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Abstract
With the rapid development of Chinese universities and colleges in the past few years, there has been a significant increase in the population of enrolled students accompanied by a big expansion of campus area. These changes have influenced and are influencing the campus residential environment and lifestyles. As a result, the issue of their relationships should call for more attention. Due to the differences in personal values and campus lifestyles, students’ demands on the residential environment show diversity. In the case study of Hangzhou City, China, viewpoints concerning personal attributes, residential preferences and campus conditions to represent the residential lifestyles on campus were introduced and analyzed. Six university campuses were selected as survey objectives in order to comprehensively demonstrate campus environment conditions in the city. Four patterns of campus residential lifestyle were classified by residential preferences; and their characteristics were compared through subjective evaluation and objective conditions. The results of this research provide the basic data for future work in the improvement of the Chinese campus environment. Furthermore, the methodology of characterizing residential lifestyles may bring about a new useful perspective for further research on the evaluation of residential environment.

Keywords: campus lifestyle; preference; residential environment; evaluation

1. Introduction
In China, a change in the system of university and college campuses has taken place during the past five years. The population of college students is increasing at an annual rate of 15% on a national level. More new campuses and buildings are changing the shape and formation of universities as well as students’ daily lives. In the central cities, where most universities and colleges are located, the type of life on campus has become a crucial part of the urban lifestyle. College campuses are distinctive for their planning, which must incorporate learning, research, sports, leisure and residence, because most students live on campus. As a result, the campus is not only an educational zone in a city, but a multi-functional complex.

Improvement in the quality of the residential environment of college campuses is one of the important goals of city policy and urban planning. Nowadays, a striking number of college campus constructions are being implemented nationwide. The issue is now focused on how to evaluate the campus residential environment. In research concerning residential environment, the evaluation model is one of the basic and most important topics. Most of the research dealt with a general evaluation model by considering the common conditions. Asami.Y. (2001) concluded the main methods and theories for residential environment evaluation. Naito.M., Morita.T. (1995) constructed the relationship between environmental indices and design. Xu.L., Yang.G (1996) conducted a general survey of residential environments in Shanghai City, China. Ge.J., Hokao.K. (2004) explored residential environments in Saga City, Japan. The existing research in residential environment evaluation focuses on the general evaluation system at a city level. In fact, environment evaluation is closely connected with the different types of residents’ characteristics and their residential lifestyles. As a result, it is necessary to deepen the residential environment evaluation of some specific residential groups. In this paper, the campus residential environment evaluation considering campus lifestyles will be examined.

In the limited literature on campus environment, the focus is mainly on the spatial formation, cultural atmosphere and landscape. Lin.Y., Hu.Z. (1992) introduced the cognitive map into campus environment design, focusing mainly on visual image from an architectural viewpoint. Zheng. M. (2001) emphasized the influence of the evaluation system in the process of campus planning. Zhu.X, Wu. S. (2002) built up a multi-level evaluation model concerning building quality, transportation, landscape and so on. However, existing research on campus environment stresses...
the apparent factors of campus environment only, neglecting psychological factors, such as residential preferences and lifestyle.

In this paper, based on the case study of Hangzhou City, the approaches embodying the residential lifestyles on campus are explained first. Then, through the campus surveys, the residential lifestyle types are classified, and the characteristics of each type are examined. Furthermore, the relationship between residential lifestyles and residential environment evaluation is analyzed. The results regarding environmental users’ diversity can help planners produce more pertinent designs during future campus planning processes. This research not only provides basic data for the improvement of campus residential environment quality, its methodology considering residential lifestyles also provides a new and useful perspective for further research concerning the urban residential environment.

2. Campus residential lifestyles

Lifestyle is generally understood as the typical way of life of an individual, group or culture. Ge.J., Hokao.K. (2004) combined a residential environment evaluation with the lifestyle in a local city in Japan. In this research, the key point is the lifestyle related to campus residence, and is defined as campus residential lifestyle. As most of the faculty of the universities or colleges do not live on campus, the majority of the residents are students. The structures and components of campus residential lifestyle are very comprehensive and complicated, with many interactive factors and personal differences. As shown in Fig.1., we proposed three approaches to embody this concept: the first is “personal attributes”; the second is “residential preferences”; and the third is “campus conditions and building conditions”. The first approach mainly refers to demographic attributes of residents (students) such as age, gender, major composition, and residential attributes such as number of roommates, length of residential period, ownership of residence, intention of permanent residence; the second approach mainly concerns the subjective personal preferences to choose residence; the third one considers the objective conditions of campuses and buildings, such as campus location, social conditions, age of building, and dorm layout. These three aspects are considered the main factors in determining the campus residential lifestyles. It not only covers the viewpoints of objective conditions and subjective preferences, but also combines both human and substantial factors. In the discussion of each sub-item of the three aspects, the corresponding satisfaction evaluation result is presented to explain how these items influence the evaluation. Finally, as a result, the classification of campus residential lifestyles will be ascertained based on the environment evaluation.

