

West Chester University

Digital Commons @ West Chester University

West Chester University Master's Theses

Masters Theses and Doctoral Projects

Spring 2020

HAZEducation: Reframing Hazing Education by Centering Connections

Sarah Ryan
sr754558@wcupa.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wcupa.edu/all_theses

Recommended Citation

Ryan, Sarah, "HAZEducation: Reframing Hazing Education by Centering Connections" (2020). *West Chester University Master's Theses*. 130.
https://digitalcommons.wcupa.edu/all_theses/130

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Masters Theses and Doctoral Projects at Digital Commons @ West Chester University. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Chester University Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ West Chester University. For more information, please contact wcressler@wcupa.edu.

West Chester University
Higher Education Policy and Student Affairs
THESIS



HAZEducation: Reframing Hazing Education
by Centering Connections

Sarah Ryan

HAZEducation: Reframing Hazing Education by Centering Connections

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the

Department of Educational Foundations and Policy Studies

West Chester University

West Chester, Pennsylvania

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of

Master of Science

By

Sarah Ryan

May 2020

© Copyright 2020 Sarah Ryan

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to anyone who has been impacted by hazing.

Acknowledgments

I would like to first and foremost to thank Dr. Jacqueline Hodes, who has been a part of our good company from day one. Always only an early email or a phone call away, you have guided us and have always been there to support us with sound advice. I know you will continue to support us as we leave this program, and I am forever grateful.

To my thesis advisor, Dr. Dana Morrison, you have constantly supported the group from day one. You have been both intentional and creative with your workshops and guides during this entire semester of crafting our theses. While I wish we had more time in person, I am glad our individual meetings and classes featured Ziggy as a special guest star.

I want to thank the entire faculty and staff of the West Chester University Educational Foundations and Policy Studies Department, especially the following: Dr. Orkideh Mohajeri, Dr. Jim Tweedy, Dr. Tammy Hilliard-Thompson, Dr. Matthew Kruger-Ross, Dr. Jason Wozniak, and Dr. Paul Morgan. Each of you have been essential throughout my graduate career, and you have continuously challenged me to think critically about the field of higher education.

To the staff in the Office of Student Conduct and the Office of New Student Programs that I had the privilege to work beside. Thank you all for the opportunity to be a part of the team and always treating me as more than “just a graduate student”. You all have been such an important part of my learning and growing as a student affairs professional. I would not be where I am today without you.

To my classmates, now colleagues, within the HEPSA program, thank you for being a part of this wonderful experience. I want to especially thank those who have turned into lifelong friends. You all have constantly supported me and have been always willing to listen or lend a helping

hand at a moment's notice. I am so grateful for our time together and I cannot wait to see where life takes you (preferably somewhere warm or near a beach that I'd like to visit).

To my family and friends, and their significant others and children, who are pretty much family, I could never thank you enough. Each of you have supported me from day one, celebrated every step of the way, and helped me grow into the person I am today.

Finally, and certainly not least, thank you to my partner, Westyn, and my furchild, Nala. Both of you have been by my side (not that you had choice, Nala) through many of these past years. From undergraduate at one PASSHE school to graduate at another, I could not be more thankful for your nonstop support. You always push me to be my best me and I am forever thankful.

Abstract

Hazing is a particularly aggressive initiation ritual that has been around for centuries yet still exists today causing psychological and physical harm to students in higher education across the United States. This critical action research thesis will explore my philosophical framework, the history of hazing, as well as how it occurs within primarily male organizations in higher education today. Student affairs educators should be working with these students collectively in order to help facilitate other ways of belonging. This has informed my programmatic intervention, HAZEducation. This intervention is designed to empower male students through skill-building to educate them about hazing, to help them confront and question their own hazing activities, as well as to aid them in developing less risky ways to form a sense of belonging. While this program is targeted for members of primarily male organizations, I would recommend this be expanded in the future to include all student organizations, since hazing can occur in any type of organization or group.

Keywords: hazing, student organizations, collegiate males, peer educators, student affairs

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	1
Chapter 2	6
Thematic Concern Statement	6
Conceptual Framework	6
My Philosophical Framework	6
Historical Context	7
Current Research/Literature	7
Other Factors	8
Definition of Terms	8
ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies	9
Chapter 3	11
Philosophy of Education	11
Character Education	12
Ontological Vocation	13
Miseducative Experience	14
Hazing as a Miseducative Experience	15
Social Norms Theory	17
History of Higher Education and Hazing	18
Current State of Hazing	24
Psychological Aspects	25
Gender and Hazing	26
Hazing Prevention	27
Unique/Relevant Factors Impacting Hazing	28
Masculinity	29
Power	31
Graduate Assistantship	32
Chapter 4	34
Programmatic Introduction	34
HAZEducation	34
Critical Action Research	35
Current Best Practices	36
Purpose	38
Goals	38
Program Objectives	38
Learning Outcomes	38
Theoretical Frameworks	39
Freire	39
Gender-Aware Practice	40
Social Norms Theory	40

Program Proposal	41
Peer Educators	41
Proposed Schedule	42
Implementation	46
Budget	46
Marketing and Recruitment	46
Timeline	47
Potential Challenges	47
Chapter 5	48
Introduction	48
Leadership and HAZEducation	48
Leadership Styles	48
Role of Leadership	49
Assessment, Evaluation and HAZEducation	50
Data Collection	51
Satisfaction & Learning Survey	51
Journal Reflection	51
Follow-up Focus Group	52
Limitations & Future	53
Issues and Populations	53
Institutional Type	54
References	56
Appendix A	63
Appendix B	64
Appendix C	65
Appendix D	66
Appendix E	68
Appendix F	69
Appendix G	70

Chapter 1

The first part of my experience that brought me to my concern begins with an incident that occurred prior to me even entering higher education. A little over 10 years ago, during my junior year in high school, I attended a party at a friend's house. There had been a decent number of us there and there had been alcohol present. Most of the individuals present were drinking alcohol and for some of the individuals it was their first time. We attended a private, Catholic high school and although we had come from both public and private primary schools the education around alcohol did not exist. Much like sex education in private schools, the approach to alcohol was the same, an abstinence approach. Drinking under the age of 21 is illegal and the United States, therefore, as teenagers unable to drink legally, education or conversations around alcohol did not exist. Nonetheless, we participated in drinking alcohol not understanding the different types, such as beer and vodka, let alone the effect it could have on our bodies. We most certainly did not know how to define a standard drink size or how to drink safely. Shortly into the evening of this party a friend of mine had become unconscious and began foaming at the mouth. This scared all of us as teenagers but what even scared some of my classmates more was the thought of getting in trouble by parents or even the police.

Luckily, I had been familiar with the area and knew where the nearby hospital was located. I was able to convince the other party attendees to agree to bring him to the nearby hospital rather than have the ambulance and police dispatched to discover the underage party. Although I advocate for always seeking professional medical attention and usually that means calling 911, I could not get the buy-in from everyone at the time and bringing him to the hospital by personal vehicle was the next best option. Despite this, the police ended up coming to the residence regardless of taking this route. My friend was admitted to the hospital overnight and

the doctor did disclose that if he had not received medical attention, he did that he would have died. While I wish I could say this has been my one and only experience with an alcohol overdose that would make for a short chapter one. Although this next incident took place during my time as an undergrad.

During my sophomore year in college, I had come home to my off-campus apartment after a hockey game one weekend evening and decided to check in with our downstairs neighbors. These neighbors were mutual friends and would typically be the place where parties or gatherings took place. It had already been late in the evening and the majority of the people had since left but there were still some individuals casually hanging out and seemed like a chill time. As I was catching up with some friends, someone announced that an individual was not only unconscious but also had just urinated himself. Others and I went over to check on him and attempted to wake him up, but he did not react whatsoever. This individual had been an acquaintance of mine so since I did not know him well and also just arrived at the party, I tried to assess the situation asking about how much he may have drank or if anyone knew how long he had been like this. No one really knew what his alcohol use had been and with the experience I had in high school in the back of my mind I decided to call 911. Unlike the high school experience with a hospital five minutes away, I went to college in a rural area where the closest hospital was 20 minutes away. The police and ambulance arrived and transported him to the hospital. Again, not being close to the individual, I am not sure the ending of his story other than the fact he had been angry at me for calling the ambulance. I am confident that I did make the right decision at the time, especially not being an alcohol expert. This continued my interest or even curiosity on binge drinking. I continued to question on why and how these situations kept happening. These experiences are part of the reason I decided to pursue a graduate degree in

higher education and even partly influenced my thematic concern.

As I began my graduate degree and attempted to narrow down my thematic concern, I encountered an experience that had transitioned my focus from binge drinking and alcohol overdoses to hazing within student organizations. Through my graduate assistantship I had the opportunity to assist in a hazing investigation of a social fraternity that included unhealthy behaviors related to alcohol misuse including threats of harm, furnishing alcohol to minors and forced alcohol consumption. This investigation included two investigators with two scribes, and the interviews alone lasted an entire eight-hour workday. The interviews consisted of both the new members (former pledges) and the executive board members of the fraternity. There were two alleged hazing activities that entailed an extreme drinking game and an intense calisthenic. Although these were the alleged violations from the initial hazing report there were other concerns that were uncovered throughout the interviews as well. This fraternity had troubling messages throughout their group chats.

Within these chats, there had been multiple derogatory comments and conversations throughout that included misogynistic and racist themes. Not all members were making these remarks, but all members had been a part of the group. Some of these members identified as a couple of the races that had been included in those derogatory comments. When asked about this group chat there were some notable responses from the individuals. These responses included multiple members stating that they did not condone what was being said in the chat, but they were afraid of being disowned from the group if they would have spoken up against these comments. These derogatory comments were not the only troublesome observation in the group chat. There had also been remarks about a physical altercation involving a potential alcohol overdose. I realized I could expand my concern to my new interest of hazing which could also

include aspects of alcohol.

The issue of hazing perplexes me because it does not happen at any one type of institution and can impact both private or public, large or small institutional types. Also, it does not occur in just one type of organization. While some of the media may focus on hazing instances occurring in Greek life, particularly fraternities, hazing reaches across all organizations from athletics to performing art organizations such as the marching band. It does not matter your organization affiliation or even your race and/or gender. Hazing can happen anywhere and has been happening since the start of education, as I will discuss in Chapter 3.

Since 1959, Hank Nuwer (2019) has found that at least one hazing death has been reported in a United States school, club, or organization every single year. Besides serious injury or death, these students may be suffering from psychological harm as a result of hazing. Hazing has been found to impact more than half of students involved in organizations (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 2), thus, not only does hazing have serious implications but it also impacts a significant number of students. It is also important to note that the students being hazed are not the only victims. The students who perpetrate hazing have most likely been victims of hazing themselves previously and can even incur psychological impacts from being the hazing perpetrator (Botello & Cruz, 2018, p. 115).

These severe impacts are why I will argue that hazing is a “miseducative experience” (Dewey, 1916/2015) for students as it could end their potential to fully develop as human beings. I believe that this is the purpose of higher education, to allow students to fully develop by finding who they are and their purpose. This is the reason why this concern is important to me. Hazing not only can cause death, injury or psychological harm, but contradicts my philosophy and purpose of higher education. In this thesis I will articulate my philosophical positionality which

draws on the works of Dewey, Freire and the Jubilee Centre while providing a thorough historical account of hazing. I will also discuss the current research around hazing while highlighting important social and cultural factors that impact the issue of hazing. I then will propose a four-part programmatic intervention called HAZEducation that will be led by peer educators who will help male student members of organization build skills and provide education around hazing. Finally, I will propose several assessments to evaluate the success of my program.

