

## ABSTRACT

Title of thesis: DEFINITIONS OF HAZING: DIFFERENCES AMONG  
SELECTED STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Chad William Ellsworth, Master of Arts, 2004

Thesis directed by: Dr. John Zacker  
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

Fraternalities, sororities, military organizations, athletic groups, and marching bands commonly are associated with hazing activities. Although such organizations have been linked to hazing activities, the fact that there is no common definition of hazing has hindered any real effort to challenge and combat such activities.

The purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among the selected student organizations. The selected student organizations included fraternities, sororities, Reserve Officer Training Corps, NCAA athletic teams, and marching bands.

This research study discovered statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) among the selected student organizations for physical hazing activities and psychological hazing activities, as well as statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between women and men for physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities. Finally, this research study found 10 activities students in the aggregate identified as hazing activities, which moves us toward a common definition of hazing.

DEFINITIONS OF HAZING:  
DIFFERENCES AMONG SELECTED STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

Chad William Ellsworth

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
2004

Advisory Committee:

Dr. John Zacker, Chair  
Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens  
Dr. Susan Komives  
Dr. Marylu McEwen

© Copyright by  
Chad William Ellsworth  
2004

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who helped make this research study possible, and who supported me throughout my graduate school career and this process. First, I would like to thank Dr. John Zacker, whose guidance, knowledge, patience, and support sustained me throughout the last two years. I could not have finished this research study without his diligence and hard work on my behalf.

Next, I have to recognize the encouragement and insight of my thesis committee: Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Dr. Susan Komives, and Dr. Marylu McEwen. Their care and concern for me as a researcher and a student, as well as a person, were invaluable. They also challenged me to be the best researcher I could be and to produce the most rigorous research study possible.

It is important for me to recognize Joe Pica and Educational Benchmarking, Inc., who offered the Web-Enabled Survey System (WESS) and their services to me free-of-charge, which enabled me to use a sophisticated, user-friendly survey system for data collection. The assistance and attention they gave me can not be measured, and certainly is appreciated.

There were a number of people who advised and guided me during this research study in a much less formal way. Dr. Karen Inkelas and Dr. William Sedlacek advised me with regard to research design and statistical analysis. Their knowledge and willingness to help are greatly appreciated.

Also, I owe a great amount of thanks to the people who gave me advice and reviewed my survey instrument, including Walter Kimbrough, Tracy Koivisto, Hank Nuwer, Val Sheley, and Terry Zacker. To have received their help and participation as expert reviewers means so much to me.

Although they did not directly participate in this research study, there were a number of people who provided immeasurable support to me throughout my graduate school career and this process. These people included my colleagues from the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life: Tiki Ayiku, Stacy Kraus, Jose Lozano, Tracie Massey, Bob Nichols, Thomas Pitchford, Fay Sharman, Amelia Simmons, and especially Matt Supple, who encouraged me and gave me time away from the office to work on this research study. In addition, my closest friends Ryan Holmes, Tisha McCoy, Hugo Najera, Chris Wegener, and Becky Zonies provided immeasurable support and motivation throughout the last two years.

Last, though certainly not least, I would like to recognize and thank my parents. They consistently provided encouragement, love, and understanding. Without them and the support they provided, my successes throughout my life, especially throughout the last two years, would not have been possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Background.....	4
Psychological Perspectives.....	4
Sociological Perspectives.....	5
Legal Perspectives.....	6
Problem Statement.....	7
Definitions.....	8
Rationale.....	9
Chapter II: Review of the Literature.....	11
History of Hazing.....	11
History of Hazing in Marching Bands.....	12
History of Hazing in Fraternities and Sororities.....	13
History of Hazing in Military Organizations.....	15
History of Hazing in Athletic Teams.....	16
Legal Issues of Hazing.....	16
Social Psychology and Sociology of Hazing.....	19
Severity-Attraction Hypothesis.....	19
Severity-Affiliation-Attraction Hypothesis.....	20
Interpersonal Dependence Hypothesis.....	21
Hazing and Involvement.....	22
Hazing and High School Students.....	23
Hazing in Student Organizations.....	24
Fraternities.....	24
Sororities.....	28
Military Organizations.....	30
Athletic Teams.....	34
Marching Bands.....	36
Perceptions of Hazing.....	36
Summary.....	39
Chapter III: Methodology.....	41
Purpose.....	41
Research Design.....	41
Variables.....	42
Instrumentation.....	42
Description of Survey Instrument.....	42
Expert Review.....	44
Pilot Test.....	46
Sample.....	47
Data Collection.....	50
Data Analysis.....	52

Chapter IV: Results.....	53
Description of Respondents.....	53
Physical Hazing Activities.....	56
Psychological Hazing Activities.....	58
Both Physical and Psychological Hazing Activities.....	60
Other Hazing Activities.....	61
Non-Hazing Activities.....	64
All Hazing Activities.....	67
Summary.....	67
Chapter V: Discussion, Limitations, and Implications.....	71
Discussion.....	73
Limitations.....	77
Implications.....	80
Future Research.....	82
Summary.....	83
References.....	90

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Categories of Hazing Activities.....	46
Table 2: Respondents by Student Organization.....	54
Table 3: Respondents by Demographic Characteristics .....	55
Table 4: Mean Scores for Physical Hazing Activities .....	57
Table 5: Mean Scores for Psychological Hazing Activities .....	59
Table 6: Mean Scores for Both Physical and Psychological Hazing Activities .....	62
Table 7: Mean Scores for Other Hazing Activities.....	64
Table 8: Mean Scores for Non-Hazing Activities.....	66
Table 9: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for All Hazing Activities .....	68

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form .....	84
Appendix B: Invitation to Participate .....	85
Appendix C: Survey Instrument .....	86

## Chapter I: Introduction

In the 1990s, at least 95 people died from hazing activities (Hollmann, 2002). In 2000 alone, 18 people perished as a result of such activities. In addition, an untold number of students suffered emotionally, physically, and psychologically because they participated in dangerous and reckless rites of passage in order to become members of student organizations (Nuwer, 1999).

Although fraternities are blamed most frequently for the deadly outcomes of reckless hazing activities, sororities, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands have received considerable attention as well (Crow & Rosner, 2002; Hollmann, 2002; Hoover, 1999; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Novak, 2000; Nuwer, 1990, 1999; Shaw, 1992; Wegener, 2001; Winslow, 1999).

As the number of deaths and physical or psychological injuries from such activities continues to grow, institutions of higher education are becoming more and more likely to be held responsible, in part, or sued because they failed to take appropriate and necessary action to combat hazing (Crow & Rosner, 2002; Hollmann, 2002; MacLachlan, 2000). As Hollmann recognized, there is a considerable amount of inconsistency among institutional policies and state laws with regard to the definition of hazing. According to the law of the state of Florida (StopHazing.org, 2003):

240.1325 Hazing prohibited. (Florida)

(1) As used in this section, "hazing" means any action or situation which recklessly or intentionally endangers the mental or physical health or safety of a student for the purpose of initiation or admission into or affiliation with any organization operating under the sanction of a postsecondary institution. Such term includes, but is not

limited to, any brutality of a physical nature, such as whipping, beating, branding, forced calisthenics, exposure to the elements, forced consumption of any food, liquor, drug, or other substance, or other forced physical activity which could adversely affect the physical health or safety of the student, and also includes any activity which would subject the student to extreme mental stress, such as sleep deprivation, forced exclusion from social contact, forced conduct which could result in extreme embarrassment, or other forced activity which could adversely affect the mental health or dignity of the student.

The law of the state of Florida also includes specific sections that forbid hazing activities at community colleges and state universities. Likewise, the state of Maryland is one of the 42 states that have laws against hazing activities (StopHazing.org, 2003):

§ 268H. Hazing students prohibited (Maryland)

(a) Haze defined. -- In this section "haze" means doing any act or causing any situation which recklessly or intentionally subjects a student to the risk of serious bodily injury for the purpose of initiation into a student organization of a school, college, or university.

(c) Consent of student not defense. -- The implied or expressed consent of a student to hazing may not be a defense under this section.

The final definition of hazing activities, according to state law, listed here is from the state of Texas (StopHazing.org, 2003):

The following Hazing Policy was passed by the Texas State Legislature relating to offenses related to hazing at or in connection with an educational institution.

"Hazing" means any intentional knowing, or reckless act, occurring on or off the campus of an educational institution, by one person alone or acting with others, directed against a student that endangers the mental or physical health or safety of a student for the purpose of pledging, being initiated into, affiliating with, holding office in, or maintaining membership in any organization whose members are students at an educational institution. The term includes but is not limited to:

1. any type of physical brutality, such as whipping, beating, striking, branding, electronic shocking, placing of a harmful substance on the body, or similar activity;

2. any type of physical activity, such as sleep deprivation, exposure to the elements, confinement in a small space, calisthenics, or other activity that subjects the student to an unreasonable risk or harm or that adversely affects the mental or physical health or safety of the student;

3. any activity involving consumption of a food, liquid, alcoholic beverage, liquor, drug, or other substance which subjects the student to an unreasonable risk of harm or which adversely affects the mental or physical health or safety of the student;

4. any activity that intimidates or threatens the student with ostracism that subjects the student to extreme mental stress, shame, or humiliation, or that adversely affects the student from entering or remaining registered in an educational institution, or that may reasonably be expected to cause a student to leave the organization or the institution rather than submit to acts described in this subsection;

5. any activity that induces, causes, or requires the student to perform a duty or task which involves a violation of the Penal Code. Sec. 4.52.

It is interesting to compare the specificity with which hazing activities are defined by Florida, Maryland, and Texas. Note that the state of Maryland does not include psychological hazing, while Florida and Texas do.

In addition to the fact that different entities and institutions create different definitions of hazing, there is confusion and dispute with regard to what causes and perpetuates hazing and what could be done to stop it. According to StopHazing.org (2003), 42 states have laws against hazing. However, as Nuwer (1999) reported, some states recognize only physical hazing, whereas others also recognize psychological hazing. It is difficult for administrators and authorities to effectively take action against hazing until it is more thoroughly understood.

### *Theoretical Background*

While administrators and authorities have sought ways to stop hazing activities, scholars have sought ways to understand them. The literature includes legal, psychological, and sociological perspectives, as well as a long history of such behavior in fraternities, sororities, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands, among other groups and student organizations.

### *Psychological Perspectives*

There are a number of psychological perspectives, which apply to both the victim and perpetrator of hazing activities. One of the foundational theories associated with hazing activities was brought forth by Aronson and Mills in 1959. The severity-attraction hypothesis states, in general, that the more effort an individual puts toward reaching a goal or object, the more the individual will rationalize the goal or object as being worthy of such effort (Aronson & Mills in Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1999). Thus, as an individual puts more and

more effort toward a goal or object, the more desirable the goal or object will become. Aronson and Mills hypothesized that individuals rationalize the goal or object as being worthy of such effort in order to reduce cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual's actions are incongruent with the individual's feelings and thoughts. When cognitive dissonance occurs, individuals will rationalize their actions in order to reduce the incongruence.

A similar hypothesis known as the severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis was proposed (Schachter in Lodewijckx & Syroit, 2001). According to Schachter, when individuals face stressful or threatening situations, they will identify with other individuals, especially those who have gone through similar situations. As the situations become more stressful or more threatening, the bond between the individual and others who have gone through similar situations will become stronger.

In 2001, Lodewijckx and Syroit tested both the severity-attraction hypothesis and the severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis. Although the results of their research study suggested a general initiation-affiliation-attraction relationship, which supports the theory that general initiation conditions bring together people involved in such situations, it did not show significant support for either of the earlier hypotheses of Aronson and Mills and Schachter, thus continuing to complicate and confuse researchers and practitioners' understanding of hazing. However, they remain some of the most relevant psychological theories about the phenomenon of hazing.

### *Sociological Perspectives*

Although it is useful to describe the psychological influences and relationships involved in hazing activities, it is impossible to ignore the sociological perspective, which

describes the relationships among the victim, perpetrator, and organization. In 1962, Schopler and Bateson examined the effects of severe initiation conditions on interpersonal relationships. They suggested that such situations fostered relationships characterized by interpersonal dependence, in which both the victim and perpetrator held some power over the other, which contributed to the continuation of such situations. That is, the perpetrator controlled a range of outcomes, both positive and negative, for the victim, while the victim controlled a range of responses, which included complying with the perpetrator and/or rebelling against the perpetrator.

Hoover and Milner conducted a research study in 1998 and reported that hazing may be linked to love and belongingness. They remarked that hazing forged bonds through shared, secretive experiences, and that such experiences actually could increase commitment to organizations. Butler and Glennen (1991) went a step further and said that sanctioned initiation rituals could increase involvement in institutions of higher education. Finally, Jones (2000) and Sweet (1999) analyzed the sociological and symbolic implications of hazing activities, giving insight to ways in which such activities are functional for organizations and fulfill students' needs for initiation rituals and rites of passage.

### *Legal Perspectives*

In addition to the theoretical foundations that give insight to hazing activities, legal perspectives demonstrate that hazing has become and remains an important issue for institutions of higher education. According to Crow and Rosner (2002), colleges and universities have been found responsible for more and more as hazing activities become increasingly common and dangerous. Such institutions should take action to protect themselves, as well as the students they serve. Hollmann (2002) remarked that, since 1990,

more alcohol- and hazing-related deaths have occurred on campuses throughout the United States than throughout the rest of the recorded history of higher education. Thus, the seriousness and urgency of the situation are well documented, and it has become imperative for administrators and Student Affairs practitioners to take strong stands against dangerous and deadly hazing activities.

In 2000, MacLachlan remarked that the recent court decisions could be troublesome for colleges and universities. Like Crow and Rosner, MacLachlan said institutions have a duty to protect students against criminal acts of other students. Institutions, the author said, are more likely to be held responsible when such acts are deemed foreseeable. Because colleges and universities have acknowledged hazing through policies, rules, and statements, courts have argued that hazing-related tragedies are foreseeable acts, and institutions could be held responsible for such tragedies. MacLachlan said that, through recent decisions including *Brueckner v. Norwich University*, *Alton v. Texas A&M University*, *Knoll v. Board of Regents of the State of Nebraska*, and *Coghlan v. Beta Theta Pi Fraternity*, it is likely the trend toward university responsibility will continue.

#### *Problem Statement*

Fraternities, sororities, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands are most commonly associated with hazing activities. It is well known that these student organizations participate in and perpetuate dangerous initiation conditions. However, even though administrators and authorities have acknowledged the role of such organizations in hazing activities, the fact that there is no common definition of hazing has hindered any real effort to challenge and combat these dangerous and even deadly rites of passage (Hollmann, 2002).

The purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among student organizations. This research study also investigated how those activities differed among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) members, student athletes, and members of the marching band.

### *Definitions*

For the purposes of this research study, it is necessary to define and delimit some of the associated terms, which have been identified here. Note that the items and definitions listed here are only for the purposes of this research study, so the items and definitions included here may not necessarily be congruent with other commonly accepted terms.

Athletic group: National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) team

Band: marching band

Fraternity: social Greek letter organization

Initiation: activity or set of activities to gain membership into a student organization

Mental or psychological hazing: hazing activity intended to embarrass, humiliate, or intimidate newcomers

Military organization: Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) organization, including Air Force ROTC and Army ROTC

Physical hazing: hazing activity involving bodily harm or injury, including branding, paddling, striking with an object, etc.

Plebe: newcomer to a military organization

Pledge: newcomer to a fraternity or sorority

Sorority: social Greek letter organization

## *Rationale*

Although hazing has been a part of the culture of higher education, especially among some student organizations, for hundreds of years, it has become increasingly dangerous and deadly, and has become a serious concern for administrators and authorities (Nuwer, 1999). According to Hollmann (2002) and Crow and Rosner (2002), institutions of higher education are more likely than ever before to be sued as a result of an alcohol- or hazing-related death. In an increasingly litigious society, administrators must be proactive and seek to eliminate dangerous and increasingly deadly hazing activities. Courts have said colleges and universities have a duty to defend and promote the safety of its students, even though the long-held idea of *in loco parentis* may have passed. In two important decisions (Crow & Rosner, 2002), *Furek v. University of Delaware* (1991) and *Knoll v. Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska* (1999), a “duty of care” on the part of the institutions was inferred, and the fact that the universities knew hazing was an issue was enough for the courts to rule that the universities should have acted more strongly to combat hazing (Hollmann, 2002; Reisberg, 1999). Finally, Butler and Glennen (1991) suggested that, by creating sanctioned initiation rituals within institutions of higher education, administrators could meet a social need, while limiting the risk usually associated with more dangerous alcohol- and hazing-related rites of passage.

