

THE INFLUENCE OF ALTERCASTING ON FRATERNITY
MEMBERS' VOTING HABITS
AND KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT EVENTS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

ELAINE M. HOLSTINE MCVAY

Dr. Esther Thorson, Thesis Supervisor

July 2016

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

THE INFLUENCE OF ALTERCASTING ON FRATERNITY MEMBERS' VOTING
HABITS AND KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT EVENTS

presented by Elaine M. Holstine McVay,

a candidate for the degree of master of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Esther Thorson

Professor Shelly Rogers

Professor Harsh Taneja

Professor Bradley Curs

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the people who have encouraged, pushed, and sometimes prodded me to complete my coursework. When I began the journey to earn a master's degree in 2008, I could not have imagined, nor would I have believed, the twists and turns the road would take. The list of people who have helped me is quite long.

Thank you to my parents, Janet and Russell Holstine, my son, Carson Andrew McVay, and my brother and his family, Brian, Elaine, Emilia and Olivia Holstine, for their unconditional love, encouragement, and belief that I could achieve this goal.

I am especially thankful for the assistance Dr. Mark Frederick provided, including access to UniLOA data, multiple readings of early drafts and regular reminders that passive voice is “the junkyard dog of APA writing.”

Special recognition is due to Dr. Kim Bodey, who patiently and willingly (sometimes at a moment's notice) answered questions and provided guidance, especially related to methodology and statistical analysis.

Thank you to my colleagues, past and present, at Purdue University, Indiana State University and Clabber Girl Corporation, for their support; they shared their energy and enthusiasm with me when mine was low. *Energy is Everything!*

I am particularly indebted to those who listened when I needed an ear, propped me up when I was dragging, or gave me a kick to “*just get it done!*” Amy McVay Abbott, Kristie Bishop, Heidi Brandon, Rev. Lant Davis, Steven C. Flowers, Jenny Gough, Trudy Ludwig Guthrie, Brandon “Positive Energy Guy” Johnson, Dr. Christine Kennedy, Peggy and Scott Ksander, Susan Reed Luse, Jane Massey, Michelle McBrite, Gordon McOuat,

Rachel Wedding-McClelland, Andy McVay, Jen Brown Perry, Peter Reed, Lori and Paul Sabol, Dr. Tara S. Singer, and Jo and Dan Wade.

My community of family and friends has blessed me beyond belief.

M-I-Z-Z-O-U!

Aho!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the contributions of many individuals who provided assistance and encouragement throughout my coursework and the completion of the requirements for the degree.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Esther Thorson for her willingness to serve as chair of my committee and her support, guidance, and patience with me. Her observations and feedback were particularly helpful and most appreciated. I would like to thank my committee members: Professors Shelly Rodgers, Bradley R. Curs and Harsh Taneja. Their thoughtful engagement and insights helped to refine the concept and distill my research into a more focused, cohesive project. I am extremely grateful that these individuals were willing to commit their time to assist me in the completion of my degree requirements. Dr. Rodgers was especially encouraging as my instructor in the first course I took as part of my work towards this degree.

Thank you to Sarah Smith-Frigerio for her unfailing support and encouragement; her patience seems to know no bounds.

A special thank you to Dr. Mark Frederick and Dr. Will Barratt for sharing UniLOA data with me. This project would not have been possible without their assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	
Development of Altercasting as a Communication Theory.....	4
Six Dimensions of Altercasting	7
Testing the Theory of Altercasting	8
Altercasting and Its Influence on Social Interaction.....	10
Altercasting and the Lost Letter Technique.....	12
Altercasting and Membership in Organizations	13
Community Living and Bandura’s Social Learning Theory	16
Influence of Fraternity Membership on Student Success	17
Development of Leadership Skills.....	18
Volunteerism and Participation in Community-Based Activities.....	22
Youth, Politics and Voting.....	24
Media Usage Promoting Interest in Community and Political Activity	26
3. METHODOLOGY	
Population and Sample	30
Research Design	30
Instrument	30
Validity and Reliability.....	31
Variables	32
Altercasting	32
Leadership	32
Likelihood of Volunteering.....	33
Usage of Media	33
Understanding of the Political Process	34

Voting.....	34
Knowledge of Current Events.....	34
Hours Spent Volunteering.....	35
Statistical Analysis.....	35
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	
Results of the Study.....	37
Descriptive Variables.....	37
Hypotheses.....	38
Summary.....	40
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	
Discussion.....	42
Hypothesis 1.....	43
Hypothesis 2.....	43
Hypothesis 3.....	44
Conclusions.....	46
Recommendations for Future Research.....	49
Summary.....	50
REFERENCES	52
APPENDIX	
University Learning Outcomes Assessment.....	57
Tables.....	66

INTRODUCTION

Social scientists have long theorized about the forces that shape human behavior. Philosophers as early as Plato, Socrates, and others throughout modern history have developed innumerable theories to examine behavior. Weinstein and Deutschberger's (1963) theory of altercasting relies upon the concept of persuasion and that an individual can be persuaded to behave in a certain way by forcing him or her into a social role. According to Weinstein and Deutschberger, pressure will direct an individual, whether it be psychological, societal, or so slight to be unnoticed, to engage in behavior to conform to another's goals.

Researchers have explored the influence that membership in groups and organizations has on an individual's behavior. Guala, Mittone, and Ploner (2013) found that affiliation with a group has a consistent, positive effect on cooperation. Kelman (2006) published a study that built upon more than fifty years of research in the field of social influence and group dynamics and his findings are consistent with the theory of altercasting. Members of the group(s) in Kelman's study experienced pressure from other members that shaped their behavior. Pratkanis (2000) explored altercasting and its influence on the role of norms and group membership and found that altercasting may be more prevalent in closed, group settings. One such group is a collegiate fraternity. Fraternities have been part of the collegiate experience since 1776, when a group founded Phi Beta Kappa at the College of William and Mary (Hastings, 1965).

The focus of this study is to present quantitative research that will show the influence that members of fraternities have on other members' leadership development, knowledge of current events, usage of media, likelihood of voting, and voting habits

when compared to non-affiliated students. In a closed community such as a fraternity, which requires membership to participate, it is likely that members exert influence upon one another.

A review of existing literature shows that altercasting takes place in organizations such as fraternities. This study will build upon the body of existing literature on the theory of altercasting as a means through which members of fraternities encourage and direct behavior of other members. To conduct this study, the author of this paper will analyze data gathered by the Center for Learning Outcomes Assessment (CLOA) for a study on the influence of fraternity membership.

In July 2009, CLOA released findings from a two-year study of five national fraternities that assessed the influence of fraternity membership on student behaviors outside the classroom using the University Learning Outcomes Assessment (UniLOA). The UniLOA is a standardized assessment instrument measuring behaviors consistent with seven distinct domains regarded as critical by employers, academicians, managers, researchers, accrediting agencies, and others (Barratt & Frederick, 2009).

Using existing data from UniLOA, this study will explore the correlation between fraternity membership and scores within the seven domains. Using Pearson correlations and multiple regression analysis, the influence of altercasting on the following selected behaviors will be measured: leadership, knowledge of current events, likelihood of volunteering time, hours spent volunteering each week, understanding of the political process, usage of media, and self-reporting of voting in a general election. Key areas of the study will examine how students are guided and directed towards specific behaviors that influence these scores through verbal and non-verbal communication, which is by

definition altercasting. This research will benefit fraternities as programs can be refined and implemented which continue to improve members' scores as measured by the UniLOA. With an enhanced understanding of the role that altercasting has in shaping the behaviors measured by the UniLOA, it is possible that strategies can be developed to apply these same behaviors to a broader, more general student population. For purposes of this study, a fraternity will be defined as a group of male students who have been initiated into a fraternal social organization. These organizations may or may not have a residential component. Honor fraternities and fraternities that accept women will be excluded as no data was gathered for these groups as part of the UniLOA study.

To gain a more thorough understanding of the influence fraternity membership has on college students, this study will examine previous literature relative to the influence of fraternity membership and accompanying student behavior. Particular attention will be given to literature that explores the usage of media and knowledge of current events, and the likelihood that fraternity members vote in local, state, and national elections. This review of the literature will also examine altercasting, the key theory that will guide the research. The final chapters of the study will explicate the analysis of the data, results of the research, and future implications of the study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Altercasting was first presented as a communications theory at the 1962 meetings of the American Sociological Association (ASA) in Washington, D.C. “Some Dimensions of Altercasting,” written by Eugene A. Weinstein and Paul Deutschberger, was read during the proceedings; a revision of the paper appeared in the ASA’s December 1963 issue of *Sociometry* (Weinstein & Deutschberger, 1963). The theory relies on the concept of persuasion; the goal of altercasting is to project an identity, (to be assumed by other(s) with whom one is interacting), which is congruent with one's own goals. Through psychological, societal, and unnoticed manipulation, an individual’s likelihood of playing out a specific social role is more likely to occur.

Development of Altercasting as a Communications Theory

Researchers prior to Weinstein and Deutschberger had begun to study the interactions among individuals, including Carl Rogers’ person-centered approach where his work outlined an understanding of personality development and use of the humanistic approach in dealing with others. Rogers’ (1951) theory of the self is grounded on nineteen propositions which describe how humans react and respond to the environment around them. Robert Cialdini’s theory of influence outlined six principles, including (a) reciprocity, (b) commitment and consistency, (c) social proof, (d) authority, (e) liking, and (f) scarcity which impact persuasion and communication (Cialdini, 2008). These studies are complementary to Weinstein and Deutschberger’s work.

Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) accepted that human behavior is goal directed, just as are the suppositions made in ancient theories developed by Plato and

Aristotle and in the late 18th century by Bentham (Allport, 1954) as well as more modern theorists.

Samuel A. Stouffer (1949) studied role obligations and the consequences when roles conflicted. Stouffer sampled 196 Harvard and Radcliffe students, mostly undergraduates, asking each to complete a brief questionnaire. Prior to completing the questionnaire, respondents were presented with a scenario in which a fellow student is seen openly cheating. Respondents were asked to indicate the action taken if they were the only individual with knowledge of the cheating. Various scenarios presented were that other students might learn the respondent had knowledge of the cheating, that authorities would find out the respondent had knowledge of the cheating, and that the respondent would be censured. Respondents were also asked to indicate their behavior if the student observed cheating was a friend and/or roommate. The questionnaire presented five actions that were an ordered sequence along a “degree of punitiveness” (Stouffer, 1949, p. 710). Respondents were more likely to discipline the student caught cheating if they did not know the student and when the respondent felt that the discipline taken would be viewed favorably by authorities.

Stouffer (1949) provides theoretical viewpoints behind this research that support the theory of altercasting:

1. In any social group there exist norms and a strain for conformity to these norms.
2. Ordinarily, if the norms are clean and unambiguous, the individual has no choice but to conform or take the consequences in group resentment.

3. If a person has simultaneous roles in two or more groups such that simultaneous conformity to the norms of each group is incompatible, he can take one of only a limited number of actions, for example:
 - a. He can conform to one set of role expectations and take the consequences of non-conformity to other sets.
 - b. He can seek a compromise position by which he attempts to conform in part, though not wholly, to one or more sets of role expectations, in the hope that the sanctions applied will be minimal (p. 707).