Chapter 2

This chapter will include my thematic concern as well as a brief overview of the frameworks that have influenced the way I have thought about this concern and my program intervention. This chapter also includes a list of definitions that will be used throughout my thesis and the connections to the College Student Educators International (ACPA) and Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA) professional competencies.

Thematic Concern Statement

This critical action research thesis will examine hazing within primarily male organizations within higher education. These organizations that participate in hazing activities perpetuate violence, forced and excessive alcohol consumption and psychological harm. These students may not define these activities as hazing but rather they want to belong and believe this is a part of the norm. The purpose of education is for students to reach their ontological vocation and become fully human. Hazing negates this purpose and additionally causes a miseducative experience to students. This concern has informed my programmatic intervention to educate about hazing, empower the male students to confront and question their own hazing activities, and help develop less risky ways to form a sense of belonging.

Conceptual Framework

The following conceptual frameworks are what guides my thesis, my programmatic intervention, and my evaluations. It is important for issues to be analyzed through philosophy, historical context, current research and other factors in order to try to understand not only how this issue is shaped but also to make change or solve the issue.

My Philosophical Framework

In this thesis I will base my philosophy on the belief that higher education can allow for a

student to reach their ontological vocation, where the student can develop themselves into becoming fully human (Freire 1968/2017). In order to achieve this, there must be an open dialogue within higher education that can allowed for shared meaning to take place as opposed to the banking model (Freire, 1968/2017), where the teacher lectures a student. Students can also develop through experiences both inside and outside of the classroom. In either setting there is a chance for a miseducative experience, which is defined as a limited experience which cuts short the possibility of future experience and does not create an environment for development to occur (Dewey, 1916/2015).

Historical Context

This paper will explore the issue of hazing back from ancient Greece and Rome to the pivotal moment in history at the end of World War II in regard to higher education institutions in the United States of America. The end of the war marked a unique experience in the mid-20th century for the United States, with 15 million veterans returning to their home (Shugart, 2013). Those veterans, now students, still wanted to have a sense of comradery and therefor became involved in fraternities. While hazing activities occurred on college campuses in the United States before the end of the war, the influx of veterans into these civilian organizations influenced how hazing perpetuated.

Current Research/Literature

I will be looking at research which explores hazing, psychological aspects of hazing, how gender may impact hazing, and hazing prevention. More than half of students have experienced hazing and today, hazing has become more frequent, demanding, violent and sexual compared to hazing in the past (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 2; Lipkins, 2006). Those who continue dangerous hazing behaviors may overemphasize the amount and severity of how their peers are hazing

others and use that thinking to justify their less severe activities which is actually considered hazing (Waldron, 2012, p. 14). This is why students must be not only educated using social norms theory but also educated in bystander intervention in order to stop these hazing activities from taking place or continuing. In order to diminish hazing, which affects more than half of students involved in organizations, we must understand why these behaviors occur (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 2).

Other Factors

The other factors I will be looking into that influence hazing are masculinity, sense of belonging, power, and society. The last outside factor is society and the media. For example, the movie *Animal House*. This movie showcased a college social fraternity and included racism, homophobia, sexual assault jokes, large amount of alcohol consumption and hazing activities (Yasharoff, 2018). Despite this movie premiering over 4 decades ago, it still influencing today's college campuses and it is not the only media influence.

Definition of Terms

The following list of words are provided to assist the reader.

Hazing	Any type of activity for someone joining or maintaining membership in a group which humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of the person's willingness to participate (Allan & Madden, 2008)
Hegemonic Masculinity	Refers to patters of practices culturally recognized as authoritatively masculine: stoicism, obsession with power and control, rejection of femininity, risk-taking, and (hetero)sexual prowess. (Catalano, Wagner, & Davis, 2018)
Male	Any masculine presenting or individual who self identifies as a male.
Masculinity	Gender expression, style, performance, and organizational process that combines with other factors that typically

	makeup social system where the cultural norms and customs favor males. (Catalano, Wagner, & Davis, 2018)
Miseducative Experience	Limited experience which cuts short the possibility of future experience and does not create an environment to learn. (Dewey 1916/2015)
Primarily Male Organization	Any type of group (i.e., athletic team, performing arts group, social/service fraternity, club/intramural sports, recreation/academic club) which has a large majority (meaning more than 60%) of males as members/teammates
Ontological Vocation	The call to humans to achieve certain goals in order to reach the end result of being fully human. (Freire 1968/2017)

ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies

Throughout both my thematic concern and program intervention there will be a few ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies mentioned. My concern will touch upon the Law, Policy, and Governance (LPG) competency through both the historical context and programmatic intervention (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). The LPG competency by ACPA and NASPA (2015) mentions, “know laws of country, state or province, and regulations that both influence and govern higher education” (p. 17). This aspect of the competency is a necessary and important to understand since anti-hazing laws exist and vary depending on each individual state which may impact higher education institutions’ policies. Additionally, it is important that students are aware and educated on these state laws and institutional policies, which will be addressed in my program. My programmatic intervention includes both Student Learning and Development (SLD) and Leadership (LEAD) competencies (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). According to ACPA and NASPA (2015), the one part of the intermediate scale within SLD is to “recognize how identity influences student development” (p. 28). This must be understood

within the programmatic intervention since it is piloted to male students. Another competency I hope to accomplish is found within the intermediate scale of LEAD. ACPA and NASPA (2015) states to, “think critically, creatively, and imagine possibilities for solutions” (p. 21). My hope that is if these males are hazing within their organizations that this program will accomplish the above statement so that they can create and implement less riskier ways for the other members to feel as though they matter and belong to the organization.

Chapter 3

In the forthcoming chapter I will describe my philosophy of education and the frameworks which inform how I have come to see both the issue of hazing and my program intervention in an attempt to change the issue. I will also discuss historical factors and current research that surrounds hazing. Lastly, I will explain the unique and relevant factors that impact the issue of hazing.

Philosophy of Education

My philosophy of education can be summarized through Martin Luther King Jr.'s (1948) statement that the function of education "is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically. As argued by Dr. King (1948), "we must remember that intelligence is not enough. Intelligence plus character – that is the goal of true education." Academics and opportunity to gain intelligence in a specific field is often the driving force behind why an individual enters into higher education. While this may be an end goal it is not the only goal nor end result of education. Students should not leave the institution just with the knowledge of their certain area, as King (1948) stated, that is not enough. Students should not be taught *what to think* but rather taught *how to think* through developing critical thinking skills to analyze content for themselves and then come to their own conclusion on subject matter. Yet in addition to intelligence and skills, I would argue that the most important part of education would be the building of character. Character education exists no matter what academic focus a student is in and will continue both inside and outside the classroom. Just like developing critical thinking skills will help a student thrive long after they graduate, so will their character continue to impact their lives as general citizens of communities.

Character Education

The cultivation of character has been involved in the history of school since ancient times and well into the 20th century (Jubilee Centre, 2017). It had not been until the end of the 20th century that it was no longer the pride of education and then disappeared from the curriculum of the majority of Western cultures (Jubilee Centre, 2017). In present day, according to the Arthur et al. (2016), “a growing general public-policy consensus, across political parties and industry, suggests that the role of moral and civic character is pivotal in sustaining healthy economies and democracies” (p. 178). While those in higher education should encourage students to be successful, which is subjective based on the individual student, character should be objective. Character development should help those students meet their own definitions of success which will overall result in well-rounded citizens, thus leading towards the greater good for the public.

The Jubilee Centre (2017) defines character education as, “helping students grasp what is ethically important in situations and how to act for the right reasons, such that they become more autonomous and reflective in the practice of virtue” (p. 2). Although the term, virtue, may have a connotation of religion, both virtue and character do not exclusively have religious notions and are not inherently paternalistic (Jubilee Centre, p. 2). Overall, developing character is building the skills, such as critical thinking, and the capacity within individuals to choose the right thing to do when difficult decisions arise (Jubilee Centre, 2017, p. 2). Additionally, character development in an individual will then in turn set the framework for society and the members to work in a collective manner with reciprocity and equal opportunity (Jubilee Centre, 2017, p. 2), essentially achieving that greater good. The Jubilee Centre (2017) states:

Human flourishing is the widely accepted goal of life. To flourish is not only to be happy, but to fulfil one’s potential. Flourishing is the ultimate aim of character education.

Human flourishing requires the acquisition and development of intellectual, moral, and civic virtues, excellence specific to diverse domains of practice or human endeavor, and generic virtues of self-management. All are necessary to achieve the highest potential of life. (p. 1)

This ultimate goal of achieving the highest potential of life is also referred to as ontological vocation (Freire, 1968/2017).

Ontological Vocation

Ontological vocation is the call to humans to achieve certain goals in order to reach the end result of being fully human (Freire 1968/2017). This, in my opinion, is the purpose of education, to reach these goals and continue to become fully human. Education, and those in positions of faculty and staff, especially student affairs practitioners, should provide opportunities for students to develop themselves more fully and guide them to their own definitions of success. Again, success is not a one size fits all approach, but what each student needs to reach their full capacity.

This ontological vocation, though, can be negated if education is not done correctly. Teaching and learning should be a shared experience. This experience, as argued by Freire, is collaborative between the teacher and the student(s). It goes beyond their roles or titles, but they influence one another just as theory and practice influence each other. The teacher should become informed from their student which should influence their practice and help guide them when conducting future education. This is especially important in thinking that the world is always changing, generation by generation, and we must continue to change alongside. This is why education should not be done through the banking model, where the teacher solely lectures the student and deposits information into them (Freire 1968/2017). According to Freire

(1968/2017):

Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the ‘banking’ concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filling, and storing the deposits. (p. 72)

This model creates a cycle of knowledge being passed from teacher to student with the student then becoming the teacher to teach a new student the same knowledge they were first taught. Instead, there needs to be the open dialogue between all parties so that they may all collectively learn from one another.

This banking model leaves students with a lack of creativity and an inability to develop their critical consciousness. Without critical consciousness, there is no critical thinking or problem solving in situations. This will not allow change to occur because questions cannot be asked, and a proper analysis will not exist. Hence, the banking model negates the student’s ontological vocation. In order to negate the negation of the banking model, there has to be the open dialogue and also problem-posing within education. According to Freire (1968/2017), “students, as they are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (p. 81). The use of problem-posing helps to develop those necessary critical thinking and problem-solving skills which then result in enacting change when challenges arise.

Miseducative Experience

Teaching and learning also occurs both inside and outside of the classroom through a variety of experiences. These experiences though, can either be positive or negative, educative or

miseducative. A miseducative experience is defined as a limited experience that does not create an environment to learn and cuts short the possibility of future experiences (Dewey, 1916/2015). Dewey (1938) further explains that a miseducative experience “may be such as to engender callousness; it may produce lack of sensitivity and of responsiveness. Then the possibilities of having a richer experience in the future are restricted” (pp. 25-26).

This is why the banking model is a miseducative experience for students. This banking model does not facilitate actual learning, rather it makes a deposit of information that continues as a vicious cycle. It does not allow the students to firstly, become a part of the learning and practice, and secondly challenge information presented. Students cannot challenge their classmates or teacher to either gain more knowledge or provide alternative perspectives. We cannot expect our students to reach their ontological vocation and become responsible citizens of the world, to not be the university’s most harmful emission, if they are taught through the banking model and endure miseducative experiences during their time in higher education.

The purpose of education is to reach one’s ontological vocation and we cannot get to that point if we are not provided with or take part in educative experiences. These educative experiences provide individuals, students and teachers with the cofacilitation needed to inform future education. Educative experiences allow for an individual to learn both knowledge and skills in order to help themselves become more fully human.

