

ABSTRACT

Title of Document:

SOCIAL BONDS AS PREDICTORS OF
COLLEGE STUDENT WILLINGNESS TO
REPORT HAZING

Joshua Bittinger, Master of Arts, 2014

Directed By:

Professor Denise Gottfredson, Department of
Criminology and Criminal Justice

Little is currently known about what factors influence a victim's willingness to report hazing experienced in higher education. This problem of hazing has largely been ignored by criminologists, despite anti-hazing statutes existing in many states. The present study aims to examine this problem through a criminological lens using Social Bonding Theory (SBT). SBT suggests that deviant behavior is more likely to occur when a person is poorly bonded to conventional society (Hirschi, 1969). This theory was originally intended to explain deviant behavior; however, this study investigates its utility in explaining reporting behavior of victimization. Data were collected from surveys administered at the University of Maryland (N = 56), utilizing vignettes to present hypothetical hazing situations and were analyzed using logistic regression. Results provide no support for the use of SBT to predict a student's willingness to report experienced hazing, as described in the vignettes. Limitations and implications are discussed.

SOCIAL BONDS AS PREDICTORS OF COLLEGE STUDENT WILLINGNESS
TO REPORT HAZING

By

Joshua Bittinger

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
2014

Advisory Committee:

Professor Denise Gottfredson, Chair

Professor Sally Simpson

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs John Zacker

© Copyright by
Joshua Bittinger
2014

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	3
Hazing	3
Reporting	11
Social Bonding Theory	14
Attachment	15
Commitment	17
Involvement	18
Belief	18
The Present Study	19
Chapter 3: Methods	21
Sample Selection and Demographics	21
Data Collection Procedure	23
Measures	24
Dependent variables	24
Independent variables	26
Control variables	31
Analysis	32
Chapter 4: Results	34
Chapter 5: Discussion	38
Appendix A: Codebook	42
Dependent Variables	42
Independent Variables	42
Maternal attachment average scale (0-5)	42
Paternal attachment average scale (0-5)	42
School attachment average scale (0 – 5)	43
Educational commitment average scale (0 – 5)	43
Occupational commitment average scale (0 – 5)	43
School belief average scale (0 – 5)	44
Norm and law belief average scale (0 – 5)	44
Control Variables	45
Appendix B: Standardized Request Sent to Instructors	46

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form	47
Appendix D: Class Introduction Script.....	50
References	51

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of sample.	23
Table 2. Correlation matrix for maternal and paternal attachment scale items.	29
Table 3. Pair-wise correlations for variables in study.	31
Table 4. Summary statistics for independent variables.	31
Table 5. Summary statistics for dependent variables.	34
Table 6. Cross-tabulation of dependent variables.	34
Table 7. T-tests of social bond scales between yes and no responses for William vignette.	35
Table 8. T-tests of social bond scales between yes and no responses for Abigail vignette.	35
Table 9. Coefficients and odds ratios for William vignette unrestricted model.	36
Table 10. Coefficients and odds ratios for Abigail vignette unrestricted model.	36

Chapter 1: Introduction

The United States Congress presented findings in 1990 indicating that violent crime on college campuses had been steadily increasing in the preceding years (Gehring, 1996). Further investigation of their findings presented some rather disconcerting information: of the 8,000 postsecondary institutions that participated in federal student aid programs at the time, only 352 institutions were voluntarily providing statistics on campus crime to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Fernandez & Lizotte, 1997; Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998; Gehring, 1996). These findings led to the passage of the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act (renamed the Clery Act in 1999) later that year (Barton, Jensen, & Kaufman, 2010; Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Mosher, Miethe, & Phillips, 2002), which required institutions to report statistics on six crimes: murder, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and sexual offenses (Gehring, 1996). In 1998, this act was amended to contain a total of 11 crimes: homicide, manslaughter, arson, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, drug offense, liquor law violations, and illegal weapons possession (Mosher et al., 2002).

A crime noticeably absent from the Clery Act, and therefore official crime statistics, is hazing. Hazing is commonly used to initiate new members into a group, typically involving harassment, humiliation, or even abuse. To some, such as viewers of the 1978 satire Animal House, hazing may appear to be a routine and acceptable part of college life. Hazing has become increasingly common on college campuses and has received relatively little attention from the research community (Hoover, 2012). Hazing takes place within the context of being initiated into a group; this practice often becomes illegal when it results in violence and possibly the commission of other crimes such as

assault. To date, 44 states have explicit anti-hazing laws (“States With Anti-Hazing Laws,” n.d.). Hazing itself is against the law in most of the United States, but when the practice turns violent, it becomes a form of interpersonal violence – a type of violence which often goes unreported to police (Gibbons, 2008).

This study aims to understand from a criminological perspective a problem that has plagued higher education: hazing. This responds to recent calls to conduct interdisciplinary studies of hazing (Hoover, 2012). Every student will respond differently to violent victimization experienced at colleges/universities: some may remain silent, some may choose to leave school, and others may choose to engage in violence themselves (Gibbons, 2008). A study from the University of Maine found that 55 percent of students involved in a student organization or team on campus had experienced hazing; 95 percent of these students failed to report their experience to campus officials (Allan & Madden, 2008). Particularly alarming is the hazing-related death toll that Nuwer (2004) has compiled: from 1981 to 1991 there were 26 deaths, 35 deaths from 1992-2002, and 43 from 2003-2013 (5 of which occurred in 2013 alone). Since hazing is not tracked by any official statistics, he relied on published accounts of hazing such as newspaper articles and books (Nuwer, 2004). Nuwer (2004) also notes that these numbers only contain the known number of deaths that resulted from initiation-related activities. As we know, violence is unlikely to come to the attention of the criminal justice system unless it is reported (Felson & Paré, 2005). Thus, the study of factors influencing student willingness to report experienced hazing is needed in order to enact better policies and practices that will increase reporting rates, and in turn, hopefully reduce victimization rates.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

A wealth of literature exists on hazing in general; however, literature relating to the criminal aspect of hazing is limited in comparison (Hoover, 2012). Despite nearly every state having laws against hazing, the practice is rarely recognized as a criminal act (Schwartz, 2008), potentially explaining the lack of attention to the subject by criminologists. In the following sections, I will give an overview of the literature of three topics: hazing, reporting, and social bonding theory. It is important to provide a picture of what hazing is and how it is defined, groups in which hazing occurs, who is likely to get hazed, and some legal considerations of hazing. These trends as well as college crime reporting trends will be discussed in the following section. In the final section, I will introduce Hirschi's social bonding theory as the lens through which willingness to report hazing will be examined.

Hazing

One of the difficulties encountered when studying hazing is establishing a clear definition, which is even more difficult when one chooses to study an array of organizational types since definitions are typically geared toward specific groups (Pelletier, 2002). Evans (2013) provides the following definition: “[h]azing refers to the practice of established members of a group engaging in systematic and often ritualized abuse of new entrants to that group.” Finkel (2002) defines hazing as “committing acts against an individual or forcing an individual into committing an act in order for the individual to be initiated into or affiliated with an organization.”

Definitions must be created that are clear enough to be understood, but also inclusive enough to encompass all potential forms of hazing. Evans (2013) offers the

following examples: “physical beating, burning or branding, sexual assault, the forced consumption of foul or toxic substances, forced over-exercise and confinement in small spaces. Dangerous over-consumption of alcohol is often associated with all these practices.” Finkel (2002) relates the injuries sustained by hazing victims to those of domestic violence victims and provides the examples of: “irreversible intracranial damage, blunt intra-abdominal organ damage, third-degree burns, heat stroke, suffocation, aspiration, sexual assault, and death.” Drout and Corsoro (2003) state that hazing typically involves “risky behavior, such as intensive drinking, or potentially life-threatening activities.” No study has been done that reports the number of hazing-related injuries that are treated by emergency departments (Finkel, 2002). The preceding examples focus on the more severe forms of hazing; however, hazing ranges in severity (Schwartz, 2008). Also, these examples focus on the violent forms of hazing, which tend to be more common in hazing within male-dominated organizations; little attention is paid to the psychological forms of hazing that are more prevalent in hazing experienced by females (Johnson, 2011).

Since this study’s population of interest is composed of students at the University of Maryland, the definition of hazing that will be used is from the University Hazing Policy:

Hazing is a fundamental violation of human dignity. It is strictly prohibited at the University of Maryland - College Park. The University defines hazing as "intentionally or recklessly subjecting any person to the risk of bodily harm, or severe emotional distress, or causing or encouraging any person to commit an act that would be a violation of law or university regulations, for the purpose of

initiating, promoting, fostering, or confirming any form of affiliation with a student group or organization, as defined by the Code of Student Conduct. The express or implied consent of the victim will not be a defense. (“University Hazing Policy”, n.d.)

Of the research that has been done on hazing, the majority of relevant studies have focused on what hazing actually is rather than why it occurs (Hoover, 2012). Within this body of literature, there is a particular focus on its use as either a test of loyalty to a group or a means by which loyalty is established (Domingo, 2008; Hollmann, 2004; Hoover & Milner, 1998; Josefowitz & Gadon, 1989; Pelletier, 2002). Studies have also suggested that initiation activities serve the purpose of preserving group-relevant skills and attitudes (Keating, Pomerantz, Pommer, Ritt, Miller, & McCormick, 2005; Pelletier, 2002). An example of a group-relevant skill/attitude is the desire for members of an athletic team to display toughness. By putting an athlete through a physical hazing initiation, current members of the team can ensure that this potential member is tough enough to play on the team.