Weinstein and Deutschberger considered Stouffer (1949), Becker's (1960) study on the concept of commitment, and Homans' (1958) study of social behavior as an exchange of goods. Building upon these findings, the theory of altercasting was conceived and tested. Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) designated "Ego" as the actor and the other, whose response is the goal, as "Alter". They wrote:

If we accept the postulate that human behavior is goal directed, then the goal of any actor in a social encounter is capable of being stated in terms of some response from other participants in that encounter. For the purposes of this paper, (and following what has become institutionalize form in these matters) the actor shall henceforth be designated "Ego," and the other, whose response is the goal, as "Alter." All of Ego's behavior directed toward Alter shall be called "lines of action." The response of Alter they are intended to elicit will be termed "the interpersonal task (p. 455).

In Erving Goffman's (1959) *"The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life,"* Goffman theorized that the focus of the problem of influencing Alter's definition of the

situation is Ego's presentation of self. Goffman (1959) concentrates more on techniques and problems of self-presentation and does not provide an in depth analysis of Alter's response.

Six Dimensions of Altercasting

Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) formulated six dimensions of altercasting on the basis of theoretical considerations and analysis of a series of role playing experiments. For their experiment, student volunteers role-played three types of situations, including (a) establishment of a relationship, (b) maintenance of a relationship under external threat, and (c) maintenance of a relationship under internal strain. Two groups of students were established with one group serving as confederates and trained by the researchers to serve as Ego in the three situations, while the other group was unaware of the experiment. The confederates were assigned different roles, dependent upon the situation, and gathered feedback; sessions were recorded using a concealed tape recorder and microphone.

Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) assumed that altercasting was taking place, and therefore their study did not attempt to demonstrate its presence, but rather, it was to determine what influence Ego had on Alter. They acknowledged that much is dependent on the confederates (Ego) and the confederates' ability to assess the responses of the subject (Alter). When trying to measure altercasting, Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) formulated six important dimensions of the role into which Alter was cast which includes:

- **Structural distance:** the position of relative authority Ego is directing Alter to play out in the current encounter.

- Evaluative Distance: the relative evaluative status of Ego and Alter as presented selves, independent of the structural distance involved.
- Emotional Distance: the “primariness” or “secondariness” of Alter’s relationship with Ego as projected by Ego.
- Support vs. Support Seeking: Ego’s indications to Alter that Alter is in an identity requiring Ego’s help or assistance (a rating of 1) or, at the other extreme, being required to give aid and comfort to Ego (a rating of 7).
- Interdependence vs. Autonomy: the extent to which Ego projects Alter as being tied to Ego by bonds of common fate, perspective, or concurrence of interests.
- Degree of Freedom Allowed Alter: the range of behavior Ego allows Alter within the encounter (p. 457-458).

Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) allowed that accounting for the process involved in interpersonal control is basic to understanding interaction, and they assumed that control is carried out through altercasting. Their research had two main purposes of testing the feasibility of this approach and testing its utility in yielding theoretically meaningful results.

Testing the Theory of Altercasting

Given the assumption that altercasting was taking place, the confederates served as raters to determine what role was accepted and the responses Alter made. Inter-rater reliability was estimated through the review of a sample of thirty sessions rated independently by two individuals. These individuals worked directly with the taped sessions, rating each on all six dimensions. Allowances were made for raters’ judgmental

processes rather than assuming that real relationships were present in the interactions. Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) determined that it was reasonable that individuals acting as Ego would cede superordination and evaluative worth to Alter when seeking support from Alter.

Language and the choice of pronouns were observed. The prediction that a high frequency of "I's" would be related to claiming superordinate status was not found. The other two hypotheses, that "we" was predicted to be relatively frequent in altercasting of interdependence, and "you" was expected to be frequent in cases where heavy constraints were placed on Alter, were confirmed. "We" was associated with greater projection of interdependence. The correlation between frequent usage of "you" and attempting to impose greater restrictions on the Alter's responsive behavior exceeded Weinstein and Deutschberger's expectations. "You" appeared to be used often for individuals who sought to control social relationships.

Weinstein and Deutschberger performed an analysis of variance on the scores in each of the six dimensions to test for role, feedback, and gender. The gender of Alter or gender of the dyad of Alter and Ego did not have significant influence with the exception of two instances. The differences by which men and women structured relationships were observed; males tended to structure the relationship in more primary terms and females tended to place heavier constraints on the relationship. The researchers noted that this may be a general tendency for middle class females as they are "more normatively limited than females in the range of roles they are allowed to play and are made conscious, during socialization, of being held accountable for the kinds of relationships they do enter" (Weinstein & Deutschberger, 1963, p. 464).

Feedback delivery was contrasted on two levels as either wholly supportive or negative (either mixed or constantly attacking). Students were not apt to expect open criticism or even feedback that was mixed; mixed feedback was likely to be viewed as an attack. Rogers' (1951) 16th of 19 propositions in the theory of self supports this, as he argued that any experience inconsistent with the organization of the structure of the self may be perceived as a threat. The greater the number of perceived threats an individual perceives, as well as the perceived intensity of the threats, the more rigidly the self works to maintain itself.

Regardless of assigned role, subjects under attack cast their Alters into positions of subordinate responsibility. They accord Alter evaluative superiority in the task at hand and project a picture of the relationship in which Alter's desires, rather than cooperation and mutual involvement, are primary. Furthermore, they tend to constrain their Alters to play this and no other role. Under attack, the main thrust of Ego's acts is to tell Alter, 'You take over,' (Weinstein & Deutschberger, 1963, p. 465).

Altercasting and Its Influence on Social Interaction

Weinstein, Wiley, and DeV Vaughn (1966) continued researching the concept of altercasting and how it influences social interaction when they published *Role and Interpersonal Style as Components of Social Interaction*, reporting on one in a series of studies exploring the usefulness of altercasting as a conceptual approach for the analysis of social interaction. In the study, students at Vanderbilt University participated in a role-playing activity in which a friend discovers an individual to have made harmful comments about the former's manner and style of dress (clothing choices) to a third

party. Students role-played again with role assignments reversed, and researchers analyzed the interactions using the patterns and dimensions outlined by Weinstein and Deutschberger in 1963. They found that there were no systematic differences between the way friends and strangers role-played friends, and the resolution to the situation was similar in both instances; however, friends arrived at resolution more quickly. The manner in which males and females resolved the issue was different however. Males were more likely than females to protest their independence and indifference to matters of taste and suggest that each go their own way. Males consistently viewed the "talker" as being at fault, while the individual perceived as being at fault in female situations varied. In some cases the female individual considered the poor dresser apologized for making choices that the other found offensive. Talkers were accorded less warmth and the ones talked about tended to use heavier and more stringent constraints in their altercasting.

The main thrust of these constraints was to get the "talker" to retreat and repair the damage to the other's identity, to put an acceptable face back on the one talked about through apology and through denial of the evaluative seriousness of the individual criticized for lack of taste. The constraints took a number of different forms. One was to project hurt and to withhold assent from any proposed resolution of the situation until apology and cosmetic work was done. Another was to make veiled and sometimes not so veiled allusions to the talker's commitments to the relationship, forcing the talker to overtly affirm commitment to the relationship and deny that the speaker's words represented any serious devaluation of the other. Withholding consent and throwing the relationship into question considerably reduce the freedom the individual in question felt

in responding. Alter's alternatives were polarized to the demand response or the disintegration of this episode of interaction.

Altercasting and the Lost Letter Technique

Milgram, Mann, and Harter (1965) conducted a study using altercasting as a theory; however, rather than using interviews and role-playing, the researchers distributed 400 stamped, addressed envelopes to people in various parts of New Haven, Connecticut. The letters were left on car windshields, dropped on the street and placed in other various locations throughout the community. The letters had no instructions with them as the purpose of the research was to determine if the letter would be mailed. The variable was the organization to which the letter was addressed. The researchers hypothesized that strangers would be more helpful to favorable organizations like medical research institutes, and less helpful to stigmatized organizations such as Friends of the Nazi Party. The letters were identical, with the only variation the organization to which the letter was addressed. One hundred letters were assigned to each of the following organizations: Friends of the Communist Party, Friends of the Nazi Party, Medical Research Associates, and Mr. Walter Carnap. The focus of the study was not on the individual reaction to the letters that were not returned but, rather, on the response rate for a particular organization relative to other organizations that served as controls. The overall rate of return of the 400 letters was 48 percent; however, most striking is that individuals returned 72 percent of the Medical Research letters and 71 percent of the personal letters while the Communist and Nazi Party return rate were each 25 percent. Milgram stated that the while the results did not expose any new or spectacular findings, they did show that the technique was

valuable as a means of assessing community orientation toward social groups or organizations.

Additional studies have shown that altercasting is an effective method for gaining compliance and guiding behavior. Pratkanis and Uriel (2011) conducted research into an influence tactic they termed as the expert snare. In the expert snare, Alter is cast into a role as “expert” by Ego, and Alter, wishing to avoid potentially embarrassing disclosure or situations, was likely to pretend to be subject matter experts and accept absurd proposals.

Altercasting and Membership in Organizations

Group membership, including fraternities, can have a significant influence on behavior. In a study where members of a group were presented with dilemmas with multiple actions, Guala, Mittone and Ploner (2013) found that group affiliation has a consistent positive effect on cooperation. In 2006, Herbert Kelman published a study that built upon fifty years of research in the field of social influence and group dynamics (Kelman, 2006). Kelman’s original work was based upon a model of quantitatively different processes of social influence, including compliance, identification, and internalization. Researchers have subsequently applied the model to influence in the context of long-term relationships as well as the analysis of the relationship of individuals to social systems (Kelman, 2006). Fraternity members’ relative higher scores in the dimensions measured by the UniLOA may be attributed to Kelman’s findings in each of the three areas of social influence. Kelman defines compliance as when an individual accepts influence from another person or a group in order to attain a favorable reaction from the other... Identification can be said to occur

when an individual accepts influence from another person or a group in order to establish or maintain a satisfying self-defining relationship to the other. (Kelman, 2006, p. 3-4)

Kelman (2006) found that internalization occurs when individuals accept influence from another in order to maintain the congruence of actions and beliefs with their own value system. Within the construct of a fraternity, it is likely that these dynamics are experienced by both new members (pledges) and those with greater seniority. Kelman's (2006) findings are consistent with the theory of altercasting as members of the group(s) in his study experienced pressure placed on other members and pressure experienced by other members. In a study that investigated living in a learning community within a fraternity or sorority, Blackburn and Janosik (2009) found that members characterized their fraternity or sorority living experience as having influence on the members' living community. Respondents reported that there was little or no influence on the community as a learning environment. Blackburn and Janosik defined fraternity or sorority housing as a closed living environment occupied exclusively by members in the same organization (Blackburn & Janosik, 2009, p. 56). Participants in this study completed the Learning Communities Assessment (LCA) (Turrentine, 2001) which had a total of forty-five items in five content areas. Participants responded on a continuum ranging from 1 (*very descriptive of my experience*) to 10 (*very unlike my experience*). The items on the LCA were grouped into four scales assessing Active Engagement, Learning, Sense of Community, and Identity.

Blackburn and Janosik (2009) found that participants in their study were actively engaged in their chapters and that a greater sense of involvement and connection among

these individuals kept them in school, which supports the findings relative to the benefits of involvement (Parker & Gade, 1981) and retention (Tripp, 1997). These interactions contributed to the Active Engagement scores. Participants in Blackburn and Janosik's study had mean scores of less than 3.0 on eight of the twelve items assessing Sense of Community, suggesting that the living experience, as measured by the LCA, was the most positive effect fraternity or sorority life had on members (Blackburn & Janosik, 2009, p. 66).

