	Elsie Ong and Samuel Kai Wah Chu	
<b>12</b>	<b>Capacity Building for Advancing and Sustaining Residential Education .....</b>	<b>151</b>
	Christina Wai-Mui Yu	
<b>13</b>	<b>Strengthening the Alignment of Residential Educational Aims and University Educational Aims .....</b>	<b>161</b>
	Michelle Wing-tung Cheng and Samuel Kai Wah Chu	

## **Part VI Future Directions and Conclusion**

<b>14</b>	<b>Summarising Chapter .....</b>	<b>181</b>
	Michelle Wing-tung Cheng, Christina Wai-Mui Yu, Kevin Conn, Chun Chau Sze, Elsie Li Chen Ong, and Samuel Kai Wah Chu	

# **Part I**

## **Introduction**

# Chapter 1

## A Review of Current University Residential Settings



Michelle Wing-tung Cheng and Samuel Kai Wah Chu

**Abstract** This chapter first gives a brief introduction of the aims of this book, providing a global overview of current residential hall systems. It then looks at the rich tradition and history of university residential halls from an educational perspective. A review of the relevant literature with regard to the university residential setting is also provided to illustrate the importance of university residential halls. The chapter concludes by examining current difficulties and challenges encountered by residential communities.

**Keywords** University residential hall systems · Educational value · Difficulties and challenges · Residential communities

### Introduction

Most universities around the world provide residential accommodation; yet, only a few, such as Harvard University, the University of Oxford, and the University of Cambridge, perceive residential halls as part of the higher education curriculum and as providing educational value. Since interpretations of residential education vary among universities and countries, this chapter first describes the history of university residential halls. Then, it provides an overview of current residential hall systems worldwide and examines them from an educational perspective. At the end of the first chapter, a review of relevant literature in regard to the challenges encountered in university residential settings is elaborated upon, so that educators and researchers who are interested in the field may further work on the identified issues to enhance the educational value of university residential halls.

---

M. W. Cheng (✉)

Graduate School, The Education University of Hong Kong, Tai Po, Hong Kong  
e-mail: [chengwt@edu.hk](mailto:chengwt@edu.hk)

S. K. W. Chu

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong

## The Origins of the University Residential System

‘Residential university’ is a concept that was newly raised by the end of the thirteenth century. Neither Oxford nor Cambridge was established as a residential university when it was founded. However, a university residential model named the Oxbridge model emerged from these two medieval universities, in the hope of providing a better and safer teaching and learning environment for scholars and students.

As one of the oldest universities in Western society, Oxford grew rapidly after 1167, when students were banned from attending the University of Paris by the British government (Morris, 1978). Social conflicts between students and townspeople arose during the medieval period, as the British King granted more privileges regarding food and shelter to Oxford students. These privileges directly harmed the interests of merchants in the town, as well as deepening social inequality, which resulted in intense relationships between the town and the university in the late twelfth century. Fierce riots broke out when town authorities did not consult orthodox bodies and hanged two Oxford scholars after accusing them of causing the death of a woman. These events resulted in the suspension and reform of Oxford, including the establishment of primitive halls of residence to protect students. Therefore, this context led to the founding of the two oldest colleges in Oxford: Balliol College (1263) and Merton College (1264).

During the suspension of Oxford, some scholars took refuge from hostile townspeople by moving from Oxford to Cambridge (Morris, 1978). This migration led to the establishment of the University of Cambridge (Leedham-Green, 1996). However, students in Cambridge were exploited by townspeople there and had to pay for overcharged rooms and food (Roach, 1959). To prevent similar incidents from occurring again in Oxford, the British King tried to ensure the protection of scholars by providing shelters for students through the absorption of hostels in the town. As a result, colleges were able to house students and the first college in Cambridge, Peterhouse (1284), was founded.