In addition to concerns with regard to students’ safety and wellness, colleges and universities seek to maintain an image and reputation free from adverse media attention (Hollmann, 2002). So, if a death or serious injury would result from a hazing activity, the college or university would face a great deal of unwanted negative attention, which in turn could seriously damage the institution’s reputation.

Despite all of the evidence that suggests colleges and universities should take stronger action against dangerous hazing activities, administrators continue to face confusion, myths, and misperceptions with regard to hazing. Hollmann (2002) argued that the lack of a common definition of hazing limits the effectiveness of anti-hazing action, legislation, and policies. She suggested that until there is consensus about the definition of hazing and student support for action against hazing, the problem will persist.

Because the purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among student organizations, it will contribute to the establishment of a common definition of hazing, especially with regard to five of the student organizations most commonly associated with hazing activities: fraternities, sororities, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands .

As this research study identifies activities recognized as hazing activities within each of the five groups, it will help administrators appropriately allocate resources with regard to confronting and limiting hazing activities. In addition, it will allow administrators to appropriately convey information about hazing activities to the five groups in order to foster student support for action against hazing. Finally, and most importantly, it will contribute to the research literature about hazing and will move the larger community of higher education toward a common definition.

## Chapter II: Review of the Literature

Hazing has been a concern since the time of the Greek philosophers, and continues to be a concern in modern colleges and universities, with most of the attention on the initiation rites of Greek letter organizations (Nuwer, 1999). However, more recently, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands have come under scrutiny with regard to their initiation rites and traditions.

In order to consider hazing in the modern academy, it is necessary to become familiar with the historical and theoretical backgrounds associated with initiation rituals and rites of passage. Next, this chapter will discuss relevant research about hazing, initiation rituals, and rites of passage in the context of each of the subgroups above: fraternities, sororities, military organizations, athletic teams, and marching bands. Finally, the chapter will focus on relevant research with regard to definitions and perceptions of hazing activities.

### *History of Hazing*

According to Nuwer (1999), hazing was documented first by the Greek philosopher Plato in 387 B.C. In addition, a later group known as the “Overturners” were involved with similar hazings in the fourth century at the center of learning in Carthage. “[The hazers] were rightly called Overturners, since they had themselves been first overturned and perverted, tricked by those same devils who were secretly mocking them in the very acts by which they amused themselves in mocking and making fools of others,” Augustine said (Nuwer, 1999, p. 93).

During the middle ages, students at medieval universities used hazing to demonstrate the privileges of precedence more senior students held over first-year students (Nuwer, 1999). For example, first-year students would have to demonstrate animal-like submission, or

in other cases would be struck with wooden objects. In addition, more senior students engaged in a practice called fagging, in which more senior students were entitled to require other students to act as their servants. During this time, authorities, including educators, landlords, and town officials, confronted hazing to different degrees, such as creating statutes against hazing, publishing lists of specific acts that were considered hazing, and removing conferred honors from students who were involved in hazing.

The earliest evidence of hazing in the United States is from Harvard College in 1657, in which an incident resulted in a judgment by the school's administration in favor of two first-year students who had been hazed (Nuwer, 1999). The first deaths that resulted from hazing activities at institutions of higher education occurred at Franklin Seminary in Kentucky in 1838 and Amherst College in 1847. Between 1838 and 1969, 35 deaths that resulted from alcohol abuse and hazing were recorded. Between 1970 and 2001, Nuwer (1999) said an additional 210 such deaths were reported.

#### *History of Hazing in Marching Bands*

Although marching bands only recently have gained attention for hazing activities, their members have been recognized for their participation in hazing activities since the early 20th century (Nuwer, 1990). According to Nuwer, the University of Gettysburg (Gettysburg College) had a group of hooded sophomores who were responsible for hazing freshman members of the marching band. Some of those students were pictured in the institution's yearbooks from 1912 to 1918. The practice was not unique to the University of Gettysburg, as similar groups existed at Barnard College and Columbia College.

Even though, according to Nuwer (1990), many people think band hazing is widespread, campus newspapers and investigative reporters have not given much attention to

the issue. Nuwer (1990) said that, since 1918, a number of incidents of band hazing have gained national attention. In 1981, an associate band director at Florida A&M University sought to end the group's hazing traditions when a seventeen-year-old band member was beaten. In 1984, Kappa Kappa Psi, a band fraternity at the University of Akron, was charged with hazing. Finally, in a 1984 news story, a band director at the University of Southern California said he encouraged upperclassmen to lean on newcomers. Of the practices described, many would be recognized as hazing activities.

### *History of Hazing in Fraternities and Sororities*

According to Nuwer (1999), hazing became part of the initiation rituals of fraternities very soon after they were founded. For example, buffoonish rituals invented by members of Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity threatened fraternal decorum so much that, by 1898, the fraternity unanimously passed a motion to end such rituals. The first recorded fraternity-related hazing death took place at Cornell University in 1873, when a blindfolded pledge of the Kappa Alpha Society tumbled into a gorge.

Because of the long tradition of hazing activities in Greek letter organizations, especially White fraternities, the North American Interfraternity Conference (NIC) has sought since 1929 to eliminate such activities in the chapters of its more-than-fifty member organizations, though such initiatives have been mostly unsuccessful (Nuwer, 1990). In 1929, the NIC conducted a survey that showed, although 90% of the membership was opposed to hazing, only 56% wanted organizations to take steps to prevent it. In 1938 and 1939, the NIC conventions announced it had beaten hazing, though half of the undergraduates surveyed at the convention in 1939 said they supported hazing. They said that paddles were effective means of disciplining newcomers.

Despite the fact that fraternities receive much of the media's attention for hazing activities, it is a concern for sororities, too (Nuwer, 1990). In 1982, the Alpha Delta Pi chapter at the University of Southern California was found guilty of hazing after an intoxicated pledge had to have her stomach pumped. Likewise, in 1988, the Alpha Chi Omega chapter at the University of Maine was suspended after three pledges were blindfolded and branded in a cemetery. Nancy L. Haigwood, in a 1983 letter to the *News-Post* of Frederick, Md., said, "I am especially incensed at vitriolic attacks on our practices of 'hazing,' which non-Greeks fail to realize serve numerous valuable functions," (Nuwer, 1990, p. 231). Haigwood, a member of Kappa Kappa Gamma, said hazing built loyalty to the pledge class and sorority, strengthened the pledges' mettle, and weeded out weaker pledges. The vice president of Haigwood's sorority soon thereafter said Haigwood did not speak for the organization and that hazing activities were isolated.

According to Kimbrough (1997), hazing became a part of the pledging process for Black fraternities and sororities as early as 1900. However, the hazing activities developed separately from those in White Fraternities and sororities. For example, pledges of historically Black fraternities and sororities were made to stand in single file lines, dress alike, and march in a group around campus. Although the pledging process had not received official sanction from any of the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) organizations, members of these organizations considered hazing activities necessary and traditional parts of the process of becoming a member. By the 1980s, hazing had become enough of a concern for historically Black fraternities and sororities that NPHC's member organizations made a radical change in the structure of their organizations.

Because of the negative attention that resulted from a number of hazing deaths and injuries, the eight organizations that were members of the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) abolished the pledging process in 1990 and instituted the membership intake process (Kimbrough, 2003). However, because of a lack of undergraduate buy-in and support, the pledging process remained as an underground method of becoming a member, or in some situations, undergraduates sought ways to restore the pledging process. Thus, hazing activities accompanied the pledging process as a semisecret, underground process that was nearly invisible to NPHC and college and university officials. According to Kimbrough, although there were 11 media reported hazing incidents in NPHC organizations in 1990 through 1995, there were 21 in 1996 through 1999, including 11 in 1999 alone. Twenty-six of these 32 incidents occurred at public, predominantly White institutions.

#### *History of Hazing in Military Organizations*

Hazing plagued military academies throughout their histories. Between 1905 and 1912, the United States Naval Academy drew considerable attention for hazing scandals (Nuwer, 1999). In 1920, academy records noted midshipmen cheered Charles Snedaker, who had been expelled for hazing, as he left the Naval Academy. More recently, Texas A&M University gained attention in 1984 when first-year student Bruce Goodrich died following an exercise session and the institution again received attention in 1991 when female cadets reported a number of abuses. In 1997, *Dateline NBC* and CNN showed evidence of some of the bloody rites of passage suffered by members of the Coast Guard, the Marines, the regular Navy, and the Navy Seals. Some rites of passage of military groups have been traced back to the sixteenth century.

### *History of Hazing in Athletic Teams*

Although hazing activities in athletic teams only recently has received considerable attention from the media, the history of hazing in such organizations can be traced back to 1923, when two senior football players were expelled from Hobart College in New York for their involvement in a hazing activity, in which freshman Lloyd Hyde was beaten and thrown into a lake (Nuwer, 2003). In addition, Nuwer reported that three other players were disciplined for their participation. In 1980, University of Michigan Athletic Director Don Canham punished some of the institution's hockey players who shaved a fellow player's pubic hair, stripped him, locked him in a trunk, and drove around before dropping the player in front of a residence hall. More recently, a rugby player at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, died when he fell into a creek after becoming intoxicated during an initiation activity. In 2003, ESPN's *Outside the Lines* aired a one-hour show and published a five-part online series on hazing in athletic teams, including high school athletes, college and university athletes, and professional athletes. According to ESPN, there were 67 reported incidents of serious hazing by athletes between 1980 and 2000, 24 of which occurred in 1999 and 2000 alone (Farrey, 2003).

### *Legal Issues of Hazing*

As the number of reported incidents of hazing activities continues to grow, Crow and Rosner (2002) suggested that legal issues of hazing are becoming more important for institutions of higher education across the nation. Crow and Rosner reported that recently student athletes have been prosecuted more often for hazing activities, and colleges and universities have been held responsible more and more. One of the difficulties is that there are a number of different definitions of hazing, and some people consider some activities

hazing while others do not. Crow and Rosner said that, although traditional hazing activities included acts of personal servitude, more recently hazing activities have included illegal and potentially dangerous acts, which have increased the number of student athletes who have been charged with criminal hazing.

According to Crow and Rosner (2002), although the doctrine of *in loco parentis* appears to be no longer relevant with regard to hazing, colleges and universities may be liable for hazing activities because of the landowner-invitee theory and as a result of the special relationship between student athletes and institutions of higher education. Courts have held colleges and universities accountable as landowners because of their ownership of campus buildings. For example, in *Furek v. University of Delaware* (1991), the Delaware Supreme Court held that a hazing activity, which had occurred on the university's property, was foreseeable because the university knew of past and continuing hazing activities in fraternities and had previously tried to regulate such activities. Likewise, in *Knoll v. Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska* (1999), the court held the university responsible, even though the fraternity building was off campus and privately owned. Crow and Rosner argue that, although the two cases above involved fraternities, student athletes could file suit against colleges and universities for similar reasons, because student athletes often use university facilities for their hazing activities.

In *The Fraternal Law*, Manley (2003) said, in a recent six-year period, the law books recorded 10 reported cases of hazing that were complete and featured a formal written legal opinion. In 2000, a member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., challenged the constitutionality of the State of Maryland's statute against hazing. The statute defined hazing as, "doing any act or creating any situation for the purpose of initiating into a student

organization that could recklessly or intentionally subject a student to the risk of serious bodily injury” (*McKenzie v. State of Maryland*, 2000, 4). The court upheld the statute, and said it did not infringe upon free speech, was not vague, and did not infringe upon freedom of assembly or freedom of association. The court noted that similar statutes in Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, and New York had survived challenges that they were unconstitutional. The court also remarked that the State of Maryland had the power to regulate conduct, even if authorities have viewed such conduct as “grand old traditions and turned a blind eye in the past” (*McKenzie v. State of Maryland*, 2000, 29). Finally, it should be noted that, in this way, the court compared hazing to lynching, date rape, and domestic abuse.

In 1999, Kendrick Morrison sued Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. and Louisiana Tech University as a result of injuries he sustained during hazing activities (Manley, 2003). The court held the local undergraduate chapter president, national fraternity, and university equally responsible for Morrison’s injuries. However, in *Lloyd v. Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity* (1999), the court ruled that Cornell University did not have a duty to control the behavior of fraternities and sororities, even though the institution was involved with the organizations in a number of ways.

Although fraternities and sororities have gained most of the attention of the courts with regard to hazing, legal action against athletic teams as a result of hazing activities unfortunately has become more common. Crow and Rosner (2002) said that, because of the special relationship between student athletes and institutions of higher education, such institutions have caused a duty of care. Courts, in general, have not recognized a duty of care between institutions of higher education and students, but some student athletes have successfully argued such a relationship exists between colleges and universities and student

athletes. Such was the case in *Kleinknecht v. Gettysburg College* (1993), because the college actively recruited the student athlete, the student athlete was at practice at the time of the incident, and the foreseeable risk of harm was reasonable. Thus, the institution created a duty of care. The legal issues of hazing are not limited to male student athletes. Crow and Rosner took note that a number of female student athletes have reported being hazed and have taken legal action against those who were responsible for the athletic teams, and thus were ultimately responsible for the hazing activities. A former female soccer player at the University of Oklahoma sued her former coach, two assistants, and the university's board of regents as a result of a hazing incident in 1997.

### *Social Psychology and Sociology of Hazing*

Although hazing has been a part of the initiation rituals and rites of passage of organizations, such as fraternities, sororities, military organizations, and athletic teams, since the earliest points in their histories, social psychological and sociological research related to cognitive dissonance theory continues to struggle to understand the dynamics of such behavior.

### *Severity-Attraction Hypothesis*

Aronson and Mills explored the connection between effort and dissonance reduction (Aronson & Mills, as cited in Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1999). In their experiment, students joined a group that would meet regularly to talk about the psychology of sex. For one-third of the group, the screening procedure to join the group was extremely difficult. For one-third, it was mildly unpleasant. The final one-third did not participate in the screening procedure. The students who went through the extremely difficult screening procedure gave much higher ratings for the group than both of the other two groups. Aronson and Mills said that

individuals tended to increase their liking for something for which they have worked hard to attain. That is, if somebody underwent an extremely effortful and unpleasant experience to become part of an organization, such as is the case in hazing, they are more likely to rationalize such effort by saying they must really like the organization to go through such an experience. Aronson and Mills called this the justification of effort, which is part of the severity-attraction hypothesis. The justification of effort suggests that individuals try to reduce an aversive motivational state through rationalization. The severity-attraction hypothesis states that for individuals who go through difficult or unpleasant experiences in order to attain a goal or object, such as becoming a member of an organization, that goal or object will become more attractive to those individuals.

#### *Severity-Affiliation-Attraction Hypothesis*

A second hypothesis that is related to cognitive dissonance theory is the severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis (Schachter, as cited in Lodewijkx & Syroit, 2001), which suggests that when individuals face stressful or threatening situations, they will seek the safe company of other individuals, especially individuals who have gone through similar situations. With regard to hazing, Schachter's hypothesis would suggest that hazing fosters stronger relationships among the group of individuals being hazed, and that more severe hazing would foster stronger relationships than mild hazing. Schachter suggested that such relationships increased group attractiveness.

In a research study by Lodewijkx and Syroit (2001), results indicated no evidence to support the hypotheses that severe initiation conditions increased group attractiveness. The researchers tested the hypotheses with a sample that included 202 female newcomers to a "severe" student organization and 46 (20 male, 26 female) newcomers to a more mild student

organization. The age of the participants ranged between 18 and 23, and the research study showed no reliable gender differences for any of the dependent variables.

These results contradicted both Aronson and Mills' (as cited in Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1999) severity-attraction hypothesis and Schachter's (as cited in Lodewijkx & Syroit, 2001) severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis, though the results supported Schachter's hypothesis that more severe initiation conditions would foster stronger relationships than mild initiation conditions. However, the results supported a general initiation-affiliation-attraction relationship, which would suggest that newcomers become more attracted to the group through relationships that result from initiation conditions, in general. In a practical sense, the results said that hazing fostered stronger relationships among the group of individuals being hazed, without increasing group attractiveness.