Tenure or length of membership may cause members to cast one another into the role of "expert" as observed by Pratkanis and Uriel (2011). College fraternities are no exception particularly as new members join fraternities each year. Using altercasting to explore the success of fraternity members is logical. An example of a validated quantitative measure for success is the University Learning Outcomes Assessment (UniLOA) (Barratt & Frederick, 2009a), which measures college behaviors beyond simple academic performance. The UniLOA is a nationally normed, highly reliable and valid measure of the "rest" of student growth, learning, and development (GLD). The critical domains the UniLOA measures include (a) critical thinking, (b) self-awareness, (d) communication, (e) diversity, (f) citizenship, (g) membership and leadership, and (h) relationships (Barratt & Frederick, 2009a.). According to a study released in July 2009 by UniLOA, students who are members of a fraternity or sorority score significantly higher and have distinctively unique patterns of GLD over the academic lifespan in these seven dimensions than do non-members (Barratt & Frederick, 2009b).

Community Living and Bandura's Social Learning Theory

The positive effect of living experience could be attributed to Bandura's social learning theory (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). When members engage in positive activities and exhibit attitudes consistent with that which is expected, they are more likely to be rewarded. Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961) conducted a series of experiments in which children observed adults exhibiting aggressive behavior towards a Bobo doll. The children in the study behaved similarly to the adults when the children interacted with the doll. The children's behavior demonstrated that people learn through observing, imitating, and modeling the behaviors of others. Observing, imitating, and modeling behavior has an influence on members of a fraternity. When Alter observes Ego being rewarded, or conversely, punished for actions, it is likely that Alter will mimic the behavior most likely to be rewarded. In this instance, Alter could be said to model Ego's behavior.

If Alter's behavior does not meet Ego's expectations or standards, additional messaging and persuasion can be applied. Pratkanis and Uriel (2011) stated that altercasting can be a tactic of persuasion because social roles serve to make certain patterns of behavior more or less likely to be engaged. A role is a "set of mutual (but not necessarily harmonious) expectations of behavior between two or more actors, with reference to a particular type of situation" (Goode, 1968, p. 249).

Fraternity members acting in the role of Ego use various messages and provide information to influence those acting in the role of Alter. Fraternity members' significantly higher scores in the seven dimensions measured by the UniLOA may be a

result of the influence and persuasion of members in elected, as well as de facto, leadership positions acting as Ego on other members in the role of Alter.

The manner in which messages and information are shared makes a difference in how they are received, and whether members acting as Ego achieve their desired outcome. Turner, Banas, Rains, Jang, Moore and Morrison (2010) built upon Milgram's lost letter research by conducting a similar study by varying it by including a positive or negative message or a direct request along with the letter. They found that altercasting was not effective when compared to a direct request. However, of significance is that negative altercasting led to significantly fewer letter returns than direct requests. Fraternities may well frame messages to members in a positive manner, which could explain the significantly higher scores on the UniLOA.

Altercasting has some limitations in this instance. Altercasting will not help answer questions about the influence of student housing on student success. It allows for measuring messages and the influence on the intended recipients; however; it does not take into account environmental factors.

Influence of Fraternity Membership on Student Success

Since the early 1930s, researchers have had an interest in the influence of fraternities on collegiate members. T.M. Carter (1934) published the results of a study conducted at Albion College regarding the influence of college fraternities on scholarship. Carter created an "index of promise" (Carter, 1934, p. 2) based upon the student's high school record and the score on the intelligence test taken upon entrance to college. He then calculated students' index of achievement (achievement quotient) while in college. Based upon the relationship between the index of promise and the

achievement quotient, Carter assumed that the study would demonstrate whether life in or out of a fraternity was most conducive to scholarship. Carter's findings indicated little or no difference in the indices of students joining fraternities and in some categories membership in fraternities may have hampered student development (Carter, 1934, p. 8).

Carter's (1934) study is relevant today as there is considerable interest in the influence that membership in a fraternity or sorority has on student behavior, academic success, and overall success. More recent research regarding fraternity members' success include Pike's (2000) study that indicated Greek students had higher levels of involvement and gains in general abilities than did non-Greek students and that their cognitive development was a result of their social involvement.

This review of the literature demonstrates that membership in a fraternity influences the collegiate experience in ways both positive and negative. In some studies, membership caused negative consequences and in others, students experienced success as a result of their membership. Higher education administrators continue to experience pressure to increase student success. These pressures come from a variety of sources, including state and federal governments, alumni, benefactors, and students and their families. Success may be defined in a number of ways, among them, higher grade point averages, involvement at an officer level in student organization(s), leadership skill development, graduating within four years, and securing gainful employment after graduation in a position relevant to the students' course of study.

Development of Leadership Skills

Fraternities and sororities were founded as a means to create community and a sense of belonging for student members, and at the same time, encourage leadership,

service and scholarship (Owen, 1991). Several studies point to fraternity and sorority leadership roles as positively influencing personal growth opportunities and leadership training (Astin, 1991; Astin, 1996; Winston & Massaro, 1987). Measuring these behaviors and validating the positive influence of fraternities on scholarship, citizenship, and personal GLD is critical to the overall success of the organizations as they seek to remain relevant in today's higher education environment.

As defined by Merriam-Webster, environment is “the conditions that surround someone or something: the conditions and influences that affect the growth, health, progress, etc., of someone or something.” The Center for Survey Research at Indiana University, administers The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which was introduced in 2000 and revised in 2013. NSSE assesses the quality of undergraduate education and in turn, colleges and universities use this information to improve and enhance student learning. Over 335,000 first-year and senior students at 568 U.S. bachelor's degree-awarding institutions responded to NSSE in 2013. The survey instrument's questions are grouped into five categories: 1) participation in dozens of educationally purposeful activities, 2) institutional requirements and the challenging nature of coursework, 3) perceptions of the college environment, 4) estimates of educational and personal growth since starting college, and 5) background and demographic information (NSSE, 2013). While these results are beneficial to educators and administrators involved in helping to plan a student's experience, they do not measure the growth, learning, and development that students experience during their college career in the same domains as does UniLOA.

Other research has been conducted to determine student success. Astin (1993) developed the Input-Environment-Outcome (I-E-O) Model to examine the student experience. Astin's model focuses on three distinct phases of the student experience: student inputs, the collegiate learning environment, and student outputs. Inputs are defined as student demographics, family background, and academic history and experiences. The environment encompasses the people, programs, cultures, policies, and practices with which and whom the student engages. Outputs, or outcomes, are the skills, characteristics, values, beliefs, and behaviors the student acquires through the dynamic exchange among these three dimensions.

Researchers have developed instruments other than the UniLOA to measure the influence of fraternity life on members, in particular those who serve as officers. Kelley (2008) explored the influence service as a fraternity chapter president has on students' self-perceived leadership development and more specifically, on students' careers. Kelley built his instrument upon those previously developed by Kouzes and Posner (2001) and by Posner and Brodsky (1992). Kouzes and Posner (2001) developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) as a tool for businesses to use in creating employee leadership development programs. The instrument measures behaviors and actions reported in five functional areas: a) Challenging the Process (Challenging), b) Inspiring a Shared Vision (Inspiring), c) Enabling Others to Act (Enabling), d) Modeling the Way (Modeling), and e) Encouraging the Heart (Encouraging).

Posner and Brodsky (1992) adapted the instrument for use with college students, creating the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI), validating it by administering it across the country in 100 chapters of a single national fraternity. Posner and Brodsky's

hypothesis was confirmed, as effective versus less effective students vary in their leadership practices as measured by the SLPI, and the SLPI can help identify and specify areas for developing personal skills necessary to be an effective leader.

Kelley (2008) developed the Leadership Acquisitions Form (LAF), an expansion of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes and Posner, 2001). The LAF measures a) Goal-Setting, b) Delegation, c) Motivating Others, d) Decision-Making, e) Problem-Solving, f) Organizational Skills, g) Meeting Management, h) Financial Management, i) Risk-Taking, j) Presentation Skills, k) Teamwork, l) Conflict Management, m) Social Skills, and n) Interpersonal Skills.

The LAF factors are measured on two separate scales, including effectiveness (on a four-point scale from very effective to very ineffective) and usefulness (on a four-point scale from not useful to very useful). To learn more about the influence of serving as president of a fraternity versus other offices, Kelley (2008) administered both the LAF and the SLPI to 134 former fraternity presidents who had also held other offices either before or after serving as chapter president. His findings were that students who served as president of their fraternities perceived that their service did have a positive influence on their leadership skills, as many of the duties and responsibilities associated with their office were unique to the role. These former students held employment at relatively high levels, with the most common employment categories being managers, attorneys, vice presidents, and CEOs/owners/presidents (Kelley, 2008, p. 5). Skills that participants cited having gained during their time in office were meeting management, conflict management, teamwork, and interpersonal skills (Kelley, 2008, p. 9). Kelley (2008) points out that while students do not have to be officers of a fraternity during their college

education to be successful, membership and holding an office do provide unique opportunities not found elsewhere.

These studies demonstrating student success point to the students' active involvement in extracurricular activities; in these cases, the activities are Greek letter organizations. George Kuh (Schroeder, 2003), a leading proponent of focusing more attention on the nature of the undergraduate experience, details the ongoing research in student engagement measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). In an interview with Charles Schroeder (Schroeder, 2003), Kuh outlines five benchmarks of educational practice (Schroeder, 2003, p. 4), the second of which is active and collaborative learning:

Active and Collaborative Learning: Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and are asked to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter during and after college. Students assess such activities as the following;

- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments,
- Tutored or taught other students, and/or
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course (p. 4).

Volunteerism and Participation in Community-Based Activities

College students participate in community-based activities and serve as volunteers for organizations in their collegiate community for a variety of reasons. Community service offers benefits to students as it encourages social responsibility and promotes

civic awareness. Researchers have found that community service among young adults offers concrete benefits: keeping kids out of trouble (Hart, Atkins, & Ford, 1998) and developing a sense of caring for those in need (Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988), positive physical and mental health (Harlow & Cantor, 1996; Stephan 1991), higher academic achievement (Johnson, Beebe, Motimer, & Snyder, 1998), and pursuit of higher education (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999).

To better understand the reasons that undergraduate students volunteer, Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) conducted public service motivation (PSM) research at North Carolina State University using an instrument developed by Perry (1996). Public service motivation was defined by Perry and Wise (1990) “as an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions.” These motives are categorized into three distinct types: rational, norm-based, and affective. Perry identified six dimensions that fall into one of these three types: a.) attraction to public policy, b.) commitment to the public interest, c.) sense of civic duty, d.) social justice, e.) compassion, and f.) self-sacrifice (Perry, 1996). Participants, all undergraduate students at the university, were asked a series of questions focused on volunteering and donating choices. Students were offered a choice between donating \$10 or two hours of volunteer time for the week in question. Variables, unique to the sample because it was drawn from an undergraduate population, included respondent’s class year, major, membership in a fraternity or sorority, familiarity with campus service organizations, student family income, and volunteer experience in high school and whether or not it was mandatory.

Clerkin et al. (2009) found that PSM has a positive effect on volunteering and donating and the greater the individual’s PSM, the greater the likelihood the individual

will choose to volunteer and/or donate. They found that fraternities and sororities usually require members to participate in service activities; however, membership in these groups is not related to whether members choose to donate or volunteer their time.

While service activities may be encouraged by Ego acting on Alter, a review of philanthropic activities on campuses with large Greek student populations shows that much of the activity is undertaken by members of Greek organizations.

