

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

Spring 2021

Student Athletes' Perception of Hazing

Faith Bradbury

Eastern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bradbury, Faith, "Student Athletes' Perception of Hazing" (2021). *Masters Theses*. 4867.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4867>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Student Athletes' Perception of Hazing

Faith Bradbury

Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

Over the years hazing has been seen as a rite of passage or a tradition among college athletes and almost an expectation for the athletes (Stuart, 2013). There is a lack of information surrounding athlete's perceptions on hazing and how this affects their confidence in addressing hazing situations. Most studies focus on what hazing is and the effects it has on students on a college campus. This qualitative study utilized semi-structured interviews to explore the athlete's perceptions surrounding hazing at a rural mid-sized university in the Midwest. The research showed that the athletes had a disconnect with the information they were receiving, what their role is surrounding hazing, and that the athletes had a skewed idea of what hazing truly is.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this to my support system! To my family, who would have thought I would have gone to get another degree? Your constant love, support and encouragement went a long way. Big Man and Mom you are the perfect examples of what parents should be. I am so honored to be able to call you my parents and friends. To Porkchop and Hopey you are my original best friends and I am so proud and blessed to have you as siblings. Just always remember that those few minutes count! To my extended family thank you for helping me push myself and listening to me complain on the phone or FaceTime!

To my best friends I love you all for different reasons. You all have seen me at the lowest of the low and the highest of the high but no matter what you love me. The reassurance and confidence boosts from you all over these past few years have been appreciated and will never be forgotten. Allison, Kenz, Mt. Horeb, Heather, Mouse thank you for showing me what true friendship is and no matter how far we are apart we will always be there for each other. I truly do not deserve the love you have given me.

To Beccah, Choppy, Kala and Derek thank you for being with me through every step of the way during class and our assistantships. These two years and a pandemic really threw a curve ball at us, but I am so proud of everyone. Thank you for the Starbucks runs, Dairy Queen runs, dinners, lunches and watching the Bears with me... I know I can be a lot. Thank you to my Lawson Hall RA/DA staff over the last 2 years. You taught me how to be a supervisor and reminded me why I love my job. I can't wait to see what you all do in the future.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my love Devin Hester. Hopefully one day you will read this and ask me to marry you.

Acknowledgement

To start off with I want to say thank you to Dr. Coleman for being an amazing advisor and support system through this. I don't think you will understand how much your encouraging words got me through writing my thesis or how much it had an impact on me. Thank you to the outstanding professionals on my thesis committee, Dr. Heather Webb and Kiersten Klekner-Alt for giving me advice and crucial insight regarding athletics and hazing.

To my core four Housing professionals Sarah J Jacobs, The Matt Boyer, Ms. Cindy and Ms. Julia. The four of you have shown me who I want to be when I grow up in Higher Ed. Sarah J Jacobs thank you for showing me I could do anything and making me look forward to work every day. Boyer thank you for being my dad away from home and caring about my growth. Ms. Cindy, I cherish our friendship and our morning talks. EIU is lucky to have you and I am so lucky to have you in my life. Ms. Julia, I don't think thank you explains how grateful I am for you. You made me feel like I made the right choice and I owe a lot of my successful at EIU to you. Thank you for being an angel on Earth.

Ozzie J Jacobs thank you for the constant snuggles and kisses that got me through the rough days.

Thank you Nicholas Fulco for showing me that I could do higher education as a job and be in housing. I appreciate you showing me how to be confident in myself and to be the best version of myself. I can't thank you enough for changing my life and still supporting me.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the study.....	2
Research Questions.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
Limitations of the Study.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
CHAPTER II	5
Review of Literature.....	5
History of Hazing	5
College Athletics and Hazing.....	11
Experience of Student Athletes.....	12
Types of Hazing.....	14
Emotional Effects of Hazing.....	16

Theoretical Framework.....	17
Moral Development Theory.....	17
Self-Authorship Theory.....	20
Summary.....	21
CHAPTER III.....	22
METHODS.....	22
Design of Study.....	22
Participants.....	22
Research Site.....	23
Instrumentation.....	24
Data Collection	24
Data Analysis.....	25
Treatment of Data.....	25
Summary.....	25
CHAPTER IV.....	26
Results.....	26
Research Question #1: How do college student athletes define hazing?.....	26
Forceful and Uncomfortable.....	26
Pressure from Teammates and Team Rituals.....	28

Research Question #2: How do athletes distinguish it (hazing) from healthy team building and other activities designed to establish camaraderie among players?.....	29
Definition of Bonding.....	29
Experience.....	30
Uncomfortable Activities.....	31
Research Question #3: How do college student athletes receive education and training on the topic of hazing?.....	33
Precollege Awareness.....	33
Athletic Staff.....	34
NCAA Materials.....	36
Media Influences.....	37
Research Question #4: What do college student athletes consider to be their role and responsibility when they encounter situations of hazing in their teams?.....	38
Lack of Understanding of What Constitutes Hazing	39
Lack of Personal Willingness to Confront	40
Denial that Hazing is an Issue.....	42
Teammate Communication.....	42
Summary.....	44
CHAPTER V.....	45
Discussion.....	45
Defining Hazing.....	45

Personal Responsibility.....	46
Educating Athletes.....	48
Conflicting Information from Media.....	49
Entertainment.....	49
Peer Connections and Communications.....	51
Recommendations for Higher Education Professionals.....	52
Recommendations for Future Research.....	53
Conclusion.....	54
References.....	57
Appendix A- Interview Protocol.....	64
Appendix B- First E-mail Template for Potential Participants.....	66
Appendix C- Second E-mail Template for Potential Participants.....	67
Appendix D – Consent to Participate In Research.....	68

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

According to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), 74% of student-athletes experience hazing while in college (Oates, 2019). Over the past several decades there have been hazing incidents on campuses that have highlighted the struggle with helping students understand what hazing is. Hazing has been justified as a "tradition" and therefore, "rationally" perceived as a rite of passage by many students (Stuart, 2013, p. 377). Due to this misperception of what hazing is and that it happens on campus, institutions' have responded by making policies and interventions designed to protect students. In 1999, there was an incident of hazing with the hockey team at the University of Vermont that resulted in significant repercussions including a cancelled season and additional actions against the individuals involved (Sussberg, 2003). The university responded by putting together a committee that provided resources regarding policies and practices for effective prevention of hazing.