## The Existing Residential System Worldwide

With the colonisation of North America, nine colonial colleges, including intuitions such as Harvard and Princeton, were founded based on the Oxbridge Model (Blimling, 2014). In the 1930s, Harvard implemented their residential college system: ‘the housing system’. It was the first university in the United States to put forth a residential college and has kept the housing arrangement to this day to mitigate socioeconomic disparities. Substantial efforts and resources are invested in the development of the Harvard community, including the provision of academic, personal, and social counselling and community services for students. Academic advisers, peer advising fellows, resident deans, and proctors help first-year students with both academic and personal matters. Under the housing system, all first-year students

are required to live in Harvard Yard, which has shared suites and dining halls that are exclusive to freshmen. After their first year, freshmen enter the housing lottery through blocking groups (Under the current upper-class housing system, “blocking groups” are self-selected groups of one to eight freshmen who are placed into the same house) (Herwitz & Siegal, 2017); then, each group is sorted into one of the 12 Harvard Houses. The author of this chapter randomly interviewed several students at Harvard. According to the respondents, over 95% of undergraduate students often choose to stay in residential houses throughout their undergraduate years at Harvard, although it is not compulsory to do so after freshman year.

At Princeton, all freshmen are assigned to one of six colleges, and upper-class housing is employed after their first year. On-campus housing for undergraduate students is guaranteed and the school has organised academic workshops and seminars in residential halls to provide academic support to students through residential education (Hageman, 1879). The author also interviewed students at Princeton. According to the respondents, residential life is central to the Princeton experience, with 98% of undergraduates living on campus. Intellectual exchange is emphasised at the college; students function as small groups, interacting with and being inspired by academic tutors and senior students.

In the above residential systems, every student at each institution has the opportunity to experience the residential system for at least one academic year. Residential experiences are not limited to lodging; they also provide opportunities for personal and social development, as well as career and academic support. Later in the twentieth century, the US National Institute of Education proposed the construction of ‘living-learning programs’ (LLPs) in university residential halls (Inkelas, 2008; Inkelas et al., 2008; Inkelas et al., 2008; Inkelas & Soldner, 2011). LLPs are defined as academic and/or extracurricular programmes that are tailored for undergraduates who live together in halls of residence (Soldner & Szelényi, 2008, p. 15). To put the idea of LLPs into practice, external parties, such as faculties and student affairs offices, take the initiative to host various LLPs in halls for student residents (Inkelas et al., 2008).

The long history of campus residency in Western countries and the concept of the residential university have slowly become more popular around Asia. For instance, the University of Hong Kong took reference from the Oxbridge model and was established as a residential-based university in 1912. However, LLPs are not a new concept in Asian countries. The University of Macau has transformed itself into a residential-college university since 2014, providing all undergraduate students with at least one year of residential experience. The school requires all full-time academic staff members to commit one hour per week to resident development services, such as providing support for student learning beyond the classroom and organising activities that challenge students to take responsibility and grow, according to Chen (2017). Prior to that, the National University of Singapore (NUS) clustered residential spaces and learning facilities to launch its University Town in 2008, in order to promote the nexus of living, learning, and working in residential colleges (Chan & Ng, 2008). This system is different from conventional residential halls in Singapore, which have minimal learning activities structured within their operations.

In 2011, a partnership between Yale University and the NUS gave rise to the Yale-NUS College. Never intended to be a carbon copy of Yale University, it has incorporated Singapore and South East Asian contexts into its curriculum. However, its residential college system mirrors that of Yale and other leading universities in the United States, effectively infusing liberal arts and science education into residential living (Bailyn, 2020). The Yale-NUS College creates ‘nested communities’ that support lifelong learning in liberal arts and sciences by combining academic, intellectual, social, cultural, athletic, and artistic life. It encourages students to pursue a co-curricular life of student governments, clubs, and organisations, so as to develop leadership, independence, agility, and strength of mind. The student-government system enshrines core values of transparency; all meetings are open to the student body, student concerns are effectively reported to all administrative arms, and accountability is employed, with all committees having student members acting as monitors for input and oversight. The college also sponsors education programming events, invites guests for tea, and offers programmes to enhance students’ intellectual and cultural experiences. The intercultural engagement of the college activates diversity consciousness and enables dialogues among students to cultivate greater bravery and inclusiveness. The college advocates a culture of self-discovery through knowledge sharing and self-exploration. In case students need any help, there are professional support staff standing by. Emotional safety plans, solidarity meals, and meditation are offered monthly as spaces for healing. The living-and-learning experience between classroom and community defines the residential model of the Yale-NUS College.