3. General conditions of the survey area

The study area is composed of six campuses, which are located around Hangzhou city. They are: Yuquan Campus and Xixi Campus of Zhejiang University (abbr. ZJU-YQ & ZJU-XX); Wenyi Campus of Zhejiang Gongshang University (abbr. ZGU-WY); Wenyi Campus of Hangzhou Teacher College (abbr. HTC-WY); Zijingang Campus of Zhejiang University (abbr. ZJU-ZJG); and Xiasha Campus of Zhejiang University of Science (abbr. ZJUS-YS). According to their different geographic, natural and social features, we can classify them into three types (shown as Fig.2. and Table 1.). Although influential factors concerning the campus environment are numerous, we chose location and surrounding condition as the criteria for classifying these six campuses.

Type A may be named Scenic Type, which is near the landscape area. ZJU-YQ (No.1) and ZJU-XX (No.2) are located in the Xihu District, the famous tourism district area noted for its beautiful natural and cultural landscape. The two campuses are more than 50 years old; some buildings are new but densely located.

Type B may be named Shopping Type, which is near the district center. ZGU-WY (No.3) and HTC-WY (No.4) are located in the northern shopping center of the city, characterized by a dense population and complete shopping facilities. Both campuses are more than 25 years old and the buildings are mostly old and densely located.

Type C may be named Suburban Type, which is located on the outskirts of the city. ZJU-ZJG (No.5) and ZJUS-YS (No.6) are located on the eastern edge and northwest edge of the city respectively, both of which are new cultural and educational areas. At present, there is a lack of municipal facilities and the population is sparse.

RA: Regression Analysis; ANOVA: Analysis of Variance; PCA: Principle Component Analysis; CA: Cluster Analysis
Fig.1. Methods for Determining Campus Residential Lifestyles
4. Questionnaire survey

From Feb. through March 2004, questionnaire surveys were performed on six campuses of Hangzhou City. A total of 850 respondents were selected randomly and each one delivered a questionnaire. The total valid response ratio was 65.9%. The questionnaire was made up of 51 questions in three parts, i.e. personal attribute, residential preference and satisfaction evaluation regarding residential environment, shown in Table 2. In the satisfaction evaluation system, a multi-level model of index is built up according to the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), including five factors, i.e. Convenience, Amenity, Health, Safety and Community. Under each factor, there are corresponding sub-factors.

5. Data Analysis

We first analyzed the satisfaction evaluation on the residential environment through the approaches of mean comparison and RA (Regression Analysis), to establish a general evaluation model to determine the residents' perception towards their campus residence. We then tried to establish a more detailed evaluation model by considering personal attributes and residential preferences through the approaches of ANOVA, PCA (Principle Component Analysis), and CA (Cluster Analysis), in order to examine the influence of residential lifestyles on residential environment evaluation.

5.1 General satisfaction evaluation

The general satisfaction evaluation results regarding residential environment are shown in Fig.3., where evaluations are given by students in terms of satisfaction using 5-grade scales: 5 (very satisfied); 4 (satisfied); 3 (ordinary); 2 (dissatisfied); and 1 (very dissatisfied). We can see that the evaluation of the campus on the item Safety and Health is the highest (3.36, 3.16), while Amenity and Convenience are the lowest (2.84, 2.92). There is a favorable response on the management of safety and health in the campuses. In contrast, building quality, landscape, daily shopping facilities/services are dissatisfaction.