Evans (2013) suggests that there are 3 main purposes of hazing: to generate group solidarity, to express dominance, and to select group members who will be committed. Hazing can also serve some tight-knit groups by protecting them from intrusion by strangers (Josefowitz & Gadon, 1989). Some victims of hazing choose to leave the organization, while others stay and assume the role of abuser for future initiates (Evans, 2013; Montague, Zohra, Love, & McGee, 2008). Many who have experienced hazing condone the practice and see it as “work that needs to be completed” (Montague et al., 2008). In this context, “work” is comparable to an essay that must be completed as part of

a class. Students may not willingly write an essay on an assigned topic, but in order to pass the class, they are required to do so. Similarly, hazing must be endured in order to complete the rite of passage to become a full member of the organization.

Cimino (2013) presents four observable traits of hazing that help further explain the practice, hazing is: temporary, unidirectional, coercive, and coalitional. Hazing is temporary in nature in that the practice typically occurs during initiation rituals and is experienced by those attempting to gain entry into an organization. This plays into it being unidirectional, since the practice is directed only at individuals trying to join the organization. Pairing this with the heavy attention paid to testing loyalty, those who are already members of an organization have already proven their loyalty by enduring the practice before. Participating in the hazing of future members may be a demonstration of continued loyalty. Individuals who are hazed are often coerced into participating in the practice, thus it is inflicted upon these persons. Hazing is coalitional in the sense that the practice typically occurs within already existing groups of people, such as student organizations, professional sports teams, military groups, and street gangs. Also inherent in this notion is that these groups who haze have engaged in some type of action as a group in the past.

There are numerous types of organizations and institutions in which hazing has occurred, such as: Greek life (Evans, 2013; Finkel, 2002; Hollmann, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Montague et al., 2008; Pelletier, 2002), marching bands (Hollmann, 2004), spirit groups (Hollmann, 2004), high schools (Hollmann, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Pelletier, 2002), sports teams (Evans, 2013; Finkel, 2002; Hollmann, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Montague et al., 2008; Pelletier, 2002), criminal gangs (Evans, 2013; Finkel, 2002; Montague et al.,

2008), work groups (Hollmann, 2004), and the military (Evans, 2013; Finkel, 2002; Hollmann, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Montague et al., 2008; Pelletier, 2002). Hazing of freshmen was common practice at American universities approximately 100 years ago and dates back even further in European institutions (Ruffins & Evelyn, 1998). This leads some to point out that hazing as it pertains to rituals and initiation is not truly the problem; instead, the problem colleges and universities are facing is the increasing violence and secrecy surrounding the practice (Ruffins & Roach, 1997).

Officially, hazing has been banned by all national Greek organizations (Drout & Corsoro, 2003, Schwartz, 2008). However, banning the practice alone will not promote eradication. The practice has been taking place in Greek organizations for over 100 years now (Cokley, Miller, Cunningham, Motoike, King, & Awad, 2001). Some Greek organization members are aware of how long hazing has been a part of their organization's rituals and history and view continuing the practice as a way to honor tradition (Montague et al., 2008). Supporting this view are some alumni who may be strong proponents and advocates of hazing (Schwartz, 2008). One study found that when a student has an uncritically positive perception of Greek organizations, s/he will become more susceptible to hazing activities (Cokley et al., 2001). This may be why some pledges are said to volunteer to be hazed (Schwartz, 2008).

There have been two predominant literatures on fraternal hazing. The first focuses on violence associated with Black fraternal hazing, paying minimal attention to White fraternities (Schwartz, 2008). The second focuses on White fraternities and deals with sexual assault and aggressive practices (Schwartz, 2008). The empirical support for both lines of literature has been relatively weak (Schwartz, 2008). Another study suggests that

White fraternities tend to use alcohol and verbal abuse during hazing activities (Ruffins & Roach, 1997). This abuse of alcohol can lead to individual or group violence (Schwartz, 2008). Fraternities tend to promote conformity (Ruffins & Evelyn, 1998; Schwartz, 2008), embrace group secrecy, and express a strong concern with masculinity, making deterrence efforts difficult to implement successfully (Schwartz, 2008). However, making generalizations about all fraternities and their members is dangerous; for example, some fraternities and/or members may be more physically or sexually aggressive than others, leading to differential involvement in hazing and/or sexual assaults (Schwartz, 2008).

While the nature of athletic hazing does not stray far from the preceding overview of the hazing literature, there are a few findings and pieces of information unique to athletics that are worth mentioning. Like other students, student athletes may choose to leave the school as a result of hazing (Rosellini, 2000); however, for some athletes leaving a school may have implications for their future careers. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) took the same approach as national Greek organizations and banned hazing and mandated that guidelines be established to ensure it does not occur (Rosellini, 2000). However, a study by Alfred University found that 79 percent of athletes had either been hazed or participated in hazing other students (Suggs, 1999). This study also found that around two-thirds of all athletes surveyed had participated in non-violent hazing and about one-fourth participated in criminal activity. Female athletes were found to have participated in a roughly equal amount of non-violent hazing, but were approximately half as likely to participate in criminal activity. The NCAA

conducted a survey of athletes that showed that 80 percent endured some form of initiation onto their teams (Johnson, 2011).

There is considerable attention paid to Greek life as being predominant perpetrators of hazing, which may lead campus administrators to ignore other student organizations. Barton, Jensen, and Kaufman (2010) explain that the focus on Greek organizations stems from their role as a major source of community at most colleges and universities. They further explain that these organizations are typically associated with activities and lifestyles that tend to increase crime and victimization. However, the results of their study showed a significant, positive relationship between student groups in general and campus crime. This led to their suggestion that colleges and universities should provide oversight to all student organizations, instead of focusing on Greek organizations. An interesting question to consider is why students endure hazing rituals instead of choosing to walk away; however, the answer is likely different for every student and highly complex. Some researchers have attempted to provide rationale for why victims “choose” to not quit the initiation process. Parks and Southerland (2013) present several explanations. Students may not consider the potential for increased harm while experiencing hazing for the first time in an organization they seek to join. Some may believe that there are not appropriate opportunities to quit the process. Other students may be wary of potential consequences of quitting. Some students believe that if they endure the hazing just a short while longer, they will finally be a member.

Montague et al. (2008) identifies three categories of individuals who are hazed within fraternities and sororities: legitimization seekers, legacy seekers, and tunnel-light lookers. Legitimation seekers tend to be focused on how they are perceived by others and

therefore endure hazing because they are looking for a sense of belonging or operating on prior assumption about what Greek life is like. Legacy seekers are looking to join an organization because someone close to them was a member of the same organization. These individuals may be pressured into joining by those who were members or may see a sense of power in being a legacy; they tend to be willing to do whatever it takes to become a member of the organization. A tunnel-light looker would like to avoid hazing but can essentially see the light at the end of the tunnel, pushing him/her to stick it out just a little longer. Individuals who fall into this category have reached a point where they are only able to endure further hazing in hopes that the next incident that occurs will be the last. In considering these potential explanations, we must take care to not to place blame on the victim for not choosing to walk away.

Legally, there are two aspects of hazing that have implications for research on this topic: lack of uniformity among hazing statutes (Hollmann, 2004; Montague et al., 2008) and the consent of the victim. Hazing statutes vary greatly from state-to-state, with some passing laws that protect witnesses from facing charges (Pelletier, 2002), others criminalizing the failure to report hazing (Montague et al., 2008; Pelletier, 2002), and a few punishing the victims along with the offenders (Ruffins & Evelyn, 1998). There have even been cases where offending organizations counter-sued the victim for defamation (Ruffins & Evelyn, 1998). This inconsistency led to the creation of the Model Uniform Anti-Hazing Statute, but it has yet to be adopted across the country (Pelletier, 2002). Even if the states were to reduce the inconsistency among their statutes, there may be continued confusion about whether colleges and universities should handle hazing allegations and investigations in-house or rely on the state to handle such matters (Ball,

2004). Adding to the confusion and lack of reporting of hazing is the lack of a specific requirement that hazing be reported in federal crime statistics (Ball, 2004).

Parks and Southerland (2013) provide an in-depth discussion of how the notion of consent comes into play in the criminal justice system. In general, criminal law rejects victim consent as a defense in most cases. Civil law, however, permits this defense to be used. To address victim consent in hazing specifically, states have done the following with hazing statutes: 16 states have added provisions that explicitly ban the victim consent defense, some have stated that participation in hazing activity is assumed to be forced, and some have stated that consent is irrelevant in application of the charge. The efforts taken by these states are promising, so that even if a student “consents” to the hazing activity, it is still likely to be considered a crime (Hollmann, 2004). However, hazing continues to be underreported both to campus administrators and law enforcement, some explanations of which are discussed below.

Reporting

Criminologists have long been concerned with the issue of underreporting and its effect on official crime data, which has led to new techniques of data collection such as self-report and victimization surveys (Mosher et al., 2002). However, a thorough review and discussion of literature relating to this problem as it impacts the reporting of all crime types is outside the scope of this paper. Instead, I will focus on factors that are related to the underreporting of campus crime and hazing and draw comparisons to other interpersonal crimes such as domestic violence and sexual assault.

