INTRODUCTION

Context

Late Night programming is increasingly used as a strategy for changing the campus environment regarding alcohol use and abuse and, hence, for reducing the number of alcohol-related incidents on campus and within the campus community. Institutions including Ohio University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Maryland, and West Virginia University have each committed significant staff time and financial resources to these initiatives. Using key benchmarks established by these universities, The Ohio State University initiated its own Late Night initiative during the 2000-2001 academic year.

The OSU Student Wellness Center developed the Late Night programming initiative as part of a comprehensive prevention plan to address alcohol use and abuse. In addition to Late Night programming, the plan includes policy review, environmental assessment, responsible hospitality, and social norms marketing. The goals of the comprehensive prevention plan include: increased alcohol education, increased opportunities for alcohol-free social events, a change in student, faculty, and staff perceptions of drinking prevalence on campus, a change in the campus communities’ attitude toward alcohol use, and a decrease in alcohol use.

Coined “Moonlight Madness,” the mission of the Late Night Program is “to provide vibrant and fun late night programs, which create a sense of campus community, for a diverse group of students. This wide array of activities provides students with programming experience, leadership development, and social interactions.” This project was designed: 1) to reinforce campus norms that support students who do not use alcohol and other drugs by providing fun, attractive events and by promoting the events to all students and, 2) to involve campus groups in promoting more social ties that do not include alcohol and other drugs by providing funding to campus organizations to hold alcohol-free, late night events and by involving student organizations in the planning of late-night activities.

A Late Night steering committee consisting of students and staff members from a variety of offices on campus including the Student Wellness Center, the Office of Residence Education, Counseling and Consultation Services, Recreational Sports and the Office of Student Affairs Assessment, manage a grant process in which campus and campus community organizations apply for funding to sponsor innovative programs that were aligned with the mission of the Late Night initiative. In order to receive funding, departments were encouraged to collaborate with student organizations in planning and implementing events and were required to contribute their own funding and resources. (See Appendix A for a listing of event co-sponsors.)
A variety of offices and community organizations applied for and received funding to coordinate Late Night events. There were 52 events during the 2001-2002 academic year including: the monthly Jericho Breakfast at Summit United Methodist Church, Late Night at the Wexner Center, and Late Night at the Columbus Zoo. There were diverse sponsoring organizations including the Wexner Center, The Ohio Union, Recreational Sports, Department of Plant Pathology and Residence Education among others. The events were diverse in focus, some drawing from very specific populations (e.g., students of color, first year students); others had a more general appeal. (See Appendix B for a complete list of events.)

A condition of the funding was to conduct evaluations of their event, a process supported by both Student Wellness and Student Affairs Assessment. Program sponsors were asked to distribute surveys to attendees. The resulting data included demographic information, satisfaction levels, and drinking behavior information. With these data, individual event evaluations were created to provide feedback to the individual event sponsors and to the Late Night committee. In addition, we were able to speak about all the events included in the evaluation. A summary of the event evaluations is provided in the Findings portion of this report.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of Late Night programming at Ohio State. Through the survey, we sought to provide data regarding students’ attendance at the Late Night events, their opinions and perceptions of the events, and the effect the events may have had on their drinking behavior.

**Study Methodology**

The Late Night survey was based on telephone interviews conducted from May 6 to May 27, 2002, of 613 Ohio State, Columbus campus students (Spring quarter, 2002). Students were randomly selected for participation from a database of all undergraduate students provided by the Office of the Registrar. Initial attempts to contact respondents were made to local telephone numbers. Respondents were called at home if necessary and at other phone numbers when such information was available. All telephone interviews were conducted at the OSU Center for Survey Research facilities.

A total of 1,000 students were randomly selected to participate in this survey. In many cases, viable telephone numbers were called upwards of 10 times in attempt to reach a respondent at a convenient time. In 27 cases the student was ineligible to participate to participate in the survey. The remaining 973 cases were presumed to be eligible cases with valid contact information. A total of 613 interviews were completed, for a response

---

1 For the 2001-2002 school year, the Late Night initiative received an additional cash allocation that doubled the amount of funding available for programming.
rate of 63 percent using the most conservative calculation suggested by the American Association for Public Opinion Research. The margin of error is 3.9%.