Nanyang Technological University (NTU) Singapore, on the other hand, has opted to layer a residential education scheme over its existing conventional residential halls, starting in 2014 with two pilot halls and progressively expanding to all 22 undergraduate halls by 2018. Although most residential activities remain extra-curricular, creative projects leveraging links between hobbies and academic disciplines have been weaved into the overall fabric of the NTU residential halls, carving a co-curricular learning niche to strengthen holistic education (Pang et al., 2016).

## University Residential Education

Residential colleges, which are responsible for providing residence, catering, socialising activities, and academic support to students under the Oxbridge model, have paved the way for university residential education. In the history of campus residency, the possibility of bringing the potential of education to students’ residential environment among education institutions was raised long ago (Astin, 1977; Chickering, 1969; O’ Hara, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Schroeder & Mable, 1994), particularly in its roles and impacts on student residents. For instance, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) compared undergraduates who were and were not living on campus. The results demonstrated that university residential experiences led to better persistence and a significantly higher graduation rate among students. Another key study, which followed 101 undergraduates for five

years to track their personal development, found that social competencies and the appreciation of diversity were higher among those who had residential experience (Magolda, 1992). In addition, Astin (1999) mentioned that students who participate in residential activities to support and build hall communities engage in learning experiences that have a positive impact on their education and personal development. However, Blimling (1989) found that simply living in residential halls does not necessarily support the contention that halls have a significant effect on students' attitudes, values, academic performance, or intellectual or psychosocial development. Current research related to university residential education is scarce, particularly in regard to student residential learning outcomes and different structured/unstructured residential programmes. Although some residential universities claim to facilitate residents' whole-person development via student residential experience, a formal evaluation of whether or not residential halls have achieved these goals is lacking, and there are now doubts that such goals can actually be fulfilled (Cheng & Chan, 2019).

### ***Sense of Belonging***

Past research has reached a consensus that residential experience promotes a sense of belonging to one's university. According to Hughes (1994), residence halls are the home in which students can develop an identity during the intensive learning period. Past research has investigated the differences between commuter students and resident students in regard to their social development on campus (Lima, 2014; Winston & Anchors, 1993). Studies revealed that, compared to resident students, commuters generally get involved less in on-campus activities and student organisations. As a result, commuters generally feel more isolated and less socially active on campus. Residential halls serve as a safety net for students to explore campus. According to Rinn (2004), 'the safety a student feels within a residence hall community can thus serve as a starting point for student exploration' (p. 69). Residents create different social circles and build peer relationships with each other in residential halls. According to the review panel on residential hall education and culture, 'hall members work hard to sustain their particular hall culture, values and identity, often encapsulated in distinctive names' (The University of Hong Kong Media, 2017, p. 1). A close-knit community can be created within each hall (Spanierman et al., 2013). When residents are strongly committed to it, a sense of belonging and bonding are created. Social identification within the residential hall can help residents to adjust to university life both academically and socially (Braxton & Mundy, 2001). Residence halls provide a social platform for residents' interactions and further encourage a sense of community, thereby reducing levels of university student departure.

## ***Academic Achievement***

The relationship between residential experience and academic achievement is uncertain. A meta-analysis was conducted by Blimling (1989), which selected 21 studies among published research regarding halls of residence in higher education across 20 years. The results suggested that students living in halls generally have better academic performance, but this result became insignificant when prior academic achievement was controlled. These results are aligned with a study in America that studied the quality of residential education by distributing questionnaires to 2678 residents (Pike et al., 1997). There was no significant increase regarding students' interactions with faculty staff or the frequency with which they accessed academic resources on campus. Students' first-year college experiences revealed that academic achievement and persistence were not directly or indirectly improved by their residential experience. However, Astin (1973) found a positive relationship between living in residential halls and GPA. Similarly, another study shows that on-campus accommodation with living-learning centres can positively affect students' academic development (Inkelas et al., 2007). Thus, the results of previous literature are not only inconclusive, but were also conducted a long time ago. The latest related research concerns how the architecture of residence halls may affect students' academic outcomes (Brown et al., 2019), but there is still a lack of current studies examining how different types of residential experiences may affect students' academic performance.