College and university campuses possess unique characteristics which make the study of campus crime difficult. The characteristics focused on in this paper are the

underreporting of campus crime and the lack of knowledge about how students decide to report crimes (Hart & Colavito, 2011). Previously, there has been reliance on official data to study campus crime, which resulted in a distorted picture of what was actually taking place (Henson & Stone, 1999). On campuses, there typically exists among students a common network of friends and a shared social group; if a crime were to happen within this network or social group, it would likely go unreported (Gibbons, 2008). A potential reasoning for this failure to report is that the relational distance between the victim and the offender is relatively small, such as if the victim and offender share a close mutual friend or are friends themselves (Felson & Paré, 2005). However, if a crime does get reported to campus officials, the college/university may opt to handle the matter itself instead of involving law enforcement (Gibbons, 2008). When this occurs, the crimes may go unreported in official campus crime statistics (Ball, 2004), making these data less useful (Felson & Paré, 2005).

With hazing in particular, the secrecy it is shrouded in often leads to a lack of awareness by both campus administrators and law enforcement who have the influence to disrupt such activities (Domingo, 2008; Felson & Paré, 2005). This lack of awareness leaves hazing largely unseen and it is presumed that the majority goes unreported (Hoover, 2012). Victims may decide not to report their experience due to a variety of reasons, including: loyalty (Pelletier, 2002), a sense of shame involved in the experience (Domingo, 2008), justified fear of retribution (Evans, 2013), fear of being implicated in illegal hazing behavior (Pelletier, 2002), potential loss of membership in organization (Domingo, 2008), protecting organization from discipline (Finkel, 2002), and/or to gain respect and status within the organization (Parks, Jones, & Hughey, 2013), leading to

acceptance by other members (Pelletier, 2002). Some individuals get hurt during initiation rituals and, despite the severity, the hazing will likely go unreported. Individuals with low-severity injuries are unlikely to seek medical attention; for those with more severe injuries who do seek medical attention, they may not accurately disclose how the injuries were sustained (Finkel, 2002). These injuries may then act as a badge of honor for the individual (Ruffins & Roach, 1997).

Pledges who are joining organizations of high prestige may be more willing to tolerate hazing because becoming a member of such a prestigious organization will enhance the pledge's self-esteem (Parks & Southerland, 2013). During the hazing process, the pledge may actually gain a deeper understanding of him/herself (Parks & Southerland, 2013). If the pledge were to report this process, s/he may be forced to relinquish that understanding as it may be challenged during the investigation into the matter. Signs of hazing are not always clear, making it difficult to discern if someone has truly been a victim of hazing or if they just made a poor choice (Ruffins & Roach, 1997). Victims who are aware that officials may not perceive them as true victims may therefore be reluctant to report their experiences.

In some ways, hazing shares characteristics of the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault. One direct way is the use of sexual assault as a hazing technique. Like hazing, most incidents of domestic violence and sexual assault are not reported to the police. This leads to the crimes being hidden from society's view (Felson & Paré, 2005; Frieze & Browne, 1989; Herzberger, 1996; Pagelow, 1984). Felson and Paré (2005) discuss reasons attributed to the reluctance to report incidents of domestic violence and/or sexual assault, including: fear of retaliation, concerns about the privacy of the situation,

desire to protect the offender, belief that law enforcement will not take the report seriously, and financial and psychological dependence on the offender. Bachman (1998) points out that if crimes such as sexual assault go unreported and therefore unsanctioned, a potential reduction in perceived likelihood of punishment may result. Many of these reasons also apply to hazing victims. Victims of these crimes fear that the offender may retaliate if the crime is reported. The anticipated violence associated with retaliation may be worse than continuing to endure the current victimization. This is related to the belief of victims that law enforcement may not appropriately handle the situation. This likely stems from a general lack of confidence in the criminal justice system, especially when this system assigns the blame to the victim instead of the offender (Felson & Paré, 2005).

While not reporting hazing victimization should not be considered as a deviant act itself, applying a theory of deviance may help us better understand the factors influencing a victim's decision. Given the collegiate context of this study, a theory of deviance should include measures of multiple aspects of the college experience. With this in mind, social bonding theory will be used to guide this research as it contains measures of aspects such as the family, the school, education, occupation, societal norms, and laws.

Social Bonding Theory

Twenty years ago, Akers (1994) stated that Hirschi's (1969) control theory was the most frequently tested and discussed criminological theory, serving as the "dominant theory of criminal and delinquent behavior" at the time. Akers (1973) established what has become the common name for this theory: social bonding. According to social bonding theory, deviant conduct is more likely to occur when social bonds to conventional society are weak. These bonds are considered weak when there is: poor

attachment to others, a lack of *commitment* to a conventional lifestyle, low *involvement* in conventional activities, and a low endorsement of conventional moral *belief* (Hirschi, 1969). Empirical research supports the relationship between social bonds and crime (Longshore et al., 2004); however, as Kempf (1993) notes, the majority of early research supporting this relationship pertained to juveniles. The theory's explanatory value has been described as good or moderate (Gardner & Shoemaker, 1989). Hirschi (2004) proposed the inclusion of an evaluation of costs into tests of social bonding theory, where the more bonds an individual had, the higher the cost would be to participate in deviant behavior (Intravia, Jones, & Piquero, 2012). The following sections will discuss how social bonding theory may apply to the underreporting of hazing.

Attachment.

Attachment pertains to the emotional ties that an individual has to significant others. The notion here is that the individual is seeking to avoid disapproval of significant others by avoiding delinquency. Since early research focused on juveniles, attachment was commonly linked to parents and schools. The traditional college student is in the age category labeled adolescence, which falls between childhood and adulthood. Measuring attachment to parents is appropriate largely because these students are likely not yet fully autonomous. Many college students live with their parents during periods when school is not in session. Some also rely on their parents for financial and emotional support. Parental relationships tend to serve as conventional attachments. Although some have questioned a continuing influence of parents during the college years (Agnew, 1985), others have demonstrated that the influence that parents have on teaching their children

socially acceptable behavior does not disappear as children enter college (Wiatrowski, Griswold, & Roberts, 1981).

The second aspect that studies have traditionally focused on is attachment to school through measurements of attitudes toward school in general and academic achievement (Wiatrowski et al., 1981). Jenkins (1997) measured student opinion about relationships with teachers and opinions toward the school itself. Marcos and colleagues (1986) point out that Hirschi's original model did not clearly differentiate school attachment from involvement and commitment. This could lead to redundancy in measurements of different elements of the bonds, which makes those measurements less reliable. In their study, Marcos et al. (1986) propose to look at attachment to school from a broader lens, "incorporating both attitudes and behavior related to present and future schooling."

The attachment to peers in relation to predicting delinquency has also been a suggested domain to measure to include in this element. Hirschi's (1969) original study included such measurements. Initially, simply having an attachment to peers was seen as an inhibitor to delinquency, no matter the peers' involvement in delinquency. However, selecting deviant peers is now seen as a form of delinquency (Chapple, 2005; Evans, Cullen, Burton, Dunaway, & Benson, 1997; Longshore et al., 2004). The studies that have been conducted relating to peer attachment have supported that the deviance of the peers needs to be taken into account. These studies have found strong correlations between deviant peers and delinquency (Akers, 1994; Krohn, Massey, Skinner, & Lauer, 1983; Longshore et al., 2004; Marcos, Bahr, & Johnson, 1986).

For the present study, attachment to parents and the school will be measured. Since delinquency has been highly correlated with attachment to deviant peers, this study will follow Marcos et al. (1986) and focus on attachment to conventional others rather than to peers.

Commitment.

Commitment refers to investment of time and energy put into conventional activities. Common conventional activities tend to include getting an education, getting married, or being employed. Measurements of the element take into account present conventional activities as well as anticipated ones (Krohn et al., 1983). Individuals who are committed to conventional activities refrain from deviance in order to protect current and future stakes in conformity that have been established. Since much of the research that has been conducted using social bonding theory has focused on juveniles, commitment has measured occupational aspirations and plans to attend college (see Agnew, 1985). Respondents for this study are already enrolled in college, so the measurement will shift to their attitude toward their current education and plans to continue their education.

Commitment to school has been found to be related to non-delinquent behavior (Hirschi, 1969; Krohn & Massey, 1980; Wiatrowski et al., 1981). Hirschi (1969) saw this element as the rational component wherein a kind of cost/benefit analysis took place. He suggested that people who obey rules of society do so out of fear of the consequences of breaking them. Personal ambition and aspiration also play an important role, explaining why commitment to future conventional activities should be taken into account. The

commitments to academic and occupational aspirations serve as “passages to adult status” (Hirschi, 1969).

This study will measure student commitment to education and occupation, including the aspirational aspect.

Involvement.

Involvement refers to the amount of time an individual spends engaged in conventional activities. The concept here is that if a person remains busy with activities, s/he will not have time to engage in deviant behavior. Some researchers have excluded this element altogether (Intravia et al., 2012) or combined it with other elements of the bond (Conger, 1976; Hindelang, 1973; Krohn et al, 1983). Krohn and Massey (1980) view involvement as the “temporal dimension” of commitment. Their rationale is that individuals who are highly involved in an activity are likely to also be highly committed. This is similar to Marcos et al. (1986) who combine educational involvement and commitment to measure educational attachment. Longshore et al. (2004) approached this element as involvement in “a conventional lifestyle,” looking at length of employment, marriage, and cohabitation. Jenkins (1997) focused solely on a student’s involvement with school.

In this study, involvement will also be treated as the temporal aspect of commitment, and therefore will not be directly measured.

Belief.

Belief refers to the acceptance of a conventional value system, such as rules and laws of society. If an individual does not have a strong belief in such a system, s/he will feel less obligation to abide by the established rules and laws. Researchers have

approached the measurement of this element in different ways. Krohn and Massey (1980) looked at belief in parental and legal norms as well as value in education. Hart and Mueller (2013) focused on social norms relating to occupation, family, friendship, and education. Durkin, Wolfe, and Clark (1999) measured belief by looking into respect for authority and acceptance of conventional beliefs. Agnew (1985) measured how much individuals agreed that being honest was important.