In a review of factors and motives contributing to student volunteerism, Moore, Warta and Erichsen (2014) found that students who were members of Greek organizations were almost twice as likely to volunteer as other students. Cruce and Moore (2007) conducted a study to determine the differences in first-year students' decision to volunteer in college as well as the differences among students who did not plan to volunteer during their college career.

Utilizing data from the 2004 and 2005 administrations of the NSSE from 623 institutions in the United States that had sufficient samples of first-year student data, Cruce and Moore (2007) found that members of fraternities and sororities were 179 percent more likely to volunteer during their collegiate years.

Youth, Politics and Voting

While Cruce and Moore (2007) found that members of fraternities and sororities are more likely to volunteer, this is contrary to the results of a study by Delli Carpini (2000). Delli Carpini (2000) cites a "decline in civic engagement over the past 30 years is evident among all age groups; it is particularly acute among young adults...America's youth appear to be disconnecting from public life, and doing so at a rate that is greater than for any other age group" (p. 341). When compared to older Americans or with

younger Americans from earlier eras, Delli Carpini (2000) found that today's young adults are significantly less interested in politics or public affairs; less knowledgeable about the substance or processes of politics; less likely to read a newspaper or watch the news; less likely to register to vote; less likely to participate in politics beyond voting; less likely to participate in community organizations designed to address public problems through collective action or the formal policy process; and less likely to connect individual efforts to help solve problems with more traditional, collective forms of civic engagement. Young adults are more likely to define civic engagement as a one-on-one experience of volunteering rather than voting or participating in organizations to bring about social change. Delli Carpini's (2000) findings point to a lack of awareness of the connection between these individual, isolated, one-on-one experiences and the opportunity to address them systematically through civic engagement (through community groups or voting) and the belief that politics matters.

Austin & Halvorson (2008) explored the reasons that drive political activity in college students; the goal of their study was to discover the recognition of a general problem(s) and involvement for politically active college students as well as the outside influences contributing to the political activity. Students' usage of media and how it impacts political activity was examined; participants were asked how many hours per week they used various types of media. Level of involvement in political activities, problem recognition relative to participants' information seeking, and behaviors in regards to general political issues were measured, as well as participants' perception of their own political activity and involvement.

Austin & Halvorson (2008) findings support those of Delli Carpini (2000), that college students narrowly define “political” as social or local activities to change society. The correlation between students who self-identified as politically active and those who identified themselves as a member of a group trying to make political or social change was much lower than expected (Austin & Halvorson, 2008, p. 16). Survey results identified significant factors contributing to political activity among college students as media usage, the proximity of issue, and inclusion in groups.

Constraints, whether real or perceived, limited students’ abilities to participate in activities of political or volunteer nature. Austin & Halvorson (2008) found that “members of groups perceived fewer constraints to activity than those not involved in campus groups, and that group membership related closely to lower perceived constraints both as an individual and as a member of a group” (p. 17). Students self-identifying as a member of a sorority or fraternity were participants which lends support to the theory of altercasting and how students are influenced to take action as pressed upon them by other members.

Media Usage Promoting Interest in Community and Political Activity

Students must be made aware of opportunities for engagement in community and political activities before they can actively participate. Various communication mediums are available, but it is unclear which is the most effective and efficient in reaching this audience. Usage of traditional mass media outlets by young people today is low (Acar, 2008; Cohen 2008). The Internet is increasingly seen as a means through which to reach this population to impact their participation in political activities (Graber, 2001; Shah, Kwak, and Holbert, 2001). Shah, Kwak and Holbert (2001) found that Internet users were

more likely to have political trust and engage more in civic matters. In a study conducted among college students in Singapore, Hao, Wen and George (2014) found that the medium through which news was gathered influenced political and civic participation. In this study, the majority of respondents used the Internet as a source for news, with 85.2 percent of them spending less than one hour and 8.3 percent more than one hour on Internet news per day. The percentage of students using other media outlets for less than one hour per day to gather news dropped considerably after that of the Internet: newspapers (68.9%), television (71.3%), and radio (35%). The attention paid to news about politics and current events varied among the respondents with 13.1 percent paying “a lot of attention,” to 64 percent paying “some attention,” and 22.9 percent paying “very little attention” (Hao, Wen, and George, 2014, p. 1227-1228). Participants were also found to have talked about politics and current events with family members and friends. Engagement in political and civic activities included donating money to a charitable organization or a cause, volunteer work, and joining student organizations as a member. News consumption overall was found to have a positive impact on political and civic engagement and was more likely to lead to students’ engagement in one or both.

Young people who frequently discuss politics with their peers are characterized by higher voting intentions and subsequent participation in elections by voting. Šerek and Umemura (2015) found that discussions with parents and exposure to political news had no such effects, pointing to the influence that a group of peers, such as a fraternity, has on a young person’s interest and participation in the political process.

Thus, the main goal of this study is to examine the relationship between the level of altercasting present and leadership, knowledge of current events, likelihood of

volunteering, hours spent volunteering, usage of media and self-reporting of voting in a general election. It should be kept in mind, however, that the test of these relationships in this study uses secondary analysis on a cross-sectional measure of collegiate members of fraternities, and therefore it is not possible to test the directionality of causal flow, and whether there is greater influence from Ego on Alter, or vice versa. In subsequent sections of this report, there is some assumption of causality (that Ego is acting upon Alter) on observed behaviors and this is done more from a theoretical than an empirical perspective.

Therefore, to determine the presence of altercasting relative to the development of leaders, likelihood of volunteering, usage of media, understanding of the political process, voting in general elections, knowledge of current events and hours spent volunteering:

H1: Fraternity members' altercasting score is positively related to fraternity members' leadership scores.

H2: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by knowledge of current events, and investment in volunteering.

H3: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by an understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events and self-reporting of voting in a general election.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of altercasting and fraternity members' engagement in the organization and how active participation affects their leadership development and serving as an officer or role model. In addition, the influence of altercasting on members' likelihood of volunteering and community engagement, usage of media, understanding of the political process and voting in the general election were examined. There seems to be little doubt among researchers that Greek life influences student members, both negatively and positively. As universities seek to make the collegiate experience more meaningful and to encourage student engagement in community, lessons can be gleaned from the fraternity experience. The UniLOA fraternity report provides insight into the positive influence that fraternities can have on members. With data from 5,189 valid responses (UniLOA, 2009), the data set is large enough to provide an accurate assessment of the influence fraternity life has on college students. For the purposes of this study, particular attention will be given to understanding how students use media to be informed of current and civic events relative to their level of community engagement and the likelihood that they will vote in a general election. The data set to be used for this study is appropriate as it measures outcomes rather than environmental factors.

Weinstein and Deutschberger's (1963) study that formulated the six dimensions of the role into which Alter is cast is likely at play in a collegiate fraternity. The results from the UniLOA will provide a framework through which to study these dimensions and the influence on members and their resulting behavior.

Population and Sample

Findings from the UniLOA were beneficial to the initial partners and there was interest in expanding the use of the instrument to more targeted populations (Barratt & Frederick, 2009). Fraternities traditionally have had complicated relationships with the administration of their respective campuses. Are the contributions these organizations make to the colleges and universities positive, or do they contribute, and even encourage, negligent student behavior? The UniLOA provides a mechanism through which this can more clearly be determined. Between 2007 and 2009, five national fraternities utilized the UniLOA instrument to assess the impact of membership and the contribution to the campus environment. A total of 5,189 valid responses were received. Survey respondents were male and enrolled as college students.

Research Design

Barratt and Frederick (2009) assert that the UniLOA differs from other nationally-normed tests such as the SAT, ACT and CIRP in that these tests measure student inputs while NSSE measures the environment. The UniLOA measures input, environment, and output and offers a more broad-based assessment of the overall student experience. As such, the secondary data collected in 2009 and available from the UniLOA were used to analyze the hypotheses in this study ($N = 5,189$). No additional data collection was undertaken.

Instrument

In response to the continued emphasis on accountability and the measurement of outcomes in higher education, the University Learning Outcomes Assessment (UniLOA) was created. To develop the instrument, Barratt and Frederick (2009) began with the

question, “What should students know and be able to do when they walk across the graduation stage to receive their diplomas?” To answer that question, focus groups, one-on-one interviews, and surveys were conducted with university administrators and faculty, employers, higher education constituents, and students themselves. Through this research, themes emerged that allowed for the identification of the seven domains measured by the UniLOA. The instrument (see Appendix A) is a self-report with seventy items and thirteen additional demographic questions, designed to measure student behaviors consistent with seven critical domains of growth, learning, and development (GLD), including a.) critical thinking, b.) self-awareness, c.) communications, d.) diversity, e.) citizenship, f.) membership & leadership, and g.) relationships. Barratt and Frederick chose to use a 10-point Likert-like scale, labeled “a” through “j” with the anchor words “never” to the left of the letter “a” and the word “always” to the right of the letter “j” to attain broad variability in student responses, which was “modeled on a semantic differential technique.” They chose letters rather than numbers to avoid possible bias associated with a rank order system (Barratt & Frederick, 2009).

For the purposes of this study, this researcher focused upon items relative to fraternity members as leaders, likelihood of volunteering, usage of media, understanding of the political process, voting in general elections, knowledge of current events, and hours spent volunteering. The influence of altercasting was also measured using items from the instrument.

Validity and Reliability

A panel of experts in higher education analyzed the wording, structure, and appropriateness to determine content validity. Items used in this study were adapted from

UniLOA (2009). Using a randomly selected sample of $N = 5,189$, this author found internal consistency for reliability: (a) altercasting composite score, ($r = .648$), $p \geq .000$; (b) leadership composite score, Cronbach's alpha = .816; (c) usage of media composite score, Cronbach's alpha = .563; (d) understanding political process composite score, Cronbach's alpha = .775; and (e) knowledge of current events composite score, Cronbach's alpha = .737. Reliability should ideally be above 0.700; in this research study, two of the scales are below this and as such, care should be taken in their interpretation.

Variables

Altercasting. In this research effort, the concept, altercasting, was operationalized using two items from the questionnaire. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to influence others. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their use of good communication skills in confronting others. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1$; $j = \text{always} = 10$). Responses were summed to generate an altercasting composite score. This composite score had a range of 2 (i.e., never influencing others and never using good communication skills in confronting others) to 20 (i.e., always influencing others and using good communication skills in confronting others). A significant positive correlation was found ($r = .648$, $p = .000$). This composite score had a mean of 14.76 ($SD = 3.369$). (See Table 5).

Leadership. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their being a role model for others. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to effectively run an organization, group or club, and their ability to use

their skills of influencing others to conduct business. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to describe common factors in leadership and membership and their perception of how this knowledge is used to make them more effective. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to confront other people in a constructive way. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to empower others around them. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to take risks to accomplish a goal or complete a job. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). Responses were summed to generate a leadership composite score. This composite score had a range of 6 to 60. Cronbach's alpha for this measure was .816 and this measure had a mean of 45.61 ($SD = 8.465$) (See Table 6).

Likelihood of Volunteering. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their acting on values of diversity and social justice by working with an organization or church to help others. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). This score had a range of 1 to 10 with a mean of 7.15 ($SD = 2.033$). (See Table 7).

Usage of Media. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to evaluate the credibility of sources and information and to tell credible sources from questionable sources. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to understand basic statistics read or seen in the media. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). Responses were summed to generate a usage of media composite score.