Hazing as a Miseducative Experience

Hazing can lead to a miseducative experience in which a student either cannot continue their academic journey in higher education. Whether it is due to psychological harm, severe injury or even death, hazing poses several barriers to future educative possibilities. The impact of hazing does not enlarge a student’s college experience, nor does it allow a student to reach their

full potential. When hazing occurs, students (both the victim and perpetrator) may have psychological impacts such as a decrease in grades or damage to relationships, just to name a few (Botello & Carlos Cruz, 2018, p. 115). These types of impacts could cause the individuals to possibly leave the organization or even leave their university. Through either of these options, the student may no longer have educative experiences, which would result in a delay or elimination of any future experiences. The overall purpose of higher education is to help everyone reach their full potential, which is negated by hazing. Hazing can cause violations within the colleges and universities and may even result in legal action depending on state statutes. It can also lead to poor academic performance because of the harm it causes, which may ultimately lead to the student's departure from the institution. If a student does end up pausing or discontinuing their education, they may not fulfill their ontological vocation.

Additionally, hazing creates a miseducative experience about what it means to belong to a group. Students who seek to be a member of an organization may want to do it for several reasons. It could be to gain a new skill, showcase their talent in a sport, enjoy a hobby, and/or even make new friendships. Regardless of the intent, there is usually a desire to belong to that group or gain a connection to their campus. When hazing occurs, it can send a message to the individual that in order to belong to this group, you must be humiliated, degraded, psychologically or mentally abused. Hazing does not showcase the true value that being a part of a group provides.

My philosophy informs my thematic concern because individuals not hazing one another and essentially harming their peers is the right thing to do. It is up to society, community, and those working in student affairs and higher educational institutions to help individuals develop a well-rounded character, which is made up of important skills like critical thinking. In helping to

develop the student we can also help them to build meaning and cultivate a sense of belonging in less risky ways than hazing. If individuals do not come into higher education with the foundation of a well-rounded character, it is up to educators within the institutions to create those opportunities or experiences for those individuals to do so. These students will then make the right choice when the time comes not only in potential situations of hazing but beyond graduation as citizens of their communities.

Social Norms Theory

Social norms are accepted behaviors within a group or a society. This theory draws attention to two major types of misperceptions regarding social norms, pluralistic ignorance and false consensus. According to Berkowitz (2005), these misperceptions often occur “in relation to problem or risk behaviors (which are usually overestimated) and in relation to healthy or protective behaviors (which are usually underestimated)” (p. 2).

In the first misperception, pluralistic ignorance, Berkowitz (2005) explained that “individuals incorrectly perceive the attitudes and/or behaviors of peers and other community members to be different from their own when in fact they are not” (p. 2). This, as stated by Berkowitz (2005), can lead individuals to “change their own behavior to approximate the misperceived norm” (p. 2). Pluralistic ignorance occurs when the majority of individuals privately disagree with the risky behavior but because the group is engaged in the behavior, the individuals believe that everyone within the group should support the behavior (Waldron, 2012). The second misperception, false consensus, occurs when individuals believe that their own beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors are common, when in fact they are not (Berkowitz, 2005).

These two misperceptions are mutually reinforcing and self-perpetuating. As stated by Berkowitz (2005), in these misconceptions “the majority is silent because it thinks it is a

minority, and the minority is vocal because it believes that it represents the majority” (p. 3). As these misperceptions are enacted, it can “cause the expression or rationalization of problem behavior and the inhibition or suppression of healthy behavior” a pattern that has been “well-documented for alcohol, smoking, illegal drug use, and a variety of other health behaviors and attitudes, including prejudice” (Berkowitz, 2005, p. 2). It is this understanding of risky behavior and the suppression of healthy behavior that frames my conceptualization of hazing in the modern university. Any intervention that seeks to address group rituals like hazing, must understand not only the existing social norms but also the social mechanisms that often reinforce and reproduce them.

History of Higher Education and Hazing

Hazing began as early as 387 B.C. during the founding of Plato’s academy, although it had been referred to as pennialism (Braswell, 2018) during that time. Pennialism is defined by the Collins English Dictionary (n.d.) as, “a system of mild oppression and torment practiced upon first-year students.” Plato himself disagreed with the act of pennialism and even compared those that perpetuated it to wild animals (Braswell, 2018). Despite Plato’s disapproval, pennialism lived on and in the 19th century gained its new title of hazing. During this time, hazing became legalized in England due to schools’ perceptions that it taught obedience (Bruckner, 2018, p. 465). Hazing dates back in the United States as early as 1657 when several upperclassmen at Harvard University were fined after hazing the freshmen (Bruckner, 2018, p. 466). These acts of hazing continued and did not only occur throughout places of education. For instance, in the mid-1800s, the United States Armed Forces had hazing ingrained into their culture; so much so that Congress passed the first anti-hazing statute in 1874, which prohibited all forms of military hazing (Bruckner, 2018, p. 466). Then in 1894, New York became the first state to legislate a

hazing statute, which may have followed due to an incident that resulted in death in the same state only roughly 20 years prior.

In the fall of 1873, 18-year-old Mortimer Marcellus Leggett attended Cornell University with hopes of becoming a patent lawyer and joining the prestigious Kappa Alpha Society (Braswell, 2018). This all came to an end though about a month later when Leggett's beaten body had been removed from one of the gorges nearby, all from a result of a part of Kappa Alpha's initiation gone wrong (Braswell, 2018). During that fatal night, Leggett had been blindfolded and led up a narrow trail adjacent to a ravine (Braswell, 2018). While unattended, Leggett lost his balance and tumbled to his death into the gorge below (Braswell, 2018). In the aftermath, none of the members of the Kappa Alpha Society received any punishment nor were the key details of the fatality, such as Leggett being blindfolded, included in the accounts (Braswell, 2018). Although this incident occurred more than a century ago, hazing still exists today, however the various activities have changed throughout the years.

Despite hazing being traced back centuries to ancient Greece and Rome and then continuing through the Middle Ages in Europe, the pivotal moment in the history of hazing within higher education institutions, would be at the end of World War II. The war began in 1939 and involved almost all parts of the world, including the United States (Royde-Smith & Hughes, 2019). World War II finally ended on September 2, 1945 after an estimated 50 million casualties, 300,000 of those casualties from the United States (Shugart, 2013). The end of the war marked a unique experience in the mid-20th century of the United States due to the 15 million veterans returning to their homes (Shugart, 2013). These veterans, according to Shugart (2013), "returned to an economy in the midst of transition from wartime to peacetime production" (p. 11). The government, in anticipation of war veteran's arrival home and wanting

to support them, enacted the G.I. Bill. Shugart (2013) describes this critical moment in history:

The social upheaval caused by this situation was extraordinary, and Congress responded by passing what we know as the G.I. Bill (The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944). Major components of the law provided for expanded health care, low-interest home loans, up to a year of unemployment benefits, and tuition and living expenses for the relatively small number who might want to attend college or a technical education program. (p. 11)

The government only anticipated a small number of veterans to take advantage of the educational benefits once they were home (Shugart, 2013, p. 11), however that is not what happened. The G.I. Bill resulted in more than 2.2 million veterans seizing the opportunity of having their education expenses covered (Shugart, 2013, p. 11). The unexpected number of students entering higher education resulted in overwhelming the various institutions. According to Shugart (2013), "many colleges and universities undertook dramatic changes of scale and mission: teachers' colleges became regional public universities, women's colleges became co-educational, colleges stretched themselves in massive buildings campaigns for both instructional and residential facilities, etc." (p. 11). While the obviously large number of students impacted the physical structures of the institutions and the institutions' missions, these students influenced organizations on their campus as well.

Bruckner (2018) found that, "after World War II, hazing picked up in the Greek organizations with veterans who returned from war bringing their 'boot camp mentality'" (p. 467). This is not to state or surmise that hazing on college campuses have been caused by World War II veterans but rather the influx of these students started to shift how hazing occurred on campuses. Those veterans, now students, still wanted to have a sense of comradery which led for

these individuals to become involved in fraternities. These students then began to introduce military hazing they had experienced as soldiers into their new fraternal organizations. These new fraternity initiations began to include physical exercise, such as calisthenics, into their pledging activities (Sterner, 2008, p. 8). While World War II influenced hazing in a negative way, soon came the Vietnam War which had the opposite effect.

The Vietnam War became a time for college students to think of greater issues occurring in the world and brought about a time of unrest and protest. Bruckner (2018) stated, “During a liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s, Greek organizations diminished because they were considered pro-establishment” (p. 467). Despite the reduction of Greek organizations, deaths from hazing activities on college campuses continued to rise as times moved on. According to Hollomann (2002):

35 deaths were recorded from 1838 through 1969. During the decade of the 1970s, 31 students lost their lives to hazing and related activities. The number increased to 55 deaths from 1980 through 1989, and almost doubled to 95 deaths during the 1990s. (p. 11)

These wars have not been the only influence on college campuses. The way the media has portrayed both Greek life and hazing activities also influenced what occurs in organizations.

Towards the end of the liberation movement, the raunchy comedy, *Animal House*, premiered in 1978. This film is categorized as a comedy classic which includes racism, homophobia, and sexual assault jokes (Yasharoff, 2018). It takes place on a college campus where actors pledge a fraternity. Despite the issues of the types of jokes highlighted before, the movie also showcases a large amount of alcohol consumption and hazing activities. Students either in or about to enter college during this time period expect to see this type of comedy and

behavior in their aspiring organizations. Even 41 years after the movie premiere, it is still regarded as an all-time great movie with students of today either wearing the main actor's, John Belushi, classic t-shirt with the word "College" written on it or even possibly the poster of him chugging a bottle of Jack Daniels in their room (Yasharoff, 2018). This movie is not the only example of how the media has showcased college, it shows up in other movies and television shows, even songs and music videos (i.e. Asher Roth's I Love College), perpetuating certain expectations of what college should be for some individuals. While occurrences in the outside world have impacted hazing in higher education so has higher education hazing impacted the outside world, especially as it relates to laws.

The year 1978 did not only include the debut of the movie *Animal House* but also another tragedy on a college campus. At Alfred University, Chuck Stenzel died from a hazing accident involving alcohol. According to Bruckner (2018), "Stenzel's death led to the creation of 'Committee to Halt Useless College Killings' ('CHUCK'). CHUCK's mission was to raise awareness about the dangers of hazing and unnecessary risks that occur" (p. 468). During the 1980s, 12 states had passed anti-hazing statutes and by 1990, 25 states had passed legislation as a result of CHUCK (Bruckner, 2018, p. 468). Today, 44 out of the 50 states have anti-hazing statutes. While this may seem like a win, there are a variety of ways in which states consider or define what hazing activities are. For example, only 18 of those 44 states prohibit 'mental or emotional' harm under their statutes (Bruckner, 2018, p. 469). This means that if a suicide death occurs as a result of a hazing activity outside of these 18 states, none of the perpetrators could be held accountable for their actions. Some additional variances in the law are that only 19 of the states barring consent as a defense and then only seven of the states of include a duty to report if a person has knowledge of hazing (Brucker, 2018, pp. 468-470). Furthermore, the fees and jail

time for a hazing violation comes in a wide range. For example, a hazing violation that results in a death in Michigan could result in up to 15 years of imprisonment and/or a \$10,000 fine while the state of Arizona requires public education institutions to have and enforce a hazing prevention policy but no fines or prison sentence if found guilty (Bruckner, 2018, pp. 470-471). These are just two examples of the extreme ends of each spectrum of the law and can be considered problematic since these laws may not protect certain victims of hazing such as those instances that result in psychological harm. Even despite the various language used in these legislations, students are still dying as a result of hazing.