**Limitations**

Inherent to survey research are limitations of imprecision and sampling error. Imprecision occurs in a number of different forms. Given the nature of phone surveys, the accuracy of the data is dependent upon the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee. Problems in question interpretation and/or interviewer interference are common. Also, surveys are subject to imprecision and bias associated with the wording and/or ordering of questions. Another limitation concerns the representativeness of the sample and potential sampling error. Although the sample was selected randomly, sampling error may interfere with the generalizability of the results.

Two limitations specific to this survey are the number of students who attended Late Night events and the timing of data collection. The number of students who actually attended events limits our ability to speak with confidence about attendance trends and opinions of subpopulations of students. While a total of 613 persons were sampled, 104 (17.0%) attended late night events. Regarding the timing of data collection (in May), Late Night events were still being held. As such, there were six events that had not yet occurred, thus reducing the opportunity to investigate attendance at and opinions about these events. Finally, given the nature of sampling, certain groups were slightly over-represented in the sample when compared to the population (e.g., Whites and those under 21) while others were slightly under-represented (e.g., African-Americans and those over 21) (See Appendix C for further detail). These differences, however, were not large enough to warrant weighting of the data.

**Description of the Sample**

A random sample of OSU undergraduate students was surveyed. Graduate and professional students were not included in the sample, as evidence has shown that they are less likely to exhibit at-risk drinking behavior.

The demographics of the students who participated in the survey were as follows: (See Appendix for comparisons with the student population.)

- **GENDER**: 48.3% were female; 51.7% were male
- **RANK**: 22.2% were first year; 23.2% were second year; 23.5% were third year; 31.2% were fourth year
- **GPA**: 48.0% had a GPA between 3.0 and 4.0; 40.6% between 2.0 and 2.99; 11.4% less than 2.0
- **AGE**: 49.6% were under 21 years of age; 50.4% were 21 or over
- **GREEK MEMBERSHIP**: 28.4% were members of a social fraternity or sorority; 71.6% were not members
- **RACE/ETHNICITY**: 82.2% were White; 6.0% were African American/Black; 5.1% were Asian/Pacific Islander; 2.9% were International; 2.1% were Hispanic/Latino(a); 0.2% were American Indian/Alaskan Native; 1.5% self-reported as “other”
- **RESIDENCE**: 30.1% lived on-campus; 69.3% lived off-campus; 0.7% were other
FINDINGS

In this report, the findings are presented regarding the evaluation and assessment of Late Night events along with students’ alcohol use and their perceptions of use. In the assessment of Late Night events, first, data are presented that summarize the 35 events evaluated during the 2001-2002 academic year. These data are taken from the evaluations conducted at each event. Second, data are presented regarding the effectiveness of Late Night events (attendance levels, event satisfaction, reductions in alcohol use). These data were collected from the phone survey described above. Also taken from these data are the findings related to students’ alcohol use and perceptions of alcohol use at OSU.

Late Night Event Evaluations, 2001-2002

The Office of Student Affairs Assessment in conjunction with the Student Wellness Center conducted on-site event evaluations at 35 of the 52 Late Night events during the 2001-2002 academic year. It is estimated that the Late Night events drew 30,000 people.

Of students who completed event evaluations (n=3038): (See Appendix for comparisons to the student population.)

- **SEX**: 47.1% were female, 52.9% were male
- **RANK**: 35.2% were first year students, 17.6% second year, 18.0% third year, 13.3% fourth year, 10.5% graduate/professional students and 5.4% other
- **AGE**: 65.1% were under 21 years of age
- **SEXUAL ORIENTATION**: 5.2% were GLBT students, 94.8% were heterosexual
- **RACE/ETHNICITY**: 66.8% were White, 10.3% African-American, 6.8% Asian-American, 5.8% international students, 2.9% Multiracial, 2.6% Hispanic/Latino(a), 0.7% American Indian/Native Alaskan, 4.1% and ‘Other’
- **RESIDENCE**: 58.1% lived on campus, 31.7% lived off campus, 2.8% lived in Greek housing and 7.5% lived at home

Attendees were asked questions about their drinking behavior. First, they were asked the number of times that they had consumed five or more drinks in one sitting:

- 62.5% stated that they had no instances of high-risk drinking
- 11.5% reported one instance
- 8.2% reported two instances
- 17.8% reported three or more instances

Students were also asked if on the night of the event they drank less.

