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What Can Student Affairs Learn From Nielsen Audio?

Benefits of Using a Modified Arbitron Assessment in Higher Education
Purpose of Presentation

- To explore the history and evolution of an Arbitron assessment in business

- Apply the Arbitron practice(s) when developing a Student Affairs evaluation model

- Explore the difference between traditional models of Student Affairs assessments and Arbitron findings
Presentation Outline

- History and Purpose of Nielsen Audio (Arbitron Assessment)
- Arbitron Expectations and Outcomes
- Modifying the Arbitron Method of assessment for Student Affairs
- Importance of subject selection
- Process and philosophy of the research design
- Reviewing a pilot study using the Arbitron method
- Interpreting the data
- Implementing the findings
- Pros and Cons of the Arbitron method in Student Affairs
- Open Discussion
Learning Objectives

- Learn the basics of a well-known, reliable and valid business evaluation model
- Learn how to transfer and modify a business evaluation model into an ongoing Student Affairs assessment model
- Learn how to interpret and assess if program changes or modifications are warranted
- Learn the pros and cons of an Arbitron format when or if applied to Student Affairs
OVERVIEW

- *Arbitron* is a business assessment process designed to evaluate syndicated radio ratings 365 days a year

- However, the process and intent conceptually fit the intent and goals of Student Affairs

- With slight modifications in design, this comprehensive evaluation system becomes dynamic and alive; streaming assessment data 24/7
Nielsen Overview
(Simple explanation - Complicated process)

- FYI: Neilson (TV) vs. Arbitron (audio);
  Neilson now owns Arbitron = Neilson Audio

- Working Philosophy: Knowing how and when to reach prospective consumers – understand the customer’s thoughts and feelings

- Holy Grail of audience measurement
Nielsen “The Process”

- Uses statistical sampling to rate shows
- Creates a “sample audience”
- Counts how many in that audience view each program
- Ratings gathered in one of two ways:
  - “Black Box” tracks when TV sets are on; records channels (Nielsen) – quantitative responses
  - “Diaries”– self-records viewing or listening habits (Arbitron) – qualitative responses
Nielsen “The Intent and Structure”

- Allows researchers to study consumer habits on a minute to minute, day to day, week to week basis, etc.,

- Historical Demographics
  Used: age, gender, race, economic class, and area

- New Proposed Demographics:
  6 viewer segments; based on consumer behavior, motivations, and psychographics
Criticism of Nielson

1. Participants are aware of being an evaluator – it can lead to response or expectation bias

2. Sample is not random in the statistical sense of experimental design

3. Paid volunteer evaluators can skew data and prediction

4. Selective use of qualitative self-reported statements
Applying Nielson to Student Affairs (Beta Project)

Addressing Criticisms first...

1. Participants are aware of being an evaluator – it can lead to expectation bias
   (new responses validated with old database; must wait one semester*)

2. Sample is not random in the statistical sense of experimental design
   (population not randomized – sample selection is; use of snowballing technique)

3. Paid volunteer evaluators can skew data and prediction
   (no volunteer compensation)

4. Selective use of qualitative self-reported statements
   (qualitative statements are quantified – with established alpha)
Participant Selection – Student Affairs (Beta Project)

1. Volunteers initially secured through four undergraduate courses

2. Peer-to-peer participant recruitment (snowballing technique)
Participant Demographics – Student Affairs (Beta Project)

- Individual participant demographics not collected
- Classroom/course demographics collected – Freshmen/Sophomore; Junior/Senior Courses
Student Affairs - Participant Survey

Link...

Participants

- sent a survey link
- can send link to peers (snowballing)
- can respond 24/7 – 365 days
# Database Sample - (Beta Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>1. What area will you assess today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/3/2014 17:07:35</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2014 18:09:04</td>
<td>I cannot change my roommate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2014 18:10:30</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2014 18:30:33</td>
<td>Career Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/2014 19:17:13</td>
<td>My advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. How would you rate this area?
- Bad
- Very Bad
- Very Bad
- Very Good
- Very Bad
3. Do you have any specific comments?
Nothing to do in this town
Too many rules
gave me a ticket when I told them I would be
I got an internship there today
Put me off schedule for graduation - I should

4. Is there something else we should know?
You have to travel to have fun and this can be dangerous
I cannot even focus now
They have nothing better to do here - it is all about
It took three weeks to fix my resume, but it was worth it
Harder than it looks to find out what it takes to graduate
## RESPONSE RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL</th>
<th># OF NEG RESPONSES</th>
<th>PERCENT NEG</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.01%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.29%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weekend Life</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.28%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Night Life</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Course(s)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decision to Attend</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Employment/Career</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Technology/Web/Library</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Staff/Administrator(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.79%</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.696**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE

UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION  3,240

SAMPLE SIZE  257

90% (+/- 5%) confidence level
Day Breakdown of Responses
## Student Affairs
### Intervention Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>Roommate Conflict(s)</td>
<td>Contracts, Education - Easy Roommate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>Same people or events over and over</td>
<td>Increased Marketing of Multiple Event Options; Encourage Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town-Gown relationship</td>
<td>Increase Business-to-Business Connections; Deals, Give-aways, Coupons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Life</td>
<td>Limited City/University Activities</td>
<td>Coordinate: Calendar of University and Local Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Life</td>
<td>No large hang-out place/limited hours</td>
<td>Ongoing Survey/Assess Student Needs/Wants for options and opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Positive Features of the Arbitron Method in Student Affairs

- Available 24/7 – 365
- Flexibility Beyond The Traditional Assessments
- Multiple Assessments Time Frames Available
- Statistical Models Available
- Open Ended Questions
- Snowballing: Allows for “Random Self-selection”
- Segment Responses
- Test Intervention Strategies
- Instant Reports
Negative Features of the Arbitron Method in Student Affairs

Must:

- have statistical/research background
- categorize/assign data
- assess “real” concern(s)
- have allotted research time (intensive)
- have dedicated/full-time staff
- decide what to do w/ “Unwanted” information
- provide or offer solution/intervention(s)
Beta FYI: Development History

Employing - Scheduled Administration; Standardized Questions; Likert Formats; Collecting Participant Demographics or Group ID found:

- Low participation rate
- Significantly higher positive evaluations
- High Drop-out rates
- Data did not match exit interviews
Any Questions?

Remember – this is a beta-assessment model – limited in scope; however,

Future options to discuss:

- Identifying participants (collect and store data)
- Targeting specific populations (main effects)
- Segmenting and assessing interaction effects
- Use marker items: satisfaction, retention, etc.,