According to a hazing database researched by Hank Nuwer (2020), from 1969 to 2019 there has been at least one hazing related death each year. As recent as November 12th, 2019 a 19-year-old first-year student at Washington State University died from alcohol poisoning at a fraternity house which is believed to have resulted from hazing, although the investigation is still ongoing (Carroll, 2019). According to Hollmann (2002), “since 1990, more deaths have occurred on college and university campuses as a result of hazing, pledging, initiation accidents, and fraternity alcohol-related incidents than all other hazing incidents in recorded history” (p. 11). Through looking at the history of higher education institutions, hazing deaths, and anti-hazing legislation it can be viewed as a never-ending cycle; someone dies as a result of hazing and then an anti-hazing statute passes in that state. Sometimes multiple deaths from hazing may occur in the same state which results in revisions to the law, such as the Piazza Law in Pennsylvania.

Timothy Piazza pledge a fraternity at Penn State University and participated in an extreme amount of alcohol consumption which led to him later falling down basement stairs multiple times with none of the fraternity members calling for emergency medical services (Bruckner, 2018, pp. 459-462). In the beginning, 18 fraternity brothers and the national fraternity

were charged with involuntary manslaughter, aggravated assault, providing alcohol to minors, tampering with evidence, and hazing (Bruckner, 2018, p. 473). However, the two most serious charges (involuntary manslaughter and aggravated assault) were dismissed; the charges that remained were all misdemeanors (Bruckner, 2018, pp. 473-474). Piazza's death resulted in legislative change in Pennsylvania. This new law requires schools to have an anti-hazing policy and requires higher education institutions to post hazing violations (both alleged and founded) on their websites ("New Anti-Hazing", 2018). Also, the law classifies hazing into tiers in which a more serious violation, causing injury or death, would make the violation a felony while a less serious incident would be classified as a misdemeanor ("New Anti-Hazing", 2018). Finally, the new law provides a safe harbor provision which may protect individuals from prosecution if they seek medical attention for a hazing victim ("New Anti-Hazing", 2018).

As this unfortunate history continues to repeat itself, it is important that we take into account influencing factors such as the war and the media. While looking at the never-ending death and law cycle, it can be emphasized that anti-legislation is not enough to prevent hazing from occurring. Lipkins (2006) summarized, "compared to the past, hazing today is 'more frequent, more demanding, more violent, and much more sexual'" (p. 4). It is important to further explore the cultures within the various types of organizations and identity factors such as gender to reach the systemic issues that reproduce hazing activities.

Current State of Hazing

The most comprehensive research around hazing occurring within higher education institutions came approximately 12 years ago. Allan and Madden (2008) conducted a study on hazing throughout 53 campuses across the United States and yielded 11,482 survey responses from undergraduate students (p. 4). The researchers defined hazing as, "any activity expected of

someone joining or participating in a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of a person's willingness to participate" (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 14). Allan and Madden's (2008) study also found the following: more than half of college students involved in clubs, teams, and organizations experience hazing; hazing occurs across a range of student groups; alcohol consumption, humiliation, isolation, sleep-deprivation, and sex acts are hazing practices common across student groups; knowledge of hazing extends beyond the student groups engaging in the behavior; most students perceive positive rather than negative outcomes of hazing; students are not likely to report hazing to campus officials; students recognize hazing as part of the campus culture; students report limited exposure to prevention efforts that extend beyond a 'hazing is not tolerated' approach; students come to college having experienced hazing; and that a gap exists between student experiences of hazing and their willingness to label it as such (pp. 14-33). Due to these findings and the complexity of the issue, there are no simple solutions or one-size fits all approach to eliminate hazing across higher education institutions. There has been some more recent research surrounding the psychological aspects and identity factors around hazing.

Psychological Aspects

Researchers found that victimization prior to college leads to a greater risk of being revictimized on a college campus (Strawhun, 2016; Reid et al., 2018). This may be due to previously victimized students having a stronger need to belong and therefore being more motivated to endure hazing activities which then leads them to feel and even describe hazing as a positive activity (Reid et al., 2018). Researchers also found that first-year college students with histories of childhood victimization are more likely to report negative consequences of college hazing (Reid et al., 2018). It can be inferred that these students may be more willing to advocate

against hazing and therefore should be considered when looking to collaborate in hazing prevention efforts.

Gender and Hazing

Véliz-Calderón and Allan (2017) extended data from the previously mentioned Allan and Madden 2008 National Study of Student Hazing, to look at the differences of gender within hazing. The authors used gender theory to analyze how students understand and define hazing through gender schemas. In the researchers' analysis they found that male students often described hazing as involving alcohol abuse and/or physical strength, referencing calisthenics (Véliz-Calderón & Allan, 2017, p. 17). However, while female students mentioned physical activity to define hazing, they described these activities as being forced to eat disgusting things or sleep deprivation (Véliz-Calderón & Allan, 2017, p. 17). Both genders also acknowledged psychological hazing although they were described in different ways; females stated being yelled at and told what to do while males talked about humiliation and the power imbalance that occurs through these types of hazing activities (Véliz-Calderón & Allan, 2017, p. 17).

Gender schemas were also present when discussing bonding and building friendships. According to Véliz-Calderón and Allan, (2017), “numerous male students touched upon the concept of friendship, indicating that the entire fraternity experience, including the hazing was worthwhile due to the lifelong nature of friendships that formed” (p. 18). When female participants described friendships, they were more likely to talk about non-hazing activities however when females talked about bonding within their groups, they believed it resulted from the secrecy that surrounds hazing (Véliz-Calderón & Allan, 2017, p. 18). Additionally, the researchers found that gender norms influenced an individual's social obligation to conform and perpetuate these hazing activities. Véliz-Calderón and Allan found that, “male students

expressed more rigid and compulsory expectations to perform masculinity by participating in hazing that required physical endurance or abuse” and that “opting out of hazing experiences is likely considered feminine, passive, and weak” (p. 20).

Hazing Prevention

Allan et al. (2018a) researched to fill the gap between effective strategies and prevention efforts to reduce or eliminate hazing. Through gathering three years of data across eight universities and developing a research-to-practice initiative the researchers created the Hazing Prevention Consortium (HPC). The HPC is influenced by the social ecological model, strategic prevention framework, and the community readiness model (Allan et al., 2018a). It had been created as a way to investigate comprehensive approaches to hazing prevention within higher education institutions. Throughout their research, they found themes related to components of the hazing prevention framework: commitment, capacity, assessment, planning, evaluation, sustainability, culture competence, and implementation (Allan et al., 2018a). Overall, the researchers found that hazing is a leadership issue which brings up the importance of involving senior leaders early in the process as well as looking towards policies and procedures to help with hazing prevention (Allan et al., 2018a).

Deitch-Stackhouse et al. (2015) elaborated on the bystander intervention addressing prevention of interpersonal violence. The article evaluates the impact of social norms throughout the bystander stages by articulating that five stages that individuals move through: noticing the event, interpreting the event as a problem, feeling responsible for finding a solution, having the skills to intervene and intervening (Deitch-Stackhouse et al., 2015). Social norms may impact individuals to not take action to either prevent the violence or interrupt the stages which ends up resulting in no intervention of the behavior. This is why violence prevention strategies need to

focus on educating individuals on the perceptions of their peers (Deitch-Stackhouse et al., 2015). The researchers focused on the gap between an individual's actual attitudes and behaviors and their perceptions of what other people are thinking and doing. Deitch-Stackhouse et al. (2015) theorize that students are more likely to intervene when they believe that their peers disapprove of violence and specifically defining interpersonal violence scenarios as problematic will result in more likelihood of feeling responsible to find a solution. Their hypotheses were supported and influence my programmatic intervention since hazing is a form of interpersonal violence and could be diminished through incorporating a bystander intervention.

Although these previously mentioned prevention efforts are newer, Allan et al. (2018b) researched the effectiveness of hazing prevention programs. The researchers collected data from a survey of 5,880 students enrolled at seven universities who had made a commitment to hazing prevention (Allan et al., 2018b). The researchers examined if there were differences depending on gender and found that 32% of males experienced hazing compared to 22% of females (Allan et al., 2018b). Additionally, they found that males are more likely to report alumni being involved in hazing activities and males also reported experiencing hazing both when joining an organization in higher education and experienced hazing in high school (Allan et al., 2018b). Through their research they identified the previously mentioned gap of students who experience hazing and the ability to label it as hazing. This is an important gap which I intend to address within my targeted audience of my programmatic intervention.

Unique/Relevant Factors Impacting Hazing

While there are many factors and components that makeup and impact hazing, I will discuss a few factors that help to inform my knowledge of the issue and my programmatic intervention.

Masculinity

Hegemonic Masculinity. Catalano et al. (2018) define this as, “pattern of practices culturally recognized as authoritatively masculine: stoicism, obsession with power and control, rejection of femininity, risk-taking, and (hetero)sexual prowess” (p. 15). This hegemonic or normative masculinity is produced and reinforced through the influences of social structures, social contexts, and social interactions (Harris III, 2010, p. 299) It is important for educators and even students themselves to understand this concept because it will influence our work and the students’ lives while also working to help students become self-aware and change the assumption that “normal” equals “correct” (Catalano et al., 2018, p. 15).

Like hazing, hegemonic masculinity shows up and can be reinforced to individuals through various forms of media. One example is based on the subject of the sexual assault of men used for comedic laugh throughout different medias. The video essayist, Pop Culture Detective, showcases just how common it is in the media to constantly degrade, humiliate or emasculate a male victim for being a victim of sexual violence. Throughout both videos, *Sexual Assault of Men Played for Laughs – Part 1 Male Perpetrators* (2019) and *Sexual Assault of Men Played for Laughs – Part 2 Female Perpetrators* (2020) the Pop Culture Detective showcases examples of how common these jokes are and are found in movies, tv shows, talk shows, and even at the Oscars, just to name a few. This is how things become normalized and people become desensitized, through this constant messaging in society and the media, such as the example above that males cannot be victim of sexual violence. There are many other examples that continue to provide a narrative of hegemonic masculinity and until we disrupt those narratives, these ideologies will continue to be reproduced and then reinforced.

Meanings of Masculinity. Harris III (2010) developed a conceptual model based on

research of 68 undergraduate males to the meanings of masculinities (p. 297) and the corresponding contextual influences (p. 304). According to Harris III (2010) the several concepts that emerged from the data were “being respected, being confident and self-assured, assuming responsibility, and embodying physical prowess” (p. 305). These concepts were influenced prior to the participants’ entering college and are considered precollege socialization which can include coming from parental units, interactions with peers, and participating in sports and other “masculine” activities (Harris III, 2010, p. 307). This is important to remember because the students entering into higher education have been experiencing these notions for many years and almost two decades. These preconceived ideas on masculinity can also be emphasized on a college campus as some participants described the culture as competitive with a constant pressure to compete with males for popularity, attention, and status (Harris III, 2010, p. 307). Additionally, participants of the study had discussed they did not approve of certain notions, like talking to females in a derogatory way, but would go along to be accepted by the group and not unsettle it (Harris III, 2010, p. 307). These same notions can explain how hazing is perpetuated year after year and we as educators have to disrupt these norms. Harris III (2010) suggested that institutional efforts should aim to:

help men to see the range of healthy options that are available to them in expressing their masculinities and recognize how developing less-conflicted gender identities leads to a host of productive outcomes that will serve them well throughout their lives. (p. 314)

Gender-Aware Practice. In order to disrupt this notion, educators can use a gender-aware practice. This practice is described by Catalano et al. (2018) as “an approach to viewing gender and using it as an intentional lens to enhance interventions in student affairs” (pp. 15-16). Catalano et al. (2018) also states that this “practice means that practitioners are aware of how

gender is constructing human experience and they support students in dissecting and disentangling the phenomenon” (p. 16).