As mentioned above, there is an absence of current research on the effectiveness of residential education. López et al. (2010) noted that the actual mechanisms of how student residents benefit from their residential experiences are still unknown and there is a lack of standardised assessment addressing how student residents benefit from residential experiences. University residential halls provide unique student involvement in the collegiate setting, which may have a distinct influence on students' development and learning, different from in-class or other out-of-class experiences. Given that actual residence life outcomes are still doubtful, the effectiveness of university residential experiences in student development remains as a question. López et al. (2010) believed that there are still missing pieces in the puzzle of why some students benefit from residing on campus and some do not. It is believed that students' social activities in residential settings should be examined to understand the actual mechanisms underlying this issue, as Terenzini et al. (1996) stated that the real advantage of university residential halls does not necessarily stem from the hall itself, but rather from the opportunities and activities for socialisation facilitated by the living space. Without a thorough understanding of how residents may benefit from residential experiences, it is difficult to design and create educational and meaningful residential experiences for students.

## Challenges to Creating Educational Residential Experiences

Although residential systems are different in various countries and universities, similar challenges have been identified in creating meaningful residential education that facilitates student development. First, internationalisation efforts within higher education have led to rapid increases in non-local students. Students with diverse life experiences, such as in their political, cultural, racial, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds, are housed together (Crisp & Turner, 2011). Although this presents opportunities to promote cultural integration, it requires extra efforts to integrate people from different walks of life. As cultural diversity in residential halls may lead to lifestyle conflicts and language barriers among residents, this may further discourage or inhibit students in regard to becoming involved in residential hall life (Blimling, 2014). Yet, some studies suggest otherwise, stating that conflicts are short-lived and students can become more open and accepting of cultural differences by living with very different people (Levine & Dean, 2012). Despite this possibility, it is unclear how cultural integration can be facilitated in hall communities.

Second, peer influence is a double-edged sword in regard to students' residential experiences. It is no wonder that residential halls were described as containing cohesive social atmospheres (O'Hara, 2016), as they are places where students build friendships and meet new people. According to Blimling (2014), this complex social system of the residential peer environment has the potential to create positive learning experiences for students. Unlike living at home, where students can take a break from socialising with their peers, living in residential halls forces residents to interact with and befriend others who are living under the same roof, especially their roommates, people who live on the same floor and residential tutors (Cheng & Chan, 2021). Residential halls provide students with many opportunities to practise interacting with others in different situations. However, residential halls also have the power to create negative peer influence on student residents. For instance, past studies have found that occurrences of binge drinking and drug abuse are significantly higher among hall residents than among commuters (Brower et al., 2003; Novik & Boekeloo, 2013; White et al., 2006).

Third, a clear and updated list of factors affecting student involvement in residential halls has not yet been established. The latest lists were developed a decade ago, reporting that intangible factors, such as students' gender, subject of study, relationships with resident tutors, and frequency of interactions with peers and faculty members have significant impacts on students' involvement in residential halls (Arboleda et al., 2003). It is not certain if such lists are still applicable today; for example, current studies have found that gender no longer plays a significant role in student hall involvement (Chu et al., 2019), while the quality and quantity of resident assistants may have more influence on residents than expected (Cheng & Chan, 2020). Thus, there is a lack of consensus regarding how various factors affect student involvement, leading to challenges in creating educational residential experiences that attract students to participate in halls.

Fourth, researchers do not have a clear understanding of the residence life outcomes that students can develop through residential hall experience. Although structured LLPs are popular around the world, Inkelaas and Soldner (2011) have criticised these residential hall programmes for lacking a systematic focus of research on their effectiveness in delivering the student residence life outcomes the programmes are designed to promote. Without knowing what residence life outcomes can be developed, it is difficult to create the kinds of residential experiences that can facilitate student development. According to Bronkema and Bowman (2017), evidence proving connections between specific characteristics of residence halls and desired residence life outcomes is almost non-existent. Although Cheng and Chan's (2019) study provided an updated reference with which to understand students' residence life outcomes in non-LLP residential settings, their work was not tested in LLP settings.

Fifth, despite there being residential educational aims that have been commonly shared by local universities, the particular residential educational aims of institutions generally diverge from one another. Stated or unstated residential educational aims have not been measured regarding their alignment with each university's educational aims. Therefore, it is still unclear whether or not residential activities are conducted in a way that facilitates the achievement of university educational aims.