Each year, around 55% of college students involved in clubs, teams, and school organizations experience hazing in some form ("Hazing Information," 2012). In order to address the dangers of hazing, it is important to recognize that hazing has been going on for thousands of years in one form or another and administrative professionals need to realize the only way hazing survives is because it depends on the tolerance of those involved, both perpetrators and victims. Higher education needs to make it a priority to work to prevent hazing from happening among its students. (Nuwer, 2001, p. 114–115). This study will focus on a particularly vulnerable student population, the

college student athlete, who may encounter incidents of hazing in the efforts to create camaraderie and team spirit that are often necessary for success in athletic competition.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study is to understand the student athletes' perception of hazing. It is crucial to understand what knowledge the athletes have about hazing and to see if they have been given accurate information surrounding hazing and their roles and responsibilities when encountering it. By having this information, athletic departments can determine if they need to change how they are educating their athletes on this important topic. By better understanding how student athletes are understanding the training and information they are receiving about hazing, higher education professionals will be better equipped to help their students avoid the risks of this behavior as well as be actively engaged in eliminating it.

Research Questions

The following research questions are being proposed to consider college student athletes' perceptions of hazing and their responsibilities when they encounter it.

1. How do college student athletes define hazing?
2. How do they distinguish it from healthy team-building and other activities designed to establish camaraderie among players?
3. How do college student athletes receive education and training on the topic of hazing?
4. What do college student athletes consider to be their role and responsibility when they encounter situations of hazing in their teams?

Significance of the study

While there is research that shows that hazing has occurred on college campuses since 1923 (Bryshun, 1997), specifically within college athletics, incidents of hazing occurring in college athletics have continued to rise. To combat this, it is important to understand what the student athletes' viewpoint is about hazing, as well as understanding what information the student has received about hazing. If students do not see that they have a role in preventing hazing, it is upon the institution to ensure that the student is informed of their role. The significance of this study is to find out what the students define as hazing, what they see as their role, and how they can build healthy relationships and team spirit without harm.

Limitations of the study

This study was done at a mid-sized Midwestern university with athletes who could have different experiences than athletes at other institutions. Additionally, there might not be any hazing occurring at the school, so there could be a lack of awareness on the part of the students if they have not encountered it. Each institution has their own approach to how athletes are educated about hazing and its effects which may make generalizing the findings of this study to other institutions difficult. Not all athletes will feel comfortable to talk about hazing and how they have been trained due to this being a potentially triggering topic. Finally, the researcher is passionate about this topic and the possibility of bias towards what should be done with the procedures of educating athletes about hazing must be recognized. As a cisgender, white, woman, these identities can cause the researcher to have bias due to having these privileges compared to some athletes who might not have the same identities.

Definitions

Hazing. is "any activity expected of someone joining a group that humiliates, degrades, or risks emotions and/or physical harm, regardless of that person's willingness to participate" (Gersehel, et al., 2003).

NCAA. The National Collegiate Athletic Association is a member-led organization dedicated to the well-being and lifelong success of college athletes (Cortez, 2020).

Summary

This chapter provided a detailed introduction to the study. It laid out the importance of the study and why there is a need to study this aspect of hazing in higher education. Four research questions were identified to guide this study as well as potential limitations impacting its success. Finally, several key definitions were provided to establish a common language for the topic. Chapter two will provide a review of the literature on hazing and its impact on athletics.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

A review of the literature was conducted on the research surrounding hazing in college as well as its impact on college student athletes. This chapter will provide a review of the history of hazing and its impact on college student athletics. The effect of hazing on student success will be examined as well as the institution's reaction to the issues of hazing and steps being taken to protect student athletes from hazing. Finally, this chapter will look at two theories that may provide a better understanding of how students perceive hazing and the dangers associated with it.

History of Hazing

But hazing has existed for much longer than the US system of higher education. Early evidence of behavior that would be considered hazing today has been found as far back as Ancient Greece in Plato's Academy in 387 BCE when it was called pennialism, "a system of mild oppression and torment practiced upon first year students" (Klinger, 2017; Finkel, 2002). Hazing behavior existed to establish the dominance and superiority of upperclass students to the freshmen members of the group (Klinger, 2017). It was in 1684 when the first student at Harvard was expelled for what would be considered hazing behavior when he was found to be striking students and forcing 'acts of servitude' upon them (Klinger, 2017). "By the seventeenth century, masters' degree students needed to obtain a document that affirmed they had gone through the equivalent of a Middle Ages hell night" (Nuwer, 1990, p.117).

Hazing existed on college campuses in one form or another, often accepted simply as a 'tradition' or action expected of all students to demonstrate loyalty to the group (Stuart, 2013). Hazing behavior through history changed and experienced times when it was less common before experiencing a resurgence among new groups (Klinger, 2017). Behaviors ranged from pranks and minor acts that were mostly harmless to those that resulted in injury and even death (Klinger, 2017). Officials at schools also struggled with how to address these behaviors. At Oxford, officials actively endorsed the hazing where "By the seventeenth century, masters' degree students needed to obtain a document that affirmed they had gone through the equivalent of a Middle Ages hell night" (Nuwer, 1990, p.117).