---

2 As defined by the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey, **high-risk drinking** is defined as having 5 or more drinks in one sitting during a two-week period.
• 42.8% stated that Late Night events reduced their drinking
• 23.4% stated that the Late Night events did not reduce their drinking
• 33.7% stated that they do not drink

In addition to demographic and alcohol-use questions, students were also asked to rate their level of satisfaction with various aspects of the events as well as their likelihood to attend other Late Night events (see Table 1.2). Most students were both satisfied with the event they attended and indicated that they were likely to attend another Late Night event.

Table 1.2: Satisfaction with and likelihood to attend other Late Night events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with the overall event? (n=2939)</th>
<th>How likely are you to attend another Late Night activity? (n=2932)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied/likely</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied/likely</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied/unlikely</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied/unlikely</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Night Assessment

In this section, data are presented from the end-of-the-year phone survey of a random sample of OSU students. Students who had attended events were asked a series of questions regarding which events they attended, how they learned about the events, how they rated the quality of the events, their alcohol consumption the night of events they attended, and their general perceptions of Late Night events.

Attendance at and Knowledge of Late Night Events

When students were asked if they had heard of Late Night programs and if they had attended events, we found that of the 613 respondents:
• 72.2% had heard of the Late Night events, and
• 17.0% had attended at least one event.

In Table 2.0, attendance rates for specific events are presented based on those students who reported that they attended Late Night events (n=104).
• Of the multiple-event programs, Late Night at the Ohio Union (50.5%) events were the most frequently attended.
• Of the single night events, Late Night Big Bad BBQ (22.8%) was the best attended.
Table 2.0: What events have you attended? (total percentage exceeds 100% because some students attended more than one event)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Event(s)</th>
<th>Percent attending (n=104)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Ohio Union*</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Wexner Center*</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night @ Residence Halls*</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Jericho Road*</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Big Bad BBQ</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night BuckeyeThon</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Buckeye Roast</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Upshaw Concert</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night New York City</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* multiple events

In Table 2.1, data are presented that show the attendance patterns of various subpopulations.

- A greater percentage of students under 21 (20.4%) attended Late Night events than those 21 and over (13.6%).
- White students and students of color attended events at a similar rate (17.3% compared to 15.6%).
- Men and women also attended Late Night events at a similar rate (18.0% compared to 15.9%).
- Students with GPA’s over 3.0 were more likely to attend than those with GPAs below this.
- On-campus students were much more likely to attend than off-campus students (26.1% compared to 13.0% respectively).

Table 2.1: Attendance at Late Night events by Age, Race/Ethnicity, GPA, Residence and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Did you attend Late Night?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 21 (n=304)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over (n=309)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of color (n=74)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White students (n=366)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 0-1.99 (n=70)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 2.00-2.99 (n=249)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 3.00-4.00 (n=294)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus (n=184)</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus (n=424)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=317)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=296)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who attended Late Night events were also asked how they had learned about the events. The Late Night committee sought to promote these as a unified program occurring throughout the year to create cohesiveness. Both the event sponsor and the Late Night committee used a variety of methods to promote the events, and not all events were advertised in the same ways (see Table 2.2).
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- Most commonly students learned about Late Night events through another student or friend (47.6%) or through flyers (43.7%).
- *The Lantern* and Residence Hall staff were also effective means of communication.

Table 2.2: How did you learn about Late Night events? (Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple response options.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=104)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another student or friend</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Lantern</em></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Staff</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Webpage</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club or organization</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another OSU event</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Event Quality

Students were asked to rate certain aspects of the events: the overall quality, the variety of events offered, the quality of activities and entertainment, the food and drinks available, the interaction with other students at events, and the location of events (see Table 3.0).

- Similar to the event evaluations, students rated the events positively.
- Most notably, 97.1% rated the overall quality of the event as either “good” or “very good.”

Table 3.0: Students’ Rating of the Event Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=104)</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of events</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of activities</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and drinks</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interaction</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Night Programming and Alcohol Consumption

As part of the comprehensive alcohol prevention plan, Late Night programming provides alcohol-free activities with the goal of reducing the amount of alcohol use. As such, a series of questions were asked that address the relationship between the consumption of alcohol and attendance at Late Night events.
In Tables 4.0 and 4.1, the relationship between high-risk drinking and attendance at Late Night events is explored.