This chapter has presented the history of residential halls, as well as their current development. It has also discussed the lack of research on student residential experiences and residence life outcomes. After describing the challenges that university residential communities encounter, it is hoped that future studies will be conducted to address the identified problems, as well as to provide evidence-based recommendations for the development of better residential environments that are beneficial to student development and the advancement of university residential education.

## References

Arboleda, A., Wang, Y., Shelley, M. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2003). Predictors of residence hall involvement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(4), 517–531. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2003.0036>

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297–308.

Bailyn, C. (2020). Diversifying the liberal arts curriculum in an Asian Context. In *Diversity and inclusion in global higher education* (pp. 163–181). Palgrave Macmillan.

Blimling, G. S. (1989). A meta-analysis of the influence of college residence halls on academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30(4), 298–308.

Blimling, G. S. (2014). *Student learning in college residence halls: What works, what doesn't, and why*. Wiley.

Braxton, J. M., & Mundy, M. E. (2001). Powerful institutional levers to reduce college student departure. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 3(1), 91–118. <https://doi.org/10.2190/M127-V05B-5E5J-F9LQ>

Bronkema, R., & Bowman, N. A. (2017). A residential paradox? Residence hall attributes and college student outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 58(4), 624–630. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0047>

Brower, A. M., Golde, C. M., & Allen, C. (2003). Residential learning communities positively affect college binge drinking. *NASPA Journal*, 40(3), 132–152. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1260>

Brown, J., Volk, F., & Spratto, E. M. (2019). The hidden structure: The influence of residence hall design on academic outcomes. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(3), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2019.1611590>

Chan, D., & Ng, P. T. (2008). Developing transnational higher education: Comparing the approaches of Hong Kong and Singapore. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 17(3), 291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678790801700306>

Chen, H. (2017, August 30). *Learning outcomes of the residential colleges at the University of Macau*. The University of Hong Kong. <http://www.cetl.hku.hk/conf2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Haydn-CHEN-Learning-Outcomes-of-the-RCs-at-UMac-2016.5.pdf>

Cheng, M. W., & Chan, C. K. (2019). Do university residential experiences contribute to holistic education? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1659211>

Cheng, M. W., & Chan, C. K. (2021). ‘Invisible in a visible role’: A photovoice study exploring the struggles of new resident assistants. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(5), 688–703. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1812547>

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Chu, S., Chau, A., Chung, R., Chong, E., Ong, E., & Tam, A. (2019). A comparison of residence hall experience for students of different backgrounds. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(3), 326–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2019.1582428>

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(2), 242–266. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021840>

Hageman, J. F. (1879). *History of Princeton and its institutions* (Vol. 2). JB Lippincott & Company.

Herwitz, E., & Siegal, G. (2017, March 9). *Blocked out: Deconstructing Harvard’s housing system*. The Harvard Crimson. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2017/3/9/deconstructing-harvards-housing-system/>

Hughes, M. (1994). Helping students understand and appreciate diversity. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 190–217). Jossey-Bass.

Inkelas, K. K. (2008). *National study of living-learning programs: 2007 report of findings*. University of Maryland. <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/8392>

Inkelas, K. K., Daver, Z. E., Vogt, K. E., & Leonard, J. B. (2007). Living–learning programs and first-generation college students’ academic and social transition to college. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(4), 403–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9031-6>

Inkelas, K. K., & Soldner, M. (2011). Undergraduate living–learning programs and student outcomes. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 1–55). Springer.

Inkelas, K. K., Soldner, M., Longerbeam, S. D., & Leonard, J. B. (2008). Differences in student outcomes by types of living–learning programs: The development of an empirical typology. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(6), 495–512. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-008-9087-6>

Inkelas, K. K., Soldner, M., & Szelenyi, K. (2008). Living–learning programs for first year students. In W. Zeller (Ed.), *Residence life programs and the new student experience* (pp. 53–67). National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Leedham-Green, E. S. (1996). *A concise history of the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.

Levine, A., & Dean, D. R. (2012). *Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today’s college student*. Wiley.

