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Ever Feel Like This???
Insanity (ɪn sænɪtI) — n, pl -ties
1. relatively permanent disorder of the mind; state or condition of being insane
2. a defect of reason as a result of mental illness, such that a defendant does not know what he or she is doing or that it is wrong
3. utter folly; stupidity
4. doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results
Our Philosophy

Where are we now?

- Bad Apples
- Hazing is a problem created by students that should be fixed by students
- Get chapter leaders together once a year and try to “guilt trip” them into fixing hazing in their organizations
- Guided by anecdotes and myths
- An isolated, chapter-by-chapter approach

Where do we need to be?

- Bad Barrels
- Hazing is a problem inherent in our organizations that should be fixed by organizational leadership
- Get all organizational leaders together to discuss ways that the organizational culture/structure can be changed to prevent hazing
- Guided by sound data from high-quality research
- A coordinated, campus-by-campus approach
Caveats

- We are not proposing that we have all the answers – rather, we are proposing that we begin asking different questions...
- Some of our suggestions are grounded in data, some are grounded in theory, some are grounded in our own suspicions...
- We do not require that you agree with all of our suggestions, but we do ask that you consider each of them with an open mind...
#1 – De-Emphasize Social Status

- Studies of bullying among adolescents (Bandura et al, 1999) and among prisoners (South & Wood, 2006) have found that bullying behaviors have a strong, positive correlation with perceived importance of social status (the more important social status is to you, the more likely you are to bully others).
Scales in Pilot Study

Social Status Scale
(α=.740)

- The social status of my fraternity on
  campus was an important factor in my
  decision to join
- Girls from the top sororities on campus
  like to do things with my fraternity and
  often date members of my fraternity
- Meeting girls and going to great parties
  were important factors in my decision to
  join my fraternity
- Most of the guys in my fraternity expect
  to “hook up” with the girls who come to
  our parties
- My fraternity works hard to maintain or
  improve its social prestige on campus –
  it is important that we have the coolest
  guys as members and throw the best
  parties
- My fraternity often considers how our
  actions will be perceived by other
  fraternities and sororities when we
  make decisions

Hazing Support Scale
(α=.816)

- I am much closer to the guys in my
  pledge/new member class than the
  guys in other classes
- The bonding and unification of the
  pledge/new member class is one of the
  most important priorities of our new
  member education program
- It is important that pledges/new
  members demonstrate their loyalty and
  devotion to the fraternity before they are
  fully initiated or have all of the rights of
  older members
- New members have to earn their
  membership during their pledge/new
  member process
- The pledge/new member process is an
  opportunity to “weed out” potentially bad
  members
### Pilot Study Results ($n=48$)

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>HazeTolScale</th>
<th>ScaleSocial</th>
<th>ScaleHazing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.318*</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GPA</strong></td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HazeTolScale</strong></td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ScaleSocial</strong></td>
<td>.318*</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ScaleHazing</strong></td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.382***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
How important is social status on your campus/in your organization? How can we de-emphasize social status?
#2 – Break the Cycle

- Owen, Burke & Vichesky (2008) study found that positive hazing attitudes are strongly correlated with victimization – the more you were a victim of hazing, the more likely you are to engage in hazing behaviors and have a pro-hazing attitude.

- Bandura et al (1996) found that bullying behavior is positively correlated with past victimization, specifically pointing out that high moral disengagers are more readily angered and ruminate about past grievances and dwell on punitive retaliations.

- Ireland and Power (2004) pointed out that prisoners who are both bullies and victims tend to have higher avoidance scores and emotional loneliness scores than any other category of prisoner. In the context of fraternity hazing, these findings would suggest that the cycle of violence in which victims become future aggressors could lead to damaging and potentially long-term negative psychological effects.
#3 – Social Norming Campaigns

- Believing your friends approve of hazing increases the likelihood that you will participate as a perpetrator (Campo et al, 2005).
- Social norming has been shown as a valuable prevention tool with other high-risk behaviors on college campuses (drug/alcohol use, date rape, etc.)
#4 – Control What We CAN See – Zero Tolerance for ANY Hazing

- Broken Window Theory - monitoring and maintaining urban environments in a well-ordered condition may stop further vandalism as well as an escalation into more serious crime (Wilson and Kelling, 1982).