Power

While hazing can occur between members of an organization or team no matter their status or at any time, not just in the beginning of a membership process or a sports season, it has commonly been found between those already in a position of power. It occurs and continues to occur due to a variety of reasons. According to Joyce and Nirh (2018), “hazing became a strategy for ensuring that exclusivity” (p. 54), meaning that the student being it is okay to be hazed in order to become a part of an exclusive or elite organization. Even those students who already are a member, like in a sports team, they feel that in order to belong or be a true member of the group they have to go endure hazing.

Salinas Jr. and Boettcher (2018) also found that, “additionally, themes of membership, belonging, and loyalty become blurred around hazing, as keeping organizational secrets is a point of pride for members and an obstacle to transparency when it comes to hazing reform” (p. 9). This is how hazing can continue to be perpetuated throughout organizations. The hazing is being reproduced as the power structures move from the student being hazed becoming a member then either an upper-class student or holding a title within the group to then hazing the new, usually younger, members. As the power cycles through the hazing is also reproduced.

According to Foucault (1980), “One needs to investigate historically, and beginning from the lowest level, how mechanisms of power have been able to function” (p. 99). This is why in order to combat hazing and potentially change the culture surrounding it the history and current behaviors need to be analyzed. In addition, while the deaths and serious injuries effects of hazing are extremely important, the subtle forms of hazing also needs to be investigated. Something that

might seem subtle and cause psychological harm to a person can have a detrimental impact. The subtle acts and behaviors of hazing can lead to fatalities.

Through taking a multifaceted approach due to all the factors and components of hazing, there can be a potential for change in the culture. The students who are hazing exercise their power into the way the students who are being hazed, conduct themselves. Different tactics and strategies can transform the culture. Creating new programs and activities for students to interact in that build relationships and the sense of belonging can take the place of hazing activities. If these programs can continue over time it would lead these organizations to their new way of thinking and even potentially produce a new way of being or even freedom of the mental and physical abuse that occur during hazing. Foucault (1978) stated, "These counter-conducts were able to put in question, work on, elaborate, and erode the pastoral power" (p. 204). Even though this is not a pastoral power, this same method can be used in other power forces like hazing. Eventually, with a lot of work and struggle, the power that hazing holds can be eroded.

Graduate Assistantship

As I mentioned in the beginning, my graduate assistantship is what brought me to this thematic concern of hazing. Throughout my two years in this assistantship, I was able to continue to assist in hazing investigations when they would come up and this past semester co-investigate an organization with another employee. I also had the privilege of attending the HazingPrevention.Org Institute with university employees from several various functional areas in student affairs. This institute walked attendees through the various steps to combat hazing at their institutions and provided different frameworks and workshops to create their institutionally personalized prevention efforts. While beneficial to institutions who may not have the resources to spend the time and effort on researching, much of this information and frameworks are already

available and for free. This institute also left me wondering how many individuals actually put into practice what they learned at the institute to their own campus – and if so, did anything change? Hazing has existed for centuries and continues to show up on our campuses, and despite best prevention efforts, students are still falling victims to hazing. According to Boettcher, M. L., & Salinas Jr., C. (2018), “as higher education professionals, we must find ways to develop belonging in meaningful and safe ways for our students. If we don’t, they will continue to develop them for themselves” (p. 19). It is not enough that we just educate students on hazing and its harm but we must help them develop these activities in less riskier ways. Practitioners need to step up and provide this learning and opportunities for students.

Chapter 4

Programmatic Introduction

Hazing is a miseducative experience for students which negates the purpose of education by not allowing individuals to reach their ontological vocation. Although some of the factors that influence our students and their relationship to hazing exist before and outside the university (i.e. gender norms), it is our job as student affairs professionals to help them make meaning and develop a sense of belonging in less risky ways, hence the development of this programmatic intervention. Due to the nature of hazing activities that occur in male organizations, such as violence and forced and/or excessive alcohol consumption, and the likelihood that males will not opt out of these hazing activities (Véliz-Calderón & Allan, 2017, p. 20), this pilot intervention will focus on primarily male organizations.

HAZEducation

HAZEducation is a series of seminars for all student members, regardless of position or role, who are involved in a primarily male organization. The seminars are led by the students' peers who will co-facilitate with the participants in order to reach the overarching aim to decrease the amount of hazing incidents occurring in a higher education institution. The individual seminars focus upon different education or skills to develop connections for members across various organizations, build accountability and responsibility among organization members, create less risky activities for organizations to form bonds and/or a sense of belonging among members, and educate on hazing activities, state laws and institutional policies. I believe that by focusing on the relational aspect of the issue of hazing, sense of belonging, rather than solely on the education of hazing, it could potentially transform the culture of hazing.

Critical Action Research

The HAZEducation program is modeled off of critical action research. Reason and Bradbury (2001) define action research as:

A participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities. (p. 1)

Additionally, action research values working collectively. Those that are a part of the collective are not just top authoritative figures within the university. The collective also encourages and even deems it necessary that input is received from the bottom. Those individuals, the researchers, involved in collaboration are able to achieve the most as well as making changes within organizations and the community (Brydon-Miller et al., 2003, p. 14). The end goal of this research is to bring about social change, which is the purpose of this program – to change the culture of hazing – within organizations by diminishing or abolishing its existence across institutions. This research does not only help theory to inform practice, but that practice can also result in producing theory. According to Brydon-Miller et al., (2003):

We began to discover the ability of theory to frame issues of power and identity; to suggest strategies for action and explanations for outcomes which had earlier left us puzzled; to provide structures within which our work could be better understood and our practice improved. (pp. 15-16)

This is how theory and practice can benefit from action and research and all be combined to

make effective change.

The research must also be critical. Fuchs (2015) states, “critical theory feels associated with actual and potential social struggles of exploited and oppressed groups. It maintains a stress on the importance of a better world. A reflection of realities, potentials, and limits of struggles” (p. 4). It cannot be critical action research if there is not only a critique of society but also an action to make a change within the society. This is why the issue of hazing throughout an array of organizations must be done through critical action research and the program must not only challenge the perceived acceptance of hazing, but it must also be scalable locally and globally.

Since previous prevention and education programs around hazing have come from administrators and faculty, providing this program to be led by the peers of student organization members, I believe it may be more effective. This would allow the peer leaders and members to become cofacilitators throughout the seminars. The ideas of developing bonds in less risky ways, not involving hazing, will come from those actually involved in the organizations rather than from authoritative figures. Although the seminars are educational at the foundational level, this program is a shared experience between the peers and the organization members in order to work collaboratively to think of alternate ways of achieving the goals they may have in their potential current hazing activities, hence the cofacilitation aspect incorporated into the overall program. I want both the theory and practice to inform one another and impact all parties involved, both the peer leaders and organization members. Throughout this program I want all students to think critically around hazing and the culture that may exist in their own specific organizations.

Current Best Practices

In the following section I will discuss two hazing prevention methods that occur within higher education institutions with both students and the administrators. Additionally, I will

provide an overview of bystander intervention programs also used in higher education.

HazingPrevention.Org Institute. HazingPrevention.Org is a national nonprofit organization that started in 2007 with the mission to prevent hazing through education, advocacy, and engaging people in their efforts (HazingPrevention.Org, 2020c). The organization provides a variety of resources from books to trainings. The organization conducts a yearly two-and-a-half-day institute targeted for higher education stakeholders (coaches, administrators, and national fraternity/sorority organizations, etc.) which provides building blocks for hazing prevention (HazingPrevention.Org, 2020a). Participants of the institute are able to develop a personalized framework of hazing prevention to their own campus or organization and leave with the tools for creating this plan of action (HazingPrevention.Org, 2020a).

National Hazing Prevention Week. This week occurs yearly in the last week of September across campuses in order to raise awareness and educate individuals about hazing and how it can be prevented (HazingPrevention.Org, 2020b). The organization provides free planning guides for both high school and high education institutions. These guides include resources, contests, and ideas to incorporate in order to have an effective prevention week. It is an opportunity to not only educate stakeholders of campus but also members of the community such as the local police (HazingPrevention.Org, 2020b).

Bystander Intervention. This type of intervention is common throughout campuses of higher education and can be applied to a variety of scenarios such as alcohol consumption, dating violence, and sexual assault. These programs encourage individuals to proactively intervene and not be a bystander, when witnessing potentially risky situations (Orchowski et al., 2016, p. 2825). Bystander approaches can even be used to empower individuals to speak up on their disapproval towards misogynistic, racist, or homophobic comments (Orchowski et al., 2016, p.

2825). Enacting bystander programs onto campuses or into organizations may even have the power to change cultures; used as a way to shift social norms. There are bystander intervention programs that look to address one goal (i.e., The Red Flag Campaign for sexual assault and dating violence or Green Dot for violence) there are also programs that focus on generally helping others and encouraging prosocial behavior (i.e., Step UP!). Regardless of the mission of certain programs, all bystander interventions educate on skills to reach the overall goal of intervening in situations.

Purpose

Goals

- Decrease the amount of hazing incidents within a higher education institution
- Empower male students to confront and question their own hazing activities
- Help male students develop less riskier ways of forming a sense of belonging
- Educate male students on the issues/harms of hazing

Program Objectives

The HAZEduation program will:

- decrease the number of hazing incidents on campus.
- increase peer support among student members across various types of organizations.

Learning Outcomes

Student members of organizations will be able to:

- understand the importance of creating connections as a way to eliminate/reduce hazing activities.
- identify anti-hazing policies at their institution.

Theoretical Frameworks

Freire

Current students as well as future students can be liberated through establishing certain programs and policies to diminish hazing. According to Freire (1968/2017), “students, as they are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (p. 81). Through creating educational programs that are continuous throughout a student’s academic career, students can see how certain problematic behavior, such as hazing, can lead to certain immediate and even future consequences. This will also allow students to challenge themselves not to be active participants or bystanders of hazing and come to their own solution to the behavior. The seminars in HAZEducation will embody Freire’s ideas by having dialogue between the facilitator and students where the students are able to become co-investigators with the facilitator (Freire, 1968/2017, p. 81). HAZEducation will use both input from the peer educators as well as the participants to develop less risky ways of forming a sense of belonging in their organizations. Additionally, to get to this point, the participants will be problem-posed through various discussion questions, role playing, and case scenarios. This type of education facilitation will allow students to deepen their consciousness. Freire (1968/2017) states, “a deepened consciousness of their situation leads people to apprehend the situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation” (p. 85). Students who are informed on risky behaviors, in this case hazing, can not only identify said behaviors, but either be proactive or reactive to the situations when they arise. Although HAZEducation is not piloted to be continuous throughout the participants’ academic career, I hope that the connections made throughout the program, peer

educator and participants and participant to participant, will remain throughout their time in higher education.

Gender-Aware Practice

This influences how the leadership, including peer educators, should be educator prior to implementing HAZEeducation, since it is piloted for primarily male organizations. According to Catalano et al., (2018) “Gender-aware practice provides a framework to help student affairs professionals more effectively recognize how habitually-embedded, gender-related expectations and behaviors influence their work and perceptions of justice” (p. 16). Dominant identities, like masculinity, can sometimes be assumed and therefor become an unconscious thought and remain unnamed (Catalano et al., 2018, p. 16). This is why the leadership must practice through this framework, especially the peer educators, so that when themes of hegemonic masculinity appear in HAZEeducation they can firstly, be noticed and named, and secondly, be discussed and addressed with participants.