#### *Interpersonal Dependence Hypothesis*

A third hypothesis with regard to the effects of severe initiation conditions involves interpersonal dependence. Schopler and Bateson (1962) described a situation in which an individual endures some very poor outcomes in a relationship, though the individual knows that some very good outcomes also are possible. Such a situation creates high dependence. The range of outcomes through which an individual actually does or potentially could move others is indicative of the individual's degree of power. The individual with power controls the range of outcomes from positive to negative. In turn, the individual without power will seek to conform (and lessen dependence) to the powerful individual's wishes, attitudes, and opinions, in order to avoid negative outcomes, which include the powerful individual's ability to injure, harm, and molest. This creates counter-power for the individual without power, which restricts the usable power of the other, as well as the range of experienced

outcomes, by limiting the extent to which the individual with power can profit by using that power. Thus, with regard to hazing, Schopler and Bateson's research study suggests that situations in which hazing (negative outcomes) encourages newcomers to conform fosters a mutually dependent situation, in which the newcomers being hazed seek to maximize positive outcomes through conformity to the wishes of the hazer, which limits the range of experienced outcomes in interaction with the hazer to the positive outcomes only.

In a research study in 1998, Hoover and Milner suggested that hazing may be linked to love and belongingness. Hoover and Milner noted that, despite legislative attempts to stop hazing, such activities have continued and individuals continue to suffer serious injuries as a result. The researchers remarked that hazing goes beyond tradition, and forges bonds through shared, secretive experiences. They said that some studies have suggested that people who were hazed were more committed to their organizations than people who were not hazed. Finally, Hoover and Milner reported that hazing serves a dual purpose: newcomer accepts the organization's authority and the newcomer separates himself from the larger society.

### *Hazing and Involvement*

Although initiation conditions create environments that encourage or support hazing, Butler and Glennen (1991) said initiation rituals could increase involvement. They hypothesized that institution-sanctioned initiation rituals could insure contacts and relationships for individuals in college, and that such rituals sponsored by fraternities, sororities, varsity or intramural athletics, and other student organizations served such purposes, though not always in positive ways. They said such initiation rituals would increase students' involvement, sense of belonging, and responsibility to the community. Butler and Glennen argued that administrators failed to create appropriately designed rites of

passage for incoming students, and that such a void had been filled by upper-class students who lacked proper guidance, the most common example of a dangerous, unsanctioned rite of passage being alcohol abuse. In addition, they suggested that current members of a group have an innate cultural or social need to require newcomers to demonstrate their worthiness to become part of the group. On the other hand, they also suggested that newcomers have an innate cultural or social need to demonstrate their worthiness to become part of the group.

Butler and Glennen (1991) offered suggestions for administrators to create properly formed and sanctioned initiation rituals. They suggested that rites of passage are characterized by three phases, a separation phase-that represents the separation of the individual from an earlier position in the social structure, a transitional or liminal phase-which represents a period of ambiguity and is marked by an ordeal in order to demonstrate worthiness, and a reincorporation phase-that represents the acceptance of the newcomer and extends to the individual all of the privileges and rights of the group.

#### *Hazing and High School Students*

In addition to Butler and Glennen's thoughts that dangerous, unsanctioned rites of passage have appeared to serve a functional role for college students and student organizations, a research study by Hoover and Pollard (2000) suggested that high school students engage in hazing activities as well. This could indicate that students come to colleges and universities with the expectation that they should participate in some sort of initiation to mark such a transition. According to the research study, which included 1,541 high school students, 48% of the respondents who belonged to groups reported being subjected to hazing activities, including 23% who reported being subjected to dangerous hazing. Of the high school students who were subjected to hazing activities, 71% reported

negative consequences, including getting into fights, being injured, doing poorly in school, or feeling angry, confused, embarrassed, or guilty. However, 48% said they participated in hazing activities because it was fun and exciting. According to a previous research study conducted by Hoover (1999), 42% of the athletes hazed in college also were hazed in high school, and 5% were hazed in middle school. Thus, although institutions of higher education are not providing sanctioned initiation rituals, it is possible that students arrive on college and university campuses with the expectation that they go through some sort of rite of passage, an expectation that may be fulfilled by some student organizations, especially athletic teams.

Because of the existence of dangerous, unsanctioned rites of passage designed by upperclass students, especially upperclass students within student organizations, hazing is a serious concern on campuses throughout the United States. According to Hollmann (2002), more deaths have occurred since 1990 on campuses as a result of hazing, pledging, and initiation accidents and fraternal alcohol-related incidents than throughout the rest of recorded history of such deaths. Hollmann said that, although fraternities and sororities received much of the attention for hazing, athletic teams, spirit groups, marching bands, military groups, cultlike groups, high school groups, and work groups also engage in hazing activities.

### *Hazing in Student Organizations*

#### *Fraternities*

Although initiation rituals and rites of passage serve practical purposes in fraternities, there are elements of the fraternity subculture that encourage and support hazing (Sweet, 1999). According to Sweet, symbolic interactionist theory can help explain how fraternities engage in the systematic manipulation of symbols, social relations, and definitions of

situations, and often result in hazing activities. Although some people have suggested that hazing is a result of sadism, Sweet argued that fraternity brothers care very deeply for pledges, and regret when pledges are injured. Although such an idea does not justify dangerous and deadly hazing activities, it refutes the idea that hazing is a malicious activity.

One way in which fraternities systematically manipulate symbols, social relations, and definitions of situations, according to Sweet (1999), is through the construction of new identity kits for pledges. For example, during the pledging process students receive books, paddles, pledge pins, and t-shirts that bear the fraternity's insignia. In this way, the fraternity becomes an increasing part of the students' identity. In addition, fraternities deliberately and systematically limit the social interactions of the pledges, which reinforces a strong collective identity. The fraternities separate pledges, which isolates them from other social groups and ties their identity to the organization. Sweet used the Thomas Theorem to articulate the importance of the definition of the situation. The Thomas Theorem suggested that definitions of situations are produced through linguistic manipulation. Although fraternities engage in hazing activities, such activities are characterized as "discipline" or "tradition," and are described as revelations of "commitment" and "loyalty," which ensure that hazing activities remain part of the fraternity subculture. Sweet argued that, as long as such a vocabulary exists, hazing will continue.

Although an organization's own tradition and vocabulary characterize and define situations for the organization's members, Sweet (1999) suggested fraternities also engage in elaborate "packaging" to give meaning to situations. For example, if fraternity members want to mark a situation as one of solemn importance, they will set a solemn environment through the use of candles, robes, etc. Sweet also argued that fraternities become important reference

groups for members and pledges, and that they become more concerned with how they might be viewed by their fellow members and pledges. In the end, Sweet suggested that, from the symbolic interactionist perspective, the willingness of pledges to submit to hazing activities is linked to their inability to think of themselves beyond their status as future fraternity members, and that pledges literally lose the social identity they held before the pledging process, which is characteristic of a liminal or transitional phase.

One cannot ignore the importance and prevalence of alcohol during the pledging process (Hunt & Laidler, 2001). Hunt and Laidler described alcohol as a social lubricant, which not only maintains the cohesion and solidarity of the group, but also affirms masculinity and male togetherness. Thus, it is no surprise that alcohol has taken a prominent role in the socialization process of newcomers in a number of student organizations.

Although historically White Greek-letter fraternities have been responsible for a great number of deaths and tragedies, much more of the available literature describes the role of hazing activities in historically Black Greek letter organizations. In addition, the pledging process of historically Black Greek-letter fraternities is indicative of the difficulty in eradicating hazing activities. According to Jones (2000), hazing activities have historically been viewed as functional in historically Black Greek-letter organizations. The pledging process is viewed as the only mandatory ritual, because it determines the type of brother the pledge will become. In addition, it is the only rite in fraternities that demands sacrifice.

Jones (2000) asserted that the common experience of the pledging process gives fraternities continuity and structure. The process is a symbolic journey, and represents the death and rebirth theme that is common in initiation rituals and rites of passage. The completion of the journey or ordeal represents the transformation from unworthy to worthy,

and a new life that is tied to a larger community. Thus, the process is not meant to discipline or reform the initiate, but to remake him entirely. In the first part of a liminal phase, the initiate loses his previous identity and status. In the second, he acquires a new status. For this reason, members of historically Black fraternities will call their initiation date the day they were “made.” Jones suggested that modern hazing is the result of the phenomenon by which symbolic journeys become real, physical ordeals and journeys. Because of its position as ritual and tradition, the pledging process is considered more legitimate than the modern intake process, and the culture and expectations around the original pledging process are resistant to change. Jones argued that, in many situations, the pledging process has suffered because members have forgotten the original purposes of fraternity ritual, which has become random and degenerative.

Ruffins and Evelyn (1998) related hazing in historically Black Fraternities and sororities to some of the types of abuse and cruelty suffered by people during slavery. Sandra Lewis in Ruffins and Evelyn lamented members of historically Black Greek-letter organizations have chosen to identify with the slave masters rather than with the slaves. Before traditions such as caning and paddling became popular, other traditions such as “line walking,” which involved close physical contact between pledges, were present. Ruffins and Evelyn attributed the persistence of hazing in historically Black fraternities to the fact that their members are more peer-oriented than other students. Many of the hazing activities of the pledging process are justified in the name of solidarity. For example, line brothers are encouraged to do everything possible to help each other.

However, Kimbrough (1995) suggested that the attitude of members of historically Black fraternities toward the value of leadership had a greater influence on their acceptance

of violent hazing. Kimbrough observed that such men had a strong desire to be led in return for the chance to lead later on.

Others have proposed other views with regard to hazing in historically Black fraternities and sororities (Ruffins & Evelyn, 1998). Although some have compared hazing, including caning and paddling, to aspects of dominance and submission found in acts of sexual sadomasochism, others have rejected the theory. Others, on the other hand, have suggested hazing may be linked to child abuse, while some have suggested a link between the influence of gangs, which coincided with the abolition of the pledging process and the development of the membership intake movement, and the rise in violent hazing.

### *Sororities*

Like their male counterparts, sorority members have received attention in the research literature about hazing, though not nearly to the same degree. In 1992, Shaw conducted a national research study of sorority hazing among land-grant institutions of higher education. The research study was designed to examine the relationship between being hazed as a pledge and hazing others later as a member, being hazed as a pledge and being able to define such activities as hazing, and hazing others as a member and being able to define such activities as hazing. Sixty-eight chapters, including 3,763 women affiliated with national sororities in 48 states and the District of Columbia responded. Shaw reported that a significantly higher number of women participated in hazing activities as both a pledge and member than did not, and that a higher number of women did not define such activities as hazing. In addition, the researcher said that a positive correlation was found between pledges and members who participated in hazing activities and those who did not define such

activities as hazing. Finally, Shaw said that a positive correlation was found between women who were hazed as pledges and who hazed others later as members.

In 1990, Shaw and Morgan conducted a research study of the perceptions of Greek advisors on sorority hazing. The research study included information from 283 Greek advisors from 45 states and the District of Columbia, and institutional size ranged from 650 students to 33,000 students. Shaw and Morgan noted that sororities tended to engage in psychological hazing activities more frequently than physical hazing activities, and such hazing activities were easier to hide. The researchers remarked that, because of the feelings of isolation and loneliness felt by some freshmen students, psychological hazing activities could be as dangerous as physical hazing activities. In addition, they suggested that, because of the influence of peer pressure, women were likely to participate in hazing activities as members even though they may have disagreed with such activities as pledges.

Significant majorities of Greek advisors reported hazing existed in some sororities on their campuses, and that their institutions had educational programs and policies about hazing. However, a significant majority said more education was needed. Some of the most common hazing activities that Greek advisors reported as prevalent on their campuses included: required signatures, scavenger hunts, use of blindfolds, required singing, early or late initiation, errands, alcohol consumption, required wearing of ridiculous clothes, and trying to scare pledges about initiation. Finally, Shaw and Morgan said that Greek advisors needed consistency with regard to definitions of hazing, educational programs and policies about hazing, as well as procedures for handling reported hazing activities.

### *Military Organizations*

Although fraternities and sororities receive much of the media's attention with regard to hazing, military organizations also have been the subjects of anecdotal, empirical, and historical literature about hazing. According to a report issued by the General Accounting Office (1992), hazing activities in the service academies were rare before the Civil War, but became more prominent and virulent by the 1870s. By the early 1900s, over 100 hazing activities had been identified in the academies. In 1874, Congress passed legislation to prohibit hazing in the academies. However, today, the language of the laws prohibiting hazing activities in the three service academies is different in each case.

In 1992, the General Accounting Office issued a report to the United States Congress about the treatment of students in the three Department of Defense service academies, which identified hazing activities as a continuing issue. The Department sought to determine the extent of hazing at the academies, review the actions taken by the academies to control and eliminate hazing, and assess the impact of hazing on cadets and midshipmen. Although more physically abusive forms of hazing were less common, the majority of students reported they had been: subjected to upperclassmen screaming in their faces; verbally harassed, insulted, and ridiculed; required to memorize and recite trivia; and forced to use study hours to prepare for fourth class duties.

The officers on the commandants' staffs tended to concur with the extent of hazing activities reported by the students, with the exception of the Air Force Academy officers, who indicated a significantly lower level of hazing activities than reported by Air Force Academy students. One of the most notable indications of the first report said that, despite efforts to eliminate hazing from the academies, it had not completely disappeared. Also, the

report said that hazing activities in the three academies occurred more frequently than officially filed charges would indicate. In addition, the General Accounting Office reported that the academies rarely charged anyone with hazing, and tended to pursue hazing-type offenses with lesser charges.

One of the most condemning statements of the General Accounting Office (1992) was that hazing was not a harmless action. It said, “A strong correlation exists between exposure to such treatment and a number of undesirable outcomes, including higher levels of physical and psychological stress among cadets and midshipmen, lower grade point averages, attrition from the academies, and reduced career motivation” (General Accounting Office, 1992, p. 3).

However, the General Accounting Office (1992) noted some positive change; since changes to the fourth class systems at the Military and Naval academies, students at the academies reported a lower frequency of hazing activities. It also reported that it was the responsibility of the leadership at the academies to effectively define hazing activities, because the distinction between hazing activities and legitimate fourth class indoctrination was unclear. The General Accounting Office also recommended that the academies continue to educate students, faculty, staff, and alumni about hazing activities, as well as improve enforcement of the prohibition against hazing.

Although the focus of this research study was limited to hazing activities of military organizations in the United States, the military organizations of other countries provide insight into the culture with regard to hazing in such military organizations. For example, Winslow (1999) conducted a research study of the Canadian Airborne Regiment. She said that, similar to the results of the research study by Aronson and Mills (1959), because of the severe hazing endured by soldiers in the Canadian Airborne Regiment, membership in the

group is more attractive. Winslow reported that, because of such hazing activities, soldiers proved their readiness to participate in the group regardless of personal cost, and have thus gained the acceptance of the group.

Winslow (1999) also identified similar processes to those identified by Sweet (1999) in her research study of fraternity hazing from a symbolic interactionist perspective. Winslow reported that, in the separation stage, the new members' former identity was stripped away, and a new collective identity formed. Then, the new members entered a liminal stage, where events become parodies and inversions of real life and new members are humiliated and tested. In the final stage, the new members become full members of the group. Winslow said that, because of little interaction and teamwork between the groups, each group developed its own practices for indoctrinating new members. With regard to the application of a symbolic interactionist perspective to the indoctrination of new members to the Canadian Airborne Regiment, Winslow said, "Culture is a social force that controls patterns of organizational behavior. It shapes members' cognition and perceptions of meanings and realities. It provides affective energy for mobilization and identifies who belongs to the group and who does not" (Winslow, 1999, p. 435).

In addition, Winslow (1999) remarked about the importance of alcohol as a cultural symbol in the Canadian Airborne Regiment. Winslow said that, as an important aspect of masculine identity, it served to affirm that identity, as well as to mark important events as a ceremonial symbol. Winslow also identified some of the undesirable effects of hazing practices on group dynamics. For example, she said that group bonding could threaten authority and undermine discipline when the group becomes more important than anything

else. In addition, she said that a strong group could develop and maintain inappropriate norms, as well as facilitate defiant and subversive acts.