Comparing the three types of campuses, analysis of variance shows that campus conditions of location and social background are powerfully influencing the students' evaluation of campus environment. Type A, defined as scenic type, has the highest total score for amenity and

| Table 1. Comparison between the 3 Types of Campuses in Hangzhou City |
| --- |
| **Campus Name** | **Length (years)** | **No. of Students** | **Land Area (Ha)** | **Floor Area (M²)** | **Type** | **Description** |
| No.1. ZJU-YQ | 52 | 10,000 | 120 | 700,000 | A: Scenic | Near the West Lake and the Plant Park |
| No.2. ZJU-XX | 52 | 7,000 | 50 | 350,000 | A: Scenic | Near the travel sites: the Yellow Dragon Cave and the Gem Hill |
| No.3. ZGU-WY | 52 | 5,000 | 25 | 200,000 | B: Shopping | Located in the north center of the city. |
| No.4. HTC-WY | 52 | 5,000 | 25 | 200,000 | B: Shopping | Located in the north center of the city. |
| No.5. ZJU-ZJG | 3 | 13,000* | 200* | 600,000* | C: Suburban | Located in the northwest suburb of the city. |
| No.6. ZJUS-XS | 2 | 18,000 | 66.7 | 317,750 | C: Suburban | Located in the eastern suburb of the city. |

*Only the eastern part of Zijingang Campus, Zhejiang University by 2004; ** Both of the eastern and western parts by 2006.

Fig.2. The Location of the Six Campuses in the Survey, Hangzhou City

| Table 2. Structure of Questionnaire |
| --- |
| **Question Contents** | **Question Number** |
| Personal Attribute | Age, Sex, Occupation, Time spent on the way to work, Family structure, Residential period, Hobby, Ownership, etc. | 15 |
| Residential Preference | Residential preference when selecting dwellings | 18 |
| Satisfaction Evaluation regarding Residential Environment | Convenience: Shopping, Facility, Parking, Inside and Outside Transportation, Service | 6 |
| | Amenity: Landscape, Street, Building | 3 |
| | Health: Water, Sound, Air, Garbage | 4 |
| | Safety: Prevention of Disaster, Accident, Crime | 3 |
| | Community: Cultural Tradition, Management | 2 |
community because of its location and history. Type B, defined as shopping type, has the highest score for convenience and safety. Type C, defined as suburban type, was evaluated to have the least scores on all factors as a result of its lack of necessary supporting facilities and being too new to create a good campus atmosphere.

5.2 Regression analysis

According to the stepwise multi-regression analysis, we obtained the regression coefficients of the satisfaction evaluation model for campus as shown in Table 3, with $R^2$ of 0.703.

| Factor   | Standardized Coefficients | t   | Sig. |
|----------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| Convenience | .320                     | 9.204 | .000 |
| Amenity   | .273                     | 8.287 | .000 |
| Health    | .095                     | 3.159 | .002 |
| Safety    | .235                     | 7.171 | .000 |
| Community | .112                     | 3.295 | .001 |

Dependent Variable: Total Evaluation, $R^2 = 0.703$

Fig.3. Comparison of Satisfaction Evaluation

5.3.1. Age

In the survey, we divided the respondents into 4 groups: younger than 20 (19 persons), 20–22 (208 persons), 23–25 (203 persons), older than 25 (130 persons). There is little difference between them. The average scores of satisfaction evaluation are 2.84, 2.92, 2.95 and 2.88 respectively. Analysis of variance between groups shows that age is not a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation.

5.3.2. Gender

There is little difference between male students (258 persons) and female students (302 persons). The average scores of satisfaction evaluation are 2.97 and 2.87 respectively. Analysis of variance between groups shows a Sig. Value is $0.224 > 0.05$. This result implies that gender is not a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation.

5.3.3. Major composition of dorm members

On campus, there are mainly 2 types of major composition in a room: same course (454 persons), and different course (106 persons). The students from different majors appear to have higher evaluation (2.98), while the ones from similar majors have a lower evaluation (2.78). Analysis of variance between groups shows Sig. Value is $0.000 < 0.01$. This result implies that the university course is a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation. This result is interesting because, although the campus environment is almost similar for them, the satisfaction evaluation is very different. This suggests that future campus planning and dorm organization should give more consideration to inter-discipline.

5.3.4. Number of dorm members

The dorms can be classified into 3 types: single or double persons per room (124 persons), three or four persons per room (299 persons) and more than four persons per room (137 persons). The average scores of satisfaction evaluation are 3.22, 2.91 and 2.82 respectively. Analysis of the variance between groups shows Sig. Value is $0.000 < 0.01$. This result implies that the number of dorm members is a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation. The dorms of single or double members provide the best privacy and interior environment, while the dorms of more than four members provide the best communication atmosphere. In Chinese college dorms, the members who live in the same room consider themselves a family. In their everyday life, they can exchange experience by studying, participating in sports and dining together. Such communication contributes to a good atmosphere.