Hazing has had a variety of both emotional and physical effects on individuals as hazing endangers one's physical and emotional well-being (Campo et al., 2005). According to the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) in 2017, 74 percent of student-athletes experience hazing while in college (Oates, 2019). To address the issues surrounding hazing, the NCAA has created materials to assist institutions in reorienting student athlete behavior from hazing into team building by focusing on the positive aspects of respect, dignity, and support (NCAA, 2007)

The NCAA defines hazing as

any act committed against someone joining or becoming a member or maintaining membership in any organization that is humiliating, intimidating or demeaning, or endangers the health and safety of the person. Hazing includes active or passive participation in such acts and occurs regardless of the willingness to participate in

the activities. Hazing creates an environment/climate in which dignity and respect are absent (NCAA Handbook, 2007)

Increases in hazing behavior among college athletes' schools, organizations, and teams have also resulted in the creation of laws aimed to curtail it that vary from misdemeanors to felonies depending on the nature of the offense (Naveira, 2018). As of 2019, Forty-four states have made hazing illegal, yet only 13 states make hazing a felony if death or serious injury results from the incident (STFBC, 2020). While not all states have taken action, the NCAA, as a governing body over athletics, has created expectations and rules that all higher education institutions are expected to follow and that they can enforce outside the criminal justice system (NCAA, 2007). While there have been steps taken to help decrease the numbers of hazing, there is still work to be done.

Hazing itself has come a long way from its beginnings in 387 BCE. Hazing is still occurring in college and universities and is affecting students in a variety of organizations and programs. The NCAA has taken action, and continues to do so, on how to help student athletes become more educated about, and better understand, what hazing is and how it affects both teams and individuals. Despite these efforts, there are still struggles with what the athlete is able to connect with and understand when it comes to hazing.

The NCAA provides the student athletes a handbook to educate and prevent hazing behaviors that commonly happen within athletic programs. The handbook begins by providing what all members of the athletic department as a whole needs to know about preventing hazing including the athletes and the administrators. The handbook identifies what hazing is, why athletes and teams haze (the myths and the truths), and educational programs about how to build a positive team bond (NCAA

Handbook, 2007). The handbook goes on to describe the difference between hazing and team building by laying out examples side by side to emphasize the differences

The NCAA clarifies the difference for students by explaining that hazing is a “power trip” while team building is a “shared positive experience” (NCAA Handbook, 2007 p. 3).

Additionally, the Handbook provides special attention to the roles of different individuals in addressing hazing among athletes. It begins by identifying the administrator’s role by breaking down issues to that they will face, and actions they can take, to prevent hazing. The first role of the administrator is to educate the athletes with prevention programs and that these programs should be happening as a group, individually, and as a community (NCAA Handbook, 2007). The administrators also need to have established an “effective department-wide means for reporting and investigating alleged hazing incidents and providing documented procedures for the adjudication process” (NCAA Handbook, 2007, p. 4).

Coaches also have a role in hazing prevention and creating awareness among their athletes and the first factor is that coaches must be willing to address hazing. (NCAA Handbook, 2007). The coach’s role can be expanded to understand the reasons why hazing happens and what hazing does to a team compared to what their student athletes believe it actually does. (NCAA Handbook, 2007). This section of the handbook clarifies the importance of the coach building the foundation for the athletes and laying out what is and what isn’t allowed. One element the Handbook emphasizes is making athletes aware that just because someone is not forced to participate, doesn’t mean that there is not hazing occurring. This is known as passive

participation and makes it clear to coaches that giving consent does not transform the behavior into no longer being considered hazing simply because an athlete volunteers to participate. (NCAA Handbook, 2007). Lastly, coaches need to be pushing athletes to be good leaders and to help the athletes build positive traditions that are meaningful to the students (NCAA Handbook, 2007). The coaching staff should be able to show the athletes what good values are and why it is important to show the students why they are participating in sports.

For the student athletes themselves, their section describes what has happened to athletes because of previous hazing situations on campuses. The handbook breaks down questions that can be asked to the athletes and make them reflect on why they are part of a team. Additionally, the handbook discusses why the relationships they build with each other are some of the most important aspects of being in athletics (NCAA Handbook, 2007). The handbook specifically explains to the athletes that hazing is does not bond a team, hazing does not instill pride in a team, and that hazing does not allow freedom of choice with the athletes (NCAA Handbook, 2007). This is a time for the athletes to bond as a team and to see what is important to the team. This can help the athletes realize what the negative impacts of hazing can have on a team.

The handbook also suggests that the team captains have a very specific role in preventing hazing. Team captains should be responsible to make sure the team is having conversation about hazing and should encourage other athletes to speak up when hazing is occurring (NCAA Handbook, 2007). The captains are told to “Recognize that you have tremendous power over the newest members of your team, but it would be wise to use your influence with them to encourage their best performance” (NCAA Handbook, 2007,

p. 11). This is done to try to show the older athletes how much other athletes look up to them and that they should use their status for good.

In addition to this information, the handbook also provides an annual timeline to help address the prevention of hazing. To begin with, teams must provide the institution and the team's written policy to all recruits that defines hazing and the consequences that come with participation in hazing behaviors (NCAA Handbook, 2007). Before preseason and throughout the year, teams need to conduct a leadership workshop and have regular meetings to distribute proper information on hazing to athletes and to how use the information as a reference (NCAA Handbook, 2007). There should be a discussion at the first team meeting that helps the team go over the current team, institution, conference, and NCAA polices regarding hazing.