Ostvik and Rudmin (2001) compared bullying and hazing among Norwegian soldiers. Ostvik and Rudmin characterized hazing as behavior by a cohort of senior members against a cohort of newcomers, public, ritualistic with little change from year to year, concluding at the end of the initiation period, bringing about group solidarity, and as a socialization process for newcomers. The researchers remarked that serious hazing incidents have resulted in deaths or suicides among military organizations from around the world. Ostvik and Rudmin reported that, although hazing occurred more frequently among soldiers in the Norwegian Army, only a small minority reported being hazed. However, 46% believed most senior members of the organization hazed newcomers, which was positively correlated with perpetrating hazing ( $r=.40, p<.001$ ) and with being hazed ( $r=.26, p<.001$ ). The researchers concluded that hazing served social and cultural functions and that, because it is resistant to efforts to end its practice, organizations should move to formalize such social and cultural rites of passage.

Finally, in another example of the degree to which hazing is embedded in the social and cultural tradition of military organizations around the world, McCoy (1995) examined hazing in the Philippine Military Academy. McCoy remarked that the ritual hazing of newcomers served as the defining moment of their lives at the academy. The researcher said such hazing activities could be found throughout the world, even among peaceful groups of people, as a central rite of passage, and that such activities could shape gender roles in those societies.

### *Athletic Teams*

Although fraternities, sororities, and military organizations have received considerable attention throughout the empirical and historical literature, athletic teams recently have emerged as a common setting for hazing activities. In 1988, Adler and Adler explored intense loyalty in college athletics through a case study with a college basketball team. They identified five conceptual elements that contributed to the development of intense loyalty in college athletics: domination, identification, commitment, integration, and goal alignment. With regard to hazing in athletic teams, the elements of dominance and identification become even more important. Adler and Adler argued that, through dominance and the related idea of subordination, athletic teams exert inordinate pressure on individuals in order to increase loyalty to the groups and weaken ties to others outside the groups. The idea is similar to the notion of the separation phase identified above. In addition, part of the socialization of student athletes involves a destruction of the old identity and the construction and legitimization of the new identity, an idea that is parallel to that of liminality, one of the transitional phases that is often a part of the socialization of newcomers. Finally, Adler and Adler identified “unification in opposition” and “group solidarity,” which also have parallels in other groups, as conceptual elements that contribute to the development of intense loyalty.

In the context of the socialization of student athletes, a research study by Hoover (1999) corroborated the idea that hazing is a part of the socialization of student athletes and discovered that hazing is a consistent issue among athletic teams at colleges and universities throughout the United States. Hoover collected information from 2,027 respondents from 224 institutions and sought to identify: the scope of initiation rites in college athletics, perceptions of what is appropriate or inappropriate, and strategies to prevent hazing. The researchers then

identified what were acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable initiation activities.

Although 12% of the respondents reported being hazed as a member of an athletic group, 79% of them said they had been subjected to one or more typical hazing activities as part of their team initiations. Ninety-six percent of the student athletes who participated in the research study reported they had participated in acceptable initiation activities; only 20% of them had participated in only acceptable initiation activities. Furthermore, Hoover suggested that 20% of student athletes participated in questionable initiation activities, and 60% participated in unacceptable initiation activities.

In addition, according to the research study conducted by Hoover at Alfred University in 1999, juniors and seniors were more likely than freshmen and sophomores to acknowledge and recognize they had been hazed, and athletic coaches, athletic directors, and deans were less likely than student athletes to know about hazing activities. Finally, the report suggested that most student athletes (60%) would not report hazing activities, a higher percentage than either athletic coaches (52%) or athletic directors (54%) who thought most student athletes would not report such activities. Student affairs officers were much more skeptical; 71% of them reported most student athletes would not report hazing activities.

With regard to strategies to prevent hazing activities, only two specific strategies were chosen by more than half of the student athletes involved in the research study by Hoover (1999): strong disciplinary and corrective measures for known cases (52%) and athletic, behavioral, and academic standards guiding recruitment (51%). More than 50% of the athletic coaches, athletic directors, and deans who participated in the research study included as strategies to prevent hazing activities: strong disciplinary and corrective measures for known cases; athletic, behavioral, and academic standards guiding recruitment;

and clear staff expectations in athletics for monitoring and enforcing. Although the majority of athletic coaches (56%) and athletic directors (56%) also suggested alternative initiation activities as a strategy to prevent hazing activities, only a minority of the deans (47%) who participated held similar views.

### *Marching Bands*

Finally, although there is anecdotal and historical evidence that band members participate in and perpetuate hazing activities, they have not been included in any of the above research studies, nor any others that have been shared throughout the empirical literature. This suggests that band members should be included in future research studies.

### *Perceptions of Hazing*

Throughout much of the literature above, researchers have commented about the lack of a common definition or set of perceptions with regard to hazing activities. In 2000, Novak examined the perceptions of hazing among students at Texas A&M University. The results of her study showed that fraternity and sorority members tended to know more about hazing activities than students who were not affiliated with the organizations. Novak also reported that nearly 20% of fraternity and sorority members said hazing did not occur in Greek letter organizations, only about 6% of non-members agreed. In addition, significantly more fraternity and sorority members attended an educational program about hazing when compared with non-members. Finally, significantly more members of Greek letter organizations than non-members strongly disagreed that hazing policies were enforced equally for all student organizations.

In addition to Novak's (2000) data about fraternity and sorority members, she discovered a number of interesting facts about Corps of Cadets students at Texas A&M

University. For example, nearly 40% of Corps of Cadets students agreed or strongly agreed that some activities Texas A&M University considers hazing should be allowed in the organization because of its military background; only 21% of non-Corps of Cadets students agreed. Also, 70% of Corps of Cadets students agreed or strongly agreed that some hazing activities associated with tradition that occur continue even though administrators know about them, though only 57.4% of non-Corps of Cadets students agreed. Finally, Novak noted that almost 46% more of the Corps of Cadets students had attended educational programming about hazing than had students who were not involved with the organization.

Wegener (2001) conducted a similar research study at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Wegener reported that, in general, fraternity and sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps students tended to agree that three scenarios, which included kidnapping, paddling, and forced consumption of alcohol, were considered hazing. Like Novak's (2000) research study, Wegener said both groups agreed that some hazing activities associated with tradition continued even though University administrators know about them. Wegener stated that more fraternity and sorority members reported knowledge of university and state policies against hazing when compared to Reserve Officer Training Corps students. Although minorities of both groups reported being involved in hazing activities as either a perpetrator or victim, most respondents said Greek organizations were most likely to have occurrences of hazing.

In addition to the more comprehensive research studies by Novak and Wegener about perceptions of hazing, other researchers have sought to identify perceptions of hazing among only fraternity and sorority members. Cokley et al. (2001) developed a survey instrument to measure perceptions of college students toward pledging and hazing in fraternities and

sororities. The researchers identified six factors that described different areas of attitudes toward fraternities and sororities: purpose of pledging, impact of pledging, conformity to pledging rules, perceptions of Greek letter organizations, moral concerns about pledging, and beliefs about pledging difficulty. They reported that some students view some sort of pledge process as desirable, and that when such students' perceptions of fraternities and sororities are uncritically positive, they are more likely to participate in hazing activities.

Drout and Corsoro (2003) conducted a research study among fraternity members, sorority members, and non-Greek students in which subjects read one of four conditions of a hazing scenario involving the consumption of alcohol. The four scenarios included: voluntary consumption provided by fraternity brother, voluntary consumption provided by fraternity president, forced consumption provided by fraternity brother, and forced consumption provided by fraternity president. The respondents were measured with regard to attributions of responsibility and causal attributions. Drout and Corsoro observed a main effect for participation, which showed respondents were more likely to hold the fraternity brother and fraternity president responsible when the scenario included the forced consumption of alcohol. The researchers did not identify a significant difference with regard to whether alcohol was provided by a fraternity brother or fraternity president. Thus, although a fraternity brother or fraternity president encouraged the consumption of alcohol in every scenario, respondents did not hold them responsible when the consumption of alcohol was not forced and the pledge maintained some control of the situation.

Drout and Corsoro (2003) also observed that sorority members and non-Greek students identified commitment to initiation and obligation to organization as having greater causal significance than did fraternity members. In addition, the researchers reported that

fraternity and sorority members scored significantly higher than non-Greek students on levels of authoritarianism. However, despite such levels of authoritarianism, fraternity and sorority members held the fraternity brother and fraternity president accountable to similar degrees in the scenarios involving forced consumption of alcohol.

### *Summary*

One of the most consistent themes throughout the literature above is the lack of a consistent definition or set of perceptions about hazing. Thus, probably the most consistent theme throughout the literature above is inconsistency. Although hazing has been an issue in higher education since the beginning of colleges and universities, hazing activities have become increasingly dangerous and violent. Institutions have sought to prohibit hazing, while some have sought to replace unofficial rites of passage with more formal, sanctioned events.

The psychological and sociological literature demonstrates that hazing activities are part of the social and cultural fabric of higher education, and that such activities have important, if misappropriated, roles in institutions and organizations. Some of the roles include: to mark transition, to provide ways for members to test newcomers in organizations, to provide ways for newcomers to prove worthiness of membership, and to provide ways for organizations to indoctrinate newcomers.

Because hazing activities are functional, though dangerous and harmful, students who are perpetrators or victims of hazing are reluctant to report such activities to authorities. In addition, because of education against hazing and enforcement of anti-hazing measures, organizations have become even more effective in carrying out and hiding hazing activities. Thus, in order to effectively confront hazing, a common definition and set of perceptions about hazing and unacceptable hazing activities should be established.

Currently, 42 states and most colleges and universities have laws and policies against hazing, but even authorities have not established common ground with regard to hazing (Hollmann, 2002). Likewise, students involved in different organizations have different definitions and sets of perceptions about what constitutes hazing, especially unacceptable hazing activities. A common definition and set of perceptions will contribute to the education against hazing and enforcement of anti-hazing measures, as well as create a common foundation for administrators, parents, students, and others to come together in a meaningful way to confront hazing.

## Chapter III: Methodology

### *Purpose*

The purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among student organizations. Specifically, this research study investigated how those activities differed among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) members, student athletes, and members of the marching band.

The research question was: Do the activities identified as hazing activities differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band? And, if there are statistically significant differences, how do the activities identified as hazing activities differ among specific student organizations?

In order to guide this research study and investigate the activities identified as hazing activities among the selected student organizations, the following null hypothesis was formed.

Null hypothesis: The activities students define as hazing activities do not differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band.

### *Research Design*

The research design was a descriptive, cross-sectional design. Because the purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students defined as hazing activities differed among student organizations, a descriptive, non-experimental design in which all data was collected at the same time from each of the different student organizations was most

appropriate. The research design facilitated a comparison of activities students defined as hazing among the selected student organizations, in order to describe how different student organizations at the institution have different definitions and perceptions of hazing activities.

### *Variables*

To investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differed among the selected student organizations, independent and dependent variables were identified and described. The variables for this research study included membership in one of the selected student organizations (independent variable) and the activities students defined as hazing activities (dependent variable). The independent variable was represented by categorical data: marching band member, fraternity member, sorority member, Reserve Officer Training Corps member, or student athlete. Fraternities, sororities, military organizations, and athletic teams have been the groups most commonly associated with hazing activities, according to the literature review, while anecdotal and historical evidence suggested marching bands should be included.

The dependent variable, activities students define as hazing activities, was represented by continuous data. Respondents indicated to what degree they agreed that each activity from a list of 42 activities was a hazing activity. Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale, from 1 *strongly disagree* to 5 *strongly agree*.

### *Instrumentation*

#### *Description of Survey Instrument*

The Web-based survey instrument was developed by the researcher for the purpose of this research study. The survey instrument consisted of two sections. The first section asked respondents to indicate to what degree they agreed that each activity was a hazing activity,

and the second section asked respondents for demographic information, in order to compare groups within the selected sample.

The dependent variable “activities students define as hazing activities” was measured by responses on a five-point Likert scale. For example, respondents indicated whether they “Strongly disagree,” “Disagree,” are “Neutral,” “Agree,” or “Strongly agree” that items such as *Attend educational presentations or programs*, *Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption*, and *Memorize and recite facts about one’s organization* were hazing activities.

The research study was conducted at a large, public, four-year research institution in the Mid-Atlantic region with a culturally diverse population. The list of activities for this research study was created from a list of hazing activities compiled by the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life at the institution in its Pan-Hellenic Council Intake Information Packet and United Greek Council Orientation Packet. The Pan-Hellenic Council includes five historically Black fraternities and sororities, as well as a Latina sorority. Likewise, the United Greek Council includes nine culturally based and multicultural fraternities and sororities, including Asian American, Black, multicultural, and South Asian organizations.

Next, the researcher submitted the list of items to the Office of Judicial Programs, where two staff members reviewed the list, adding suggestions where appropriate in order to make the list inclusive and representative of the five groups selected for this research study. Finally, the list was reviewed by one representative each from the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, Army Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Athletic Department.

The second section, which consisted of demographic information, asked respondents to indicate their age, grade point average, race or ethnicity, sex, how long they had been

enrolled in a college or university, and how long they had been members of a band, fraternity, sorority, Reserve Officer Training Corps, or NCAA Athletic Team. Finally, the respondents answered a question to give more information about their organizations. For example, fraternity members indicated if they were members of Interfraternity Council organizations, Pan-Hellenic Council organizations, or United Greek Council organizations; sorority members indicated if they were members of Panhellenic Association organizations, Pan-Hellenic Council organizations, or United Greek Council organizations. The Interfraternity Council consisted of historically White fraternities; the Pan-Hellenic Council consisted of historically Black fraternities and sororities; the Panhellenic Association consisted of historically White sororities; and the United Greek Council consisted of other culturally based fraternities and sororities.

Likewise, Reserve Officer Training Corps members indicated if they were members of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps or Army Reserve Officer Training Corps; and student athletes indicated if they competed in individual or team sports. There was no corresponding question for marching band members.

Finally, because the survey instrument was developed by the researcher for the purpose of this research study, it did not have established norms for comparison.

#### *Expert Review*

The validity of the instrument was established through both expert review and a pilot test. For the purpose of the expert review, three administrators, including the Acting Director of the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, a Captain from the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps, and an Associate Athletic Director, were consulted, as well as two authors, who have been recognized as authorities and researchers with regard to hazing, and whose

research has been referenced throughout this research study. The Acting Director of the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, Captain from the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Associate Athletic Director who were chosen as experts to review the instrument were from the institution where this research study was conducted, a large, public, four-year research institution in the Mid-Atlantic region with a culturally diverse population.

The five people chosen for the expert review were selected because of their roles as advisors or staff members with the selected student organizations and/or because of their knowledge and research with regard to hazing. These people reviewed the list of hazing activities and survey instrument for clarity, content, and face validity.

In addition to establishing face validity, the expert reviewers identified each of the 42 items included on the instrument as either: physical hazing, psychological hazing, both physical and psychological hazing, not hazing, not sure, or other hazing. The categories were chosen based on the literature review, which suggested that physical hazing and psychological hazing were the two major categories of hazing activities.

In order for an item to meet the standard of acceptance for one of the six categories, three out of the five expert reviewers had to agree on the category the item represented.

At least three out of the five expert reviewers identified five items as physical hazing, two items as psychological hazing, nine items as both physical and psychological hazing, eight items as other hazing, and eight items as non-hazing activities. No items met the standard of acceptance for “not sure,” and there were ten items that did not meet the standard of acceptance for any of the six categories. Although those ten items were part of the survey instrument, they were not part of the statistical analysis, because the survey instrument was developed and submitted to Educational Benchmarking, Inc., before the expert review.

Table 1

*Categories of Hazing Activities*

Category	Hazing activity
Physical hazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consume alcoholic beverages</li> <li>Deprived of beverages or food by others</li> <li>Do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels</li> <li>Forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages</li> <li>March, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances</li> </ul>
Psychological hazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perform in public, such as dancing or singing</li> <li>Subjected to verbal abuse or harassment</li> </ul>
Both physical and psychological hazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deprived of sleep by others</li> <li>Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption</li> <li>Handcuffed or tied to a building or structure</li> <li>Kidnap a current member of one's organization</li> <li>Participate in streaking or other activities while naked</li> <li>Perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time</li> <li>Perform sexual acts</li> <li>Receive a brand or tattoo</li> <li>Struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle</li> </ul>
Other hazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blindfolded during activities</li> <li>Participate in an activity against your will</li> <li>Participate in drinking games</li> <li>Perform chores or tasks for others</li> <li>Shave one's head or other part of one's body</li> <li>Stand in line for excessive amounts of time</li> <li>Steal an item</li> <li>Stranded alone or with other newcomers</li> </ul>
Not hazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend educational presentations or programs</li> <li>Attend mandatory study halls</li> <li>Complete a specific number of community service hours</li> <li>Learn historical facts about one's organization</li> <li>Maintain a minimum grade point average</li> <li>Memorize and recite facts about one's organization</li> <li>Study a specific amount of time</li> <li>Wear a specific clothing item or color of clothing item</li> </ul>

*Pilot Test*

Before the beginning of this research study, the researcher conducted a pilot test with a convenience sample of fraternity men and sorority women in order to establish face

validity. The researcher selected eight men and eight women to participate in the pilot test. Because the researcher serves one of the institution's fraternities as a house director, members of that fraternity were selected for the pilot test and those members were not included in the sample of fraternity members. Likewise, the eight women who participated in the pilot test were not included in the sample. Participants in the pilot test completed a paper and pencil version of the survey instrument, in lieu of the Web-based survey instrument. If a large enough sample had been obtained for the pilot test, it would have been possible to perform a factor analysis for the types of hazing activities. Rather, the types were formed through the expert review.