Social Norms Theory

In the HAZEeducation seminar we will educate individuals on accurate normative data by educating the participants of HAZEeducation on the accurate normative data of hazing. Berkowitz (2005) suggests that this theory, “predicts that interventions to correct misperceptions by revealing the actual, healthier norm will have a beneficial effect on most individuals, who will either reduce their participation in potentially problematic behavior or be encouraged to engage in protective, healthy behaviors” (p. 3). This aspect of social norms theory can also apply to training bystanders, or those that refrain from confronting the others’ behaviors because they incorrectly believe it is accepted by the entirety of the group (Berkowitz, 2003). These bystanders may underestimate the discomfort of their peers. Just like accurate data, if the actual

discomfort level of peers is revealed then those bystanders may take action by expressing their own discomfort to the offender(s) of the risky/problematic behavior. Although it is not only those who partake or even witness in the risky behavior that reinforce the misperceptions. Any individual who has a misperception contribute to the culture that allows risky behavior to occur even if they do not actively participate. In addition to providing accurate normative data, HAZEducation will focus on disrupting these perceived norms of bystander intervention in Part 2 of the program.

Program Proposal

The HAZEducation program consists of four parts, three seminars and one activity. The four parts will take place over the course of the fall semester. The individual parts will occur bi-weekly on Sundays during the months of September and October. HAZEducation is open to any type of members from primarily male organizations. The program is capped to 50 participants. Each part of the program builds upon different goals and skills for the participants which is outlined below in the proposed schedule.

Peer Educators

It is essential that this program is facilitated by peer educators for several reasons. Firstly, according to Beltman and Schaeben (2012), peer educators “is a well-established, evidence-based social support strategy that can enhance academic, social, personal and career outcomes of recipients” (p. 34). Secondly, it negates the banking model by providing a reciprocal relationship through both the peer educators and the participants of the program. Through using peers, HAZEducation can be done in this mode of facilitation where all parties work to make the change together. Finally, since the topic of hazing can be one with secrecy, I believe participants receiving this information regarding anti-hazing would best be received from their peers. While

not the goal of HAZEeducation, peer educators will also have outcomes from this program such as networking, collegiality, increased self-awareness and confidence, and even leadership skills (Beltman & Schaeben, 2012, p. 35).

I propose that the training for the peer educators take place over a three-day period for approximately eight hours each day. Over these three days, peer educators will be taken through the ins-and-outs of HAZEeducation, learning both the material and programs goals, in order to confidently facilitate the program to the participants. If the peer educators are knowledgeable in the material and aware of the goals, they will feel more confident and comfortable in their roles allowing them to enjoy the program as a developmental experience for themselves (Cornelius et al., 2016, p. 195). Peer educators will also receive the education through a gender-aware practice to learn about masculinities, include hegemonic masculinities, since male participants are the audience for the pilot of HAZEeducation. Additionally, peer educators will go through NASPA's Certified Peer Educator (CPE) Training which aims to provide "foundational skills necessary to foster individual, small group, and campus dialogues and events on prevention, health and safety" (para. 1). This training includes modules on: understanding the power of peer education, strategies for change in high-risk behaviors, listening skills, responding and referral skills, intervention skills, developing inclusive peer education efforts, programming and presentation skills, taking care of yourself, and group development and success (NASPA, n.d.).

Proposed Schedule

HAZEeducation Schedule Part 1: 10AM-1PM	
Summary	This seminar will focus on establishing connections between the peer educators and the participations as well as between participants across various organizations. This will also introduce discussion questions to have participants begin to evaluate their own organizations' values, activities, etc.
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PowerPoint Slides

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pens • Hardcover Journals • “Your Organization” Handout – <i>Please see Appendix A</i>
Agenda	<p>Introductions of Peer Educators</p> <p>Overview of HAZEducation</p> <p>Break off into smaller groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 groups of 5 student participants • 2 Peer Educators per group • Quick intros within groups (name, organization, etc.) <p>Icebreaker</p> <p>Activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute “Your Organization” handout – have participants read and reflect in their journals • Spend time talking about it in small groups <p>Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion in small groups on participants’ expectations of the program & what they hope to get out of it <p>Debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report out for each small group on the reflections and discussions of “Your Organization” • Report out expectations and what participants hope to gain from this program

HAZEducation Schedule Part 2: 10AM-1PM	
Summary	This seminar will focus on education around bystander intervention and social norms. This will aim to build skills and empower participants to question and confront their own activities (if they are hazing).
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PowerPoint Slides • Bystander Intervention Handout
Agenda	<p>Check-in</p> <p>What Would You Do?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2BY8hTksf4k (9 minutes) <p>Debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you respond if you were in this situation?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why would/would you not respond? <p>Bystander Introduction (<i>in the small groups</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice the event • Interpret behavior(s) as a problem • Feel responsible for the solution • Acquire the skills to act (leadership & communication) • Intervene <p>Lunch</p> <p>Case Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read through & discuss in small groups • Debrief case study then as entire group <p>Role Play (<i>in small groups</i>)</p> <p>Debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss if they felt comfortable/uncomfortable intervening in the situation • If there was discomfort: 1) notice the feeling 2) name, the feeling 3) sit with the feeling 4) let the feeling go • If they did not intervene, would they have done anything differently? If so, what?
--	--

HAZEducation Schedule Part 3: 8AM-4PM*	
Summary	This activity will focus on personal growth as well as discussion around what it means to be a part of a group. This activity will also continue to build connections amongst the participants.
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation – Charter Bus • Ropes Course Package • Meal
Agenda	<p>Transportation from campus to ropes course</p> <p>Ropes Course and Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask discussion questions throughout the day in-between activities <p>Reflection & Debrief (<i>in small groups</i>)</p> <p>Transportation from ropes course to campus</p>

***Times may vary depending if using an on-campus ropes course versus traveling to a ropes course**

HAZEducation Schedule Part 4: 10AM-1PM	
Summary	This seminar will begin with a check-in to discuss the previous week's activity of the ropes course. It will follow with an activity to put into practice developing new activities to form a sense of belonging. The seminar will then focus on defining what hazing entails and also the impact hazing can have on both the perpetrator and the victim. Afterwards there will be a brief overview of the state law (if applicable), institutional policy, reporting options/obligations at the institution, and available support and resources. The seminar will end the entire HAZEducation program with a distribution of framed certificates to each participant.
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Is It Hazing” Handout – <i>Please see Appendix B</i> • “Creating Activities” Handout – <i>Please see Appendix C</i> • PowerPoint Slides • Meal • Framed Certificates
Agenda	<p>Check-in</p> <p>Activity (<i>in small groups</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute “Is It Hazing” handout – take some time for participants to review and reflect on by themselves (there should be no recording or actual answering of the questions) • Using “Creating Activities” handout – discuss and begin to create activities to build bonds/develop a sense of belonging among group members • Spend some time comparing the answers to “Your Organization” that was done during Part 1 until now – discuss if anything has changed. <p>Lunch</p> <p>Hazing Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define hazing • Discuss harm hazing can have on victim & perpetrator <p>Anti-Hazing State Law Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define hazing as the state law defines it (if applicable) <p>Institutional Policy Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define hazing as the institution defines it (if applicable) <p>Reporting Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obligations to report hazing incidents (if applicable) • Where and how to fill out a report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens after? <p>Support & Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both on campus and off campus <p>Distribution of Framed Certificates</p>
--	---

Implementation

Budget

The budget has been broken up into four different sections: Peer Educators, HAZEducation Part 1, 2, and 4, HAZEducation Part 4, and HAZEducation: Campus Stakeholders. The bottom-line price for the entire intervention is approximately \$20,000. The proposed funding for this initiative is either from a grant application completed by the administrator, restricted funds, or a restricted gift from an alumni or community member who had a previous experience as an educator or mentor. Please see *Appendix D* for an itemized budget for the entire intervention.

Marketing and Recruitment

The marketing for peer educators will occur throughout the entire year but mainly concentrated towards the end of the fall semester and beginning of the spring semester of each academic year. Throughout the year there will be promotional posters and tabling done during involvement fairs. Additionally, during the concentrated promotional periods, emails will be sent to faculty and administrators to nominate or suggest students they believe would either learn from or excel in this role. Once the program grows hopefully recruitment will be spread via word of mouth from past peer educators or even past student participants. Please see *Appendix E* for the peer educator job description and *Appendix F* for the peer educator application. There will be no recruitment for participants as this will be mandatory for participating in any type of primarily male organization that is recognized by the institution. Members will be required to attend

HAZEducation within their first year of being a part of the organization.

The marketing and recruitment for stakeholder participants will be advertised all throughout the year via promotional posters, emails, and as the program grows, word of mouth.

Timeline

The timeline for recruiting, interviewing and hiring of the peer educators will take place in the spring semester to the prior academic year of when the HAZEducation program will actually commence. The training for peer educators will then occur over the weekend before HAZEducation: Part 1. The HAZEducation will then follow a bi-weekly pattern, every Sunday 1pm to 4pm for the months of September and October. All parts are three hours except for Part 3, the ropes course, which will be eight hours long, 8am to 4pm (two hours total for transportation and six hours for the ropes course).

Potential Challenges

The potential challenges include possible lack of recruitment for the peer educators although the pay should hopefully be an incentive. A way to solve this problem would be if it were required for students who are already in positions like Leadership Consultants, it could already be built into the job description.

Chapter 5

Introduction

Anyone who is a part of the institution can be a leader. Leadership in Higher Education and Student Affairs is not just a title or a position within the institution. An individual does not have to be in a position of power. According to Sriram and Farley (2014), “student affairs administrators can gain and use power through symbolic, political, and human resource means when they do not possess it structurally” (p. 105). In addition to power there are systemic issues within higher education that influence how leadership can be enacted. These systems in higher education exist as departments, areas, and divisions (Sriram & Farley, 2014). These systems can also be categorized into internal systems, those individuals within the same department, and external systems, individuals who are a part of the same institution but exist outside the department (Sriram & Farley, 2014). Student affairs educators must understand these systems to be able to use their skills in effective ways in order to become in a position of power or gain support of those in power to be able to make change.

Leadership and HAZEducation

Leadership Styles

To enact change, there are a variety of characteristics or skills that comprise leadership. The most encompassing model of these characteristics is the Social Change Model (SCM). This model focuses on fostering change and actions that improve either the human condition or the environment with both modal and end values (Komives et al., 2017). The model also recognizes that all people are potential leaders and it is not limited to a specific role or title (Komives et al., 2017). The SCM consists of three components: individual, group and community which all have different values for creating change (Komives et al., 2017). The different values, also known as

the seven C's, include: citizenship, common purpose, controversy, consciousness, congruence and commitment (Komives et al., 2017). Through these different components and values, positive change can be enacted. This is not to say that it is a checklist of completing these values but rather they are continually development throughout this process of change.

In addition to this model, other important models of leadership include relational and servant. The relational model focuses on positive change and includes five foundational philosophies of purposeful, inclusive, empowering, ethical, and process oriented (Dugan, 2017). Servant leadership emphasizes a movement beyond management, engagement with values and ethics, and development of followers (Dugan, 2017). This leadership style focuses on social responsibility and includes certain behaviors leaders should follow such as conceptual skills, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowerment, and creating a value for the community (Dugan, 2017).

Role of Leadership

In order to implement HAZEducation into an institution the leadership must encompass the above models and values. The SCM would serve the as the foundational goals of HAZEducation, to foster change and also take into account the individual, group, and community. There needs to be a focus on the individual to do their part to not haze, the group also has to not perpetuate hazing in their "rituals" or organizational culture, and the community has to have the buy-in to support these anti-hazing efforts. The relational leadership model is essential in anti-hazing prevention because it focuses on group processes. When incorporating this model within enacting HAZEducation, it can help students build strong organizations and let the members know that they matter (Dugan, 2017). Servant leadership should also be incorporated into HAZEducation to be effective in social responsibility. This model states that

these behaviors must be individualized which is necessary to both the various types of organizations but the individual participants of HAZEducation. It is especially important to dismantle hazing as servant leadership's framework has been created, according to Dugan (2017), "to challenge commonly held conceptions of power and production." (p. 195) Hazing continues to be reproduced and accepted partially because of the power of older students. This notion must be challenged so that change can happen to diminish hazing activities that students may consider traditions.