The students should also be given a written definition of what hazing is and the code of conduct that talks about what expectations a university has of the their student athletes (NCAA Handbook, 2007). Early during the first week, or at their preseason, the team needs to put on an educational program on hazing and, should provide an orientation seminar for first-year student athletes (NCAA Handbook, 2007). Periodically throughout the season there should be constant reminders of the "institution view on anti-hazing through posters, bookmarks and handouts, and the resultant consequences for participation in these types of activities" (NCAA Handbook, 2007, p. 14). While there are trips and traveling that happens with the athletes, the coaching staff and other members on the team are encouraged to remind the athletes to still follow all hazing polices.

College Athletics and Hazing

The 2018-2019 NCAA Division 1 Handbook explains that "a basic purpose of this association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body" (NCAA, 2019). Every student-athlete has this handbook and it discusses how to be the best athlete and the best version of themselves including stressing the importance of not engaging in hazing activities which violates the policies that all athletes are expected to follow. "With any prevention activity, you first must have a policy that is disseminated, talked about, and understood. For any campus, having a good policy is a cornerstone of prevention" (Pollard, 2020).

The NCAA provides resources to institutions, coaches, team captains, and individual members on how to deal with, and approach, issues relating to hazing (NCAA, 2007). The association also provides a timeline for hazing prevention education starting with the recruitment process and going all the way through the athlete's graduation. Proving common language, messages, and alternatives to hazing (NCAA, 2007), the goal is to recognize the likelihood of hazing among sports programs and athletes and provide tools and training to eliminate as much as possible these dangerous behaviors that students have faced.

Individual schools such as Cornell University, have had student made videos to show what hazing is and how to report hazing. Cornell also discusses that changing the culture of hazing is being able to educate the campus on what hazing is and the ways that athletes can report it (Pollard, 2020) Even with the NCAA handbook existing and having specifically created anti-harassment policies that all athletes need to follow, Hazing is

still happening in colleges and high schools (Naveira, 2018). Institutions will continue to find ways to ensure that students coming to campus are educated about hazing, but also aware of the responsibilities that they have in helping prevent it on the campus.

Experience of Student Athletes

College is a unique socialization experience. It's the time when an individual is able to figure out who he or she is, as well as the type of friends he or she wants in his or her life (Learning, 2019). With a college athlete being so involved in their sports team, there is not a lot of time for a student-athlete to be doing anything else. Student-athletes spend the majority of their time going to practices, competing and weightlifting so their time is limited in other aspects. (Harrison, 2019). With athletes spending so much time with each other, it can be hard for them to get out and meet others not affiliated with their team or sport. As a result, when athletes are being hazed, they are often not able to leave this negative environment and are forced to continue to interact with the individuals who were hurting them (Warldon, 2015). If a student joins the team, the veteran player could feel threatened for many different reasons. With the veteran athletes feeling threatened, they are less likely to build a bond with the new players. If the "threat is low, groups and their leaders may instill threat in potential members by invoking perceived enemies" (Hogg, 2001). When a student is feeling threatened, they tend to "pick" on the new athlete. This can be seen in athletes showing that another athlete had a public failure, and this increased the athlete to compliant (Van Duuren & Di Giacomo, 1996). While some athletes are more likely to report physical hazing that causes them pain (Keating et al., 2005). While this could be part of the reasons why athletes participate there could be many other reasons as well.

Athletes are trying to find their athletic identity and trying to figure out their role on a team. If an athlete has strong feelings of acceptance, they are more likely to participate in hazing activities (Wilfret, 2007). The athlete is also trying to find their place in the team, so they are hoping that participating and 'going along' with the activities will help them in this search for identity and acceptance (Oates, 2019).

When veteran athletes feel threatened, they might not see hazing as actual hazing. This can be seen through Tom Farrey's work: *They Call It Leadership* was written where he talks about Derrick Manning, a senior soccer player at Quincy University in Illinois. (Sussberg, 2003). In 2001 when Derrick a student was asked to explain what hazing is at his university, he said "They think we're just trying to punish freshmen, but [we're] really trying to gain a little more respect and bring us all together. We would never try to harm one of the freshmen" (Sussberg, 2003). The student went on to explain that he did not think anything was wrong with what his teammate's and him were doing, but it was negatively affecting the younger athletes. In this case, the older players "believed they were part of a better team because of the relationships that developed during the initiations. However, their record was worse than the previous season when these activities had not taken place" (Sussberg,2003). As Sabo (1987) suggests with respect to sport, socialization encourages initiates to think in hierarchical terms and "positively value rather than reject status differences" (p. 2).

Hazing has been a broad term that universities and athletics have used to defined inappropriate behavior. Hazing is defined as "Any activity, required implicitly or explicitly as a condition of initiation or continued membership in an organization, that may negatively impact the physical or psychological well-being of the individual"

(Campo et al., 2005, p 47). One example of this kind of behavior is when athletes may use underage drinking as a way to fit in or please other athletes on the same team as them (Allan & Madden, 2008).

Due to athletes being in a hierarchy within in their sport, there is a social dominance aspect among members of teams which causes veterans athletes to have more power (Waldron, 2015a). This helps build the power dynamic between the veteran athletes and new athletes. Hazing is designed to humiliate younger and often smaller team members and to keep them in their place (Stuart, p.380, 2013). In other words, athletes are putting pressure on each other and forcing others to binge drink.