This composite score had a range of 2 to 20 with a mean of 14.95 ($SD = 3.408$). (See Table 8). A positive correlation was found ($r = .437, p > .000$).

Understanding of the Political Process. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of the time spent researching candidates prior to voting. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their seriousness relative to voting. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their ability to identify good political leaders. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their engagement in the political process demonstrated by voicing viewpoints. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). Responses were summed to generate an understanding of the political process composite score. This composite score had a range of 4 to 40. Cronbach's alpha for this measure is .775. A positive correlation was found ($r = .446, p < .000$) (See Table 9).

Voting. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their voting habits and voter registration. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). This score had a range of 1 to 10. A positive correlation was found ($r = .329, p < .000$) (See Table 10).

Knowledge of Current Events. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their knowledge of local, regional, national and international current events relative to their usage of various media sources. Fraternity members were asked to indicate their perception of their knowledge of current political and social issues within their community. Participants answered on a 10-point continuous scale of responses ($a = \text{never} = 1; j = \text{always} = 10$). Responses were summed to generate a knowledge of current

events composite score. This composite score had a range of 2 to 20. (See Table 11). A positive correlation was found ($r = .479, p < .000$). There is evidence in the research, especially among males, that self-perceived knowledge is higher than actual measured knowledge.

Hours Spent Volunteering. Fraternity members were asked to indicate the number of hours spent volunteering each week in an open-ended question. This score had a range of 1 to 15. (See Table 12).

Statistical Analysis

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of altercasting and other self-reported behaviors exhibited by fraternity members as measured by the UniLOA. The statistical analysis for the specified hypotheses is as follows:

H1: Fraternity members' altercasting score is positively related to fraternity members' leadership scores.

Using a Pearson correlation analysis, dependent variable fraternity members' altercasting was positively related to fraternity members' leadership. A significant positive correlation was found ($r = .648, p < .000$).

H2: Fraternity members' altercasting score is positively related to knowledge of current events, the likelihood of volunteering time, and the hours spent volunteering.

Using multiple regression analysis, dependent variable fraternity members' altercasting was regressed on a linear combination of knowledge of current events, the likelihood of volunteering time, and the hours spent volunteering.

Variables were entered into the model in the order listed. A positive correlation was found between altercasting and fraternity members' knowledge of current

events ($r = .479, p < .000$) and between altercasting and the likelihood of volunteering time ($r = .440, p < .000$). The correlation between altercasting and the hours spent volunteering was not significant ($r = .011, p < .229$).

H3: Fraternity members' altercasting score is positively related to a linear combination of understanding the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and self-reported voting in a general election.

Using multiple regression analysis, dependent variable fraternity members' altercasting was regressed on a linear combination of understanding the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and voting in a general election. Variables were entered in the order listed. In the regressions, understanding of the political process was significant ($B = 0.106, p < .000$), as were knowledge of current events ($B = 0.165, p < .000$), and self-reported voting in a general election ($B = 0.100, p < .000$).

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of altercasting on fraternity members' leadership scores, knowledge of current events, and their likelihood of voting in a general election. Specifically, this study addresses the following hypotheses:

H1: Fraternity members' altercasting score is positively related to fraternity members' leadership scores.

H2: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by knowledge of current events, and investment of time and interest in volunteering.

H3: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by an understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and self-reporting of voting in a general election.

In this research effort, altercasting and the dependent variables noted in the hypotheses were defined as described in the previous chapter.

Results of the Study

Prior to addressing research questions, the general characteristics of the distribution were analyzed. A univariate analysis was conducted for each variable to garner descriptive statistics and a Shapiro-Wilk test was used to test for normality. SPSS Statistics (Version 22.0) was used in the analysis. Descriptive statistics and research findings are presented in detail as follows.

Descriptive Variables

In this sample, the vast majority of the sample identified as European Americans (89.0%). The remaining participants identified as African American (1.5%), Hispanic

American (4.5%), Asian Pacific Islander (2.2%), Native American (2.1%) and International (0.7%).

In this sample, participants indicated a wide range in hours completed; they ranged from 0-120 and are as follows: 0-15 hours (19.4%), 16-30 hours (10.7%), 31-45 hours (15.8%), 46-60 hours (11.8%), 61-75 hours (14.4%), 76-90 hours (8.2%), 91-105 hours (10.2%) and 106-120 hours (9.5%).

In this sample, the vast majority of participants indicated grade point averages in the upper range: 3.01-3.5 (36.3%) and 3.51-4.0 (38.2%). The remaining participants indicated grade point averages as follows: 0-0.50 (0.2%), 0.51-1.00 (0.2%), 1.01-1.50 (0.3%), 1.51-2.00 (0.8%), and 2.01-2.50 (5.6%).

In this sample, the age of participants were primarily distributed evenly across the sample. The distribution is as follows: 17 (0.8%), 18 (19.9%), 19 (29.5%), 20 (25.6%), 21 (19.3%), 22 (4.0%), 23 (0.7%), 24 (0.3%). Two participants indicated an age of 25 or above.

Hypotheses

Given that the basic expectations were about the first order correlations of all variables, all variables were correlated with each other (see Table 13). As can be seen, there are significant positive correlations between seven of the variables, with the exception one, which was the number of hours spent volunteering each week.

Hypothesis 1. Fraternity members' altercasting is positively related to fraternity members' leadership scores.

A Pearson correlation was calculated to indicate the degree of association between fraternity members' altercasting and fraternity members' leadership scores. A

significant positive correlation was found ($r = .648, p < .000$). Table 13 reports the correlation between altercasting and fraternity members as leaders.

Hypothesis 2: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by knowledge of current events, and investment of time and interest in volunteering.

A Pearson correlation was calculated between the dependent variable, altercasting, and each of the independent variables included in this hypothesis. A positive correlation ($r = .479, p < .000$) was found between altercasting and fraternity members' knowledge of current events. Between altercasting and the likelihood of voting, there is a positive correlation ($r = .329, p < .000$). The correlation between altercasting and the number of hours spent volunteering each week is insignificant ($r = .011, p < .229$).

Using multiple regression analysis, fraternity members' altercasting was regressed on a linear combination of knowledge of current events, the likelihood of volunteering time, and the hours spent volunteering. Variables were entered in the order listed. The model was significant. The equation containing three variables accounted for 30 percent of the variance in fraternity members' altercasting score, $F(3,4908) = 701.52, p = .00$. (See Table 14.) Review of the standardized estimates (beta) indicated that altercasting was positively related to knowledge of current events, $\beta = .357$, and positively related to likelihood of volunteering time, $\beta = .294$. Hours spent volunteering was not significant.

Hypothesis 3: Fraternity members' altercasting score is increased by an understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and self-reporting of voting in a general election.

A Pearson correlation was calculated between the dependent variable, altercasting, and each of the independent variables included in this hypothesis. A positive correlation ($r = .446, p < .000$) was found between altercasting and fraternity members' understanding of the political process. Between altercasting and fraternity members' knowledge of current events, there is a positive correlation ($r = .479, p < .000$). The correlation between altercasting and fraternity members' self-reporting that they vote in a general election is positive ($r = .329, p < .000$).

Using multiple regression analysis, fraternity members' altercasting was regressed on a linear combination of understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and self-reporting of voting in a general election. Variables were entered in the order listed. The model was significant. The equation containing four variables accounted for 36 percent of the variance in altercasting, $F(4,005) = 697.77, p = .00$. (See Table 15.) Review of the standardized estimates (beta) indicated that altercasting was positively related to understanding of the political process, $\beta = .106$; usage of media, $\beta = .337$; knowledge of current events, $\beta = .211$; and self-reporting of voting in a general election, $\beta = .100$.

Summary

This research effort addressed three hypotheses related to altercasting among fraternity members. Hypothesis 1, altercasting is positively related to fraternity members' leadership scores, was supported. Hypothesis 2, altercasting is positively related to fraternity members' awareness of current events and the likelihood of volunteering were supported but hours spent volunteering, was not supported. Hypothesis 3, altercasting is

positively related to fraternity members understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events, and self-reporting of voting, was supported.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Student success is an area of concern in higher education, and the factors contributing to success have been explored through various research studies. Over seventy-five years of research has documented the influence a student experiences from living in on-campus housing, participating in extracurricular activities and seeking membership in organizations, including fraternities. The relationship between membership in a collegiate fraternity and members' usage of media, the likelihood of voting and volunteering, and understanding of the political process has been relatively unexplored. Limited research indicates that such a relationship exists, and as fraternities continue to experience pressure to validate their positive influence on members, such research will bring visibility to the positive attributes of membership.

This study was designed to understand the relationship between altercasting and a fraternity member's likelihood of developing leadership skills, understanding of the political process, voting intentions, and contributing to their community through volunteer activities. In the following sections, major findings are discussed in relation to each of these areas in context of the literature review. Implications of these findings as well as recommendations for future research are presented. Again, it should be kept in mind that the directionality of causation from altercasting cannot be determined whether the behavior is from Ego to Alter or from Alter to Ego. However, the high correlations are in the expected direction that altercasting is playing a causal role.

Discussion

To understand the relationship between altercasting and fraternity members' leadership development, likelihood of voting, media usage, understanding of the political

process, knowledge of current events, and hours spent volunteering, three hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1

The literature relative to fraternity membership developing leadership skills provides mixed results pertaining to the relationship between the two. Some authors contend that an inverse relationship exists and others contend that fraternity membership develops strong leaders who carry their experience into work and social environments outside the fraternity. As predicted, this study found the level of leadership was positively correlated with fraternity membership ($r = .648, p > .000$). This is consistent with research findings that indicated members of fraternities were actively engaged in their chapters and that the connection among these individuals kept them enrolled in school (Blackburn & Janosik, 2009) as well as positively influenced personal growth opportunities and leadership training (Astin, 1991; Astin, 1996; Winston & Massaro, 1987).

Hypothesis 2

Researchers have investigated a wide variety of behaviors and characteristics related to fraternity membership yet little data exists on the relationship between membership and the knowledge of current events, the likelihood of volunteering time and hours spent volunteering. In this study these factors were selected. Results indicated 30 percent of the variance in fraternity members was explained by the relationship between membership and these three factors. Among these variables, knowledge of current events (beta = .280, $p = .00$) and the likelihood of volunteering (beta = .488, $p = .00$) made a significant contribution to the explained variance. The number of hours spent volunteering per week was found to be insignificant (beta = .010, $p = .504$).

The positive relationship between college students and volunteerism, particularly college students who are members of a fraternity, is well documented in the literature. Fraternity members are more likely to spend time volunteering (Clerkin, Paynter & Taylor, 2009; Moore, Warta & Erichson, 2014; Cruce & Moore, 2007). This study found a comparable relationship. Cruce and Moore's (2007) position that members of fraternities and sororities were 179 percent more likely to volunteer during their college years was supported, in that participants in the UniLOA were more likely to volunteer. It is likely this can be attributed to the dependent variable, altercasting ($b = .488, p < .000$). It is reasonable to expect that members of a fraternity create an environment where participation in volunteer activities is highly encouraged and somewhat expected, with a positive relationship between volunteer commitments fulfilled and level of commitment to the fraternity. Delli Carpini's (2000) findings that there has been a decline in civic engagement among youth was not supported. Thus, the expected relationship between altercasting and the variables is measured here.