### *Reliability*

The reliability of the instrument with the participants in this research study was measured through the use of a Cronbach alpha test. The Cronbach alpha for the activities identified as hazing activities was .95, whereas for non-hazing activities, it was .74. For physical hazing activities, it was .82; for psychological hazing activities, it was .67; for both physical and psychological hazing activities, it was .93; and for other hazing activities, it was .88.

### *Sample*

The researcher employed a stratified systematic technique, which was most appropriate for the purpose of this research study. Because the purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among student organizations, it was important to identify and include those student organizations most commonly associated with hazing activities. Through a stratified technique, the researcher was able to select and target specific groups, or student organizations, for this research study.

The population included marching band members, fraternity members, sorority members, members of military organizations, and student athletes from a large, public, four-year research institution in the Mid-Atlantic region. The five groups were selected based upon a literature review, including anecdotal and historical evidence that revealed the student organizations that were most frequently associated with hazing activities.

Because the purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students defined as hazing activities differed among student organizations, it was important to have comparable sizes for each of the groups in the sample. By trying to have comparable sizes for each of the groups in the sample, the researcher wanted to control against heterogeneity of variance. The researcher selected a random sample from each of the above organizations through a systematic technique, in which every *n*th person was chosen. The smallest group in the population was that of Reserve Officer Training Corps members, which included 32 students. Thus, the researcher sought to obtain approximately 30 usable responses from each of the groups, which would facilitate a comparison among the selected student organizations. According to a researcher at the institution (T. Zacker, personal communication, March 5, 2004), research studies, including both paper and Web-based survey instruments, that have been conducted previously at the institution suggested that researchers may expect 30% response rates for fraternity and sorority members, while student athletes tend to respond at lower rates. Because the data for this research study was collected the week before Spring Break, the researcher anticipated a lower response rate and over-sampled for fraternity members, sorority members, and student athletes. In order to obtain approximately 30 usable responses from each of the groups, the researcher sampled 50 band members, 150 fraternity members, 150 sorority members, and 150 student athletes.

To obtain electronic addresses for 150 fraternity members and 150 sorority members, the researcher selected every eighth person from a list of 1100 fraternity members and 1250 sorority members. Likewise, to obtain electronic addresses for 150 student athletes, the researcher selected every fourth person from a list of 650 student athletes. To include band members in this research study, the researcher used a convenience sampling technique, which included 50 band members who also were members of Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma. Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma are a fraternity and a sorority, respectively, which are advised through the Music Department and whose members are drawn from the marching band. Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma provided electronic addresses for all of their members through their respective Web sites. However, because Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma are a fraternity and sorority, respectively, the experiences of their members may not be indicative of the experiences of all members of the marching band.

The strengths of this technique included the ability to have strong representations of each of the groups for comparison, which was the core interest of this research study. Thus, this technique helped account for underrepresented groups, such as band members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, and student athletes, and helped provide for better data analysis among different groups. The weaknesses of this technique included the increased bias for underrepresented groups and increased difficulty in obtaining the desired sample. In addition, because of the nature of the chosen groups, it was more difficult to gain access to the population in order to carry out this research study, whereas a simple random or systematic technique that included all of the institution's students would have been more convenient. The limitations of the technique also included an overrepresentation of smaller

groups. Finally, the technique required more effort in the administration of the survey instrument to the sample population.

### *Data Collection*

The data for this research study were collected through the use of a Web-based survey instrument. The Web-based survey instrument was created and monitored by the researcher, and was hosted by and used software provided by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. Educational Benchmarking, Inc., is an organization that provides assessment resources and services to colleges and universities, as well as educational organizations including the Association of College Unions International, Association of College and University Housing Officers International, and the Association of Fraternity Advisors. The survey software is called the Web-Enabled Survey System (WESS). Educational Benchmarking, Inc., was chosen for this research study because WESS offers many more administrative options and tools, as well as an improved user interface, when compared with the Web-based survey software used by the institution. Finally, because Educational Benchmarking, Inc., offered WESS free of charge to the researcher, the improved Web-based survey software was as cost effective as the software used by the institution.

Each of the groups within the sample was notified of the Web-based survey through direct mailing (electronic), a copy of which is available in the Appendix. Electronic addresses were obtained by the researcher from the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life for fraternity and sorority members and Army Reserve Officer Training Corps offices for Reserve Officer Training Corps members, while names and electronic addresses for student athletes were obtained from athletic team rosters published by the Athletic Department and through the institution's directory information. The electronic addresses for fraternity and

sorority members were obtained from an electronic student organization reporting system, in which student organizations self-reported the names and electronic addresses of their members. Finally, electronic addresses for band members were obtained from Web sites for Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma, a fraternity and sorority, respectively, which were associated with the marching band.

Respondents completed the informed consent form electronically. The informed consent form was included on the first page of the electronic link to WESS. Students were required to indicate they had read and understood the form before they were allowed to participate in this research study. The informed consent form also was included in the electronic message each student received that encouraged and invited them to participate.

Students who were included in the sample were encouraged to participate through the offering of incentives to students who participated. The incentives included 5 gift certificates to Best Buy stores and 5 gift certificates to Target stores in the amount of \$20 each, and participants were randomly selected by WESS to receive the incentives. The survey system randomly selected the electronic addresses of the respondents who received gift certificates, which allowed the researcher to select recipients of the gift certificates without making connections between the respondents and the respondents' surveys, which maintained the confidential nature of the respondents' surveys.

The Web-based survey was offered from March 12 to March 19, and the site was removed at the end of the designated time. On March 17, a follow up direct mailing (electronic) reminded students to participate, as well as thank those who already had participated. The data collection occurred the week before Spring Break, which may have impacted the response rate. On March 22, the responses were downloaded and analyzed.

### *Data Analysis*

The data for this research were analyzed through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The mean differences of the activities students defined as hazing activities (dependent variable) were analyzed among student organizations (independent variable). Because the sample sizes of each of the student organizations differed, the researcher used Levene's test in order to test against heterogeneity of variance.

The null hypothesis for this research study was: The activities students define as hazing activities do not differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band.

Composite variables, including *physical hazing activities*, *psychological hazing activities*, *both physical and psychological hazing activities*, *other hazing activities*, and *non-hazing activities* were examined, as well as individual items. The mean scores for each activity (dependent variable) for each of the five groups (independent variable) were compared through a complex contrasts ANOVA in order to determine if significant differences existed among the five groups. For each significant difference, a Dunn (Bonferroni) test was used in order to determine which of the mean scores were significantly different. The significance level sought was  $p < .05$ .

## Chapter IV: Results

This research study examined the activities students define as hazing activities, especially with regard to the differences among the selected student organizations: bands, fraternities, sororities, athletic groups, and military organizations. The chapter is organized in terms of the five types of items included in the survey instrument: physical hazing items, psychological hazing items, both physical and psychological hazing items, non-hazing items, and other hazing items. The five types of items were identified by the expert reviewers, as discussed in Chapter 3. No items met the standard of acceptance for “not sure.” The chapter first reports the findings with regard to the four types of hazing items: physical hazing, psychological hazing, both physical and psychological hazing, and other hazing, then reports the findings with regard to the non-hazing items. The null hypothesis that guided this research study was: the activities students define as hazing activities do not differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band.

Finally, as an ancillary analysis, the activities men in the sample defined as hazing activities were compared to the activities women in the sample defined as hazing activities. Before covering the differences among the selected student organizations, this chapter will describe the respondents, discuss the representativeness of the sample, including response rate and bias, and explore other limitations and inference problems directly related to the response rate and sample.

### *Description of Respondents*

Of the 532 messages that were sent, only one was returned as undeliverable, so ultimately the sample included 531 students. At the end of the collection of data, 115

students or 21.7% of the sample had responded, including 114 usable responses. The respondents included 16 fraternity members, 36 sorority members, 17 Reserve Officer Training Corps members, 37 student athletes, and 8 members of the marching band. Thus, the response rates differed for each of the types of student organization (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Respondents by Student Organization*

Student organization	Number of respondents	Response rate
Fraternity	16	10.67%
Female	0	of 150
Male	16	
Sorority	36	24.00%
Female	36	of 150
Male	0	
Reserve Officer Training Corps	17	53.13%
Female	0	of 32
Male	13	
NCAA Athletic Team	37	24.67%
Female	22	of 150
Male	12	
Marching Band	8	16.00%
Female	2	of 50
Male	4	

Because this research study focused on the differences among the selected student organizations, the primary limitation with regard to the response rate of each of the five groups is that, for the groups with lower response rates, it is more likely that outliers could significantly impact the mean scores for those respective groups. However, in light of the response rate for all of the groups, it is possible that outliers could significantly impact all of the mean scores.

In addition to the five groups described above, additional demographic information was collected (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Respondents by Demographic Characteristics*

Demographic characteristics	Number of respondents	Percentage of sample
<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		
African American, not of Hispanic origin	10	8.70%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	6.09%
Hispanic	13	11.30%
Multiracial	4	3.48%
White, not of Hispanic origin	76	66.09%
Race not included in the list	4	3.48%
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	58	50.43%
Male	43	37.39%
<b>Age (in Years)</b>		
Mean = 19 years old		
18	10	8.70%
19	27	23.48%
20	21	18.26%
21	29	25.22%
22	11	9.57%
23	3	2.61%
<b>Grade Point Average</b>		
Mean = 2.75 to 2.99		
0.0 to 2.2	9	7.83%
2.25 to 2.49	8	6.96%
2.5 to 2.74	12	10.43%
2.75 to 2.99	23	20.00%
3.0 to 3.24	21	18.26%
3.25 to 3.49	13	11.30%
3.5 to 3.74	16	13.91%
3.75 to 4.0	12	10.43%
<b>Year in School</b>		
Mean = 1 year		
Less than 1 year	17	14.78%
1 year	14	12.17%
2 years	30	26.09%
3 years	23	20.00%
4 years	25	21.74%
5 years or more	5	4.35%

There is no information available with regard to the demographic characteristics for the population of the five selected student organizations, so it is not clear how representative the sample is of the total population of those student organizations.

### *Physical Hazing Activities*

In the expert review, five items were identified as physical hazing activities: *consume alcoholic beverages, deprived of beverages or food by others, do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels, forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages, and march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances.*

For the composite variable that consisted of all of the activities identified by the expert reviewers as *physical hazing activities*, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores for the five groups,  $F(4, 94) = 2.90, p < .05$ . The mean scores for each of the five groups were:  $M = 4.04$  ( $SD = 0.87$ ) for fraternity members;  $M = 4.39$  ( $SD = 1.00$ ) for sorority members;  $M = 3.47$  ( $SD = 1.02$ ) for Reserve Officer Training Corps members;  $M = 3.88$  ( $SD = 0.80$ ) for student athletes; and  $M = 4.17$  ( $SD = 0.51$ ) for marching band members. A mean score of 4 indicated that a group agreed that the activities were hazing activities, whereas a standard deviation of 1 suggested scores were as low as 3 (neutral), or as high as 5 (strongly agree). A Dunn (Bonferroni) post hoc test revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps members. In addition, for the composite variable *physical hazing activities*, there was a significant difference  $t(85) = 2.33, p < .05$ , between women ( $M = 4.23, SD = 0.92$ ) and men ( $M = 3.78, SD = 0.89$ ).

In the mean scores for the five groups, statistically significant differences were discovered ( $p < .01$ ) for *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels*,  $F(4,99) = 4.01$ , and *march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances*,  $F(4,99) = 4.77$  (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Mean Scores for Physical Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Fraternity	Sorority	ROTC	NCAA	Marching Band	F(x)
Consume alcoholic beverages <i>M</i> = 3.93 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 3.69 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 4.40 <i>SD</i> = 1.10	<i>M</i> = 3.93 <i>SD</i> = 1.44	<i>M</i> = 3.62 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 4.14 <i>SD</i> = 0.69	2.05
Deprived of beverages or food by others <i>M</i> = 4.22 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	<i>M</i> = 4.60 <i>SD</i> = 0.74	<i>M</i> = 4.38 <i>SD</i> = 1.27	<i>M</i> = 3.69 <i>SD</i> = 1.40	<i>M</i> = 4.12 <i>SD</i> = 1.07	<i>M</i> = 4.43 <i>SD</i> = 0.79	1.58
Do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels <i>M</i> = 3.81 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 3.80 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	<i>M</i> = 4.33 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 2.88 <i>SD</i> = 1.54	<i>M</i> = 3.69 <i>SD</i> = 1.16	<i>M</i> = 4.25 <i>SD</i> = 0.89	4.01**
Forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages <i>M</i> = 4.45 <i>SD</i> = 1.17	<i>M</i> = 4.67 <i>SD</i> = 0.62	<i>M</i> = 4.37 <i>SD</i> = 1.38	<i>M</i> = 4.06 <i>SD</i> = 1.48	<i>M</i> = 4.49 <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 5.00 <i>SD</i> = 0.00	1.00
March, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances <i>M</i> = 3.51 <i>SD</i> = 1.33	<i>M</i> = 3.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.51	<i>M</i> = 4.10 <i>SD</i> = 1.26	<i>M</i> = 2.44 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	<i>M</i> = 3.58 <i>SD</i> = 1.16	<i>M</i> = 3.25 <i>SD</i> = 1.16	4.77**

1 = Strongly disagree that each activity is a hazing activity, 5 = Strongly agree  
\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

A Dunn (Bonferroni) post hoc test revealed that there were statistically significant differences between sorority members ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ ) and Reserve Officer Training Corps members ( $M = 2.88$ ,  $SD = 1.54$ ) for *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels*, and between sorority members ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ) and Reserve Officer Training Corps members ( $M = 2.44$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ), and Reserve Officer Training Corps members and student athletes ( $M = 3.58$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ), for *march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances*.

With regard to the differences between women and men, there were statistically significant differences ( $p < .01$ ) for the two groups for the two physical hazing activities above: *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels*  $t(90) = 3.22$ , and *march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances*  $t(90) = 3.89$ . In both cases, the mean scores for women  $M = 4.14$  ( $SD = 1.18$ ) and  $M = 4.02$  ( $SD = 1.19$ ), respectively were higher than those for men  $M = 3.31$  ( $SD = 1.30$ ) and  $M = 3.00$  ( $SD = 1.33$ ), respectively.

#### *Psychological Hazing Activities*

The expert reviewers indicated two items, *perform in public, such as dancing or singing* and *subjected to verbal abuse or harassment*, were psychological hazing activities.

For the composite variable that consisted of all of the activities identified by the expert reviewers as *psychological hazing activities*, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores for the five groups,  $F(4, 99) = 2.74$ ,  $p < .05$ . The mean scores for each of the five groups were:  $M = 3.17$  ( $SD = 1.22$ ) for fraternity members;  $M = 3.95$  ( $SD = 1.14$ ) for sorority members;  $M = 3.23$  ( $SD = 0.96$ ) for Reserve Officer Training Corps members;  $M = 3.65$  ( $SD = 0.99$ ) for student athletes; and  $M = 2.88$  ( $SD = 0.95$ ) for marching band members. A mean score of 4 indicated that a group agreed that the activities were hazing activities, whereas a standard deviation of 1 suggested scores were as low as 3 (neutral), or as high as 5 (strongly agree). A Dunn (Bonferroni) post hoc test did not reveal for what groups there was a statistically significant difference among the selected student organizations.

In addition, for the composite variable *psychological hazing activities*, there was a significant difference,  $t(90) = 3.29, p < .001$ , between women ( $M = 3.87, SD = 1.07$ ) and men ( $M = 3.13, SD = 1.07$ ).