Types of Hazing. There are many different types of hazing and it can be broken down into three categories: subtle hazing, harassment hazing and violent hazing (Crow, & Rosner, 2002) . Subtle Hazing can be defined as those actions that: When there is a power imbalance between the rookie members and the veterans there can be acts of hazing that are accepted as harmless. Instead of speaking up about the treatment the rookies are receiving, the rookies take this harm because they want to be accepted by their new team (Wilfret, 2007). Subtle hazing mostly involves ridicule, embarrassment and humiliation to the athlete and some new members seem to expect the treatment that they are given as part of the price for being a part of the program. The most common form of subtle hazing is name calling and new athletes often choose to endure, and not report, the ridicule because they want to be accepted by their peers (NCAA Handbook, 2007).

The rookie athletes are doing this because of the dominance veteran athletes have over them. Nuwer (2018) explained that hazing could also be activities that do not have to end in someone dying or tearing people down by going more in-depth about how there

are different levels of hazing and it can help show us the effects it has on individuals.

Harassment Hazing is hazing that can be defined as "Behaviors that cause emotional anguish or physical discomfort that puts unnecessary stress upon the victims (e.g., verbal abuse and threats, etc.)" (Wilfret, 2007, p. 17).

The third category of hazing, Violent Hazing, can be defined as those "Behaviors that have the potential to cause physical and/or emotional harm (e.g., beating, branding, excessive exercise, forced alcohol consumption, etc.) (Wilfret, 2007, p. 17). It is essential to notice that hazing itself has evolved and changed over time since it was first recognized in higher education. Hazing started as "fairly innocent activities that included carrying veterans' travel bags or performing songs and skits in front of teammates" (Sussberg, 2003, p. 23) and has grown to include such behaviors as "kidnapping, binge drinking, sexual harassment and exploitation" (Sussberg, 2003, p. 23). One example of violent hazing happened when a New Jersey High School lacrosse team gathered together for what was considered the team's initiation of the freshman by the junior team members. In this incident, the veterans made the freshman gather in a room, put on all their lacrosse gear, and fight one another until there was one freshman left standing. All of the losing freshmen were then required to shave their hair, except for the winner, who got to keep his (Rees, C. R. (2010). However, it is not just the students at risk when hazing occurs as the individuals who are failing to enforce hazing policies can also be found guilty of breaking the laws such as when former Louisiana State University student Matthew Naquin "was found guilty of negligent homicide" due to forcing a pledge brother to chug 190 proof liquor if he answered questions wrong about the fraternity (Grinberg, 2019).

Emotional Effects of Hazing

While hazing acts that are violent can cause physical damage to the athlete, they can also cause emotional damage due to the severe stress resulting from the incident.

Evan Petrich, a former Drury University swimmer, experienced hazing while he was on the team from other players that caused mental and physical scars (Press, 2017).

Evan said, “the abuse occurred during an ‘initiation week’ in 2015 when he and other freshmen swimmers were taken blindfolded to home and held in a basement while being forced to drink alcohol until some vomited and others nearly blacked out” (Press, 2017, p. 25). This was not the only incident of hazing Evan experienced as a swimmer at his university.

Other forms of hazing he experienced included an event when Evan and other swimmers expressed that they were hit by dodgeballs while they were naked and were forced to watch pornographic videos as well as being told that they needed to rank the female swimmers on their appearance (Press, 2017). Through all of this, Evan was struggling both mentally and emotionally as a result of the hazing he experienced. Evan described how he is still struggling with “conversion disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder caused by the hazing” (Press, 2017, p.27).

Psychological experiences will differ based on the athlete, the hazing activity, and the environment in which it occurs, but it is impacting these students and while some psychological experiences may only last a short period of time, others may be much longer-lasting (Waldron, 2015b). Psychological effects for students because of hazing can include decrease in confidence, self-doubting, depression, helplessness, low self-esteem, and suicidal thoughts (Waldron, 2015b). These psychological experiences

may result in athletes feeling like they are unable to be friends with people on the team and may even result in athletes quitting their sport. Additionally, these psychological experiences can affect other areas of the athletes' lives, including school and family (Waldron, 2015b). Evan's case was a clear example of how there can be different psychological effects of hazing on individuals when they experience different kinds of hazing.

Some athletes accept hazing as valid and even worthwhile when they experience feelings of connection and bonds of affection for those going through the experience with them and even for those committing the acts. They often confuse the value of the experience of hazing for real bonding experiences (Baron, 2000). However, bonding can be described as "A binding or uniting force. Hazing, however, is divisive and will likely cause new members to be pitted against veterans, causing feelings of alienation and mistrust!" (Wilfret, 2007). He describes that it can be an issue in addressing hazing effectively because people tend to use the words hazing and bonding interchangeably, when, in fact, they are not the same thing at all. In order to understand what hazing is and the effects it has on individuals, students and administrators must know the difference.

Theoretical Framework

This study will utilize two theories to interpret the information provided by the participants and their views on hazing. These theories are Lawrence Kohlberg's (1997) theory of Moral Development adapted by R.H Hersh and Marcia Baxter Magolda's theory of Self-Authorship (2001).