Lima, M. C. M. (2014). *Commuter students’ social integration: The relationship between involvement in extracurricular activities and sense of belonging* (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University). PQDT Open. <https://pqdtopen.proquest.com/pubnum/3617177.html>

López Turley, R. N., & Wodtke, G. (2010). College residence and academic performance: Who benefits from living on campus? *Urban Education*, 45(4), 506–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085910372351>

Magolda, M. B. B. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development*. Jossey-Bass.

Morris, J. (1978). *The Oxford book of Oxford*. Oxford University Press.

Novik, M. G., & Boekeloo, B. O. (2013). Comparison of student self-reported and administrative data regarding intercession into alcohol misuse among college freshmen dormitory residents. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54(2), 202–208. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2013.0016>

O'Hara, R. J. (2006, November 27). *Four foundations for the renewal of university life*. Collegiate Way. <http://collegiateway.org-foundations/>

Pang, N., Sze, C. C., Tan, O. K., Lwin, M., & Kwok, K. W. (2016). *Making connections: Fieldwork and visual arts at the studio@ CresPion Halls of residence at National Technological University*. HKU Centre for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning. <https://www.cetl.hku.hk/conf2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Studio-Paper-FINAL-v2.pdf>

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. Jossey-Bass.

Pike, G. R., Schroeder, C. S., & Berry, T. R. (1997). Enhancing the educational impact of residence halls: The relationship between residential learning communities and first-college experiences and persistence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(6), 609–621.

Rinn, A. (2004). Academic and social effects of living in honors residence halls. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council: Online Archive*, 173.

Roach, J. P. C. (Ed.). (1959). *A history of the county of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 3, the city and University of Cambridge*. British History Online. <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/cambs/vol3>

Schroeder, C. C., & Mable, P. (1994). *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls*. Jossey-Bass.

Soldner, M., & Szelényi, K. (2008). A national portrait of today's living-learning programs. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 35(1), 14–31.

Spanierman, L. B., Soble, J. R., Mayfield, J. B., Neville, H. A., Aber, M., Khuri, L., & De La Rosa, B. (2013). Living learning communities and students' sense of community and belonging. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(3), 308–325. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2013-0022>

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 149–162.

The University of Hong Kong Media. (2017, February 5). *Towards a holistic education: Transforming education culture*. The University of Hong Kong. [https://www.hku.hk/press/news\\_detail\\_15889.html](https://www.hku.hk/press/news_detail_15889.html)

White, B. P., Becker-Blease, K. A., & Grace-Bishop, K. (2006). Stimulant medication use, misuse, and abuse in an undergraduate and graduate student sample. *Journal of American College Health*, 54(5), 261–268. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.54.5.261-268>

Winston, R. B., & Anchors, S. (1993). Student development in the residential environment. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 25–64). Jossey-Bass.

## **Part II**

# **Models and Outcomes**

# Chapter 2

## A New Theoretical Model Through Which to Examine Student Residence Life Outcomes



Michelle Wing-tung Cheng

**Abstract** To understand students' development through their unique residential experiences, a new model is proposed to explain factors that affect students' hall involvement, particularly in regard to how various residential experiences may result in different student residence life outcomes. The model is built upon a preliminary framework that consists of the input-environment-output model (Astin's student involvement theory) and the presage-process-product (3P) model. It is crucial to first understand how the residential environment has impacts on student involvement and development, before any practical recommendations or interventions are given to the residential community. Adopting this new model can enable researchers and stakeholders to better understand student dynamics in university residential settings.

**Keywords** Residential experiences · Residential outcomes · Theory of student involvement · Presage-process-product model

### Introduction

Various university residential systems exist around the world; yet, no consensus has been reached regarding how to understand student residential experiences and their residential outcomes. There is an absence of a structured framework with which to investigate student development in non-academic contexts. To better understand student residential outcomes after living in halls, this chapter combines two existing theories—the theory of student involvement (specifically, the input-environment-outcome model) and the presage-process-product (3P) model—to propose a new student involvement model for university residential halls. The new model complements the I-E-O model by including the cognitive elements of students, while also taking into account the 3P model by considering the impact of the environment.

---

M. W. Cheng (✉)

Graduate School, The Education University of Hong Kong, Tai Po, Hong Kong

e-mail: [chengwt@eduhk.hk](mailto:chengwt@eduhk.hk)