Taking into account previous studies and the population of interest, this study will measure belief in the University's conventional value system and respect for the norms and laws of conventional society. This will ensure that measurements of belief do not overlap with measurements of other elements of the bond.

The Present Study

The present study will employ Hirschi's (1969) social control theory to explore the predictive power of the social bond on the reporting of hazing. This focus will be driven by the question: Why do students report hazing? I predict that a strong social bond will be related to a greater stated willingness to report hazing. Conversely, students with weak social bonds will be less willing to report such incidents. Hirschi's theory pertains to the perpetration of deviant behavior, while this study will focus on the reporting of experienced deviant behavior. Thus, his theory cannot be applied exactly as was originally intended. Instead, this study will investigate if this theory of deviance can be used to explain reporting behavior. To guide this investigation, I will test the following hypotheses:

1. Each separate social bond scale value will be higher for respondents who state that they would report a hazing experience.

2. The sum of the social bond scales will be higher for respondents who state that they would report a hazing experience.

This thesis also intends to determine if a respondent's propensity to report experiences of hazing can be predicted using these social bond scales.

Chapter 3: Methods

This study employed the use of a survey that was developed to measure the attachment, commitment, and belief elements of Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory. The survey was administered to students at the University of Maryland during Summer Sessions I and II of 2014, resulting in a final sample size of 56. Due to the binary nature of the dependent variables, logistic regression was used for analysis. The following sections provide more detail on the sample, the survey, and the analytical techniques used.

Sample Selection and Demographics

The sample for this study was obtained at the University of Maryland – College Park. Participants were enrolled in courses selected not-at-random using an electronic master list of all courses being offered during the summer of 2014 (Testudo). Classes were initially selected because they belonged to the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (initial considerations included: African American Studies, Criminology and Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Sociology). However, enrollment numbers in many of these courses were low and several were being offered online, requiring the inclusion of courses outside of the college. I went through the course offerings alphabetically until I reached a discipline that offered multiple potential courses during the summer of 2014 (Communication). I contacted fifteen instructors via my university-associated E-Mail address, using a standardized request, as mandated by the Institutional Review Board (see Appendix B). In short, this request indicated my affiliation with the institution, the purpose of my study, a brief overview of my study, and my request to distribute surveys to their students. I was granted permission to distribute my survey in eight courses.

However, I was not able to do so in two courses because one course did not have any current students enrolled and the instructor of the second failed to respond to several follow-up E-Mails to decide on a date for the distribution.

The six courses in which I was able to distribute my survey were offered by the Criminology and Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Communication departments. According to Testudo, there were 100 total students enrolled in these courses; however, the total number of students present on the day that I distributed my survey in each class was 71. Out of these 71 students, only 56 completed the survey (response rate of approximately 56% of enrolled students and 79% of students attending class on the survey date). Important to note is that for two of the courses, students were not allowed to complete the surveys in-class. In my standardized e-mail to course instructors, I indicated that the survey should not take longer than 20 minutes for students to complete. However, upon arrival at two course locations, the instructors informed me that I would be able to distribute my survey to the students, but the students would not be able to complete it during class. These were the only two courses that I did not have a 100% response rate in. Additionally, for one of these courses, I returned to the class twice after the initial distribution in order to collect completed surveys (this was at the request of the students). Demographic statistics are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Gender	
Male	55.4%
Female	42.9
Other	1.8
Race	
White	44.6%
Asian	23.2
Black	21.4
Other	10.7
Classification	
Freshman	5.4%
Sophomore	19.6
Junior	33.9
Senior	41.1
Transfer	
Yes	55.4%
No	44.6
Organization Member	
Yes	51.8%
No	48.2
Age	21.6 (mean)

Note: N = 56

Data Collection Procedure

Before distributing the surveys to students in a course, I read to them a standardized introduction script required by the Institutional Review Board (see Appendix D). In this script, I introduced myself and my purpose as well as giving instructions on how to complete the survey. I reiterated to the students that participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain confidential should they choose to participate. I passed out informed consent forms and gave students time to read over the document and sign. After collecting the completed forms, I distributed the survey as well as a blank copy of the informed consent form that I told students to keep in case they had any concerns at a later point in time. By collecting the completed informed consent forms separately, I was able to better ensure confidentiality since these forms were not collected

in conjunction with the completed surveys. Thus, I was unable to identify which student had completed which survey. After all students appeared to have completed the survey, I collected them and thanked the students and instructors for their time.

Measures

Dependent variables.

Four binary dependent variables were measured in the survey: LikeWilliam, LikeAbigail, WilliamSim, and AbigailSim. These variables were measured using two vignettes - one detailing a situation in which William was involved, the other in which Abigail was involved. Both situations were created for the purpose of this study; William and Abigail do not represent actual hazing victims and any similarities are purely coincidental. These vignettes were placed at the end of the survey and were each followed by several questions, two of which all students could answer (per vignette).

Respondents were first presented with the vignette of William:

William recently joined a student organization at the University of Maryland. Before becoming a member, the current members of the organization required him to approach each member and ask them to punch him in the face. After each member had punched him, William had to go to the Health Center to have several deep cuts and bruises tended to. He did not tell the nurse or any other campus official about the cause of his injuries.

After reading this scenario, respondents were presented with the following question: “If you were William, would you have told campus officials about what you were required to do?” Responses to this question are used to measure dependent variable LikeWilliam. William’s experience can be classified as a violent form of hazing, which is

both a violation of university policy and state law. The student's response should be indicative of whether or not s/he feels that violent hazing should be reported. All students are able to answer this question. This question is followed by: "During your time here at the University of Maryland, have you experienced a similar situation?" This question is used to measure if the respondent has experienced violent hazing, instead of explicitly asking if s/he has been a victim of hazing. The response was recorded in WilliamSim. Both of these questions provided the answer options "Yes" or "No."

If a respondent indicates that s/he has experienced a situation that was similar to the one William did, s/he is asked several follow up questions. The first three of these measured if the student reported the hazing to anyone, whether that person served in a professional capacity at the University or was a confidante. The questions were: "Did you tell the campus police?" "Did you tell a campus official? Common examples of campus officials are: Health Center nurses, resident assistants, and Office of Student Conduct employees," and "Did you tell friends, family members, or significant others?" These three questions also gave "Yes" or "No" as response options. Finally, these three reporting questions were followed by a question investigating why the student chose not to tell anyone: "If you answered 'No' to question a, b, or c above, why did you choose not to tell?" Respondents were given the following options, and asked to circle all options that applied: "Injuries not serious enough," "Embarrassed," "Didn't want to get friends in trouble," "Part of becoming a member," "Didn't want to risk membership," "Afraid organization would find out I told someone," "Didn't know who to tell," "Private or personal matter," and "Didn't want to experience retaliation." These provided reasons are

based on literature previously discussed and attempts to provide the most common explanations for why a hazing victim chooses not to report the crime.

Respondents were then presented with the vignette of Abigail:

Abigail recently joined a student organization at the University of Maryland. During the process of becoming a member, other students who were already members required her to consume a large amount of alcohol. She ended up passing out and being transported to the hospital. The Office of Student Conduct scheduled a meeting with Abigail to talk about her transport to the hospital. During this meeting, she told a staff member that she drank so much as part of the process to join an organization on campus.

Following this scenario, respondents were presented essentially the same questions (William's name was replaced for Abigail's). Abigail's situation did not involve the physical, violent hazing that William's did. This scenario was presented as a nonviolent form of hazing so as to compare student thoughts on reporting hazing of different degrees of violence. Two different options for why someone who experienced this form of hazing in the past chose not to report are offered: "Not serious enough" and "No injuries". The option of "Injuries not serious enough" was removed.

Independent variables.

The survey used in this study was primarily composed of questions that attempted to measure three of the four components of the social bond: attachment, commitment, and belief. In total, 35 questions measured these constructs. While factor analysis has been used in past studies to identify the number of distinct factors present in the scale and standardizing variable scores (e.g. Krohn et al., 1983; Marcos et al., 1986), this method

could not be used for this study due to the small sample number. However, Marcos et al. (1986) created two scales for each construct, one that was calculated using factor analysis and another by simply summing all of the measurements. Their results were nearly identical, with the correlations between the scales differing by only .02. Considering that my scales do not contain an equal number of items, I calculated the average of the responses within each scale. This forced all values to fall between 0 and 5 so as to not allow any scale to contribute disproportionately when all of the scales were summed.

To measure each item in the following scales, I presented respondents with a statement and asked them to indicate how much they agree with that statement using a 6-point Likert scale. The following options were provided: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Respondents were purposefully not provided with a “Neutral” or “No Response” option. This decision was made based on Krosnick and Fabrigar’s (1997) conclusion that offering such an option may reduce data quality due to satisficing. Krosnick (1991) suggests that satisficing occurs when a respondent loses his/her motivation to reach the “optimal answer” that the researcher is looking for and instead provides only a satisfactory response, such as a neutral option. Due to the length of the survey used in this study and lack of benefits for the respondent for completion or participation, satisficing was of particular concern. By removing the neutral option, the respondent is not able to select a satisfactory answer such as neutral and avoid forming opinions of the statements (Krosnick & Fabrigar, 1997). Krosnick (1991) also warned about respondents selecting one or two ratings for a sequence of questions using the same scale. This was a concern for my survey since all of the following scales were measured using the same response scale. In order to avoid

satisficing in this manner, I worded some items in the scales negatively. When coding the surveys, these negatively-worded statements were scored in reverse.