For *perform in public, such as dancing or singing*, there were no statistically significant differences among the mean scores of the five groups: fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band (see Table 5). However, for *subjected to verbal abuse or harassment*, there was a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ), though a post hoc Dunn (Bonferroni) test did not indicate such a difference.

Table 5

*Mean Scores for Psychological Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Fraternity	Sorority	ROTC	NCAA	Marching Band	F(x)
Perform in public, such as dancing or singing $M = 3.20$ $SD = 1.30$	$M = 2.94$ $SD = 1.34$	$M = 3.45$ $SD = 1.36$	$M = 3.13$ $SD = 1.20$	$M = 3.30$ $SD = 1.20$	$M = 2.50$ $SD = 1.51$	1.11
Subjected to verbal abuse or harassment $M = 3.83$ $SD = 1.24$	$M = 3.40$ $SD = 1.40$	$M = 4.28$ $SD = 1.19$	$M = 3.31$ $SD = 1.25$	$M = 4.00$ $SD = 1.11$	$M = 3.25$ $SD = 1.04$	2.91*

1 = Strongly disagree that each activity is a hazing activity, 5 = Strongly agree

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Although only the second psychological hazing activity, *subjected to verbal abuse or harassment*, showed a significant difference among the selected student organizations, both psychological hazing activities showed statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between women and men. For *perform in public, such as dancing or singing*,  $t(93) = 2.47$ , whereas for *subjected to verbal abuse or harassment*,  $t(91) = 3.00$ . In both cases, the mean scores for

women ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ) and ( $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = 1.12$ ), respectively, were higher than those for men ( $M = 2.79$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ) and ( $M = 3.48$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ), respectively.

#### *Both Physical and Psychological Hazing Activities*

According to the expert review, there were nine activities that the expert reviewers considered both physical and psychological hazing activities. They included: *deprived of sleep by others, drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption, handcuffed or tied to a building or structure, kidnap a current member of one's organization, participate in streaking or other activities while naked, perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time, perform sexual acts, receive a brand or tattoo, and struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle.*

For the composite variable that consisted of all of the activities identified by the expert reviewers as *both physical and psychological hazing activities*, there was not a statistically significant mean difference,  $F(4, 90) = 2.08$ ,  $p < .05$ . The mean scores for each of the five groups were:  $M = 4.10$  ( $SD = 0.89$ ) for fraternity members;  $M = 4.37$  ( $SD = 1.16$ ) for sorority members;  $M = 3.97$  ( $SD = 0.67$ ) for Reserve Officer Training Corps members;  $M = 4.12$  ( $SD = 0.79$ ) for student athletes; and  $M = 4.38$  ( $SD = 0.37$ ) for marching band members. A mean score of 4 indicated that a group agreed that the activities were hazing activities, whereas a standard deviation of 1 suggested scores were as low as 3 (neutral), or as high as 5 (strongly agree). In addition, for the composite variable *both physical and psychological hazing activities*, there was not a significant difference, between women ( $M = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) and men ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ).

After analyzing the mean scores for each activity for each of the five groups, a single statistically significant difference among the groups was discovered for the nine activities

identified by the expert reviewers as *both physical and psychological hazing activities*. For *perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time*, a significant difference at  $p < .05$  was found (see Table 6). A Dunn (Bonferroni) post hoc test showed that the difference was between sorority members ( $M = 4.21, SD = 1.29$ ) and Reserve Officer Training Corps members ( $M = 2.94, SD = 1.09$ ). Similarly, there was a significant difference between women and men for *perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amount of time*,  $t(90) = 2.75, p < .01$ ; the means and standard deviations were  $M = 4.06 (SD = 1.24)$  and  $M = 3.36 (SD = 1.21)$  for women and men, respectively.

#### *Other Hazing Activities*

During the expert review, at least three of the five expert reviewers identified eight activities as either physical hazing, psychological hazing, or both physical and psychological hazing, but at least three of the five did not agree on a specific type of hazing activity, though they agreed those activities were some type of hazing activity. Such activities included: *blindfolded during activities, participate in an activity against your will, participate in drinking games, perform chores or tasks for others, shave one's head or other part of one's body, stand in line for excessive amounts of time, steal an item, and stranded alone or with other newcomers*. For the composite variable that consisted of all of the activities identified by the expert reviewers as *other hazing activities*, there was not a statistically significant mean difference,  $F(4, 94) = 2.07, p < .05$ . The mean scores for each of the five groups were:  $M = 3.32 (SD = 0.92)$  for fraternity members;  $M = 3.98 (SD = 1.01)$  for sorority members;  $M = 3.29 (SD = 0.89)$  for Reserve Officer Training Corps members;  $M = 3.56 (SD = 0.86)$  for student athletes; and  $M = 4.38 (SD = 0.37)$  for marching band members.

Table 6

*Mean Scores for Both Physical and Psychological Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Fraternity	Sorority	ROTC	NCAA	Marching Band	F(x)
Deprived of sleep by others <i>M</i> = 4.16 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 4.40 <i>SD</i> = 0.83	<i>M</i> = 4.16 <i>SD</i> = 1.27	<i>M</i> = 3.94 <i>SD</i> = 1.29	<i>M</i> = 4.09 <i>SD</i> = 1.11	<i>M</i> = 4.43 <i>SD</i> = 1.13	0.44
Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption <i>M</i> = 4.25 <i>SD</i> = 1.19	<i>M</i> = 4.20 <i>SD</i> = 1.01	<i>M</i> = 4.33 <i>SD</i> = 1.40	<i>M</i> = 3.75 <i>SD</i> = 1.29	<i>M</i> = 4.32 <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 4.86 <i>SD</i> = 0.38	1.25
Handcuffed or tied to a building or structure <i>M</i> = 4.31 <i>SD</i> = 1.22	<i>M</i> = 4.29 <i>SD</i> = 1.27	<i>M</i> = 4.52 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 4.19 <i>SD</i> = 1.38	<i>M</i> = 4.12 <i>SD</i> = 1.23	<i>M</i> = 4.71 <i>SD</i> = 0.49	0.65
Kidnap a current member of one's organization <i>M</i> = 3.63 <i>SD</i> = 1.26	<i>M</i> = 3.29 <i>SD</i> = 1.44	<i>M</i> = 3.90 <i>SD</i> = 1.29	<i>M</i> = 3.25 <i>SD</i> = 1.18	<i>M</i> = 3.86 <i>SD</i> = 1.17	<i>M</i> = 3.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.07	1.79
Participate in streaking or other activities while naked <i>M</i> = 4.13 <i>SD</i> = 1.18	<i>M</i> = 4.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.32	<i>M</i> = 4.52 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 3.93 <i>SD</i> = 1.28	<i>M</i> = 3.89 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 4.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.92	1.42
Perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amount of time <i>M</i> = 3.64 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 3.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.46	<i>M</i> = 4.21 <i>SD</i> = 1.29	<i>M</i> = 2.94 <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 3.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.25	<i>M</i> = 4.13 <i>SD</i> = 0.83	3.38*
Perform sexual acts <i>M</i> = 4.22 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 4.07 <i>SD</i> = 1.33	<i>M</i> = 4.48 <i>SD</i> = 1.33	<i>M</i> = 3.79 <i>SD</i> = 1.19	<i>M</i> = 4.20 <i>SD</i> = 1.23	<i>M</i> = 4.43 <i>SD</i> = 0.79	0.85
Receive a brand or tattoo <i>M</i> = 4.30 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 3.93 <i>SD</i> = 1.44	<i>M</i> = 4.55 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	<i>M</i> = 4.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.36	<i>M</i> = 4.31 <i>SD</i> = 0.95	<i>M</i> = 4.57 <i>SD</i> = 0.53	1.10
Struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle <i>M</i> = 4.34 <i>SD</i> = 1.18	<i>M</i> = 4.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.41	<i>M</i> = 4.41 <i>SD</i> = 1.18	<i>M</i> = 4.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.41	<i>M</i> = 4.51 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 4.63 <i>SD</i> = 0.52	0.99

1 = Strongly disagree that each activity is a hazing activity, 5 = Strongly agree

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

In addition, for the composite variable *other hazing activities*, there was a significant difference,  $t(85) = 2.91, p < .01$ , between women ( $M = 3.85, SD = 0.97$ ) and men ( $M = 3.29, SD = 0.82$ ).

Of these eight activities that were identified as other hazing activities, an analysis of variance showed one statistically significant difference. For the activity, *participate in drinking games*, there was a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ). The Dunn (Bonferroni) test showed that there were significant differences between sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps members, and sorority members and student athletes (see Table 7). For sorority members, the mean score for *participate in drinking games* was  $M = 4.17 (SD = 1.05)$ , whereas for Reserve Officer Training Corps members and student athletes, it was  $M = 3.00 (SD = 1.16)$  and  $M = 3.27 (SD = 1.26)$ , respectively.

Even though there was only one statistically significant difference among the five groups for the eight activities identified as other hazing activities, there were five significant differences between women and men for those activities.

The activities *blindfolded during activities* and *perform chores or tasks for others* were significant at  $p < .05$ , while *participate in an activity against your will* was significant at  $p < .01$ , and *shave one's head or other part of one's body*, and *stand in line for excessive amounts of time* were significant at  $p < .01$ . For these activities, the mean scores for women were:  $M = 3.11 (SD = 1.22)$ ;  $M = 3.69 (SD = 1.24)$ ;  $M = 4.16 (SD = 1.20)$ ;  $M = 4.16 (SD = 1.11)$ ; and  $M = 3.56 (SD = 1.27)$ , respectively, whereas for men the mean scores were:  $M = 2.56 (SD = 1.07)$ ;  $M = 3.17 (SD = 1.08)$ ;  $M = 3.47 (SD = 1.20)$ ;  $M = 3.22 (SD = 1.35)$ ; and  $M = 2.78 (SD = 1.11)$ .

Table 7

*Mean Scores for Other Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Fraternity	Sorority	ROTC	NCAA	Marching Band	<i>F(x)</i>
Blindfolded during activities <i>M</i> = 2.88 <i>SD</i> = 1.19	<i>M</i> = 2.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.13	<i>M</i> = 3.12 <i>SD</i> = 1.48	<i>M</i> = 2.73 <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 3.08 <i>SD</i> = 0.97	<i>M</i> = 2.00 <i>SD</i> = 0.76	2.30
Participate in an activity against your will <i>M</i> = 3.76 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 3.31 <i>SD</i> = 1.25	<i>M</i> = 4.03 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 3.37 <i>SD</i> = 1.26	<i>M</i> = 3.92 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 3.71 <i>SD</i> = 1.38	1.43
Participate in drinking games <i>M</i> = 3.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.31	<i>M</i> = 3.12 <i>SD</i> = 1.59	<i>M</i> = 4.17 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 3.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	<i>M</i> = 3.27 <i>SD</i> = 1.26	<i>M</i> = 3.38 <i>SD</i> = 1.41	3.41*
Perform chores or tasks for others <i>M</i> = 3.56 <i>SD</i> = 1.21	<i>M</i> = 3.31 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 3.93 <i>SD</i> = 1.22	<i>M</i> = 3.50 <i>SD</i> = 1.21	<i>M</i> = 3.43 <i>SD</i> = 1.26	<i>M</i> = 3.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.92	1.01
Shave one's head or other part of one's body <i>M</i> = 3.82 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 3.71 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 4.34 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 3.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.42	<i>M</i> = 3.56 <i>SD</i> = 1.34	<i>M</i> = 4.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.15	2.00
Stand in line for excessive amounts of time <i>M</i> = 3.35 <i>SD</i> = 1.31	<i>M</i> = 2.87 <i>SD</i> = 1.41	<i>M</i> = 3.77 <i>SD</i> = 1.33	<i>M</i> = 3.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.41	<i>M</i> = 3.32 <i>SD</i> = 1.18	<i>M</i> = 3.50 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	1.61
Steal an item <i>M</i> = 4.03 <i>SD</i> = 1.25	<i>M</i> = 3.50 <i>SD</i> = 1.22	<i>M</i> = 4.31 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 3.69 <i>SD</i> = 1.45	<i>M</i> = 4.03 <i>SD</i> = 1.23	<i>M</i> = 4.63 <i>SD</i> = 0.74	1.81
Stranded alone or with other newcomers <i>M</i> = 3.62 <i>SD</i> = 1.30	<i>M</i> = 3.53 <i>SD</i> = 1.25	<i>M</i> = 3.97 <i>SD</i> = 1.32	<i>M</i> = 3.19 <i>SD</i> = 1.38	<i>M</i> = 3.62 <i>SD</i> = 1.34	<i>M</i> = 3.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.74	1.05

1 = Strongly disagree that each activity is a hazing activity, 5 = Strongly agree

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

*Non-Hazing Activities*

Finally, although this research study first focused on the activities students define as hazing activities, it also was important to examine the activities that are not considered

hazing activities. According to the expert review, there were eight activities that were non-hazing activities. Those activities included: *attend educational presentations or programs, attend mandatory study halls, complete a specific number of community service hours, learn historical facts about one's organizations, maintain a minimum grade point average, memorize and recite facts about one's organization, study a specific amount of time, and wear a specific clothing item or color of clothing item.*

For the composite variable that consisted of all of the activities identified by the expert reviewers as *non-hazing activities*, there was a statistically significant mean difference,  $F(4, 99) = 3.40, p < .05$ . The mean scores for each of the five groups were:  $M = 1.90$  ( $SD = 0.62$ ) for fraternity members;  $M = 2.09$  ( $SD = 0.68$ ) for sorority members;  $M = 1.98$  ( $SD = 0.73$ ) for Reserve Officer Training Corps members;  $M = 2.03$  ( $SD = 0.50$ ) for student athletes; and  $M = 1.23$  ( $SD = 0.37$ ) for marching band members. A mean score of 2 indicated that a group disagreed that the activities were hazing activities, whereas a standard deviation of 1 suggested scores were as low as 1 (strongly disagree), or as high as 3 (neutral). In the mean scores for the five groups, a statistically significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) for *memorize and recite facts about one's organization*,  $F(4, 107) = 3.53, p < .05$ , was apparent (see Table 8). After the Dunn (Bonferroni) test, it was discovered that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of student athletes and members of the marching band for *memorize and recite facts about one's organization*. But, because only 8 members of the marching band responded, such a difference must be viewed with caution. There were no significant differences between women and men with regard to activities that were identified as non-hazing activities.

Table 8

*Mean Scores for Non-Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Fraternity	Sorority	ROTC	NCAA	Marching Band	<i>F(x)</i>
Attend educational presentations or programs <i>M</i> = 1.51 <i>SD</i> = 0.90	<i>M</i> = 1.60 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>M</i> = 1.74 <i>SD</i> = 1.07	<i>M</i> = 1.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.62	<i>M</i> = 1.41 <i>SD</i> = 0.83	<i>M</i> = 1.13 <i>SD</i> = 0.90	1.20
Attend mandatory study halls <i>M</i> = 1.75 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 1.75 <i>SD</i> = 0.86	<i>M</i> = 2.06 <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 1.59 <i>SD</i> = 0.80	<i>M</i> = 1.70 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 1.00 <i>SD</i> = 0.00	1.97
Complete a specific number of community service hours <i>M</i> = 2.22 <i>SD</i> = 1.10	<i>M</i> = 2.38 <i>SD</i> = 1.36	<i>M</i> = 2.21 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 2.47 <i>SD</i> = 1.13	<i>M</i> = 2.25 <i>SD</i> = 1.02	<i>M</i> = 1.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.74	1.49
Learn historical facts about one's organization <i>M</i> = 1.64 <i>SD</i> = 0.99	<i>M</i> = 1.50 <i>SD</i> = 0.82	<i>M</i> = 1.66 <i>SD</i> = 1.14	<i>M</i> = 1.63 <i>SD</i> = 0.96	<i>M</i> = 1.83 <i>SD</i> = 1.00	<i>M</i> = 1.00 <i>SD</i> = 0.00	1.28
Maintain a minimum grade point average <i>M</i> = 1.55 <i>SD</i> = 0.94	<i>M</i> = 1.38 <i>SD</i> = 0.50	<i>M</i> = 1.57 <i>SD</i> = 1.01	<i>M</i> = 1.59 <i>SD</i> = 0.94	<i>M</i> = 1.68 <i>SD</i> = 1.11	<i>M</i> = 1.13 <i>SD</i> = 0.35	0.71
Memorize and recite facts about one's organization <i>M</i> = 2.18 <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 1.75 <i>SD</i> = 0.77	<i>M</i> = 2.29 <i>SD</i> = 1.10	<i>M</i> = 2.13 <i>SD</i> = 0.96	<i>M</i> = 2.49 <i>SD</i> = 1.02	<i>M</i> = 1.25 <i>SD</i> = 0.71	3.53**
Study a specific amount of time <i>M</i> = 1.97 <i>SD</i> = 1.07	<i>M</i> = 2.06 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>M</i> = 2.16 <i>SD</i> = 1.19	<i>M</i> = 2.13 <i>SD</i> = 1.36	<i>M</i> = 1.89 <i>SD</i> = 0.88	<i>M</i> = 1.13 <i>SD</i> = 0.35	1.71
Wear a specific clothing item or color of clothing item <i>M</i> = 2.76 <i>SD</i> = 1.27	<i>M</i> = 2.63 <i>SD</i> = 1.45	<i>M</i> = 3.00 <i>SD</i> = 1.37	<i>M</i> = 2.60 <i>SD</i> = 1.24	<i>M</i> = 2.89 <i>SD</i> = 1.12	<i>M</i> = 1.88 <i>SD</i> = 0.99	1.47

1 = Strongly disagree that each activity is a hazing activity, 5 = Strongly agree

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

### *All Hazing Activities*

If a continuum of the mean scores for hazing activities for the five student organizations included in this research study were made, it would be demonstrated that fewer Reserve Officer Training Corps members identified activities as hazing activities, whereas more sorority members identified such activities as hazing activities. For all hazing activities, including physical, psychological, both physical and psychological, and other hazing activities, the mean score for Reserve Officer Training Corps members was 3.47, whereas for sorority members it was 4.17. For fraternity members, it was 3.67. For student athletes and members of the marching band, it was 3.83 and 3.91, respectively.