Hypothesis 3

Researchers have also investigated a variety of factors related to college students' participation in the political process. In this study, four factors were selected. Results indicated 36 percent of the variance in fraternity members' participation was explained by understanding of the political process, usage of media, knowledge of current events and self-reporting of voting in a general election. Among these variables, media usage ($\beta = .334, p > .000$) and knowledge of current events ($\beta = .165, p > .000$) made a significant contribution to the explained variance. As predicted, media usage was positively related to fraternity membership as were knowledge of current events,

understanding of the political process, and the self-reported likelihood of voting in a general election.

While there are numerous communications media available to students, it is unclear which are the most effective at reaching this audience. Acar (2008) and Cohen (2008) found that usage of traditional mass media outlets is low. Students are increasingly likely to use the Internet to gather information about political activities and their availability (Graber, 2001; Shah, Kwak & Holbert, 2001) and in turn, organizations are more likely to use this medium to reach this population. Results of this study are consistent with literature stating that college students using the Internet as their source for news were more likely to engage in civic and political activities (Hao, Wen & George, 2014). In addition, results of this study support the findings of Šerek and Umemura (2015) that young people who frequently discuss politics with their peers are characterized by higher voting intentions and in turn, participation in elections by voting.

Fraternity members spend a substantial amount of time with their fellow members. They maintain similar schedules (e.g., meals, study tables, membership meetings and social activities) and are likely to have similar media habits relative to media usage. Given that many fraternity members live together in group housing, they develop similar habits and perspectives relative to many activities, including exploration of current events through media usage and an increased interest in the political process. Austin & Halvorson's (2008) findings that members of campus groups perceive fewer barriers to activity than those not involved were supported by the results of this study. As was expected, the presence of altercasting and the expectation that students place upon their peers to participate in political activities was confirmed.

Conclusions

Membership in fraternities influences student behavior, and can be explained by altercasting. Kelman's (2006) findings support that members of groups experience pressure from other members that shapes their behavior. Guala, Mittone and Ploner (2013) found that affiliation with a group has consistent, positive effect on cooperation among members. Pratkanis (2000) explored altercasting and its influence on roles and social behavior and that it may be more prevalent in closed, group settings, such as a fraternity. Results from this study suggest that altercasting contributed significantly to fraternity members' behavior relative to the development of leadership skills, the likelihood of volunteering, usage of media, understanding of the political process, the intention to vote, and knowledge of current events. In light of these results, several conclusions may be drawn.

First, fraternities at the national level should use the results from the UniLOA and this study to develop a communications and marketing plan for use nationally, regionally, and locally at campus levels to inform stakeholders of membership benefits of membership. Particular emphasis should be placed on the contributions made through volunteering and other contributions made by members to their communities. This plan may be tailored to individual campuses while the overarching plan would provide consistency in messaging. Training on how the plan should be executed could be provided at national, regional, and local fraternity conferences and workshops.

Second, fraternity members are more likely to vote in general elections than the overall student campus populations. Therefore, political organizations and candidates seeking election should develop a plan to target this population. Given the findings of

Šerek and Umemura (2015) that college-aged students are more apt to discuss politics with their peers, this is a logical way to inform, engage and sway students to vote for a particular candidate or support an issue. Hao, Wen and George's (2014) results indicate that these candidates would benefit from using the Internet as the primary means of communication.

Third, organizations seeking volunteer and monetary contributions should consider developing messages and using targeted communication channels to specifically inform fraternity members of existing opportunities. Since many organizations are heavily dependent on volunteer hours for their success, fraternity members' propensity to volunteer make them a logical population upon which to draw. In particular, organizations with missions centric to student success and philanthropic causes linked to fraternities at the national level should use this tactic.

However, there are constraints that should be taken into consideration when reviewing the results of this study. First, each of the variables used in the study (and those of the UniLOA itself) are self-reports. There are considerable opportunities for bias in that individuals may tend to overestimate their skills, abilities, knowledge, and behaviors in given situations. These biases may have contributed to the positive correlations found when the data were analyzed for this particular study.

Most social fraternities have membership selection processes which are competitive in nature. The demographics of students who choose to join fraternities may be similar which in turn, may have an impact on the findings of the UniLOA and this research study. For example, Astin (1984) found that freshman students living in

residence halls are more likely to join fraternities or sororities than commuter students and be involved in general in other student organizations and government.

Altercasting was measured using only two items from the UniLOA study, which asked the respondent to indicate their perception of their ability to influence others using their communication skills and their perception of their ability to confront others in a non-threatening way to influence and/or change behavior. Participants may have had an inflated self-perception of these abilities which, again, might have played a role in the significant, positive correlations among the majority of the variables. This is a somewhat simplistic measure of one's ability to influence others and as such, there may be other theories of equal or greater significance to explain the factors at play.

As the UniLOA is a cross-sectional study, each of the items is measured at one point in time. There is no opportunity for a study of longitudinal data which might better predict the influence that fraternity membership has on individuals and a collective group, and provide a better understanding of cause and effect.

The UniLOA has been administered to a general college student population, of which fraternity members were a subset. This researcher had particular interest in the influence of fraternity membership and so the demographics for this study were confined to that population. Influence similar to that found in this study may be present among an at-large college student population.

The hypotheses presented in this study were confirmed, and are suggestive that further research is needed.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are offered for future research of altercasting and its influence on fraternity members' behaviors. Specific research questions are presented here and in addition, there are overarching recommendations for further research that should be considered.

The data utilized for this study was secondary, and this researcher would suggest that future studies utilize primary data collection through both quantitative and qualitative methods. The data available from CLOA through the UniLOA is robust as there are thousands of available data points, yet in this particular study, there were limitations due to the secondary nature of the data. Gathering primary data through both quantitative and qualitative methods would provide opportunities for more in-depth analysis of the communication methods used by fraternity members to affect change (altercasting) among their peers. In addition, employing these methods would help determine causality and the direction of altercasting. Knowledge of the direction of altercasting (Ego upon Alter, or Alter upon Ego) is beneficial when designing programs to support student development as measured by the UniLOA and other assessments.

Specific questions are as follows:

1. What are the activities that occur within a fraternity chapter/house that influence member behavior? An understanding of this would help develop plans to influence students across a wider percentage of any given student population.
2. What influence is exerted upon a student over the course of their college career that can be measured by the UniLOA? Is there a measureable change in a

students' self-perception from their first year (freshman) in college to their final year (senior)?

3. What differences exist in the influence experienced by fraternity members when compared to a general collegiate population relative to the knowledge of current events and the political process, their likelihood of volunteering, and voting in a general election?
4. What news mediums are most effective and efficient in reaching fraternity members to inform them of volunteer opportunities and current events? Future studies may include a comparison of traditional campus news outlets, such as student newspapers and electronic and static bulletin boards with online social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram.
5. Does altercasting influence a fraternity members' political viewpoint and party affiliation, or lack of? Is there a difference between members of a fraternity and a general collegiate student population relative to political viewpoint and party affiliation? What tactics can be used to influence these choices?

Summary

Membership in a fraternity, while an elective activity, provides many benefits to the individual member. Members are likely to develop leadership skills that they will carry with them after college. Habits centered around volunteering, community engagement and voting, influenced by altercasting, will contribute to members' personal success as well as that of the communities in which they live and participate. Fraternities should capitalize on these positive messages to help ensure their continued presence on college campuses. As the debate continues over student success, no matter how it is

defined; the increasing length of time needed for a student to graduate; and the increasing costs associated with a college degree, organizations that contribute to student well-being and foster their development will be seen as a positive part of the collegiate landscape. Fraternities should seize this opportunity to frame their story in a positive light.

References

- Acar, A. (2008). Antecedents and consequences of online social networking behavior: The case of Facebook. *Journal of Website Promotion*, 3 (1/2), 62-83. doi:10.1080/15533610802052654.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). The historical background of modern social psychology. In G. Lindzey, (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Cambridge: Addison Wesley.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Phoenix: The Oryx Press.
- Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 518-529.
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22, 187-202.
- Astin, H. S. (1996). Leadership for social change: Enriching the student learning experience. *About Campus*, 3, 4-10.
- Austin, L., & Halvorson, E. (2008). What drives political activity in college students? An application of the situational theory of publics. *International Communication Association 2008 Annual Convention*, Quebec, Canada.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through the imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63 (3), 575–582. doi:10.1037/h0045925. PMID 13864605.
- Barratt, W., & Frederick, M. (2009a). *Developing an instrument to measure student learning outcomes: The university learning outcomes assessment*. (Unpublished manuscript). Bayh College of Education, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Barratt, W., & Frederick, M. (2009b). *The American college fraternity impact of membership on student growth, learning, and development*. (Unpublished manuscript). Bayh College of Education, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.

- Blackburn, S., & Janosik, S. (2009). Learning communities in fraternity/sorority housing. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 4(2), 56-70.
- Carter, T. M. (1934). The effect of college fraternities on scholarship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 18(3), 393-400.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and practice* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Clerkin, R. M., Paynter, S. R., & Taylor, J. K. (2009). Public service motivation in undergraduate giving and volunteering decisions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 39(6), 675-698. doi:10.1177/0275074008327512
- Cohen, N. (2008). The valorization of surveillance: Towards a political economy of Facebook. *Democratic Communique*, 22(1): 1-22.
- Cruce, T. M., & Moore, J. V. (2007). First-year students' plans to volunteer: An examination of the predictors of community service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(6), 655-673. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0063
- Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000). Gen.com: Youth, civic engagement, and the new information environment. *Political Communication*, 17, 341-349.
- Guala, F., Mittone, L., & Ploner, M. (2013). Group membership, team preferences, and expectations. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 86, 183-190.
- Goode, W. J. (1968). Norm commitment and conformity to role-status obligations. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 246-258.
- Graber, D. A. (2001). *Processing politics: Learning from television in the internet age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hamilton, S., & Fenzel, M. (1988). The impact of volunteer experience on adolescent social development: Evidence of program effects. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 3, 65-80.
- Hao, X., Wen, N., & George, C. (2014). News consumption and political and civic engagement among young people. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(9), 1221-1238. doi:10.1080/13676261.2014.901490
- Harlow, R., & Cantor, N. (1996). Still participating after all these years. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1235-1249.

- Hart, D., Atkins, R., & Ford, D. (1998). Urban America as a context for the development of moral identity in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 513-530.
- Hastings, W. T. (1965). *Phi Beta Kappa as a secret society with its relations to Freemasonry and Antimasonry: Some supplementary documents*. Richmond, VA: United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.
- Homans, G. C. (1958, May). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 63*(6), 597-606.
- Johnson, M., Beebe, T., Motimer, J., & Snyder, M. (1998). Volunteerism in adolescence: A process perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*, 301-332.
- Kelley, D. (2008). Leadership development through the fraternity experience and the relationship to career success. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisor, 3*(1), 1-12.
- Kelman, H. C. (2006). Interests, relationships, identities: Three central issues for individuals and groups in negotiating their social environment. *Annual Review Psychology, 57*, 1-26. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190156
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2001). *Leadership practices inventory* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Milgram, S., Mann, L., & Harter, S. (1965). The lost-letter technique: A tool for social research. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 29*, 437-438.
- Moore, E. W., Warta, S., Erichsen, K. (2014). College students' volunteering: Factors related to current volunteering, volunteer settings, and motives for volunteering. *College Student Journal, 48*(3), 386-397.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2013). *A fresh look at student engagement*. Retrieved from http://nsse.indiana.edu/NSSE_2013_Results/
- Owen, K. C. (1991). Reflections on the college fraternity and its changing nature. *Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, Baird's Manual Foundation, Indianapolis (Indiana)*.
- Parker, D., & Gade, E. M. (1981, July). Fraternity and sorority perceptions of their residence environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22*(4), 358-62.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(3), 231-237.

- Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5-22.
- Perry, J., & Wise, L. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/9766>
- Pike, G. R. (2000). The influence of fraternity or sorority membership on students' college experiences and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1), 117-139.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(3), 231-237.
- Pratkanis, A. R. (2000). Altercasting as an influence tactic. In D. J. Terry & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Attitudes, behavior, and social context: The role of norms and group membership* (pp. 201-226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Pratkanis, A. R., & Uriel, Y. (2011). The expert snare as an influence tactic: Surf, turf, and ballroom demonstrations of some compliance consequences of being altercast as an expert. *Current Psychology*, 30(4), 335-344. doi:10.1007/s12144-011-9124-z
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications and theory*. London: Constable.
- Šerek, J., & Umemura, T. (2015). Changes in late adolescents' voting intentions during the election campaign: Disentangling the effects of political communication with parents, peers and media. *European Journal of Communication*, 30(3), 285–300. doi:10.1177/0267323115577306
- Schroeder, C. (2003, March/April). How are we doing at engaging students? Charles Schroeder talks to George Kuh. *About Campus*, 8(1), 9-16.
- Shah, D. V., Kwak, N. & Holbert, R. L. (2001). "Connecting" and "disconnecting" with civic life: Patterns of Internet use and the production of social capital. *Political Communication*, 18(2), 141-162. doi:10.1080/105846001750322952.
- Stephan, P. (1991). Relationships among market work, work aspirations, and volunteering: The case of the retired women. *Nonprofit Volunteer Sector Quarterly*, 20, 225-236.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1949). An analysis of conflicting social norms. *American Sociological Review*, 14(6), 707-717.

- Tripp, R. (1997). Greek organizations and student development: A review of the research. *College Student Affairs Journal, 16*(2), 31-39.
- Turner, M. M., Banas, J. A., Rains, S. A., Jang, S., Moore, J. L., & Morrison, D. (2010). The effects of altercasting and counterattitudinal behavior on compliance: A lost letter technique investigation. *Communication Reports, 23*(1), 1-13.
- Turrentine, C. (2001). *Learning communities' assessment*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- UniLOA. (2009). *The American college fraternity: Impact of membership on student growth, learning and development*. Retrieved from http://www.measuringbehaviors.com/UniLOA_About.html
- Weinstein, E. A. & Deutschberger, P. (1963). Some dimensions of altercasting. *Sociometry, 26*(4), 454-466. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2786148>
- Weinstein, E. A., Wiley, M. G. & DeV Vaughn, W. (1966). Role and interpersonal style as components of social interaction. *Social Forces, 45*(2), 210-216. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2574391>.
- Winston, R. B., & Massaro, A. V. (1987). Extracurricular involvement inventory: An instrument for assessing intensity of student involvement. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*, 169-182.

APPENDIX A

University Learning Outcomes Assessment

We are interested in what you do, in your activities and behaviors. Many of the behaviors listed below are things teachers and parents tell you that you should do. Please be honest in each answer and don't tell us what you think we want to hear. Tell us what you really do.

On the attached answer sheet please fill out your last and first name, as well as your University ID number. These will be kept confidential. Use the scale below to tell us how often you do each one of the items below by filling in the corresponding letter on the attached answer sheet. If you never do it, mark A on the sheet. If you always do it, mark J on the sheet. If you do it some of the time, select a point that represents to you, how often you do this behavior.

Don't tell us what you think we want to hear, tell us what you really do.

Never - A B C D E F G H I J - Always

1. I rely on multiple kinds of information when I form an opinion. For example I look for a variety of facts and informed opinions before forming my own conclusion.
2. I list my personal goals for a class or activity. For example I list my learning goals for a class beyond the learning outcomes listed in the syllabus, as well as my goal for a grade.
3. My presentations in classes are concise, precise, and persuasive. For example they are always within the time limit and don't wander off the point and I typically get an A on my presentations.
4. I have personal relationships with several people who are ethnically different from me. For example I have several African-American or European-American friends.
5. I spend time researching candidates before I vote. For example I will read some independent sources about more than one presidential candidate before making up my mind.
6. I know when and where skills and talents can most benefit the larger group. For example I look for and actively participate in groups or work teams based on my skills and abilities.
7. I balance keeping personal, social, and professional relationships healthy with the rest of my life. For example I spend time on relationships and still get my school work done.
8. I can see what a problem is like from a different perspective. For example I anticipate different possible solutions and outcomes based on different perspectives.
9. I can express my personal goals to others. For example I have engaged in meaningful meetings with significant others to assist in establishing and clarifying goals and making a plan to accomplish those goals.

10. I use my best active listening skills. For example at parties and in class I use active listening and check with others to make sure I have heard them appropriately.
11. In a class or among my friends I will advocate for diversity and social justice. For example I make sure that everyone is treated the same way.
12. I am serious about voting. For example I actively access the media to learn about and to address questions about a candidate's platform, beliefs, and values.
13. I am a role model for others. For example I am aware of how others see me and I act in ways that provide a positive example for others to follow.
14. I understand and improve my self-expression in relationship management. For example I am able to express my thoughts and feelings with others consistent with the situations I share with them.
15. I can analyze complicated problems by identifying the component parts and issues. For example I can plan an event or activity that takes into account resources, social and cultural differences, scheduling, and advertising.
16. I am able to attach lived experience to emotional/affective response. For example I can manage the emotional response I experience and accept the comfort and discomfort they bring to me.
17. I adjust my communication skills to whatever setting I am in. For example I use different kinds of skills in class than I do during informal situations.
18. I take the time to see things from a different gender, ethnic, or social class perspective. For example in class assignments I will use a perspective different from my own to help strengthen the paper.
19. I am informed of current events. For example I regularly read, listen, or watch various media to remain current in my knowledge of local, regional, national and international events.
20. I have polished communication skills for influencing others. For example I have learned effective ways to influence others and have observed situations where others have changed their minds based on my influences.
21. I use effective networking skills. For example I go out of my comfort zone to introduce myself to and establish and maintain an appropriate relationship with others, such as my professors and supervisors.
22. I can tell when something is a belief, when something comes from science, and when something is logical. For example in class discussions, political debates, personal differences, and areas of conflict, I listen for these different perspectives.
23. I can describe myself accurately. For example I have engaged in reflection with others and have sought their input to check the accuracy of my perceptions.
24. I use technical terms and jargon as appropriate. For example I adjust the level of my communication to my audience, I don't communicate the same with professors as I do with first year students on campus.
25. I behave in such a way to offset my inherent gender, ethnic, and social class bias. For example I work hard to see things from other gender, ethnic, or social class points of view.
26. I vote. For example I am registered and vote in campus, local, state and national elections.

27. I use good skills in confronting others. For example I share my observations of another person in a constructive and non-threatening way to influence changes in their behavior.
28. I take an active part in class discussions. For example I engage in discussions with others who are different than me and make new friends and acquaintances outside my own "circle".
29. I evaluate the credibility of sources and information. For example when I am using the Internet, or reading popular media, I know how to tell credible sources from questionable sources.
30. I talk freely about my strengths and weaknesses. For example I have admitted to others when I cannot do something and have taken action to improve the skills that I found lacking.
31. I make sure that when I am talking with someone I change my communication style to be consistent with their world view. For example when speaking to someone who is devoutly religious I take that into account when I speak with them.
32. I can tell anyone what diversity is. For example I have a 'standard answer' when someone asks me about diversity.
33. I know about current issues within the community. For example I know what the hot political and social issues are in my town.
34. I know how to effectively run an organization, group, or club. For example I use my skills of influencing others to help conduct the business of organizations I belong to.
35. I foster cooperation rather than competition. For example I am not always trying to "win" at relationships.
36. I identify valid and invalid arguments and can spot fallacies of deductive and inductive arguments. For example I see when someone has a problem with the logic and structure of their argument, or is confusing cause and effect, or is missing key pieces that are needed.
37. I have a career plan. For example I have a written and comprehensive career plan and understand how my daily activities compliment that plan in achieving my goals.
38. I use correct grammar when appropriate in speaking with others. For example when speaking in class or to professors I use correct 'standard English' even though I may use dialect and slang with my friends.
39. I talk with other people who are different than me about our differences. For example I will talk with someone who is ethnically different from me to try to understand the world from their point of view.
40. I contribute financially to causes I believe in. For example I make financial donations to charities, organizations, and causes.
41. I engage in constructive dialog rather than arguments. For example when I confront others I focus on minimizing a negative emotional response from people I'm confronting.
42. I actively engage in relationship development and management with a wide variety of "others". For example I work on my relationships with peers, faculty, supervisors, etc.
43. I identify the basic assumptions behind opinions and arguments. For example I can specify my assumptions and values that lead to my points of view or other people's assumptions and values.

44. I can describe the skills that I have gotten from my education. For example I have identified skills and ability that I didn't possess before going to school and I can tell others what they are.
45. My oral presentations are well structured. For example I spend a lot of time organizing what I am going to say, and even map out or outline my presentation.
46. I act on the values of diversity and social justice. For example I work with an organization or with my church to help others.
47. I can identify good political leaders. For example I am able to report to others the values, voting records, platform and political philosophy held by political leaders and understand how these compliment or contrast to those of the community.
48. I can describe the common factors in both leadership and membership. For example I can use this knowledge in a way that makes me effective as either a leader or a member.
49. I know how my gender, ethnicity, social class, and personality affect my relationships. For example when my relationships have problems I think through how my gender, ethnicity, social class, or personality might be affecting the relationship.
50. I understand basic statistics that I read or see in the media. For example when I see or read statistics I know what they mean and how they are being used to represent information appropriately or inappropriately.
51. I am aware of real results of decisions and the effectiveness of their implementation. For example my decisions usually involve thinking about the consequences of my actions for myself and for others around me.
52. I use supporting material for my presentations and papers. For example I rely on reliable sources and references to help me make my points.
53. I value differences between people as part of the overall human experience. For example I know that we are not a melting pot where people who are different can come to be seen as 'all the same'. I know that people are different and that these differences are important.
54. I engage in the political process through voicing viewpoints. For example I write letters to the editor, engage in debate with others, or contact political leaders to voice my opinion.
55. I balance my needs and the group's needs so that neither is neglected. For example sometimes I will give up what I want or need so that the group will succeed.
56. I can confront other people in a constructive way. For example when I have a disagreement with someone or don't agree with what they say or do I can constructively bring this problem out into the open.
57. I am good at describing things in class. For example I answer the teacher's questions when we are reviewing material.
58. I am self-monitoring. For example I am constantly checking if I am where I want to be in my life and who I want to be.
59. I 'self disclose' appropriately in conversation or in class. For example I share my genuine thoughts, feelings, and personal experiences as needed, but not too much so.
60. I see myself as a member in multiple communities. For example I see myself as a member of a club, an organization, a social group, a family or origin, a local community, a state, a nation, etc. all at the same time.