5.3.5. Length of stay in the residence

The personal attribute can be classified into 4 types
Table 4. Analysis of Variance between the Groups in Terms of Personal Attributes

| Catalog of personal attributes | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Sig. Value |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|
| 5.3.1. Age                     | Variation | <20 years old | 20-22 years old | 23-25 years old | >25 years old | 0.892 > 0.05 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 2.84 | 2.92 | 2.95 | 2.88 |
| 5.3.2. Gender                  | Variation | Male | Female |         |            | 0.224 > 0.05 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 2.97 | 2.87 |
| 5.3.3. Major composition of dorm | Variation | Same major | Different major |        |            | 0.000 < 0.01 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 2.78 | 2.98 |
| 5.3.4. Number of dorm members | Variation | 1 or 2 mates | 3 or 4 mates | >4 mates |        | 0.000 < 0.01 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 3.22 | 2.91 | 2.82 |
| 5.3.5. Length of stay in the residence | Variation | <1 year | 1-2 years | 3-4 years | >4 Years | 0.000 < 0.01 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 2.72 | 2.78 | 3.12 | 3.25 |
| 5.3.6. Ownership of residence  | Variation | Rented | Assigned |        |            | 0.000 < 0.01 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 3.16 | 2.90 |
| 5.3.7. Permanence in terms of residence | Variation | Continue to stay | No consideration | Wish to move |        | 0.000 < 0.01 |
|                                | Average S.E. | 3.12 | 2.96 | 2.49 |

according to the length of stay in the residence, less than 1 year (174 persons), 1-2 years (147 persons), 3-4 years (203 persons) and more than 4 years (36 persons). The average scores are 2.72, 2.78, 3.12 and 3.25 respectively and incrementally. Analysis of the variance between groups shows Sig. Value is 0.000 < 0.01. This result implies that the length of residence is a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation, because (1) community is effective in campus environmental evaluation and (2) those who evaluate it highly stay.

5.3.6. Ownership of Residence

Ownership of campus residence can be divided into 2 types: rented and assigned. The former are the SOHO (Small Office Home Office) (39 persons) and the latter are school dorms (521 persons). There is an obvious difference of evaluation overall (3.16 versus 2.90) with Sig. Value 0.000 < 0.01. This shows that it is necessary to improve the items of amenity and safety inside the campus.

5.3.7. Permanence in terms of residence

Permanence in terms of residence is defined as the intention of community residents to permanently reside in their current place. It can be classified into 3 types, which are: wishing to continue to reside (274 persons), without consideration (132 persons) and wishing to move house (154 persons). The average scores are 3.12, 2.96 and 2.49 respectively and incrementally. Analysis of variance between groups shows Sig. Value is 0.000 < 0.01. It is apparent that the type that wants to continue to reside gave the highest evaluation for all items, while the type that wants to move gave the lowest evaluation for all factors.

5.4. Evaluation considering campus conditions and building quality

5.4.1. Campus conditions

In the universities of Hangzhou city, the main types of campus can be classified as A (Scenic type), B (Shopping type), and C (Suburban type), according to their geographic and social conditions (shown in Fig.2 and Table 1). The students living in scenic type campuses evaluate their residential environment with 3.23. The ones living in shopping type campuses evaluate it with 3.11. And the ones living in Suburban type campuses evaluated it with the lowest 2.57. Analysis of variance between groups shows Sig. Value is 0.000 < 0.01. As the discussion in 5.1 shows, this result implies campus condition is an important factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation.

5.4.2. Dorm layout

In the universities of Hangzhou city, the main types of dorm layout can be classified as Tube type, Home type and SOHO type. Students living in tube-shaped dorms evaluate their residential environment with 2.66, students living in the family apartments evaluate it with 2.98, and those living in the SOHO apartments evaluate it with the highest 3.15. Analysis of variance between groups shows Sig. Value is 0.000 < 0.01. This result implies dorm layout is an important factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation.

5.4.3. Age of buildings (Time since built)

The personal attributes connected with residence can be classified into 4 types according to the age of buildings: less than 5 years, 5-10 years, 11-15 years, and more than 15 years. The average scores are 2.79, 3.26, 2.95 and 2.99 respectively. Analysis of variance between groups shows Sig. Value is 0.000 < 0.01. This result implies that the age of buildings is a factor influencing the satisfaction evaluation. New buildings are mostly located in suburban campuses although they are spacious and fashionable.