In addition, it is beneficial to examine the grand means for each of the hazing activities, as well as the standard deviations for the activities (see Table 9). Such data provide information about to what degree students think the activities are hazing activities, as well as the average variance.

### *Summary*

Although only a few statistically significant differences in the activities students defined as hazing activities were discovered, there were some statistically significant differences, most of which were between sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps members. Such differences were present for three of the five types of hazing activities. Those types included physical hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities. Physical hazing activities where significant differences were present included *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels*, both physical and psychological hazing activities included *perform feat of strength or*

*physical activity for excessive amounts of time, and other hazing activities included participate in drinking games.*

Table 9

*Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for All Hazing Activities*

Hazing Activity	Mean	Standard Deviation
Forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages	4.45	1.17
Struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle	4.34	1.18
Handcuffed or tied to a building or structure	4.31	1.21
Receive a brand or tattoo	4.28	1.14
Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption	4.25	1.19
Deprived of beverages or food by others	4.22	1.15
Perform sexual acts	4.22	1.24
Participate in streaking or other activities while naked	4.13	1.18
Deprived of sleep by others	4.12	1.21
Steal an item	4.03	1.25
Consume alcoholic beverages	3.94	1.20
Subjected to verbal abuse or harassment	3.84	1.24
Do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels	3.82	1.30
Shave one's head or other part of one's body	3.82	1.30
Participate in an activity against your will	3.76	1.24
Kidnap a current member of one's organization	3.64	1.26
Perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time	3.64	1.30
Stranded alone or with other newcomers	3.62	1.30
Perform chores or tasks for others	3.56	1.21
March, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances	3.51	1.32
Participate in drinking games	3.47	1.31
Stand in line for excessive amounts of time	3.37	1.31
Perform in public, such as dancing or singing	3.20	1.30
Blindfolded during activities	2.88	1.19

The data collected in this research study suggested that there were some significant differences in the activities students define as hazing activities among the selected student organizations. The data showed that, for the composite variables *physical hazing activities*

and *psychological hazing activities*, there were significant differences among the selected student organizations. Thus, the null hypothesis that the activities students define as hazing activities do not differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band was rejected.

For the entire sample, there were ten activities that the respondents agreed, as evidenced by mean scores greater than 4, were hazing activities when done to or required of members or newcomers (see Table 9). They included: *forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages; struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle; handcuffed or tied to a building or structure; receive a brand or tattoo, drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption, deprived of beverages or food by others; perform sexual acts, participate in streaking or other activities while naked, deprived of sleep by others; and steal an item.*

There were two statistically significant differences between Reserve Officer Training Corps members and student athletes. Such differences were evident for a physical hazing activity, *march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances*, and one other hazing activity, *participate in drinking games*.

In addition, a number of statistically significant differences were present between women and men, including significant differences in four of the five types of hazing activities, including physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities. Such hazing activities included: *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels; and march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances; perform in public, such as dancing or singing; subjected to verbal abuse or harassment; perform feat of strength or*

*physical activity for excessive amount of time; blindfolded during activities; perform chores or tasks for others were significant; participate in an activity against your will; shave one's head or other part of one's body; and stand in line for excessive amounts of time.*

## Chapter V: Discussion, Limitations, and Implications

According to the literature review (Crow & Rosner, 2002; Hollmann, 2002; Hoover, 1999; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Novak, 2000; Nuwer, 1999; Nuwer, 1990; Shaw, 1992; Wegener, 2001; Winslow, 1999), fraternities, sororities, athletic groups, military organizations, and marching bands are most commonly associated with hazing activities. The purpose of this research study was to investigate if the activities students define as hazing activities differ among student organizations, specifically fraternities, sororities, athletic groups, military organizations, and marching bands. Similarly, because the collected data indicated that the activities students define as hazing activities differed, this research study also investigated how those activities differed among the selected student organizations.

As explained in Chapter 2 this research study explored the activities students define as hazing activities, specifically students who were fraternity members, sorority members, ROTC members, student athletes, and members of the marching band. The null hypothesis that guided this research study was: the activities students define as hazing activities do not differ among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band. As such, this research study was approached from a quantitative perspective, with a descriptive, cross-sectional design. This design facilitated a comparison of activities students defined as hazing activities among the selected student organizations, in order to describe how different student organizations at the institution have different definitions and perceptions of hazing activities.

This research study asked fraternity members, sorority members, ROTC members, student athletes, and members of the marching band to complete a researcher-designed Web-based survey, which consisted of 49 items. For 42 of these items, students indicated to what

degree they agreed that each of the 42 items was a hazing activity. Their responses were made according to a five-point Likert scale. The remaining seven items asked for demographic information. Although this research study will make meaning of the data, these findings must be interpreted with great caution because the response rate was only 26%. In addition, the response rate for some of the groups was even lower, so these findings may not be representative of the respective groups.

For the composite variables *physical hazing activities* and *psychological hazing activities*, there were significant differences among the selected student organizations. In addition, for the composite variables *physical hazing activities*, *psychological hazing activities*, and *other hazing activities*, there were significant differences between women and men. This suggests that there are differences in the activities students identify as hazing activities among the selected student organizations, and that students in those organizations have different perceptions of hazing. With regard to the differences between women and men, those differences suggest that women and men have different perceptions with regard to hazing.

Through this research study, a number of statistically significant differences were discovered. Such differences were evident between sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps members for physical hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities, as well as between Reserve Officer Training Corps members and student athletes for a physical hazing activity and one other hazing activity. Physical hazing activities where significant differences were present between sorority members and Reserve Officer Training Corps members included *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels*, both physical and psychological hazing

activities included *perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time*, and other hazing activities included *participate in drinking games*. The physical hazing activity and other hazing activity where significant differences were present between Reserve Officer Training Corps members and student athletes included *march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances*, and *participate in drinking games*, respectively.

In addition, a number of statistically significant differences were present between women and men, including significant differences in four of the five types of hazing activities, including physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities. Such activities included: *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels; and march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances; perform in public, such as dancing or singing; subjected to verbal abuse or harassment; perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amount of time; blindfolded during activities; perform chores or tasks for others were significant; participate in an activity against your will; shave one's head or other part of one's body; and stand in line for excessive amounts of time*.

#### *Discussion*

Although there has been very little research with regard to the perceptions of hazing activities among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band, especially the differences among the selected student organizations, this research study served to corroborate and underscore a number of the research studies of other researchers. For example, Novak (2000) and Wegener (2001) concluded that fraternity and sorority members demonstrated

considerable knowledge about hazing activities. Likewise, this research study showed that, for the hazing activities where statistically significant differences were present, the mean scores of sorority members, which measured to what degree they agreed that the activities were hazing activities, were higher than the mean scores of the members of the other selected student organizations. On the other hand, the mean scores of Reserve Officer Training Corps members, for the activities where statistically significant differences were present, were lower than the mean scores of the members of the student organizations to which they were compared.

But, this research study also demonstrated other differences among the selected student organizations. In some cases, activities that were identified as hazing activities by the expert reviewers may be necessary components of the culture of some of the organizations, so those activities might not be considered hazing activities. For example, to do calisthenics in the Reserve Officer Training Corps ( $M = 2.88, SD = 1.54$ ) or to perform in public for members of the marching band ( $M = 2.50, SD = 1.51$ ) may be necessary parts of the culture of those organizations, and the members of those organizations were less sure that those activities were hazing activities, as evidenced by the mean scores for the respective activities and student organizations.

Likewise, some activities are not parts of the culture of some of the student organizations. For example, the mean scores and standard deviations for *forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages* ( $M = 5.00, SD = 0.00$ ) and *drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption* ( $M = 4.86, SD = 0.38$ ) for members of the marching band suggest that those students clearly identify such activities as hazing activities, and that those activities are not part of the culture of the organization. However, for other activities

and student organizations, there was greater variance. For example, *participate in drinking games* for fraternity members ( $M = 3.12, SD = 1.59$ ) and *stranded alone or with other newcomers* for student athletes ( $M = 3.62, SD = 1.34$ ), the respective mean scores and standard deviations showed students' perceptions that such activities were hazing activities were between "disagree" and "strongly agree."

On the other hand, this research study also demonstrated that there are some activities that, for the most part, are clearly identified as hazing activities in the selected student organizations, as evidenced by the grand mean scores. They included: *forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages; struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle; handcuffed or tied to a building or structure; receive a brand or tattoo, drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption, deprived of beverages or food by others; perform sexual acts, participate in streaking or other activities while naked, deprived of sleep by others; and steal an item*. The grand mean scores for the 10 activities all were greater than 4, which corresponded to "agree" on the survey instrument.

Additionally, this research study demonstrated there are significant differences between women and men with regard to hazing activities. For the composite variables *physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities*, as well as a number of the individual activities, there were significant differences between women and men. However, such differences should not be surprising. According to Gilligan's theory of women's moral development (1982), the care orientation and the focus on relationships and responsibility suggest that, for many women, moral thinking is different from men's, which relies on individual rights and justice. In such a way, the moral thinking and ways in

which women relate to others may explain differences between women and men with regard to perceptions of hazing activities.

In the literature review, other researchers implied there could be differences between women and men with regard to hazing activities and perceptions of hazing activities (Morgan & Shaw, 1990; Nuwer, 1999; Shaw, 1992). As this research study showed, there were a number of statistically significant differences between women and men with regard to the activities they define as hazing activities. Such significant differences were evident in the mean scores for four of the five types of hazing activities, as identified by the expert reviewers: physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, and other hazing activities. In every one of the 10 activities where significant differences were present, women had higher mean scores than men. This suggests that the perceptions of hazing activities of the women in this research study are more congruent with those of the expert reviewers, who set the standard of acceptance for this research study for whether the activities included were: physical hazing activities, psychological hazing activities, both physical and psychological hazing activities, other hazing activities, or non-hazing activities. But, it should be noted that, of the 58 women who participated in this research study, 36 were sorority members.

In general, however, there were only a few differences among fraternity members, sorority members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band with regard to the activities they define as hazing activities. Also, such differences were not isolated within a single type of hazing activity, such as physical hazing, psychological hazing, both physical and psychological hazing, or other type of hazing.

However, there were more significant differences between women and men with regard to what activities they defined as hazing activities.

### *Limitations*

There were a number of limitations with regard to this research study, which could have impacted its results. First, because hazing is such a controversial subject, some organizations or students may have been reluctant to participate. In this way, the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, after agreeing to participate in this research study and provide electronic addresses for all of its members, later declined the opportunity to participate. It is probable that, because of the controversial nature and history of hazing in military organizations (Nuwer, 1999), the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps sought to avoid the risk of receiving negative information. Also, because of the controversial subject, it is possible that some of the respondents gave socially desirable responses, which would bring into question the results of this research study.

One of the most notable limitations of this research study was with regard to the number of respondents and representativeness of the sample. As discussed in the previous chapter, the number of responses and response rates for fraternity members, Reserve Officer Training Corps members, and members of the marching band made it difficult to draw conclusions with regard to those three groups. Likewise, it was not possible to compare the activities students define as hazing activities with regard to smaller groups within the sample. For example, because of the abundance of literature about National Pan-Hellenic Council groups with regard to hazing activities, it would have been beneficial to be able to compare North-American Interfraternity Conference, National Panhellenic Conference, and National Pan-Hellenic Council groups, as well as other culturally based fraternities and sororities. In

addition, with regard to studying the sample in aggregate, the groups with greater response rates will more significantly impact the mean scores than the groups with lower response rates. In addition, because Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma are a fraternity and sorority, respectively, the experiences of their members may not be indicative of the experiences of all members of the marching band. Finally, because more female athletes participated than male athletes, the results may not be indicative of the aggregate population of student athletes.

With regard to the survey instrument, it is possible that it did not adequately reflect hazing activities within sororities, which would contribute to the fact that more sorority members identified activities as hazing activities when compared to any other group. Morgan and Shaw (1990) and Shaw (1992) suggested that hazing activities among sorority members frequently involved activities that would be described as psychological hazing activities. In addition, it also could be suggested that this research study did not accurately represent the hazing activities associated military organizations, athletic groups, and marching bands. Through the literature review, it was obvious that much of the information with regard to hazing activities was representative of fraternities and sororities, while there was relatively less information with regard to such activities in military organizations, athletic groups, and marching bands.

In addition, there were a number of limitations that resulted from the context within which this research study was conducted. For example, the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps is a relatively new student organization at the institution where this research study was conducted, so its traditions may not be the same as those of other Army Reserve Officer Training Corps at other institutions where the student organization has had a longer history. In addition, the respective programs of the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, Athletic

Department, Music Department, and Division of Student Affairs may be different from those at other institutions, so readers should use caution before generalizing the results of this research study to other campuses. Then, there were some limitations with regard to the researcher. Because the researcher is a fraternity member and an employee of the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life at the institution where this research study was conducted, the researcher's own experiences and opinions could have influenced the creation of the survey instrument and the methodology of this research study. However, the researcher sought to minimize the influence of potential biases through debriefing with an advisor and through the expert review of the survey instrument.

Next, although there were a number of concerns with regard to the use of a Web-based survey instrument, there were a number of benefits, as well (Gunn, 2002). Some of the limitations included the fact that the survey could have appeared differently to respondents who used different computers or Web browsers, a lack of experience with computers could have been a source of error, and additional concerns with regard to data security. Although such concerns could not be completely eliminated, because Educational Benchmarking, Inc., an experienced corporation with regard to Web-based survey systems, hosted the Web-based survey instrument, such concerns were minimal. And, although Web-based survey instruments tend to have lower response rates than traditional survey instruments, Carini and associates reported only a small difference (Carini et al., 2001).

In addition to the concerns and limitations Gunn (2002) identified, there were a number of benefits to the use of a Web-based survey instrument. Such benefits included: easier to send reminders to participants; easier to process data, since responses could be downloaded to a spreadsheet, data analysis package, or a database; dynamic error

checking capability; option of putting questions in random order; the ability to make complex skip pattern questions easier to follow; the inclusion of pop-up instructions for selected questions; and, the use of drop-down boxes. (n.p.)

Finally, it is important to note that, although Web-based survey instruments offered a number of technological advantages, Gunn (2002) said some research studies have suggested response rates were greater for more simplistic Web-based survey instruments when compared to more elaborate instruments. Unfortunately, this was not the case in this research study, which did not benefit from a high response rate.