Maternal Attachment is the average of responses to four statements: “When I have a problem, I can talk to my mother about it” (Durkin et al., 1999; Intravia et al., 2012; Marcos et al., 1986), “I would never ask my mother for advice” (Intravia et al., 2012), “I can share my thoughts and feelings with my mother” (Durkin et al., 1999; Krohn et al., 1983; Massey & Krohn, 1986), and “I talk about future plans with my mother” (Durkin et al., 1999). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .92.

Paternal Attachment is the average of responses to five statements: “When I have a problem, I can talk to my father about it” (Durkin et al., 1999; Intravia et al., 2012; Marcos et al., 1986), “I would never ask my father for advice” (Intravia et al., 2012), “I can share my thoughts and feelings with my father” (Durkin et al., 1999; Krohn et al., 1983; Massey & Krohn, 1986), “I talk about future plans with my father” (Durkin et al., 1999), and “I desire to be like my father.” The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .93.

Some studies either measure maternal and paternal attachments as one construct (e.g. Durkin et al., 1999; Marcos et al., 1986) or combine the two measures during analysis (e.g. Krohn et al., 1983). I chose to measure these two constructs separately and include them as separate scales in my model, much like Intravia et al. (2011). Table 2 shows the correlations among the items in each scale. The Spearman correlations between the maternal attachment scale items and paternal attachment scale items are shaded. As can be seen from this table, the r_s values for the correlations between maternal and paternal factors range in strength from very weak (.02) to moderate (.55) and vary in terms of significance.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix for Maternal and Paternal Attachment Scale Items

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.MProb	1.00								
2.MAdvice	.72**	1.00							
3.MThoughts	.86**	.77**	1.00						
4.MFuture	.59**	.74**	.67**	1.00					
5.PProb	.41**	.36**	.48**	.19	1.00				
6.PAdvice	.30*	.42**	.33*	.21	.78**	1.00			
7.PThoughts	.47**	.44**	.55**	.25	.87**	.75**	1.00		
8.PFuture	.21	.35**	.25	.32*	.65**	.68**	.66**	1.00	
9.PDesire	.13	.15	.10	.02	.63**	.73**	.66**	.72**	1.00

Note: N = 56 *p<.05; **p<.01

School Attachment is the average of responses to 2 statements: “UMD is the right school for me” and “I wish that I would have gone to another school” (Jenkins, 1997). The Cronbach’s alpha score for this scale was .94.

Educational Commitment is the average of responses to 8 statements: “I don’t care if my homework is done correctly or not” (Massey & Krohn, 1986), “Getting good grades is important to me” (Durkin et al., 1999; Intravia et al., 2012; Jenkins, 1997; Marcos et al., 1986), “None of my classes are important” (Jenkins, 1997), “It is important to me that I always attend class” (Durkin et al., 1999), “I try hard in school” (Durkin et al., 1999; Intravia et al., 2012), “I plan to continue my education once I graduate by attending graduate school or taking more classes” (Jenkins, 1997; Krohn et al., 1983; Marcos et al., 1986; Massey & Krohn, 1986), “I am proud to be in college,” and “Getting an education is important” (Jenkins, 1997). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .89.

Occupational Commitment is the average of responses to 2 statements: “I know what type of job I want to have one day” and “I have no idea what kind of career I want.” The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .89.

School Belief is the average of responses to 7 statements: “The University’s policies are fair,” “All students are treated fairly by professors and staff,” “Some students are treated better than others by professors and staff,” “The punishments for breaking rules are the same at this school no matter who you are,” “People of all races are treated equitably at this school,” “People at this university are treated equally, no matter their gender,” and “People of a certain gender are treated better on this campus by professors and staff.” All questions were derived from Jenkins (1997). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .88.

Norm and Law Belief is the average of responses to 7 statements: “It is okay to sneak into a movie or ballgame without paying” (Marcos et al., 1986), “It is important to pay for everything taken from a store” (Marcos et al., 1986), “I have a lot of respect for campus police officers” (Durkin et al., 1999), “University policies exist to protect students,” “I have a lot of respect for local police” (Durkin et al., 1999), “It is important to try to obey the law” (Marcos et al., 1986), and “It is okay to steal a bicycle if I won’t get caught” (Marcos et al., 1986). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .85.

Summated Social Bond Scale is the summation of each of the 7 preceding averages. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was calculated including all of the preceding variables, for a value of .92.

Table 3 is a correlation matrix showing the correlations between the dependent and independent variables used during analysis. The two dependent variables show a moderate, statistically significant, and positive relationship. All independent variables are positively correlated. This was anticipated and desired as all of the scales are measuring elements of the social bond. While the coefficients vary for each correlation, the strength of the relationship of those that were determined to be statistically significant were

moderate to strong. These positive correlations provide support to the validity of my measures.

Table 3. Pair-Wise Correlations for Variables in Study

	DV1	DV2	IV1	IV2	IV3	IV4	IV5	IV6	IV7	IV8
DV1	1.00									
DV2	.50 ^{t**}	1.00 ^t								
IV1	.22	.17 ^t	1.00							
IV2	-.11	-.07 ^t	.29 [*]	1.00						
IV3	-.17	-.19 ^t	.04	.23	1.00					
IV4	.16	.19 ^t	.49 ^{**}	.16	.15	1.00				
IV5	-.09	-.06 ^t	.20	.14	.35 ^{**}	.12	1.00			
IV6	-.17	-.11 ^t	.17	.22	.47 ^{**}	.14	.19	1.00		
IV7	.23	.01 ^t	.50 ^{**}	.16	.17	.67 ^{**}	.16	.26	1.00	
IV8	-.02	-.04 ^t	.63 ^{**}	.60 ^{**}	.62 ^{**}	.58 ^{**}	.52 ^{**}	.59 ^{**}	.62 ^{**}	1.00

Note: N = 56, unless marked with ^t, in which case n = 54

*p<.05; **p<.01; DV1 = Tell campus official (William); DV2 = Tell campus official (Abigail); IV1 = maternal attachment; IV2 = paternal attachment; IV3 = school attachment; IV4 = educational commitment; IV5 = occupational commitment; IV6 = school belief; IV7 = norm and law belief IV8 = summed scale averages

Table 4 provides summary statistics for the independent variables. For each variable, the mean response is provided along with range and standard deviation.

Table 4. Summary Statistics for Independent Variables

Scale	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Maternal Attachment	3.79	1.14	.25	5
Paternal Attachment	3.34	1.31	0.00	5
School Attachment	3.74	1.26	0.00	5
Educational Commitment	4.10	.75	.38	5
Occupational Commitment	4.18	.96	1.00	5
School Belief	3.21	.93	1.14	5
Norm and Law Belief	3.73	.75	.71	5
Summated Social Bond	26.09	4.23	16.03	35

Note: N = 56

Control variables.

This study used two control variables: gender and race. Previous studies indicate that gender plays a role in predicting likelihood of reporting of crimes such as domestic violence and sexual assault, with female victims being particularly reluctant to report

(Belknap, 2001; Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Felson, Messner, Hoskin, & Deane, 2002; Felson & Pare, 2005; Frieze & Browne, 1989; Herzberger, 1996; Pagelow, 1984). Felson et al. (2002) found that of incidents not reported to the police, 57.9% of the victims were male, suggesting that males are as likely to not report domestic violence victimization. Hart and Rennison (2003) concluded that violent incidents involving women were more likely to be reported to the police. Baumer and Lauritsen (2010) found that males were less likely to report violent victimization of any type.

Felson et al. (2002) also found that of the incidents not reported, 8.7% of the victims were Black. These results are in line with studies finding that Black victims are more likely than White victims to report violent victimization to the police (Avakame, Fyfe, & McCoy, 1999; Bachman, 1998; Felson, Messner, & Hoskin, 1999; Felson et al., 2002; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Hart and Rennison, 2003). Contrary to these findings, Dugan (2003) found that White victims were the most likely to report victimization in domestic violence incidents. Baumer and Lauritsen (2010) found that for overall violent victimization, Blacks had an increased likelihood of notifying the police; however, for rape and sexual assault, there was a decreased likelihood of Blacks reporting victimization. For my study, race was coded into 2 variables: Black and Asian.

Analysis

Two dependent variables were dropped from analysis due to a lack of variation in responses. Only one student reported having an experience similar to William's. Three students reported experiencing something similar to the Abigail vignette. For the two dependent variables I included in the analysis, I first conducted t-tests to determine if the scale averages differed between students who responded "Yes" or "No" to willingness to

report an experience similar to those presented. Since my dependent variables are binary, I then used STATA to create logistic regression models (LRM) to analyze the effects of the social bond scales on whether the respondent would have reported the event that occurred if s/he was William or Abigail. This is appropriate given the binary nature of the dependent variables, which cannot be assumed to be linear.