- High-risk drinkers and low-risk drinkers attended the Late Night events at similar rates – 18.4% and 16.0% respectively.
- Of the students who attended events, 47.1% were high-risk drinkers.

**Table 4.0: Attendance at Late Night and High-Risk Drinking**
(In the past two weeks, how many times did you have five or more drinks at one sitting?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you attend Late Night?</th>
<th>Non-binge drinkers (n=55)</th>
<th>Binge drinkers (n=49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: High-Risk Drinking Rates: Attendees and Non-attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attendees (n=104)</th>
<th>Non-attendees (n=507)</th>
<th>Totals (n=611)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-bingers</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingers</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to looking at the relationship between drinking and attendance at Late Night events, students (n=104) were asked about their drinking behavior the night they attended events.

- 76.9% stated that they did not drink any alcohol before the event.
- 97.1% stated that they did not drink any alcohol during the event.
- 77.1% stated that they did not drink any alcohol after the event.

When asked how Late Night programming affected their drinking habits (see Chart 1.0):

- Over a third (34.0%) stated that they drank less than they normally would have.
- Over 42% (42.3%) stated that they drank about the same as the normally do.
- Only 3.1% stated that they drank more than they normally would have.
- Another 20.6% stated they do not drink.
Students’ Perceptions of Late Night Programming

In this section, students were asked about their perceptions of Late Night events. First, students who had attended events were asked about how Late Night programs contributed to the campus. Second, all students who had heard about the events were asked whether they thought Late Night programming results in less drinking among its attendees and then, why or why not.

Those who had attended Late Night events were asked a series of questions concerning their perceptions and opinions of the program (see Table 5.0).

- A large majority of attendees stated that they either “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” that Late Night programs contribute positively to the Ohio State environment (95.2%) and that Late Night programming is a good example of how you can have fun without alcohol (91.3%).
- Over three-quarters of attendees (76.9%) stated that Late Night activities make it easier to meet other students.
- Over half of attendees (59.7%) stated that they either “strongly disagree” or “somewhat disagree” that there is a negative stereotype associated with Late Night events. However, 27.8% stated that they agreed that a negative stereotype exists.
Table 5.0: Perceptions of Late Night Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>percentage (n=104)</th>
<th>Do you think Late Night programs contribute positively to the Ohio State environment?</th>
<th>Do you think Late Night activities make it easier to meet other students?</th>
<th>Do you think there is a negative stereotype associated with those who attend Late Night events?</th>
<th>Do you think Late Night programming is a good example of how you can have fun without alcohol?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who had heard of Late Night, but had not necessarily attended (n=442), were asked if they thought Late Night activities result in less alcohol use among students (see Chart 2.0) and then, why or why not.

- A majority of respondents (57.7%) stated that they thought Late Night programming results in less drinking among students who attended these events.

![Chart 2.0: Do you think Late Night programming results in less drinking among those who attend these events?](chart)

Students who thought that the Late Night events reduced alcohol use gave a variety of reasons for the change in behavior. (Note that multiple responses were possible therefore percentages will not equal 100%.)

- 41.6% stated that people would attend Late Night instead of drinking
- 26.5% stated that the events are a good alternative
- 15.9% stated that it cuts down on drinking hours
- 15.1% stated that the events capture the attention of people so that they do not think of drinking
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• 1.6% stated that people might bring along friends that might go elsewhere to drink
• 1.2% stated that it was free
• 17.9% provided other reasons for the effectiveness of Late Night events reducing alcohol abuse.