According to the above analysis we find that personal attributes and campus conditions have considerable influence on the residential environment evaluation. Different types have different demands and evaluation standards in mind. The classification and analysis of personal attributes and campus objective conditions is an effective approach to examining the residential lifestyle and its influence on residential environment evaluation.
5.5. Evaluation considering residential preferences

5.5.1. Classification of campus residential preferences

According to the campus survey, we obtained results regarding students' preferences when choosing a residence. The most frequent options are (A) Shopping Convenience, (B) Service Convenience, (C) Landscape Amenity, (D) Building Amenity, (E) Fresh Air, (F) Traffic Safety, (G) Crime Prevention, (H) Community. Based on the students' importance evaluation concerning these 8 items in terms of priority elicited on a 5-grade scale (5-very important; and 1-very unimportant), we extracted four principle components of preference for campus residence. According to these results, the main types of residential preference are listed in Tables 5 and 6. The first principle component consists of Crime Prevention, Traffic Safety and Fresh Air, so it can be described as a Security factor. Correspondingly, the other principle components can be named as Comfort factor, Community factor and Convenience factor. The cumulative percentage of variance shows that the above five principle components can explain residential preference quite well, with the cumulative 82.130%, in which the first two factors had 53.144%.

A Cluster Analysis was then conducted according to the 1st component (security in Table 6.) and 2nd component's (comfort in Table 6.) score of all residents obtained by Principle Component Analysis. This was done in order to classify the residential preference type from all the samples. The results showed that 4 groups have been classified, with the ratio of 277 (49.5%), 95 (17.0%), 86 (15.4%) and 102 (18.2%) among all the samples respectively (shown as Fig 4).

5.5.2. Characteristics of residential preference

According to the above analysis, there are 4 main types of campus residential preference, the process being shown in Fig.5. After analysis of variance between groups in terms of personal attributes or residential conditions, it showed that 7 aspects are different from each other (Table 7.).

As a result, the following classification of campus residential lifestyles can be drawn, and corresponding characteristics of each type are described, including the satisfaction evaluation (Table 8.), personal attributes, residential preferences and campus conditions (Table 9.). Through comparison, the corresponding campus residential lifestyles are defined as:

(1) Balanced style: this group of students considers most aspects when they choose a living place and evaluate the current campus environment with uniform scores on all the aspects of evaluation index. At present, nearly half of all college students belong to this style due to the fact that the traditional campus, located in an urban area, is the dominant mode with an even residential environment.

(2) Low-level style: this group of students considers convenience and community as they choose a living place and evaluate the current campus environment with low scores on most aspects of the evaluation index. At present, about 17% of college students belong to this group, which is comprised mainly of undergraduates who are living in old buildings.

(3) Centrifugal style: this group of students considers safety and health as they choose a living place and evaluate the current campus environment with middle scores on total evaluation. At present, about 15% of college students belong to this group, which is comprised mainly of undergraduates who are living in new suburban campuses. That is the reason why convenience and community are evaluated low.

(4) Comfortable style: this group of students considers amenity and service as they choose a living place and evaluate the current campus environment with high scores on most aspects of the evaluation index. At present, about 18% of college students belong to this group. They are mainly postgraduates who are living in home-type or SOHO-type rooms.

Table 5. Rotated Component Matrix of Preferences

| Preference          | Component 1 | Component 2 | Component 3 | Component 4 |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| (G) Crime Prevention| .885        | .209        | .186        | .132        |
| (F) Traffic Safety  | .856        | .251        | .140        | .154        |
| (E) Air health      | .636        | .421        | .281        | -.034       |
| (D) Building amenity| .367        | .823        | .165        | .095        |
| (B) Service convenience| .068  | .683        | .497        | .320        |
| (C) Landscape amenity| .423      | .644        | .013        | .187        |
| (H) Community       | .290        | .162        | .893        | .115        |
| (A) Shopping convenience| .143      | .198        | .130        | .946        |

Table 6. Variance Explained of Principle Component

| Component | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |
|----------|----------------------------------|
|          | Total % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 Security | 2.344 | 29.295 | 29.295 |
| 2 Comfort  | 1.908 | 23.849 | 53.144 |
| 3 Community| 1.222 | 15.281 | 68.425 |
| 4 Convenience| 1.096 | 13.705 | 82.130 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Fig.4. Cluster Analysis by PCA
6. Conclusions

Through the case study in Hangzhou City, the concept of campus residential lifestyle has been presented from three aspects: personal attributes, residential preferences and campus conditions.

1) In the satisfaction evaluation of campus residential environment, safety has the highest rank and amenity, the lowest value. The design and maintenance of the buildings are the most important aspects in improving residential quality in Chinese universities.