In total, I tested four models. In the first two, each social bond scale was included separately. For the third and fourth, the scales were condensed into a single variable. The unrestricted models constructed were:

$$[1] \text{ P(LikeWilliam}=1) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{MAScaleSum} + \beta_3 \text{PAScaleSum} + \beta_4 \text{SAScaleSum} + \beta_5 \text{ECScaleSum} + \beta_6 \text{OCScaleSum} + \beta_7 \text{SBScaleSum} + \beta_8 \text{NLBScaleSum} + \text{Controls}$$

$$[2] \text{ P(LikeAbigail}=1) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{MAScaleSum} + \beta_3 \text{PAScaleSum} + \beta_4 \text{SAScaleSum} + \beta_5 \text{ECScaleSum} + \beta_6 \text{OCScaleSum} + \beta_7 \text{SBScaleSum} + \beta_8 \text{NLBScaleSum} + \text{Controls}$$

$$[3] \text{ P(LikeWilliam}=1) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{SocialBondAvgSum} + \text{Controls}$$

$$[4] \text{ P(LikeAbigail}=1) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{SocialBondAvgSum} + \text{Controls}$$

Chapter 4: Results

Tables 5 and 6 contain the summary statistics for the two dependent variables used and the cross-tabulation of the two, respectively. Two students did not provide a response as to whether they would report experiencing a situation similar to the Abigail vignette. The proportion of respondents responding “Yes” to either dependent variable was nearly identical, with 59% for the William vignette and 61% for the Abigail vignette. From the cross tabulation, we can see that a respondent’s response to one dependent variable was likely to predict his/her response to the second, since nearly 76% of respondents provided consistent answers across the two questions.

Table 5. Summary Statistics for Dependent Variables

Variable	N	Mean	SD
LikeWilliam	56	.59	.50
LikeAbigail	54	.61	.49

Table 6. Cross-Tabulation of Dependent Variables

		LikeAbigail		Total
		No	Yes	
LikeWilliam	No	15	7	22
	Yes	6	26	32
	Total	21	33	54

Note: Pearson’s $\chi^2 = p < .000$

To evaluate whether differences existed between the social bond scale averages for respondents who responded “Yes” and “No” to the William vignette, t-tests were conducted; the results are presented in Table 7. These results indicate that no difference was statistically significant, showing no difference in means.

Table 7. T-Tests of Social Bond Scales Between Yes and No Responses for William Vignette

Scale	Responded "Yes"	Responded "No"	Difference
Maternal Attachment	4.00	3.49	.51
Paternal Attachment	3.22	3.51	-.29
School Attachment	3.56	4.00	-.44
Educational Commitment	4.20	3.96	.24
Occupational Commitment	4.10	4.28	-.18
School Belief	3.07	3.40	-.33
Norm and Law Belief	3.87	3.53	.34
Sum of Scale Averages	26.03	26.17	-.14

Note: N = 56; no t-test with $p < .05$

Table 8 contains the results of the t-tests conducted to investigate any differences between the scale averages for respondents who responded "Yes" and those who responded "No" to the Abigail vignette. As with the previous t-tests, no support was found to suggest that a statistically significant difference existed between the scale averages for the two responses.

Table 8. T-Tests of Social Bond Scales Between Yes and No Responses for Abigail Vignette

Scale	Responded "Yes"	Responded "No"	Difference
Maternal Attachment	3.97	3.57	.40
Paternal Attachment	3.29	3.48	-.19
School Attachment	3.56	4.07	-.51
Educational Commitment	4.23	3.93	.30
Occupational Commitment	4.12	4.24	-.12
School Belief	3.14	3.35	-.21
Norm and Law Belief	3.74	3.71	.03
Sum of Scale Averages	26.05	26.36	-.31

Note: N = 54; no t-test with $p < .05$

Table 9 shows the coefficient and odds ratio values for the William Vignette unrestricted model. No variable was found to have a statistically significant relationship with LikeWilliam. A comparison of the restricted and unrestricted models resulted in a χ^2 of 3.58 with a p-value of .311. This suggests that including the variables Gender, Black, and Asian does not improve the ability to predict whether a student would report hazing if s/he was faced with a situation similar to that of William.

Table 9. Coefficients and Odds Ratios for William Vignette Unrestricted Model

Variable	Coefficient	SE	Odds Ratio	SE
MAScaleAvg	.59	.42	1.80	.75
PAScaleAvg	-.29	.33	.75	.24
SAScaleAvg	-.08	.32	.92	.30
ECScaleAvg	-.10	.78	.90	.70
OCScaleAvg	-.32	.40	.73	.29
SBScaleAvg	-.93	.52	.39	.20
NLBScaleAvg	1.36	.75	3.90	2.92
Gender	-.12	.71	.89	.63
Black	-1.17	.84	.31	.26
Asian	.80	.90	2.23	2.01

Note: No variable was statistically significant at $p < .05$; $n = 56$; log likelihood = -30.35; $\text{prob} > \chi^2 = .13$

Table 10 shows the coefficient and odds ratio values for the Abigail Vignette unrestricted model. The control variable Black was found to have a significant relationship with the LikeAbigail dependent variable, at the $p < .05$ level. A comparison of the restricted and unrestricted models resulted in a χ^2 of 11.67 with a p-value of .009. This suggests that including the variables Gender, Black, and Asian does improve the ability to predict whether a student would report hazing if s/he was faced with a situation similar to that of Abigail either.

Table 10. Coefficients and Odds Ratios for Abigail Vignette Unrestricted Model

Variable	Coefficient	SE	Odds Ratio	SE
MAScaleAvg	.78	.45	2.17	.98
PAScaleAvg	-.06	.29	.94	.27
SAScaleAvg	-.31	.36	.74	.27
ECScaleAvg	.58	.68	1.80	1.22
OCScaleAvg	-.15	.39	.86	.34
SBScaleAvg	-.73	.51	.48	.25
NLBScaleAvg	-.26	.70	.77	.54
Gender	-.61	.77	.54	.42
Black	-1.91*	.95	.15*	.15
Asian	2.47	1.35	11.87	16.00

Note: * $p < .05$; $n = 54$; log likelihood = -26.55; $\text{prob} > \chi^2 = .04$

Finally, I used the summated social bond scale along with the Gender, Black, and Asian control variables to predict the outcomes of LikeWilliam and LikeAbigail. No coefficients in these models were statistically significant.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the applicability of social bonding theory to predicting a college student's willingness to report experienced hazing. Before interpreting the results, it is important to address several limitations of this study. The sample introduces several constraints which limits the generalizability and reliability of the findings. The sample size ($n = 56$) is small, and originates from only one university. The size of the sample restricted the type of data analysis that could be run; for example, factor analysis could not be performed. Additionally, the sample was composed of students enrolled in summer courses. As the majority of students do not take these courses, it may be reasonable to assume that the students who do are different from the students who do not. The average age of the sample was 21.6, which is at the end of the range that is typically referred to when talking about traditional college students. Half of the respondents transferred to the university. The high average age and percentage of transfer students may suggest that the students did not have the opportunity to become a member of an organization, in which hazing might have taken place. Since the students were asked to only include hazing experienced at the University of Maryland, the lack of variance in the two dropped dependent variables is not surprising. These students might have experienced hazing at a previous institution, which they did not report due to my limiting of their reference period. As mentioned in the literature review, some students may leave an institution as a result of hazing, so a question asking if the respondents transferred as a result might have been useful. If respondents did transfer as a result of being hazed, their willingness to report hazing could have reasonably been impacted. It

may also be reasonable to assume that students at the University at Maryland are different from students at other universities, therefore the findings would not apply to them.

If we draw from Allan and Madden's (2008) study that suggests that 55% of students in organizations are hazed, we would expect that 16 students in my study would have been hazed. However, only 4 students reported having experiences similar to William or Abigail. This discrepancy might be explained by how hazing experiences were measured by this study. The use of vignettes avoided the difficulty of defining hazing to respondents. However, it is uncertain what effect not labeling the experiences as hazing had on responses. One possibility is that by not explicitly using the term, the rate of disclosure increased. Labeling the events as hazing could have introduced the stigma of being hazed to the respondents and discouraged them from honestly responding. On the other hand, by not labeling the experiences as hazing, the respondents might not have thought of the experiences as such, resulting in a lower disclosure rate. Additionally, using only two vignettes limited the types of hazing that could be recorded since the questions asking respondents to disclose their hazing victimization were tied to these vignettes. Creating more vignettes could more accurately measure the wide variety of activities that could be considered hazing. Future studies should investigate the effect of explicitly labeling activities as hazing along with the use of a variety of vignettes.

Willingness to report was rather consistent between the William and Abigail experiences. For those who stated that they would not report an experience such as William's, 15 also said they would not report an experience such as Abigail's. For those who stated they would report an experience such as William's, 26 said they would also report an experience like Abigail's. Combined, 76% of respondents responded

consistently between the two scenarios. This result may suggest that willingness to report was not dependent on the severity of the incident. However, this must be interpreted with caution as the instrument used measured intentions to act, not actual behavior.

The t-test results indicate that no statistically significant scale average difference was present between “Yes” and “No” responders to either vignette. This suggests that no scale was useful in predicting the probability of a respondent reporting willingness to report hazing similar to either vignette. No evidence was found to support either of this study’s hypotheses.

In the Abigail vignette model, the control variable Black reached a .05 level of significance. The coefficient in this model was negative, suggesting that being Black decreased a respondent’s willingness to report hazing similar to Abigail’s experience. The odds-ratio is .15, which gives the odds of a respondent being willing to report a similar experience (a success). Since this value is less than 1, it is somewhat difficult to understand. Instead, the odds of failure can be calculated ($1/.15$) which gives a ratio of 6.67. This can be interpreted as the odds of reporting the experience for non-Black students is 6.67 times higher than for Black students. Given that this vignette was non-violent, this result cannot be properly compared to the reporting literature relating to race previously discussed. However, the small proportion of Black respondents in the sample necessitates the need for caution when interpreting these results.