Moral Development Theory. Moral Development theory developed by Lawrence Kohlberg and adapted by Richard Hersh (1997) explains the development of moral

reasoning of the individual and how they make ethical decisions when facing moral dilemmas. Kohlberg identified three levels of moral reasoning, pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional, comprised of two stages within each of the three levels (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage one is punishment- and- obedience. In the first pre-conventional level, stage one, moral reasoning is predicated on "The physical consequences of an action determine its goodness or badness, regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences" (Kohlberg, 1981). As this stage the individual makes moral decisions based on the avoidance of punishment. The individual makes a choice not based on a moral belief or higher reasoning, simply (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage two is instrumental-relativist orientation. In this stage the individual is making decisions by looking for the best results for themselves and not anyone else (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997). The only way the individual is going to go out of their way is if someone else is going to help them. If no one is going to help them, then they are not going to help anyone else. Elements of fairness, reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present as they consider their choices, but individuals are not making decisions because of loyalty, gratitude, or justice. (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage three is the interpersonal concordance or "good boy- nice girl" orientation. At the conventional level, there is a shift as external forces begin to effect moral reasoning. At this stage, the individual is considering other people's options as they become essential to one's own self. An individual places more importance on being perceived as being a "good" person and they want the approval of

others. Ethical behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage four is the "law and order" orientation. At this stage, moral reasoning develops is an "orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake" (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997). Decision making is focused on how individuals are showing respect for authority by their actions, and this is because the individual does not want to get in trouble as a result of a more reasoned view than simply avoiding punishment (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage five is the social-contract, legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones. At the post-conventional level, moral reasoning shifts to define right actions by general rights that are intensely looked at and then agreed upon by an entire society (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997). "The result is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view," but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing the law in terms of rational consideration of social utility" (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Stage six is the universal- ethical-principal orientation. For the final stage, being ethical is thought about and practices at a universal level. "Universal principles of justice, the reciprocity, and equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons" (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1997).

Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory will help explain how the athletes are making moral decisions about hazing based up the reasons and rational for their behavior whether it is going along with the actions or reporting them. Allan, et. al

Madden, M. (2018) also found that most of the college hazing was in college athletics and within the teams themselves. While college athletes have an extensive range of students from first-year students to Seniors, the "Students who leave high school and are going into college are the most at-risk students to have hazing be done to them." (Smokowski, & Evans 2019). Here is where students would be in the first stage, and they are avoiding punishment from other student-athletes.

Self-Authorship Theory. In 2001, Marcia Baxter Magolda developed her Self-Authorship theory from an earlier researcher, Keegan, who examined how people make meaning of life. Baxter Magolda focused on how individuals take ownership of one's actions and thoughts in what she called self-authorship. In this process, a person moves from external identification to internal sources and finally to self-authorship in their ways of making meaning and she identified four stages for this process: Following Formulas, Crossroads, Becoming the Author of One's Life, and finally Internal Foundation. Student-Athletes, like all students, are moving along this path in higher education. Baxter Magolda explains this by talking about how in the Following Formulas stage, individuals look to external sources to tell individuals what they should believe, how they seek approval from others, and learn from adults such as coaches and teachers, as well as their peers (Baxter Magolda, 2001). This external source of meaning making helps explain how young students can be pressured into accepting hazing as well as participating in the hazing of others due to the desire to fit in.

In the Crossroads stage the individual starts to question the choices they have made and look for more authentic relationships, including among their peers (Baxter Magolda, 2001). This shift from external to internal sources of making meaning

allows individuals define their own values and beliefs and in the process work to become more autonomous in their decision making. This shift would imply that students who are in the Crossroads stage would be less willing to support or participate in hazing behaviors as they find greater confidence in their own ability to make decisions.

The final stages of Self-Authorship expand on the values found during Crossroads as individuals defend and refine their values and beliefs, neither of which are supportive of the attitudes and acceptance that allows hazing to continue. While it is possible to see students in these two stages of making meaning based on their age and experience, this study will seek to identify students' decision making in the first two stages of self-authorship.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature around hazing and student athletics by looking first at the history of hazing and how it has developed over the years and into higher education. A review of how athletics have interacted with hazing as well as the impact, both physical and emotional, was examined in addition to the legal issues that have arisen over the last several decades as colleges work to eliminate hazing from the campus. Finally, two theories relevant to making meaning of the participants' experiences and thoughts were reviewed in the context of this study. Chapter Three will review the methodology that will be used in the performance of this study.

Chapter III

Methods

The purpose of this study was to investigate how education about hazing is received by student athletes and how they incorporate that education into their own definition of hazing and how they define responsibility if they encounter it. This information will help institutions see if there is a disconnect between the institutional educational efforts around hazing and how student athletes think about it as well as their own responsibilities regarding hazing to determine if current practices are effective. This chapter will review the design of the study, research site, participants, and collection and treatment of the data.

Design of Study

The study utilized a phenomenological approach in order to gain the most data about the participants' thoughts and impressions surrounding the phenomenon of hazing and their responsibilities when they encounter it (Saldana, 2013). Qualitative research allows for a greater examination of an issue by providing exploration of the participants thoughts, feelings, and experiences. A phenomenological approach allows for the indepth examination of a single phenomenon from the experiences of multiple participants (Saldana, 2013).

Participants

This study targeted students who are collegiate athletes at a mid-sized university in the Midwest. The population consists of Division 1 (D1) college athletes that are involved in any of the official sports teams at the institution including basketball, baseball, football, volleyball, soccer, swimming, and softball with at least one full year of

experience at the institution and on the team. A group of 5 participants were selected from those students who indicate a willingness to participate in the study. The Associate Athletic Director/ Compliance Director was provided with an original email (Appendix A) that she sent to the list of current athletes through email. After the email was sent and a week past she sent a follow up email on behalf of the researcher (Appendix B) to the athletes as well. Based off the responses to the emails is how the participants were randomly selected.