Finally, there were some limitations about how the results of this research study inform practice and research. Although the results give some ideas with regard to what activities students define as hazing activities, it does not offer insight with regard to whether or not such activities are harmful or inappropriate, whether or not students have been victims or have participated in such activities, or whether or not students would report such activities. However, for the activities they have defined as hazing activities, they at least have acknowledged that such activities could be in violation of campus policies or state laws.

### *Implications*

Although this research study demonstrated there are significant differences among the selected student organizations with regard to the activities they identify as hazing activities, there were a number of activities that students agreed were hazing activities, as evidenced by the mean scores greater than 4. Such activities included: *do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels; and march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances; perform in public, such as dancing or singing; subjected to verbal abuse or harassment; perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amount of*

*time; blindfolded during activities; perform chores or tasks for others were significant; participate in an activity against your will; shave one's head or other part of one's body; and stand in line for excessive amounts of time.*

However, this research study also demonstrated that hazing activities have contextual elements, as evidenced by the fact that some student organizations strongly agreed that activities were hazing activities when others did not, while others in light of the culture of the organizations did not identify activities as hazing activities. For example, while sorority members agreed *that march, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances* was a hazing activity ( $M = 4.10, SD = 1.26$ ), Reserve Officer Training Corps members did not think that activity was a hazing activity ( $M = 2.44, SD = 1.15$ ).

Because the results of this research study indicated that, in general, there were relatively few differences among the selected student organizations with regard to the activities they define as hazing activities, it could be suggested that all of the five groups should continue to receive education about appropriate and inappropriate initiation rituals and rites of passage. In addition, the results of this research study are interesting because, although fraternity members and sorority members receive a great amount of education about hazing activities through administrators, advisors, and inter/national headquarters staff, sorority members more consistently identified activities as hazing activities, whereas fraternity members did not show any statistically significant differences when compared to Reserve Officer Training Corps members, student athletes, and members of the marching band. For this reason, it would be beneficial to look at the amount and impact of educational presentations and programs about hazing in each of the selected student organizations.

Of particular use to administrators and advisors who work with fraternities, sororities, Reserve Officer Training Corps, NCAA athletic teams, and marching bands may be the mean scores of each of the respective student organizations with regard to what activities the members of those organizations define as hazing activities. Such data will help administrators and advisors direct education to the students they work with; staff members will be able to identify what information students already have, as well as what information they lack. In a similar way, for the activities with larger standard deviations, staff members will know that the students they work with do not have clear perceptions with regard to hazing activities.

#### *Future Research*

As discussed above, there remains a great amount of research to be done about hazing activities in student organizations. Because such a lack of research with regard to hazing practices and traditions in fraternities, sororities, Reserve Officer Training Corps, NCAA athletic teams, and marching bands exists, this research study with regard to what activities students define as hazing activities could be a good foundation on which to build future research. With some knowledge about the activities students define as hazing activities, future research studies should explore whether or not such activities are harmful or inappropriate, whether or not students have been victims or have participated in such activities, or whether or not students would report such activities. Similarly, because this research study examined definitions and perceptions of hazing only through the eyes of students who were members of the selected student organizations, it would be useful to explore the definitions and perceptions of hazing through the eyes of administrators, faculty

and staff members, and students who are not involved with any of the student organizations selected for this research study.

Also, because a number of the hazing activities purposefully were worded in a general and vague way, such as complete a specific number of community service hours, do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels, or forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages, it would be beneficial to explore at what point such activities become excessive. A number of the other activities could be explored in a more specific way in order to determine at what point activities could become hazing activities.

In addition, in light of the research that suggests hazing activities are functional, even if in a destructive way (Butler & Glennen, 1991; Jones, 2000; Sweet, 1999), it would be beneficial for administrators and advisors to explore what makes students participate in hazing activities, and what outcomes students seek through hazing activities. In such a way, administrators and advisors would be able to design and implement alternative, appropriate initiation rituals and rites of passage for the students with whom they work, while eliminating or limiting the danger and risk associated with inappropriate hazing activities.

### *Summary*

Although this research study demonstrated there are significant differences of the perceptions of hazing activities among the selected student organizations, it also showed that there are a number of activities that students in those organizations agree are hazing activities. In addition, and probably more importantly, this research study showed that there are significant differences between women and men with regard to the activities they identify as hazing activities. These findings support those of previous research studies, and

underscore the differences between women and men in ways of relating and thinking. By offering more information about the culture of the student organizations in this research study and providing insight into the differences between women and men with regard to hazing activities, this research study has contributed to our understanding of hazing practices, and will help administrators and advisors continue to combat and confront these phenomena.

## Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

### Identification of Project/Title

Assessment on activities students define as hazing activities

### Statement of Age of Subject

I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dr. John Zacker and Chad Ellsworth in the College Student Personnel Program in the Department of Counseling & Personnel Services at the University of Maryland.

### Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to assess activities students define as hazing activities.

### Procedures

The procedures involve my completion of a Web-based survey instrument. In the Web-based survey instrument, I will indicate to what degree I agree that each of a list of activities is a hazing activity. Such activities will include: "Blindfolded during activities," "Complete a specific number of community service hours," and "Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption." I will not be asked to identify which activities have been done to me or which activities I have done to others.

### Confidentiality

All information collected in this research study is confidential and my name will not be identified at any time. The data I provide will be grouped with data others provide for reporting and presentation.

### Risks

None; there are no known risks associated with this research study.

### Benefits, Freedom to Withdraw, & Ability to Ask Questions

The experiment is to help the researcher learn more about activities students define as hazing activities. My participation is voluntary. I am free to ask questions or withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

### Contact Information of Investigator

(Primary) Dr. John Zacker, 2118 Mitchell Building, College Park, MD 20740.

E-mail: jzacker@umd.edu. Telephone: 301-314-8204

(Student) Chad Ellsworth, 0110 Stamp Student Union, College Park, MD 20740.

E-mail: cellsworth@union.umd.edu. Telephone: 301-314-5406

### Contact Information of Institutional Review Board

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research related injury, please contact: Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, 20742. E-mail: irb@deans.umd.edu. Telephone: 301-405-4212.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B: Invitation to Participate

To: Participant

From: Chad Ellsworth

Subject: \$20 Best Buy or Target gift certificate

Participant's Name,

You have been selected as a members of the a fraternity, a sorority, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), NCAA Athletic Team, or marching band at the University of Maryland, College Park, to participate in an assessment on activities students define as hazing activities. Your participation involves the completion of a Web-based survey, which will take only 5-10 minutes of your time. If you choose to participate, you may be randomly selected to receive a \$20 gift certificate to either Best Buy or Target stores.

This research study is being conducted by Dr. John Zacker and Chad Ellsworth in the College Student Personnel Program in the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services. The purpose of this research study is to assess activities students define as hazing activities.

To participate, click on the link below and complete a 5-10 minute survey. Then, you may be randomly selected to receive a \$20 gift certificate to either Best Buy or Target stores!

## Appendix C: Survey Instrument

Assessment on Activities Students Define as Hazing Activities

**You have been selected as a member of a fraternity, a sorority, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), NCAA Athletic Team, or marching band at the University of Maryland, College Park, to participate in an assessment on activities students define as hazing activities. Please respond to the questions based on your experience with that organization.**

**The survey should take 5-10 minutes to complete.**

**What activities, when done to or required of members or newcomers in your organization, do you agree are hazing activities? Please indicate to what degree you agree that each activity is a hazing activity.**

A = Strongly disagree  
B = Disagree  
C = Don't know/Neutral  
D = Agree  
E = Strongly agree

Attend educational presentations or programs

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Attend mandatory study halls

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Blindfolded during activities

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Clean up after others

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Complete a specific number of community service hours

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Consume alcoholic beverages

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Deprived of beverages or food by others

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Deprived of sleep by others

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Do calisthenics for excessive amounts of time or to excessive levels

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Drink or eat substances not intended for normal consumption

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Forced to consume excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Handcuffed or tied to a building or structure

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

- Have a specific item in one's possession at all times  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Have restricted communication with others  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Have restricted use of specific doors or rooms  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Kidnap a current member of one's organization  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Learn historical facts about one's organization  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Maintain a minimum grade point average  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- March, walk, or run for excessive amounts of time or for excessive distances  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Memorize and recite facts about one's organization  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Participate in an activity against your will  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Participate in drinking games  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Participate in scavenger hunts  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Participate in streaking or other activities while naked  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Perform chores or tasks for others  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Perform feat of strength or physical activity for excessive amounts of time  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Perform in public, such as dancing or singing  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Perform sexual acts  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Prepare or serve meals to others  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Purchase alcohol for others  
A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)
- Purchase an item from others

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Receive a brand or tattoo

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Shave one's head or other part of one's body

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Sleep in a common area with other newcomers

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Stand in line for excessive amounts of time

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Steal an item

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Stranded alone or with other newcomers

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Struck by an object, such as a ball, baton, fist, or paddle

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Study a specific amount of time

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Subjected to verbal abuse or harassment

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Wear a specific clothing item or color of clothing item

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

Wear some sort of item that marks one's status as a newcomer

A (Strongly disagree) --- B (Disagree) --- C (Neutral) --- D (Agree) --- E (Strongly agree)

### **Background Information**

(Mark one response for each item.)

1. Age

A. 18

B. 19

C. 20

D. 21

E. 22

F. 23

G. 24

H. 25 or older

2. Grade point average

A. 0.0-2.24

B. 2.25-2.49

C. 2.5-2.74

D. 2.75-2.99

E. 3.0-3.24

F. 3.25-3.49

G. 3.5-3.74

H. 3.75-4.0

3. Race or ethnicity
- A. Native American/Indian
  - B. African American, not of Hispanic origin
  - C. Asian/Pacific Islander
  - D. Hispanic
  - E. Multiracial
  - F. White, not of Hispanic origin
  - G. My race or ethnicity was not included in the list

4. Sex
- A. Female
  - B. Male

5. How long have you been enrolled in a college or university?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. One year
  - C. Two years
  - D. Three years
  - E. Four years
  - F. Five years or more

6. How long have you been a member of your fraternity?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. One year
  - C. Two years
  - D. Three years
  - E. Four years
  - F. Five years or more

**\*\*Fraternity Version\*\***

7. Which of the following best describes your fraternity?
- A. Interfraternity Council (IFC) organization
  - B. Pan-Hellenic Council (PHC) organization
  - C. United Greek Council (UGC) organization

**\*\*Sorority Version\*\***

7. Which of the following best describes your sorority?
- A. Panhellenic Association (PHA) organization
  - B. Pan-Hellenic Council (PHC) organization
  - C. United Greek Council (UGC) organization

**\*\*ROTC Version\*\***

7. Which of the following best describes your Reserve Officer Training Corps?
- A. Air Force ROTC
  - B. Army ROTC

**\*\*Student Athlete Version\*\***

7. Which of the following best describes your NCAA Athletic Team?
- A. Individual sport
  - B. Team sport

Please use the space below for any additional comments or suggestions.  
Thank you for your time and participation.

## References

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1988). Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 401-417.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (1999). *Social psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers.
- Butler, E. R., & Glennen, R. E. (1991, April). *Initiations rituals: Sanctioning rites of passage rituals to increase involvement*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, Reno, NV.
- Carini, R. M., Hayek, J. H., Kuh, G. D., Kennedy, J. M. & Ouimet, J. A. (2003). College student responses to web and paper surveys: Does mode matter? *Research in Higher Education*, 44, 1-19.
- Cokley, K., Miller, K., Cunningham, D., Motioke, J., King, A., & Awad, G. (2001). Developing an instrument to assess college students' attitudes toward pledging and hazing in Greek letter organizations. *College Student Journal*, 35, 451-456.
- Crow, R. B., & Rosner, S. R. (2002). Institutional and organizational liability for hazing in intercollegiate and professional team sports. *St. John's Law Review*, 76, 87-114.
- Drout, C. E., & Corsoro, C. L. (2003). Attitudes toward fraternity hazing among fraternity members, sorority members, and non-Greek students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31, 535-544.
- Farrey, T. (2003). *Athletes abusing athletes*. Retrieved January 8, 2004, from <http://espn.go.com/otl/hazing/monday.html>
- General Accounting Office, Division of National Security and International Affairs. (1992). *DOD service academies: Status report on reviews of student treatment*. Statement of

- Paul L. Jones, Director, Defense Force Management Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division. *Testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.* (EDRS Publication No. GAO/T-NSIAD-92-41). Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- General Accounting Office, Division of National Security and International Affairs. (1992). *DOD service academies: More changes needed to eliminate hazing. Report to Congressional Requesters.* (EDRS Publication No. GAO/NSIAD-93-36). Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gunn, H. (2002). Web-based surveys: Changing the survey process. *First Monday, 7(12)*. Retrieved January 8, 2004, from [http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue7\\_12/gunn](http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue7_12/gunn)
- Hollmann, B. B. (2002). Hazing: Hidden campus crime. In C. K. Wilkinson & J. A. Rund (Eds.), *Addressing contemporary campus safety issues* (pp. 11-23), *New Directions for Student Services, 99*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoover, J., & Milner, C. (1998). Are hazing and belongingness related to love and belongingness? *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 7*, 138-141.
- Hoover, N. C. (1999). *Initiation rites and athletics: A national survey of NCAA sports teams. Final report.* Alfred, NY: Alfred University.
- Hoover, N. C., & Pollard, N. J. (2000). *Initiation rites in American high schools: A national survey. Final report.* Alfred, NY: Alfred University.
- Hunt, G. P., & Laidler, K. J. (2001). Alcohol and violence in the lives of gang members. *Alcohol Research & Health, 25(1)*, 66-71.

- Jones, R. L. (2000). The historical significance of sacrificial ritual: Understanding violence in the modern Black fraternity pledge process. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 24, 112-124.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (1995). Self-assessment, participation, and value of leadership skills, activities, and experiences for Black students relative to their membership in historically Black fraternities and sororities. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64(1), 63-74.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (1997). The membership intake movement of historically Black Greek-letter organizations. *NASPA Journal*, 34, 229-239.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2003). *Black Greek 101*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Lodewijckx, H. F. M., & Syroit, J. E. M. (2001). Affiliation during naturalistic severe and mild initiations: Some further evidence against the severity-attraction hypothesis. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 6(7), 90-107.
- Manley, R. E. (2003, November). Hazing plagues Greeks. *The Fraternal Law*, 86, 1-4.
- MacLachlan, J. (2000). Dangerous traditions: Hazing rituals on campus and university liability. *Journal of College and University Law*, 26, 511-548.
- McCoy, A. W. (1995). "Same banana": Hazing and honor at the Philippine Military Academy. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 54, 689-726.
- McKenzie v. State of Maryland, 748 A.2d 67 (Md. App. 2000).
- Novak, K. (2000). [Texas A&M University campus assessment on hazing]. Unpublished raw data.
- Nuwer, H. (1990). *Broken pledges: The deadly rite of hazing*. Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press.

- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nuwer, H. (2003, May 17). *Hank Nuwer's unofficial clearinghouse to track hazing deaths and incidents*. Retrieved December 1, 2003 from <http://hazing.hanknuwer.com>
- Ostvik, K., & Rudmin, F. (2001). Bullying and hazing among Norwegian army soldiers: Two studies of prevalence, context, and cognition. *Military Psychology, 13*(1), 17-39.
- Reisberg, L. (1999, November 12). Court says U. of Neb. had duty to protect pledge from hazing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A55-58.
- Ruffins, P., & Evelyn, J. (1998, June 25). The persistent madness of Greek hazing. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, pp. 14-18.
- Schopler, J., & Bateson, N. (1962). A dependence interpretation of the effects of a severe initiation. *Journal of Personality, 30*, 633-649.
- Shaw, D. L. (1992). A national study of sorority hazing incidents in selected land-grant institutions of higher learning. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*, 1077.
- Shaw, D. L., & Morgan, T. E. (1990). Greek advisors' perceptions of sorority hazing. *NASPA Journal, 28*(1), 60-64.
- StopHazing.org. (2003). *StopHazing.org: Educating to eliminate hazing*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from <http://www.stophazing.org>
- Sweet, S. (1999). Understanding fraternity hazing: Insights from symbolic interactionist theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 355-364.
- University of Maryland. (2003, December). *Hazing policy*. Retrieved January 8, 2004, from <http://www.jpo.umd.edu/related/hazing.html>

Wegener, C. J. (2001). *Perceptions of hazing among Greek and ROTC students at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Winslow, D. (1999). Rites of passage and group bonding in the Canadian Airborne. *Armed Forces & Society*, 25, 429-457.