Future studies can improve upon this study by including psychological forms of hazing as vignettes. Johnson (2011) pointed out that females are more likely to experience psychological forms of hazing, which gets little attention. By incorporating psychological vignettes, we will be able to better understand what influences female

students' willingness to report hazing that they are more likely to experience. Additional studies would benefit by including measures of deviant subcultures and socialization processes. Many studies have shown hazing to take place within groups as a test of loyalty (Domingo, 2008; Hollmann, 2004; Hoover & Milner, 1998). As such, hazing reporting may be better understood when factors relating to loyalty and commitment are included. These factors may serve to mitigate the effects of the social bond. This also draws on Gibbons (2008) who suggests that crimes which occur within students' social networks are likely to go unreported. There has also been considerable support for the effect of deviant peers on delinquency (Akers, 1994; Krohn et al., 1983; Longshore et al., 2004; Marcos et al., 1986). Taking into account the deviance of the victims' peers may better explain why some students are reluctant to report hazing. For example, if their peers are the perpetrators of hazing, this may impact their social bonds by reducing their commitment to conventional society in favor of a deviant subculture.

This study set out to answer Hoover's (2012) call for interdisciplinary research around hazing. Hazing can be seen as a problem embedded in the culture of universities, but we must not forget that it is also a crime across much of the United States. As such, it is imperative that criminologists take heed and contribute to the knowledge around why hazing occurs and why it goes unreported in an effort to help eradicate this problem. While the results of this study must be interpreted with caution, it provides measures of social bonds that could be used in future studies. Hazing is a complicated issue that needs additional attention to better understand, or else it is likely to persist in spite of current efforts to eradicate its practice.

Appendix A: Codebook

Dependent Variables

LikeWilliam – *If you were William, would you have told campus officials about what you were required to do? (Yes/No) (1/0)*

LikeAbigail – *If you were Abigail, would you have told campus officials about what you were required to do? (Yes/No) (1/0)*

WilliamSim – *During your time here at the University of Maryland, have you experienced a similar situation? (Yes/No) (1/0)*

AbigailSim – *During your time here at the University of Maryland, have you experienced a similar situation? (Yes/No) (1/0)*

Independent Variables

Maternal attachment average scale (0-5).

MProb – *When I have a problem, I can talk to my mother about it. (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)^{1,2,3} (0,1,2,3,4,5)*

MAdvice – *I would never ask my mother for advice. (SD to SA)³ (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

MThoughts – *I can share my thoughts and feelings with my mother. (SD to SA)^{1,4,6} (0 to 5)*

MFuture – *I talk about future plans with my mother. (SD to SA)¹ (0 to 5)*

Paternal attachment average scale (0-5).

PProb – *When I have a problem, I can talk to my father about it. (SD to SA)^{1,2,3} (0 to 5)*

PAdvice – *I would never ask my father for advice. (SD to SA)³ (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

PThoughts – *I can share my thoughts and feelings with my father. (SD to SA)^{1,4,6} (0 to 5)*

PFuture – *I talk about future plans with my father. (SD to SA)¹ (0 to 5)*

PDesire – *I desire to be like my father. (SD to SA)³ (0 to 5)*

School attachment average scale (0 – 5).

SARight – *UMD is the right school for me. (SD to SA) (0 to 5)*

SAAanother – *I wish that I would have gone to another school. (SD to SA)⁵ (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

Educational commitment average scale (0 – 5).

ECHomework – *I don't care if my homework is done correctly or not. (SD to SA)⁶ (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

ECGrades – *Getting good grades is important to me. (SD to SA)^{1,2,3,5} (0 to 5)*

ECClasses – *None of my classes are important. (SD to SA)⁵ (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

ECAttend1 – *It is important to me that I always attend class. (SD to SA)¹ (0 to 5)*

ECTry – *I try hard in school. (SD to SA)^{1,3} (0 to 5)*

ECMoreEd – *I plan to continue my education once I graduate by attending graduate school or taking more classes. (SD to SA)^{2,4,5,6} (0 to 5)*

EC Proud – *I am proud to be in college. (SD to SA) (0 to 5)*

ECImport – *Getting an education is important. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

Occupational commitment average scale (0 – 5).

OCKnow – *I know what type of job I want to have one day. (SD to SA) (0 to 5)*

OCDont – *I have no idea what kind of career I want. (SD to SA) (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

School belief average scale (0 – 5).

PoliciesFair – *The University's policies are fair. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

FairTreatAll – *All students are treated fairly by professors and staff. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

UnfairTreat – *Some students are treated better than others by professors and staff (SD to SA) (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

SamePunish – *The punishments for breaking rules are the same at this school no matter who you are. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

RaceEqual – *People of all races are treated equitably at this school. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

GenderEqual – *People at this university are treated equally, no matter their gender. (SD to SA)⁵ (0 to 5)*

GenderUnequal – *People of a certain gender are treated better on this campus by professors and staff. (SD to SA) (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

Norm and law belief average scale (0 – 5).

PolicyStudents – *University policies exist to protect students. (SD to SA) (0 to 5)*

SneakInto – *It is okay to sneak into a movie or ballgame without paying. (SD to SA)² (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

PayFor – *It is important to pay for everything taken from a store. (SD to SA)² (0 to 5)*

CPDRespect – *I have a lot of respect for campus police officers. (SD to SA)¹ (0 to 5)*

PoliceRespect – *I have a lot of respect for local police. (SD to SA)¹ (0 to 5)*

ObeyLaw – *It is important to try to obey the law. (SD to SA)² (0 to 5)*

StealBike – *It is okay to steal a bicycle if I won't get caught. (SD to SA)² (5 to 0; reverse-scored)*

Control Variables

Gender – *What is your gender? (Male/Female) (0/1)*

Black – *Are you Hispanic or Latino? What is your race? (Black/Asian/White/Other)*
(1/0/0/0)

Asian – *Are you Hispanic or Latino? What is your race? (Black/Asian/White/Other)*
(0/1/0/0)

Demographic Variables

Age – *What is your current age? Please write on the following line: (18 – 99)*

Classification – *What is your current classification?*
(Freshman/Sophomore/Junior/Senior) (1/2/3/4)

Transfer – *Did you transfer to the University of Maryland? (Yes/No) (1/0)*

OrgMem – *Are you currently a member of a student organization at the University of*
Maryland? (Yes/No) (1/0)

Questions modeled after those used in the following studies:

¹ Durkin et al. (1999)

² Marcos et al. (1986)

³ Intravia et al. (2012)

⁴ Krohn et al. (1983)

⁵ Jenkins (1997)

⁶ Massey & Krohn (1986)

Appendix B: Standardized Request Sent to Instructors

Dear [Instructor Name],

My name is Joshua Bittinger, and I am collecting data to use in my Master's thesis as a degree requirement for the Criminology and Criminal Justice department here at the University of Maryland. I am contacting you today to request permission to distribute surveys to your students during one of your class sessions for [Course number] this summer. The survey should take students no longer than 20 minutes to complete and no further participation would be required of them.

The survey will measure a student's social bond to conventional society and their experience with hazing while a student at the University of Maryland. A study conducted by the University of Maine indicated that 95% of students who are hazed do not report their experience to the police or campus officials. By conducting this research, I hope to better understand why some students do choose to report what they experienced in order to better inform both higher education and criminal justice policy. I am studying the impact of the student's social bond on his/her reporting behavior to see if the social bond can be used to predict reporting behavior. My hypothesis is that students with strong social bonds will be more inclined to report hazing experiences.

Being allowed to distribute my survey during your class would be extremely beneficial to my research and would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions about this request, I would be happy to answer them. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Joshua Bittinger,
Master's Candidate
Principal Investigator

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Project Title	Social Bonds as Predictors of College Student Willingness to Report Hazing
Purpose of the Study	This research is being conducted by Joshua Bittinger at the University of Maryland, College Park. We are inviting you to participate in this research project because you belong to our population of interest: college students. The purpose of this research project is to determine the role that social bonds have on the likelihood of students reporting harmful behavior to campus police, officials, or others.
Procedures	<p>For this study, I ask that you complete a brief survey, taking no longer than 20 minutes to complete. Once you have completed the survey, no further participation is required. Your instructor may offer extra credit in this course as an incentive for participation. If your instructor does offer extra credit for participating in this research, s/he will also provide you with a different opportunity for extra credit if you do not want to complete the survey. Many of the questions use a scale of agreement such as the following sample question:</p> <p>1. The University of Maryland is a great institution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Strongly Disagree b. Disagree c. Somewhat Disagree d. Somewhat Agree e. Agree f. Strongly Agree <p>Other questions ask about your experience, such as:</p> <p>2. During your time at the University of Maryland, have you ever visited McKeldin Library?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No
Potential Risks and Discomforts	There are no known risks to participants. However, a few of the questions may cause uneasiness or invoke bad memories.
Potential Benefits	There are no direct benefits from participation in this research. However, possible benefits include a greater understanding of why hazing incidents on college campuses tend to go unreported. With this increased understanding, future harm to students may be reduced.
Confidentiality	Any potential loss of confidentiality will be minimized by storing completed surveys in a locked office. Responses will be coded and stored on a private, password protected computer. The surveys are anonymous and will not contain information that may personally

	<p>identify you.</p> <p>If we write a report or article about this research project, your identity will be protected to the maximum extent possible. Your information may be shared with representatives of the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.</p>
Right to Withdraw and Questions	<p>Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify. If you would like to talk to someone about bad memories that come up while taking the survey, please contact the Counseling Center at (301) 314-7651.</p> <p>If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the investigator:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Joshua Bittinger joshbitt@umd.edu 301-314-8204</p>
Participant Rights	<p>If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">University of Maryland College Park Institutional Review Board Office 1204 Marie Mount Hall College Park, Maryland, 20742 E-mail: irb@umd.edu Telephone: 301-405-0678</p> <p>This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.</p>
Statement of Consent	<p>Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. You will receive a copy of this signed consent form.</p> <p>If you agree to participate, please sign your name below.</p>

Signature and Date	NAME OF PARTICIPANT [Please Print]	
	SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT	
	DATE	

Appendix D: Class Introduction Script

Good [morning/afternoon], my name is Joshua Bittinger, and I am a graduate student in the Criminology and Criminal Justice program here at the University of Maryland. I am here today to ask you to complete a brief survey, which will provide me with data to complete my master's thesis. The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete and is completely voluntary. I will now pass out informed consent forms. Please read over this form and if you would like to participate in this study, please sign at the end of the form. Once I have collected these forms, I will hand out the surveys and copies of the informed consent form for you to keep. Please keep in mind that your responses are confidential, so do not write any identifying information on your survey such as name or student ID number. If you choose to not participate in this study, please hold onto the survey while others complete it. Please pass in your blank survey when I collect the surveys from the rest of the class.