The overall most important characteristics of an effective leader is collaboration. The idea that one person has the answer in this complex and interconnected world is not only ridiculous but inefficient (Davis, 2019). Collaboration allows change to not only happen but ensure it is a sustainable change. For HAZEducation to successfully exist on the campus, there needs to be support from the university from the president to the student body. The program also must be sustainable and continue to run on a yearly basis to inform those organizations from year to year.

Assessment, Evaluation and HAZEducation

Assessments and evaluations are critical for programs and initiatives within higher education. It allows one to see what learning goals and program objectives have been met in order to see the overall effectiveness of the program. It can allow us to also capture the overall experience of the participants. Collecting data, analyzing it and reporting it is how we can hold ourselves accountable and determine whether or not we need to make improvements. According to Schuh et al. (2016), "with accountability come such features as answerability to stakeholders, shared governance, organizational transparency, and so on." (p. 9) Assessment and evaluation can inform our future practice. Just as in critical action research as theory informs our practice

and practice informs theory is the same is true of assessment. It is a continuous process as both our programs and participants within the programs may change and our findings must inform our future program implementation. Below are descriptions of each assessment and evaluation measures with the examples of assessments in *Appendix G*.

Data Collection

The overall goal of the program is to diminish hazing within a higher education institution. A simple way to measure this is through collecting data regarding reported hazing incidents and determining if that decreases either each semester, or academic year. However, it should be noted that this may not capture the entire truth or accurate data for a number of reasons; hazing may not necessarily be talked about outside of the organization, the victims of hazing may not define it as hazing (Allan & Madden, 2018), and how to report a hazing incident may not be widely known. Through implementing this program, these potential contributing factors may also be solved but data would still have to be tracked throughout multiple semesters or years to see if the program effective.

Satisfaction & Learning Survey

Each HAZEducation seminar/activity will end with participants completing a small survey. This survey will gather general satisfaction and qualitative data of what has been learned from that specific portion of the program.

Journal Reflection

In the beginning of the program, participants will be given a journal. Participants will be advised that this journal is for them to reflect throughout the duration of the entire program either during their free time, at the scheduled journal breaks, or both and that their journals will be collected at the end of the program. After the completion of the program and once journals are

collected, the Peer Educators will review the journals of their corresponding small group participants. Peer Educators will analyze the journals by looking for themes that spoke to an understanding of the importance of belonging, moral and ethical questions about hazing, and the significance of building community. After this, the Peer Educators may wish to follow-up with some participants if they want to provide any feedback. Once data is collected, journals will be returned to the participants.

Follow-up Focus Group

There will be a follow-up focus group between the Peer Educators and their small groups. Since there are two Peer Educators assigned to each group, one educator will ask the questions while the other educator scribes and records both the responses and also any body language and/or gestures. This focus group will occur either the following semester or approximately one year after the completion of the HAZE education program (preferably before the start of the next round of participants). This will be a time where participants can reflect on the experience as well as share what they have done since the completion of the program. The other program goal is for the participants to create new ways of developing a sense of belonging among their organizations in order to build those connections. During this focus group we will try to determine whether or not they have met this goal. This is also a way for other organizations to connect and see what kinds of programs/activities they are doing for their members/teammates. The focus group will allow for in-depth feedback needed to evaluate whether or not the students have been putting into practice what they have learned from the program. There will be 8-12 questions to be discussed during this experience. In order to ensure that everyone gets a chance to both speak and listen, the focus group should be done in a talking stick style. The Peer Educators can pass around the stick once or multiple times until they believe the question has

been thoroughly answered and once it's been passed around at least once, anyone who wishes to provide further feedback can do so if they have the stick or object (Marrelli, 2008, p. 40).

Limitations & Future

Issues and Populations

As mentioned previously, hazing can occur within any and all types of organizations, which means it impacts a variety of populations. While HAZEducation is focused on primarily organization with male members, this program could and should be expanded, including a focus of both race, gender, and organizational type. The hazing activities may vary depending on these various factors. These multiple identities or factors must be incorporated into future programming, to address their specific hazing activities in order to abolish them.

Another issue is this program does not cover stakeholders. There should be education for stakeholders in order for them to understand what hazing actually entails, so that if they see it, they could potentially intervene or if not, report it. Additionally, they should be educated on state laws, institutional policies and reporting as well. Hazing is a form of interpersonal violence and according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2019), "ultimate goal is to stop violence before it begins", which is why the social-ecological model will be applied to this program. The CDC (2019) has developed a four-level social-ecological model to better understand violence as well as the effect of potential prevention strategies. The levels of the model are not a step process but rather all levels must be considered at all times. The first level as the individual which contains biological and personal history factors that increase the likelihood of either becoming a perpetrator or victim of violence (CDC, 2019). The CDC (2019) explains, "the second level examines close relationships that may increase the risk of experiencing violence as a victim or perpetrator". Community is the third level which

investigates the settings in which social relationships occur and looks to identify the characteristics that would influence those involved with violence. The CDC's (2019), "fourth level looks at the broad societal factors that help create a climate in which violence is encouraged or inhibited".

Institutional Type

While this program has been created in mind for a regional mid-sized institution, I believe it could be replicated at any institution. Students do not have to have experience to be a Peer Educator and can be recruited from a variety of places, not just a student involvement office. Additionally, the program can be adjusted to fit either a smaller or larger group of participants as long as there are enough educators to support them. The budget presumes that an institution does not have a ropes course, if this cannot be replicated with an in-house ropes course at an institution or due to budgeting issues, other less costly activities can be substituted. As long as the activity incorporates challenges the participants and includes the value of building connections, being a part of a team, and leadership it can be used in the program.

"What meanings do men who are enrolled at a small liberal arts institution, community colleges, religiously affiliated institutions or historically Black institutions ascribe to masculinities?" (Harris III, 2010, p. 316) – the same should be said with female and other gender identities at these various institutions.

Future

The task to lead a change to hazing is difficult and can seem impossible. Hazing becomes imbedded into the culture not only within the specific organization but in the university as a whole. To change the culture there must be a collaborative effort among all members of the institution, not just solely the leaders or just the students. It does have to be a grassroots effort in

terms of having the students participate throughout the process of changing the culture. The ultimate goal is to transform the culture and while this program will not solve it entirely, its goal is to focus on the relational aspects so that these students develop a sense of belonging in safe and non-hazing ways. There is a difference in providing education and programming to just comply with the state laws and institutional policies or rather to be transformative.

During this time of the COVID-19 pandemic, many students are away from one another and either minimally socializing or not socializing at all. The importance of connections and relationships become more exposed. Once the stay-at-home orders are lifted, my hope is that students do not lose the importance of connections and could possibly be less likely to harm their peers through hazing activities.

References

- ACPA: College Student Educators International and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2015). *Professional competency areas for student affairs educators*. https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA_NASPA_Professional_Compencies_FINAL.pdf
- Allan, E.J. & Madden, M. (2008). *Hazing in view: College Students at risk*. Stop Hazing. https://www.stophazing.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hazing_in_view_web1.pdf
- Allan, E. J., Payne, J. M., & Kerschner, D. (2018a). Transforming the culture of hazing: A research-based hazing prevention framework. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 55(4). 412-425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1474759>
- Allan, E.J., Kerschner D., & Payne, J.M. (2018b). College student hazing experiences, attitudes, and perceptions: Implications for prevention. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* (56)1, p. 32-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1490303>
- Arkansas Tech University. (n.d.). *Hazing prevention guide*. <https://www.atu.edu/nohazing/docs/HazingPreventionGuide.pdf>
- Arthur, J., Kristjánsson, K., Harrison, T., Sanderse, W., & Wright, D. (2016). *Teaching character and virtue in schools*. Taylor & Francis.
- Beltman, S. & Schaeben, M. (2012). Insitution-wide peer mentoring: Benefits for mentors. *The International Journal of First Year in Higher Education*, 3(2), 33-44.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In H. W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse* (pp. 259–279). Jossey-Bass.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). An overview of the social norms approach. In L. Lederman, L. Stewart,

- F. Goodhart, & L. Laitman (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated prevention campaign*. Hampton Press.
- Bloom, J. & Propst Cuevas, A. E. (2018). An appreciative approach to hazing prevention. In C. Salinas Jr. & M. L. Boettcher (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on hazing in colleges and universities: A guide to disrupting hazing culture* (pp. 126-136). Taylor & Francis.
- Botello, R. & Cruz, N. C. (2018). The psychological shadow of hazing: Mental health issues and counseling. In C. Salinas Jr. & M. L. Boettcher (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on hazing in colleges and universities: A guide to disrupting hazing culture* (pp. 111-125). Taylor & Francis.
- Boettcher, M. L., & Salinas Jr., C. (2018). Testimonies: Hazing firsthand. In C. Salinas Jr. & M. L. Boettcher (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on hazing in colleges and universities: A guide to disrupting hazing culture* (pp. 14-24). Taylor & Francis.
- Braswell, S. (2018). *The sordid and dangerous history of hazing*. OZY.
<https://www.ozy.com/flashback/the-sordid-and-dangerous-history-of-hazing/88471>
- Bruckner, H. (2018). Students fall victim to hazing epidemic: Unity at what cost? *Touro Law Review*, 34(2), 459-493.
- Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., & Maguire, P. (2003). Why action research? *Action Research*, 1(1), 9-28. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/14767503030011002>
- Carroll, M. (2019). *WSU freshman Samuel Martinez died of alcohol poisoning, investigation ongoing*. KREM. <https://www.krem.com/article/news/local/wsufreshman-died-of-alcohol-poisoning/293-5d0b114c-3e39-4f8f-bc5c-5f27e8f08d88>
- Catalano, D. C. J., Wagner, R., and Davis, T. (2018) Approaching masculinities through a gender-aware practice framework. *New Directions for Student Services*, 164(1), p. 11-17.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *Violence prevention: The social-ecological model*. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/publichealthissue/social-ecologicalmodel.html>

Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot Bystander Intervention to Reduce Interpersonal Violence Among College Students Across Three Campuses. *Violence against women*, 21(12), 1507–1527. <https://doi/10.1177/1077801214545284>

Cornelius, V., Wood, L., & Lai, J. (2016). Implementation and evaluation of a formal academic-peer-mentoring programme in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 193-205.

Davis, L. (2019, December 12). *A guide to collaborative leadership*. [Video]. TED. https://www.ted.com/talks/lorna_davis_a_guide_to_collaborative_leadership/up-next?language=en

Deitch-Stackhouse, J., Kenneavy, K., Thayer, R., Berkowitz, A., & Mascari, J. (2015). The influence of social norms on advancement through bystander stages for preventing interpersonal violence. *Violence Against Women*, 21(10).

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education*. Hall-Quest, A. L. (Ed.). Touchstone.