61. I empower those around me. For example I actively seek the opinions of others and assess them in contrast to my own and am able to withhold judgment of the other person
62. I take risks to accomplish a goal or to get the job done. For example I don't fear failure in such a way that I won't act and I will try new ways of doing things.
63. I don't shy away from a relationship that may be hard. For example if I think a relationship might cause some problems for me or be challenging or me I don't back off because I know that I will really learn something in this relationship.
64. I know when someone is using misleading language. For example I can tell when a TV advertisement has used some 'weasel words' to try to confuse or mislead me.
65. I am very organized in my work. For example I keep a "to do" list and use it.
66. I know what others think about my communication style. For example I listen when others tell me how I come across to them.
67. I behave in such a way to offset my inherent gender, ethnic, and social class bias. For example I work hard to see things from other gender, ethnic, or social class points of view.
68. I am active in organizations related to professional and personal interests without overextending my commitments. For example I belong to professional and hobby clubs and groups.
69. I take risks to accomplish a goal or to get the job done. For example I don't fear failure in such a way that I won't act and I will try new ways of doing things.
70. I know how my gender, ethnicity, social class, and personality affect my relationships. For example when my relationships have problems I think through how my gender, ethnicity, social class, or personality might be affecting the relationship.

Please continue to the next page.

These items are important also so that we can determine the kinds of things that are related to your behaviors above. Please take a moment more and fill these out accurately.

71. What is your gender?
a. Male, b. Female
72. What ethnicity do you primarily identify with?
a. European-American b. African-American c. Hispanic-American d. Asian and Pacific Island-American e. Native-American f. International student
73. Hours completed
a. 0-15
b. 16-30
c. 31-45
d. 45-60
e. 61-75
f. 76-90
g. 91-105
h. 106-120
74. GPA (If this is your first semester on campus then your High School GPA)
a. 0.0-0.5
b. 0.51-1.0
c. 1.01-1.5
d. 1.51-2.0
e. 2.01-2.5
f. 2.51-3.0
g. 3.01-3.5
h. 3.51-4.0
75. Age at last birthday.
a. 17 b. 18 c. 19 d. 20 e. 21 f. 22 g. 23 h. 24 i. 25 j. Over 25
76. Pell grant status
a. I have a Pell grant, b. I do not have a Pell grant.
77. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
a. Accounting
b. African American Studies
c. American Studies
d. Anthropology
e. Art and Art History
f. Asian Studies
g. Astronomy
h. Athletic Training
i. Atmospheric Science/Meteorology
j. None of the above

78. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
- a. Audiology and Hearing Sciences
 - b. Biological Sciences
 - c. Business
 - d. Chemistry
 - e. Cognitive Science
 - f. Communication and Culture
 - g. Computer Science and Information Systems
 - h. Criminal Justice
 - i. Early Childhood and Elementary Education
 - j. None of the Above
79. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
- a. Earth Science, Geography, and Geology
 - b. Economics
 - c. English
 - d. Ethnic Studies
 - e. Exercise Science
 - f. Film
 - g. Finance
 - h. Gender Studies, Women's Studies, Men's Studies
 - i. Health, Physical Education. and Recreation
 - j. None of the above.
80. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
- a. History
 - b. Human Development/Family Studies
 - c. Interior Design
 - d. International Studies
 - e. Journalism
 - f. Languages
 - g. Legal Studies / Pre-Law
 - h. Linguistics
 - i. Management, Business Administration
 - j. None of the above
81. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
- a. Mass Communications (Radio, TV)
 - b. Merchandising and Marketing
 - c. Music
 - d. Nursing
 - e. Nutrition and Dietetics
 - f. Occupational Safety
 - g. Occupational Therapy
 - h. Operations Research and Management
 - i. Peace and Conflict Studies
 - j. None of the above

82. Major (If you don't see your major here, mark j and move on to the next item.)
- Philosophy
 - Physical Education
 - Physical Therapy
 - Physics
 - Political Science
 - Psychology
 - Public Affairs
 - Public Health
 - Regional Studies (i.e. Latin American, Asian, African)
 - None of the above
83. Major
- Religious Studies
 - Secondary Education
 - Social Work
 - Sociology
 - Special Education
 - Theater, Dance and Performance Studies
 - None of the above
84. How many student or campus organizations do you or have you belonged to this year?
- a. 1, b. 2, c. 3, d. 4, e. 5, f. 6, g. 7, h. 8, i. 9, j. Over 9
85. How many offices like Chair, Vice-Chair, or Treasurer have you held this year in student or campus organizations?
- a. 1, b. 2, c. 3, d. 4, e. 5, f. 6, g. 7, h. 8, i. 9, j. Over 9
86. I live:
- On Campus,
 - Off Campus
87. Father's educational attainment
- Less than 7th grade
 - Junior high / Middle school (9th grade)
 - Partial high school (10th or 11th grade)
 - High school graduate
 - Partial college (at least one year)
 - College education
 - Graduate degree
88. Mother's educational attainment
- Less than 7th grade
 - Junior high / Middle school (9th grade)
 - Partial high school (10th or 11th grade)
 - High school graduate
 - Partial college (at least one year)
 - College education
 - Graduate degree
89. How many hours have you transferred to this university?
- a. 0 b. 3 c. 6 d. 9 e. 12 f. 15 f. 18 g. 21 i. 24 j. over 24

90. Marital/Living status
 a. Single, b. Married, c. Living Together, d. Divorced, e. Separated
91. How many children do you have?
 a. 0, b. 1, c. 2, d. 3, e. 4
92. Years since High School Graduation
 a. this year b. 1 c. 2 d. 3 e. 4 f. 5 g. 6 h. 7 i. 8 j. over 8
93. Military Service
 a. I have never served, b. Discharged from active service, c. I serve/served in the Reserve
94. Roommate status
 a. I live in a single, b. I live in a double, c. I live in a triple
95. Scholarship Status
 a. I have an academic scholarship
 b. I have an athletic scholarship
 c. I have another type of scholarship
 d. I have no scholarship
96. How many hours per week do you study on average?
 a. 2 or less, b. 4, c. 6, d. 8, e. 10, f. 12, g. 14, h. 16, I. 18, j. Over 18
97. How many hours per week do you watch TV on average?
 a. 2 or less, b. 4, c. 6, d. 8, e. 10, f. 12, g. 14, h. 16, I. 18, j. Over 18
98. How many hours per week do you work for pay on average?
 a. 2 or less, b. 4, c. 6, d. 8, e. 10, f. 12, g. 14, h. 16, I. 18, j. Over 18
99. How many hours per week do you volunteer in some organized activity on average?
 a. 1, b. 2, c. 3, d. 4, e. 5, f. 6, g. 7, h. 8, i. 9, j. Over 9
100. On average how many hours per night do you sleep?
 a. 5 or less, b. 6, c. 7, d. 8, e. 9, f. 10, g. 11, h. 12 or more,

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1

Ethnicity (N = 4,299)

	Frequency	Percent %
European American	3,826	89.0%
African American	64	1.5%
Hispanic American	192	4.5%
Asian PI American	95	2.2%
Native American	90	2.1%
International Student	32	.7%
Total	4,299	100.0%

Table 2

College Hours Completed (N = 4,299)

	Frequency	Percent %
0-15 Hours	833	19.4%
16-30 Hours	459	10.7%
31-45 Hours	678	15.8%
45-60 Hours	508	11.8%
61-75 Hours	620	14.4%
76-90 Hours	354	8.2%
91-105 Hours	437	10.2%
106-120 Hours	410	9.5%
Total	4,299	100.0%

Table 3

Grade Point Average (N = 4,299)

	Frequency	Percent %
0-.5	7	.2%
.51-1.0	7	.2%
1.01-1.5	13	.3%
1.51-2.0	34	.8%
2.01-2.5	241	5.6%
2.51-3.0	792	18.4%
3.01-3.5	1,561	36.3%
3.51-4.0	1,644	38.2%
Total	4,299	100.0%

Table 4

Age (N = 4,299)

	Frequency	Percent %
17	34	.8%
18	855	19.9 %
19	1,269	29.5%
20	1,099	25.6%
21	829	19.3%
22	170	4.0%
23	28	.7%
24	13	.3%
25+	2	0.0%
Total	4,299	100.0%

STATISTICS

Table 5

Altercasting (N = 5,166)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Altercasting	14.76	3.369	2	20	18

Table 6

Leadership (N = 5,090)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Fraternity Members as Leaders	45.61	8.465	6	60	54

Table 7

Likelihood of Volunteering (N = 5,164)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Act on Values of Diversity	7.15	2.033	1	10	9

Table 8

Usage of Media (N = 5,117)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Usage of media	14.95	3.408	2	20	18

Table 9

Understanding of the Political Process (N = 5,096)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Understanding of the Political Process	25.67	8.202	4	40	36

Table 10

Voting (N = 5,161)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
I vote	7.28	2.931	1	10	9

Table 11

Knowledge of Current Events (N = 5,158)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Current Events	12.69	4.307	1	10	9

Table 12

Hours Spent Volunteering (N = 5,158)

Category	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Range
Acting on Values of Diversity	2.86	2.749	1	15	14

Table 13

Pearson Correlations for All Study Variables ($N = 5,166$)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Altercasting	1.000							
2. Leadership	0.648	1.000						
3. Likelihood of Volunteering	0.440	0.514	1.000					
4. Usage of Media	0.516	0.606	0.437	1.000				
5. Understanding of Political Process	0.446	0.479	0.443	0.467	1.000			
6. Voting	0.329	0.329	0.219	0.301	0.481	1.000		
7. Knowledge of Current Events	0.479	0.457	0.411	0.483	0.649	0.380	1.000	
8. Hours Spent Volunteering	0.011	0.007	-0.001	-0.003	0.022	0.002	0.010	1.000

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .017$

Table 14

Summary of Regression Analysis of Altercasting and Individual Factors Relating to Knowledge of Current Events, Likelihood of Volunteering, and Hours Spent Volunteering (N = 5,166)

Variable	b	SE	beta	t	p
1. Intercept	7.690	0.167	0	46.065	<.000
2. Knowledge of Current Events	0.280	0.010	0.357	27.305	<.000
3. Likelihood of Volunteering	0.488	0.022	0.294	22.488	<.000
4. Hours Spent Volunteering	0.010	0.015	0.008	0.668	0.504

Note: $R^2=.30$, $F(3,4908)=701.52$, $p<.000$

Table 15

Summary of Regression Analysis of Altercasting and Individual Factors Relating to Fraternity Members Understanding of the Political Process, Usage of Media, Knowledge of Current Events and Likelihood of Voting (N = 5,166)

Variable	b	SE	beta	t	p
1. Intercept	5.707	0.181	0	31.495	<.000
2. Understanding Political Process	0.043	0.007	0.106	6.559	<.000
3. Usage of Media	0.334	0.013	0.337	25.222	<.000
4. Knowledge of Current Events	0.165	0.012	0.211	13.573	<.000
5. Likelihood of Voting	0.115	0.015	0.100	7.683	<.000

Note: $R^2=.36$, $F(4,5005)=697.77$, $p=.00$

Table 16

R2 for Altercasting and Individual Factors Relating to Fraternity Members Knowledge of Current Events, Likelihood of Volunteering, Hours Spent Volunteering, Understanding of the Political Process, Usage of Media, and Likelihood of Voting (N = 5,166)

Variable	b	SE	beta	t	p
1. Intercept	7.690	0.167	0	46.065	<.000
2. Knowledge of Current Events	0.121	0.011	0.155	10.739	<.000
3. Likelihood of Volunteering	0.122	0.021	0.074	5.812	<.000
4. Hours Spent Volunteering	-0.021	0.015	-0.015	-1.416	0.157
5. Understanding Political Process	0.005	0.006	0.013	0.848	0.396
6. Usage of Media	0.120	0.014	0.120	8.749	<.000
7. Likelihood of Voting	0.078	0.014	0.068	5.619	<.000