References

- Agnew, R. (1985). Social control theory and delinquency: A longitudinal test. *Criminology*, 23, 47-61.
- Akers, R. L. (1973). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Akers, R. L. (1994). *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Allan, E., & Madden, M. (2008). Retrieved from http://umaine.edu/hazingresearch/files/2012/10/hazing_in_view_web.pdf
- Avakame, E. F., Fyfe, J. J., & McCoy, C. (1999). Did you call the police? What did they do? An empirical assessment of Black's theory of mobilization of law. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 4, 765-792.
- Bachman, R. (1998). The factors related to rape reporting behavior and arrest: New evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 1, 8-29.
- Ball, J. (2004). This will go down on your permanent record (but we'll never tell): How the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act may help colleges and universities keep hazing a secret. *Southwestern University Law Review*, 33, 477-495.
- Barton, M. S., Jensen, B. L., & Kaufman, J. M. (2010). Social disorganization theory and the college campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 3, 245-254.

- Baumer, E. P., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2010). Reporting crime to the police, 1973-2005: A multivariate analysis of long-term trends in the National Crime Survey (NCS) and National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). *Criminology*, 48, 1, 131-186.
- Belknap, J. (2001). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice* (2nd Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Chapple, C. L. (2005). Self-control, peer relations, and delinquency. *Justice Quarterly*, 22, 89-106.
- Cimino, A. (2013). Predictors of hazing motivation in a representative sample of the United States. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34, 6, 446-452.
- Cokley, K., Miller, K., Cunningham, D., Motoike, 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*.
- Conger, R. (1976). Social control and social learning models of delinquency: A synthesis. *Criminology*, 14, 17-40.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1998). *Rethinking violence against women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Domingo, A. (2008). Hazing. In *Encyclopedia of interpersonal violence*. Retrieved from <http://proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http%3A%2F%2Fsearch.credoreference.com%2Fcontent%2Fentry%2Fsageiv%2Fhazing%2F0>
- 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, 6, 535-544.

- Dugan, L. (2003). Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of domestic violence, police involvement, and arrest. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2, 283-312.
- Evans, R. (2013). Hazing in the ADF: A culture of denial? *Australian Army Journal*, X, 3, 113-127.
- Evans, T. D., Cullen, F. T., Burton, V. S., Jr., Dunaway, R. G., & Benson, M. L. (1997). The social consequences of self-control: Testing the general theory of crime. *Criminology*, 35, 475-501.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., & Hoskin, A. W. (1999). The victim-offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology*, 37, 931-947.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology*, 40, 617-647.
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 3, 597-610.
- Fernandez, A., & Lizotte, A. J. (1997). An analysis of the relationship between campus crime and community crime: Reciprocal effects? In B. Fisher & J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (pp. 79-102). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Finkel, M. A. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 20, 3, 228-233.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: Results from a national-level study of college women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30, 6-38.

- Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J.J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the ivory tower: The level and sources of student victimization. *Criminology*, 36, 671-710.
- Frieze, I. H., & Brown, A. (1989). Violence in marriages. In L. E. Ohlin & M. H. Tonry (Eds.), *Family Violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gehring, D. D. (1996). Campus crime, college policy, and federal laws and regulations. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 95, 17-28.
- Gibbons, R. (2008). Campus violence. In *Encyclopedia of interpersonal violence*. Retrieved from http://proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http%3A%2F%2Fsearch.credoreference.com%2Fcontent%2Fentry%2Fsageiv%2Fcampus_violence%2F0
- Hart, C. O., & Mueller, C. E. (2013). School delinquency and social bond factors: Exploring gendered differences among a national sample of 10th graders. *Psychology in the Schools*, 50, 2, 116-133.
- Hart, T. C., & Colavito, V. (2011). College student victims and reporting crime to the police: The influence of collective efficacy. *Western Criminology Review*, 12, 3, 1-19.
- Hart, T. C., & Rennison, C. (2003). Reporting crime to the police, 1992-2000. *Reporting crime to the police, 1992-2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Henson, V. A., & Stone, W. E. (1999). Campus crime: A victimization survey. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 4, 295-307.
- Herzberger, S. D. (1996). *Violence within the family: Social psychological perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Hindelang, M. J. (1973). Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems*, 20, 471-487.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T. (2004) Self-control and crime. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and application* (pp. 537-552). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hollmann, B. B. (2004). Hazing: Hidden campus crime. *New Directions for Student Services*, 99, 11-23.
- Hoover, E. (2012). As deaths mount, a question is raised: Are students hard-wired for hazing? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Hoover, J., & Milner, C. (1998). Are hazing and bullying related to love and belongingness? *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 7, 3, 138-141.
- Intravia, J., Jones, S., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). The roles of social bonds, personality, and perceived costs: An empirical investigation into Hirschi's "new" control theory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56, 1182-1200.
- Janosik, S. M., & Gehring, D. D. (2003). The impact of the Clery Campus Crime Disclosure Act on student behavior. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 1, 81-91.
- Johnson, J. (2011). Through the liminal: A comparative analysis of communitas and rites of passage in sport hazing and initiations. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 36, 3, 199-227.

- Josefowitz, N., & Gadon, H. (1989). Hazing: Uncovering one of the best-kept secrets of the workplace. *Business Horizons*.
- Keating, C. F., Pomerantz, J., Pommer, S. D., Ritt, S. J. H, Miller, L. M., & McCormick, J. (2005). Going to college and unpacking hazing: A functional approach to decrypting initiation practices among undergraduates. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9, 2, 104-126.
- Krohn, M. D., & Massey, J. L. (1980). Social control and delinquent behavior: An examination of the elements of the social bond. *Sociological Quarterly*, 21, 529-543.
- Krohn, M. D., Massey, J. L., Skinner, W. F., & Lauer, R. M. (1983). Social bonding theory and adolescent cigarette smoking: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24, 4, 337-349.
- Krosnick, J. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 213-236.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. In L. Lyberg, P. Biemer, M. Collins, L. Decker, E. DeLeeuw, C. Dippo, N. Schwarz, and D. Trewin (Eds.), *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Longshore, D., Chang, E., Hsieh, S., & Messina, N. (2004). Self-control and social bonds: A combined control perspective on deviance. *Crime & Delinquency*, 50, 542-564.
- Marcos, A. C., Bahr, S. J., & Johnson, R. E. (1986). Test of a bonding/association theory of adolescent drug use. *Social Forces*, 65, 1, 135-161.

- Montague, D. R., Zohra, I. T., Love, S. L., & McGee, D. K. (2008). Hazing typologies: Those who criminally haze and those who receive criminal hazing. *Victims and Offenders*, 3, 258-274.
- Mosher, C. J., Miethe, T. D., & Phillips, D. M. (2002). *The mismeasure of crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nuwer, H. (2004). *The hazing reader*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1984). *Family violence*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Parks, G. S., Jones, S. E., & Hughey, M. W. (2013). Belief, truth, and positive organizational deviance. *Howard Law Journal*, 56, 2, 399-445.
- Parks, G. S., & Southerland, T. F. (2013). The psychology and law of hazing consent. *Marquette Law Review*, 101-154.
- Pelletier, A. (2002). Regulation of rites: The effect and enforcement of current anti-hazing statutes. *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement*, 28, 377-414.
- Rosellini, L. (2000). The sordid side of college sports. *U.S. News & World Report*.
- Ruffins, P., & Evelyn, J. (1998). The persistent madness of Greek hazing. *Black Issues in Higher Education*.
- Ruffins, P., & Roach, R. (1997). Frat-ricide: Are African American fraternities beating themselves to death? *Black Issues in Higher Education*.
- Schwartz, M. (2008). Fraternities and violence. In *Encyclopedia of interpersonal violence*. Retrieved from http://proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http%3A%2F%2Fsearch.credoreference.com%2Fcontent%2Fentry%2Fsageiv%2Ffraternities_and_violence%2F0

States With Anti-Hazing Laws. (n.d.). In *StopHazing*. Retrieved September 13, 2014, from <http://www.stophazing.org/laws/states-with-anti-hazing-laws/>.

Suggs, W. (1999). 79% of college athletes experience hazing, survey finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

University Hazing Policy. (n.d.). In *Office of Student Conduct*. Retrieved September 13, 2014, from <http://osc.umd.edu/OSC/NonAcademicStudentsHazingPolicy.aspx>.

Wiatrowski, M. D., Griswold, D. B., & Roberts, M. K. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 525-541.