Table 3.1

Name of Participant	Year in school	Racial Identity	Gender Identity
Devin	Senior	African American	Male
Hester	Junior	Biracial	Female
Hope	Junior	African American	Female
Suzanne	Senior	White	Female
Sammie	Grad Student	African American	Female

The participants were members of the following teams: Football, Golf, Cross Country and Track & Field, and two participants were on the Softball team.

Research Site

The population of the institution is approximately 7,800 undergraduate students. The institution offers multiple undergraduate and master's graduate degree programs along with post-baccalaureate programs. Based on university statistics, 40% of the university's students are male and 60% are female, and over half of the students are enrolled full time. Racially, the largest population of students is white with 63.28% of the institution followed by 14.84% African American and 10.52% Hispanic. (Institution A, 2020). The institution competes in 17 sports (eight men's and nine women's) and has nearly 580 student athletes with 60% of them men and 40% women. (Institution A, 2020).

Instrumentation

For this study semi-structured interviews were used to interview participants. A semi-structured interview allows the interviewer to gather consistent information from all participants, while still allowing the opportunity to follow up on individual responses. "Although the interviewer prepares a list of predetermined questions, semi-structured interviews unfold in a conversational manner offering participants the change to explore issues they feel are important" (Clifford et al. 2016). The questions that were asked are located in Appendix A. In addition, demographic information will be gathered from the participants included in the Interview Protocol.

Data Collection

The interviews happened in the fall, 2020 semester and were scheduled for between 45-60 minutes each. Interviews were conducted virtually through Zoom due to restrictions from COVID-19 mandates. The interviews were recorded on two separate devices, with

prior notification given to the participants to ensure that they were aware that they were being recorded. The interviews then were transcribed, and a copy was sent to the participant to perform a member check to improve accuracy and provide any recommended changes.

Data Analysis

After the interviews were complete, transcriptions were coded to identify common elements. Coding is where there is a common theme found in the participant's responses. Common themes were then be identified in further detail and assessed through using standard coding techniques (Saldana, 2013). After coding was completed, transcripts were analyzed to identify themes identified and organized around the research questions. A thematic analysis allows "for flexibility in the researchers choice of theoretical framework" (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Treatment of Data

Participants were assigned pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality during the semi-structured interviews. This information was kept on two password-protected USB drives and kept by the interviewer in a locked filing cabinet. After the study is completed, the transcriptions and recordings will be stored with the researcher for three years before being deleted according to IRB protocol.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the proposed methodology that will be used in this study. First, a review of the research design and research site was provided. Next, participants and the instrument to be used for this study was explained. Finally, how the

collection, analysis, and treatment of the data will be managed was described. Chapter Four will provide the findings from the study participants.

Chapter IV

Results

This chapter will focus on summarizing the five semi-structured interviews conducted and reporting the themes found to understand athlete's perceptions of hazing in college athletics. Themes were found from analyzing the five interviews and are arranged based on the research questions.

Research Question #1: How do college student athletes define hazing?

There were two overall themes that occurred with when the athletes were defining hazing. The two themes are that they defined hazing as being forceful and uncomfortable as well as there being pressure from teammates surrounding hazing and team rituals.

Athletes define hazing in different ways but the participants in this study overall understood that hazing is a negative concept. There was confusion about what truly was hazing and whether any particular action amounted to hazing despite the education and training that they received. The participants here defined hazing as restricted to something that was a forceful experience and something that makes others feel uncomfortable. The participants also felt that hazing was the result of Pressure from Teammates and Team Rituals.

Forceful and Uncomfortable

One of the most commonly repeated descriptions that was used by the participants in defining hazing was that something was only hazing if it was a forceful activity. One of the participants, Devin, explained hazing as "making somebody do something that they do not want to do." He was discussing that he knows that hazing is forceful and that it is not voluntary. The other participants shared that perspective when they

restricted their definitions of hazing to something that participants felt that they did not have an option to decline if they did not want to participate in the activities. Hester highlighted this by talking about how upperclassman athletes hazed the underclassman because they told the underclassman they will gain something if they participate in hazing.

While some participants talked about hazing being forceful, but they also included it as something that caused those targeted to be uncomfortable as well. Sammie described hazing as “A team thing. I would define it as forcing somebody to do an activity or perform something that they don't feel comfortable [with].” Participants discussed how it can be more than one athlete feeling uncomfortable in a hazing situation. Devin described that “Hazing is when somebody will be real uncomfortable and it'll be something a lot of people are uncomfortable with.”

Some athletes felt that hazing has to be an extreme event in order to actually be considered hazing. Devin described hazing as having to be something out of this world and that he has never heard about. Devin continued to express that his older cousin was involved in a hazing incident at another university and that his cousin described not knowing it was hazing due to it not being a wild or extreme situation. If it was not described like that, then he would not consider it to be hazing even if there was some type of negative treatment to the other athlete. While Devin was the only participant to be straightforward and express that is how he defines hazing, most of the others described similar feelings but were not able to articulate it as clearly. While Devin understood there could be activities that make athletes uncomfortable, and the activities are forceful, he does not describe that as hazing unless it crosses that line he has established.

Pressure from Teammates and Team Rituals

The participants also discussed how there was a significant amount of peer pressure from teammates to participate in activities, even those that could be considered hazing. Sammie described hazing as something that has a lot of peer pressure involved and that there were negative emotions about the actions that were happening. As well as the underclassman athletes were trying to fit in with the team but in a negative way which then involved hazing. There was also an element of pressure to go along with it due to the activity being part of a team ritual or tradition. Suzanne expressed that she feels hazing occurs when,

Upperclassmen, or people with more authority on the team, [are] trying to pressure newcomers on the team into doing something embarrassing or something illegal or something that could potentially bring them harm, as like a Rite of passage, when really it's just for their own entertainment and using peer pressure to do that.