Dewey, J. (2015). Education as a necessity of life. In *Democracy and education*. Project Gutenberg. (Original work published 1916)

Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Freire, P. (2017). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1968)

- Foucault, M. (1978). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the college de France, 1977-78*.
M. Senellart, F. Ewald, A. Fontana, & A. Davidson (Eds.). (G. Burchell, Trans.).
Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C.
Gordon (Ed.). (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). New York, NY:
Pantheon Books.
- Fuchs, C. (2015). Critical theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication*
(G. Mazzoleni, Ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118541555.wbiepc001>
- Harris III, F. (2010). College men's meanings of masculinities and contextual influences:
Toward a conceptual model. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(3), 297-318.
- HazingPrevention.Org. (2020a). *About the institute*.
<https://hazingprevention.org/education/institute-home/>
- HazingPrevention.Org. (2020b). *National hazing prevention week*.
<https://hazingprevention.org/home/prevention/national-hazing-prevention-week/>
- HazingPrevention.Org. (2020c). *Who we are*. <https://hazingprevention.org/home/about/who-we-are/>
- Hollmann, B. (2002). Hazing: Hidden campus crime. *New Directions for Student Services, 99*. p.
11
- Joyce, B. S. & Nirh, J. (2018). Fraternity and sorority hazing. In C. Salinas Jr. & M. L. Boettcher
(Eds.), *Critical perspectives on hazing in colleges and universities: A guide to disrupting
hazing culture* (pp. 52-64). Taylor & Francis.
- Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues. (2017). *A framework for character educations in*

schools. University of Birmingham. <https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/527/character-education/framework>

King Jr., M. L. (1948). *The purpose of education*. The Seattle Times.

<https://special.seattletimes.com/o/special/mlk/king/education.html>

Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., and Associates (Ed.) (2017). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. Jossey-Bass.

Lipkins, S. (2006). *Preventing hazing: How parents, teachers, and coaches can stop the violence, harassment and humiliation*. Jossey-Bass.

Marrelli, A. F. (2008). Collecting data through focus groups. *Performance Improvement* 47(4), 39-45.

NASPA. (n.d.). Certified peer educator training.

https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/events/CPE_Training_Description_8.18Update2.pdf

New anti-hazing law signed in Pennsylvania after death of Penn State student. (2018). NBC.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/new-anti-hazing-law-signed-pennsylvania-after-death-penn-state-n922231>

Nuwer, H. (2020). Hazing deaths database. <http://www.hanknuwer.com/hazing-deaths/>

Orchowski, L. M., Berkowitz, A., Boggis, J., & Oesterle, D. (2016). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(17), 2824-2846. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515581904>

Pennalism. (n.d.). In *Collins English Dictionary*. Retrieved from

<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/pennalism>

Pop Culture Detective. (2019, February 11). *Sexual assault of men played for laughs – Part 1 male perpetrators* [Video]. Youtube.

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uc6QxD2_yQw&t=12s
- Pop Culture Detective. (2020, January 30). *Sexual assault of men played for laughs – Part 2 female perpetrators* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9nheskbsU5g>
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. Sage Publications.
- Reid, G.M., Holt, M.K., Felix, E.D., & Grief Green, J. (2018). Perceived consequences of hazing exposure during the first year of college: Associations with childhood victimization. *Journal of American College Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2018.1484363>
- Royde-Smith, J. G. & Hughes, T. A. (2019) World War II. In *Encyclopedia Britannica online*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/World-War-II/Forces-and-resources-of-the-European-combatants-1939>
- Salinas Jr., C. & Boettcher, M. L. (2018). History and definition of hazing. In C. Salinas Jr. & M. L. Boettcher (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on hazing in colleges and universities: A guide to disrupting hazing culture* (pp. 1-13). Taylor & Francis.
- Schuh, J. H., Biddix, J. P., Dean, L. A., & Kinzie, J. (2016). *Assessment in student affairs*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shugart, S. (2013). The challenge to deep change: A brief cultural history of higher education. *Planning for Higher Education*, 41(2), 7-17.
- Sriram, R. & Farley, J. H. (2014). Circular framing: A model for applying Bolman and Deal's four frames in student affairs administration. *Journal of Student Affairs*, 23, 103-112.
- Sterner, R. (2008). The history of hazing in American higher education. <https://ruthsterner.files.wordpress.com/2008/05/histpdf.pdf>
- Strawhun, J., (2016). *Psychological factors that underlie hazing perceptions: A mixed methods*

study. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from digital commons. (269).

Véliz-Calderón, D., & Allan, E. J. (2017). Defining hazing: Gender differences. *The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 12(2), 12-25.

Waldron, J. (2012). Social norms approach to hazing prevention workshops. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 3, 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2011.639854>

Yasharoff, H. (2018). In the era of #MeToo, is it still OK to laugh at ‘Animal House’?
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/life/movies/2018/07/27/animal-house-turns-40-can-we-still-laugh/822642002/>

Appendix A

Your Organization (Bloom & Propst Cuevas, 2018, pp. 131-132)

- Describe a time when you were new to an organization. What emotions did you feel? How did people make you feel welcome?
- What motivate you in terms of wanting to contribute to the success of organization?
- IF you could make your organization into the perfect organization where every member is engaged in helping the organization and all its members be successful, what would that look like?
- If you wanted to plan the ideal way to bring new members into your organization and integrate them successfully into the organization, what would that look like?
- As people, we all want to feel like we matter, belong, and are valued. How can you make your organization one that fulfills those goals?
- If you were to dream about ways new members thrive and do not merely survive during your initiation process, what would that look like?

Appendix B

Is it Hazing? (Arkansas Tech University, n.d.)

If you or other members of your organization are planning or participating in any activity that you are concerned may be hazing, ask yourself these questions:

1. Do you have any reservations about what is being asked of you or someone else in your organization?
2. Does this activity have the potential to cause any physical, emotional, or psychological harm?
3. Is the activity aimed at belittling or humiliating a group or individual?
4. Does the activity include any kind of physical exertion or abuse? Could the activity lead to loss of sleep or sleep deprivation?
5. Does the activity involve any illegal activities?
6. Are new members coerced, pressured, or encouraged to consume any alcohol, liquor, beverage, food, drug, or substance?
7. Would you be concerned if parents, advisors, administrators, or the general public found out about the activity?
8. Would you be concerned if the activity was broadcast on the local news station, written about in the local newspaper, or posted on any social media site?
9. Does the activity go against your club/organization/team's purpose or values?

If you answered YES to any of these questions, then the activity is most likely an act of hazing and should be stopped immediately.

Appendix C

Creating Activities (Bloom & Propst Cuevas, 2018, pp. 132-133)

- Develop a list of specific steps that can be taken to positively welcome and initiate new members into your organizations.
- What components of your initiation process can you use as building blocks for making the initiation process both safe and memorable?
- If you were totally in charge of transforming the initiation process, what role(s) would you assign to yourself? What roles would you assign to others?
- When you run into setbacks as we deliver on the plan you designed, how are you going to regroup quickly and learn from our mistakes?
- What strategies can we use to deal with unexpected challenges that may arise in carrying out your plan?
- Who are people you can go to for assistance if you run into unexpected barriers?
- Are there other organizations that have done this work whose experience might inform what you are about to take on?

Appendix D

EXPENSE	DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST	UNIT	TOTAL COST	FUNDING
Peer Educators	<i>Create a comprehensive, healthy, and educated campus community on hazing prevention.</i>		<i>8 hour training, 3x academic year</i>	<i>\$ 7,549.00</i>	<i>Grant, Restricted Gifts/Funds</i>
Staff	Train the peer educators	\$ -	1	\$ -	
Marketing - Emails	Sent to students to recruit & also faculty/staff to nominate students they feel would make great peer educators	\$ -		\$ -	
Marketing - Posters	Posted around campus to promote students getting involved in the program	\$ 5.00	20	\$ 100.00	
Marketing - Tabling at Involvement Fairs		\$ -	2x an academic year	\$ -	
Meals (including snacks)	Light breakfast with refreshments & lunch with refreshments	\$ 20.00	40	\$ 800.00	
NASPA CPE Training (with institutional membership)	Training for Peer Educators	-		\$ 4,000.00	
Room	Space for training - on campus	\$ -		\$ -	
Pens	Used for training & to keep	\$ 0.20	20	\$ 4.00	
Binder	Used for training & to keep	\$ 2.00	20	\$ 40.00	
Printed Training Materials for Binder	Used for training & to keep - approximately 25 pages per binder	\$ 0.05	500	\$ 25.00	
Legal Pads	Used for training & to keep	\$ 1.00	20	\$ 20.00	
Padfolio with Logo	Used for training & to keep	\$ 15.00	20	\$ 300.00	
Salary	\$12 per hour	\$ 288.00	20	\$ 5,760.00	

Quarter Zip	Incentive for completing the training	\$ 20.00	20	\$ 400.00	
Sweatshirt with Logo	Used to preserve certificate	\$ 3.00	20	\$ 60.00	
Frame					
EXPENSE	DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST	UNIT	TOTAL COST	FUNDING
HAZEducation Parts 1, 2, & 4	<i>Various educational objectives to build skills to prevent/diminish hazing incidents on campus.</i>		<i>3 hour seminars, 3x academic year</i>	\$ 4,646.50	<i>Grant, Restricted Gift/Funds</i>
Room	Space for seminars - on campus	\$ -	50	\$ -	
Peer Educators	Salary for seminars	\$ 108.00	20	\$ 2,160.00	
Pens	Used for seminars & to keep	\$ 0.20	50	\$ 10.00	
Hardcover Journals	Used for seminars & to keep	\$ 2.48	50	\$ 124.00	
Meal	Lunch with refreshments	\$ 10.00	210	\$ 2,100.00	
Handouts	Educational Information - approximately 10 pages per individual	\$ 0.05	50	\$ 2.50	
Printed Certificate	Incentive for completing HAZEducation	\$ 2.00	50	\$ 100.00	
Frame	Used to preserve certificate	\$ 3.00	50	\$ 150.00	
HAZEducation Part 3	<i>Bonding activity at ropes course & celebration of completion</i>		<i>6 hours, 1x academic year</i>	\$ 7,300.00	<i>Grant, Restricted Gift/Funds</i>
Ropes Course Package	Full day customized program of teambuilding activities & initiatives	\$ 70.00	70	\$ 4,900.00	
Chaperones	Employees	\$ -	2	\$ -	
Transportation	To & from the ropes course	\$ 1,700.00	1	\$ 1,700.00	
Meal	Lunch	\$ 10.00	70	\$ 700.00	
BOTTOM LINE				\$19,495.50	

Appendix E

Peer Educator Job Description

Purpose: Create a comprehensive, healthy, and educated campus community on hazing prevention.

Duties & Responsibilities:

- Facilitate bystander intervention programming (at least 2 per semester)
- Host informational tabling events (at least 2 per semester)
- Give presentations
- Must be able to make a 2-semester commitment
- Recruit 1-2 peer educators for the following year

Benefits:

- Improve public speaking skills
- Gain leadership skills
- Collaborate with various departments throughout campus
- Receive continuous learning & support from campus staff

Desired Qualifications:

- Commitment to contributing to a positive campus environment
- Ability to model healthy and prosocial behaviors for peers
- Positive attitude
- Professional communication skills
- Excellent time management skills

Appendix G

Satisfaction & Learning Survey

1. What did you like most about this seminar?
2. What did you like least about this seminar?
3. What is one thing you learned from this seminar?
4. Additional comments (*optional*):

Follow-up Focus Group

Engagement Questions

1. Introduce yourself – name, organization, etc.
2. How did you feel about being a member of your organization prior to HAZEducation?
3. How has the time been between ending HAZEducation and now?

Exploration Questions

4. What did you think about the bystander intervention portion of HAZEducation?
5. What changes, if any, have you made to your organization post HAZEducation?
6. If you have not made changes to your organization, what problems do you see implementing change?
7. What have you done to build community in your organization? In your own community?

Exit Questions

8. What did you like least about HAZEducation?
9. What did you like best about HAZEducation?
10. How did you feel about being a member of your organization after HAZEducation?
11. What else would you like to say about HAZEducation?