2) From the regression equation, it can be seen that facility convenience also plays an obvious role. As a consequence, a complete set of facilities is the most important aspect in improving the residential environment for a campus. And the aspect of community should not be ignored.

3) Through the ANOVA, several factors influence the satisfaction evaluation, such as dorm layout, number of persons per room, university course composition, building age, permanence in terms of residence and length of stay in the residence.

4) Principle component analysis of residential preferences shows that security (safety + health) and comfort (amenity + service) are the main concerns when students consider their residential choices.

5) The four types of campus lifestyle have been profiled according to the combination of residential preferences, campus conditions and environmental evaluations. They are Balanced Type, Low-level Type, Centrifugal Type, and Comfortable Type. Each of them bears distinctive characteristics, such as personal attributes, evaluation ranks and preferences.

In this study, it is confirmed that lifestyle is an influential factor in environmental evaluation. The comparison between the four types of campus lifestyles shows the current diversity of college students and indicates developing trends in campus planning. The results also proved that the methodology combining both objective and subjective aspects is effective in environmental evaluation. At the same time, the concept of campus lifestyles can also bring about a new perspective for further exploration on campus planning.
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Table 8. Comparison of Satisfaction Evaluation between 4 Types of Preference

| Group No. of Preference | Convenience | Amenity | Health | Safety | Community | Total Evaluation |
|------------------------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|-----------|------------------|
| 1. Generality           | 2.9242      | 2.7906  | 3.1516 | 3.4260 | 3.0181    | 2.9495           |
| 2. Convenience+community| 2.8211      | 2.6105  | 2.8737 | 3.0842 | 2.8316    | 2.7684           |
| 3. Security             | 2.8140      | 2.9302  | 3.2326 | 3.4419 | 2.7791    | 2.9186           |
| 4. Comfort              | 3.1078      | 3.1078  | 3.3922 | 3.3725 | 3.2745    | 3.1608           |
| Total                   | 2.9232      | 2.8393  | 3.1607 | 3.3607 | 2.9964    | 2.9161           |
Table 9. Characteristics of Four Campus Residential Lifestyles

| Type   | Percentage | A: Characteristic of Satisfaction Evaluation | B: Characteristic of Personal Attribute | C: Characteristic of Preference | D: Campus Conditions and Building Conditions |
|--------|------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Balanced style | 277 (49.5%) | 1. Almost all the items are evaluated uniformly. | 1. The number of roommates is about 4. 2. Average Area is the middle, 5.48m². 3. Tube-type dorms. | 1. Prefer Safety, Health, Amenity and Service generally; 2. Neglect Community and Shopping. | 1. Complete facilities. 2. Mature campus. 3. Near the district center. |
| Low-level style | 95 (17.0%) | 1. Overall Evaluation is lowest (2.77); 2. Evaluation on convenience is lowest (2.61). 3. Evaluation on health is seriously low (2.87). | 1. Almost junior undergraduate; 2. The number of roommates is usually more than 5; 3. Average Area is the lowest, 4.33m²; 4. The buildings are old. 5. Tube-type dorms | 1. Prefer Convenience and Community; 2. Neglect other aspects. | 1. Complete facilities. 2. Low quality of dorm service. 3. Mature campus. 4. Near the district center. |
| Centrifugal style | 86 (15.4%) | 1. Overall Evaluation is middle (2.92); 2. Evaluation on safety is highest (3.44); 3. Evaluation on convenience is lowest (2.81); 4. Evaluation on community is lowest (2.78). | 1. The number of roommates is less than 4; 2. Average Area is large, 7.13m²; 3. The buildings are the newest. 4. Tube-type or home-type dorms. | 1. Prefer Safety and Health; 2. Neglect Amenity and Service. | 1. Suburb Campus; 2. Newly built buildings. 3. Lack of facility. 4. Far from landscape. |
| Comfortable style | 102 (18.2%) | 1. Overall Evaluation is the highest (2.96); 2. Evaluation on amenity is highest (3.11); 3. Evaluation on community is highest (3.27) 4. Evaluation on health is highest (3.39) | 1. Mainly senior undergraduates and postgraduates; 2. Number of roommates is less than 3; 3. Average Area is the largest, 8.36m²; 4. Buildings are new. 5. Many rented. 6. Home-type or SOHO-type apartments. | 1. Prefer Amenity and Service; 2. Neglect Safety and Health. | 1. Good service. 2. Mature campus. 3. Near the district center. 4. Near the landscape. |