Of those who believed that Late Night programming does not reduce alcohol consumption, there were also a variety of reasons given. (Note that multiple responses were possible therefore percentages will not equal 100%.)
• 50.9% stated that students would still drink before and after the events
• 10.4% stated that students will drink on other nights
• 5.7% stated that the activities do not keep the attention of students
• 36.8% provided other reasons for the ineffectiveness of Late Night events reducing alcohol abuse. Some of those responses include the following:
  o Students will drink if they want to drink (15)
  o People that go to Late Night do not drink (14)
APPENDIX A

Event Co-Sponsors

Community Organizations
- American Indian Council
- Indianola Presbyterian Church
- National Coalition of Racism in Sports and Media
- Summit United Methodist Church
- University Lutheran Chapel

OSU Departments, Offices, and Committees
- America Indian Student Services
- Asian America Student Services
- Asian Pacific American Heritage Month Committee
- Ethnic Student Services
- First Year Collegian Programming Committee
- Housing and Residence Education
- International Education
- Off-Campus and Commuter Student Services
- Office of Student Affairs
- Ohio Union
- PHARM (Plant Health and Resource Management)
- Plant Pathology
- Student Gender and Sexuality Services
- Student Wellness Center
- Wexner Center

Residence Halls
- Blackburn, Haverfield, and Nosker Complex
- Drackett
- Halloran, Barrett, and Houck Complex
- Norton-Scott Complex
- Stradley Hall Council
- Smith Hall Council
- Park Hall Council
- Steeb Hall Councils
- Taylor Tower

Student Organizations
- Alpha Phi
- Asian American Association
- Black Student Association
- Bucket and Dipper
- Buckeyethon
- FUSION
- Jewish Queers
- Ohio Union Activities Board
- OSU Breakdancers
- Peer Advocates for Total Health
- PRIDE
- Res Rules Service and learning Organization
- RHAC
- Romophos
- Spanish and Latino Student Association
- Student Art League
- The Underground
- Turf Grass Science Club
- Undergraduate Student Government
- Interfraternity Council
APPENDIX B

Late Night Programming, 2001-2002

September
13: Late Night with The OWLs
20: Steeb-Smith Late Night Games
21: Late Night Wexner Center
28: Late Night Upshaw Concert

October
5: Late Night Buckeye Roast
5: Jericho Road Breakfast
6: Late Night Post-Game
10: Late Night Karaoke
11: Late Night South Area Basketball
12: Late Night Ohio Union
18: Late Night 13th Avenue Public House
19: Late Night COSI

November
2: Jericho Road Breakfast
15: Late Night 13th Avenue Public House
16: Late Night Ohio Union
30: Jericho Road Breakfast

December
31: Late Night Times Square
31: New Year’s Eve Pow Wow

January
11: Jericho Road Breakfast
19: FREE Video Games
26: Late Night Ohio Union
26: FREE Broomball

February
1: Jericho Road Breakfast
1-2: Late Night BuckeyeThon
8: Late Night Wexner Center
15: Just up the Road- Indianola
16: Late Night Movie Night F.R.E.E.
22: Late Night Frostburn

March
1: Jericho Road Breakfast
2: FREE Comedy Club
9: Late Night Ohio Union
9: FREE Casino Night
15: FREE St. Patrick’s Day Dance

April
5: Jericho Road Breakfast

11: Late Night Get in the Game F.R.E.E.
12: Late Night F.R.E.E. Bowling
13: Late Night Wexner Center
19: Latino Late Night
20: Big Bad BBQ
27: The Other Prom

May
2: Late Night NYC
3: Jericho Road Breakfast
3: Eyes (Wide) Speaking
4: Late Night Li’l Sibs Carnival
10: Late Night at the Zoo
11: FREE Video Game Tournament
24-26: Memorial Day Pow Wow

June
1: Late Night Ohio Union
1: Just Down the Road @ Indianola Presbyterian
1: FREE Event
7: Jericho Road Breakfast
7: SpringFest ‘02
APPENDIX C

Demographic Comparisons

In Table 6.0, the demographics of the population are presented along with the demographics of
the Late Night survey sample and the Late Night evaluation respondents.

When comparing the population to the students who participated in the Late Night survey, we
find that generally the sample was representative of the population with the exception of two
areas – age and GPA. Students under 21 years of age and with higher GPAs were more highly
represented in the sample than in the population.

When comparing students who completed the Late Night evaluations, and hence attended Late
Night events, to the population, we find the following:

Table 6.0: Comparisons between Population Parameters and the Late Night Survey and Evaluation
Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Population (n=32515)</th>
<th>Late Night Survey Sample (n=613)</th>
<th>Late Night Survey: Attendees (n=104)</th>
<th>Late Night Evaluation Respondents (n=3038)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and Over</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.00</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.99</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-4.0</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>