- New York City Subway System

- How often do we ignore, gloss over, or look the other way when we see “minor” acts of hazing? How do these “minor” acts create an environment that makes the “serious” acts seem less of a problem?
What are the broken windows on your campus/in your organization???
#5 – Focus on the Positives
(Instead of telling students what they *can’t* do, let’s start telling them what they *can* and *should* do)

- Nationally proscribed membership education models/standards *(sororities have done a pretty good job of this!!!)*
- Hazing persists because it accomplishes intended objectives. Thus, we must either:
  - Change the objectives (away from horizontal bonding); or,
  - Provide well-developed and thought out activities (that can be easily facilitated by a 20 year old NME) that accomplish the same objective *without* hazing
#6 – Let your students define hazing

- The FIPG hazing definition was developed in 1986

- Represents an extensional definition
  - Attempts to define hazing through examples
  - Literature indicates incidents of hazing increasing (Hollmann, 2002)
  - 90% of students experiencing hazing do not recognize it (Allan & Madden, 2008)
#6 – Let your students define hazing

- Consider allowing students to define hazing
- Review existing models
- Discuss descriptive statements
- Adopt a new Anti Hazing Policy
#7 – Create institutional buy-in based on legal exposure

- Legal landscape is changing
  - (MacLachlan, 2000; Crow & Rosner, 2002; Pearson & Beckham, 2005; Gerstein & Gerstein, 2008; Hall, 2009)
  - Dixon v. AL (1961)
  - Bradshaw v. Rawlings (1979)
  - ends *in loco parentis*
  - consumer/service relationship (Hall, 2009)

- Landowner-invitee theory
  - Duty to act reasonably
  - Furek v. University of Delaware (1991)
#7 – Create institutional buy-in based on legal exposure

- Knoll v. Board of Regents (1999)
  - Landowner-invitee theory
  - the University’s prior knowledge of hazing incidents involving fraternities
  - the University’s knowledge of past infractions involving FIJI fraternity members
  - the proximity of the FIJI house to university property
  - the consideration of the FIJI house as student housing by the University’s Code of Conduct
#7 – Create institutional buy-in based on legal exposure

- Given the right set of circumstances, universities have been found negligent for failure to meet the standard of care arising from a special relationship with students (Pearson & Beckham, 2005, p. 462)
  - College took steps to ensure safety
  - Must ensure physical safety
#7 – Create institutional buy-in based on legal exposure

  - foreseeable risk
  - Institutional control
#8 – Eliminate the power differential

- The prisoners and the guards in the Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE) were the same psychologically, socially, and academically before they joined the experiment.
- "Psychological prisons" that constrict human experience and undermine human potential.
- "Mind-altering" social psychological dynamics can distort individual judgment and negatively influence behavior.
#8 – Eliminate the power differential

- “Adult” supervision
- Responsible leadership
  - where commanders and leaders share “crystal clear” stand
- No tolerance approach for hazing
  - they will not tolerate doing harm
  - that personal dignity will always be respected
- Rules of engagement will be known by all
- Everyone is ultimately personally responsible for their actions
- Hazing violations will be met with public censure and punishment (Zimbardo, 2007) (http://blog.guykawasaki.com/2007/04/ten_questions_w.html#ixzz1f40j28zl)
What are some strategies we can employ to eliminate or lessen the power differential between “actives” and “pledges?”
#9 – Eliminate Pledging

- 1990’s – NIC Task Force
  - Alpha Gamma Rho, Zeta Beta Tau revise membership policies, eliminate pledging
  - Has it worked???
- 2000’s – Sig Ep Balanced Man
  - Has it worked???
- 2011 – Cornell University Bans Pledging

Can we expect to have no hazing, knowing what we know about human nature and the power of context, in a system where new members have a trial period of second-class citizenship?
Multiple studies have shown that fraternity members have lower levels of moral development when compared to their non-affiliated counterparts (Sanders, 1990; Marlowe & Auvenshine, 1982; Derryberry and Thoma, 2000; Pike, 2006; Carroll, 2009).

Increased levels of moral development have been strongly linked to pro-social behavior:
- “Defenders” in bullying situations (Bandura et al, 1999)
- Decreased rape-supportive attitudes (Carroll, 2009)
- Strong negative correlations with cheating and academic misconduct (Cummings, Dyas, Maddux & Kochman, 2001; Malinowski & Smith; 1985)

Students amenable to moral interventions (King and Mayhew, 2002):
- Semester-long courses with strong emphasis on social justice
- Service learning programs
Hypothesized Moral Model

- Moral Judgment (N2 Score, PI Score)
- Moral Disengagement
- Hazing Supportive Attitude
So what does it all mean? What else should be on this list?