Athletes participate in hazing because they feel like they have to because they want to be part of the tradition. Hope defined hazing as “An act or ritual that is done to people that can cause harm or lead to negative effects to a person just to join an organization.” She felt that the involvement in hazing causes problems for students and their relationships with others. Sammie went more in depth by describing something she would consider to be hazing:

If you have a karaoke night and maybe, it's a team tradition that they (the team) think it's important. They make the freshmen do it and the freshmen don't want to

do it. Then if you keep trying to force them to do it, I think that's considered hazing.

The participants described how even though there are “traditions” that the teams do, the other teammates might not want to participate in them.

Overall, the participants defined hazing as something uncomfortable, forceful, and usually the result of pressure by other teammates to participate in because of traditions or rituals associated with the team. There was also the element that the activity needed to be an extreme event in order for it to really rise to the level in order to be considered hazing. These participants had many different definitions of what hazing is and how it relates to athletics.

Research Question #2: How do athletes distinguish it (hazing) from healthy team-building and other activities designed to establish camaraderie among players?

Many athletes understand there is a difference between hazing and a healthy bonding experience. The participants were able to provide a definition of what constituted a healthy bonding experience, provided some examples of those activities, and were able to identify some activities that made them feel uncomfortable.

Definition of Bonding

The participants defined bonding as an enjoyable way for teammates to get to know one another. Suzanne described bonding as a “more positive experience and everybody just kind of respects what you want to do and how you want to get to know each other better.” Devin shared that he viewed bonding activities as “hanging out, trying to get to know somebody, and just talking.” A key element for the participants was the idea of trying to build those foundational friendships with the other athletes. All of the

participants really emphasized that bonding is a time to get to know the other athletes on the team. As well as simply enjoying spending time with one another to build those relationships among teammates.

A second aspect of defining bonding was that there was a very clear understanding with the participants that that any true bonding activity is something that is both voluntary and enjoyable. Hope expanded on that idea by explaining that bonding was “something you would want to do instead of what someone else wants you to do.” She emphasized that the activity that the other athletes were wanting them to do was voluntary and that everyone felt safe in declining if they were not interested in participating. The participants shared that the activities were supposed to be things that everyone would want to participate in. Hester clarified that the bonding activities were “not forceful” and that she felt that she had the option to decide whether or not to participate.

Experience

The participants shared what their team does for bonding activities both pre-COVID and during the current COVID pandemic. While some of the activities the teams did were structured and formal, others were more casual where they just hung out together with their teammates at their apartments. Sammie shared that “the team would just hang out with each other” as a way to bond. Several participants also shared that most of the athletes on the teams live together in the same apartment or complex and thus are more able to relax and hang out together simply by being in close proximity.

Hope described that when there were recruits coming into town to meet the team, “we do more game nights and things like that.” While they do a lot of talking and getting-

to- know-you events, the teams also go out and do bonding activities. Sammie expressed that her team goes bowling a lot and are able to have fun doing something that is competitive. Suzanne shared that her and her team had a fun game day as a team where they “played spike ball and volleyball and kickball”. Some of the participants shared that they did volunteer work, jumped in the campus pond for charity, went camping, and would go to the town’s lake to go hiking with their teammates.

One major kind of bonding activity that was shared by all of the participants was bonding over food as a team. Teams will often go out for dinner together as a standing event. Suzanne described how her team goes to town and as a team they eat Mexican food together. Sammie talked about how at some of her team’s dinners, the coaches were there or even sometimes the coaches provided food for the players. Hope explained how her coaches put together an annual cooking night every year at the beginning of the season where they have a “soup night where my coach makes a bunch of different soups.” Hester described how her team tries to have team dinners “at least once a month”. And some of the participants discussed how their team would spend the night making food together as another way to bond.

Uncomfortable Activities

While many of the participants talked about all the positive bonding they do as a team, there were some participants who felt uncomfortable with some of the activities that their teams wanted them to do. One example of this was when Suzanne shared that she “doesn’t feel super comfortable participating in underage drinking or things like that.” Suzanne explained that while she didn’t really feel pressured by her teammates into doing those activities, she still felt uncomfortable with them and the unspoken push to

participate in them. Suzanne did share that when she chose not to participate, she did not feel that it negatively affected her relationship with her teammates. She shared that the other athletes on her team did not have a problem with her not participating in the drinking and that she felt supported by her teammates with her decision.

There were other activities that were coordinated for the teams that just were not of interest to the participants and that was acceptable as well. Hope explained that her team went camping and that she since does not like nature, she chose not to go. Because she felt uncomfortable participating in the activity since she does not like camping, combined with the fact that she did not have a lot of experience camping, made it an activity that she simply declined to join in with. Suzanne shared similar positive reactions from her team who understood that she didn't want to participate in some of the activities that were planned and left it at that.

While two of the participants shared specific examples of how they did not feel comfortable participating in particular activities, the other three indicated that they had never felt uncomfortable in any of the activities they did as a team. Sammie, Hester and Devin all stated that they felt that they would probably be willing to do anything that the team came up with and that they had felt comfortable participating in all the activities their team did so far. Sammie expressed that her team hasn't "really done anything that I felt uncomfortable with." The participants felt comfortable in expressing their feelings if they did not want to participate in the activities, so they did not consider it to be an issue for them. Devin also expressed that he had "never been asked to do something I did not want to do." There was enough of a positive relationship as teammates that they wouldn't feel uncomfortable in saying no. Finally, Hester described that there is nothing that she

would not feel comfortable participating in.” She explained that she will “do everything and that I want to participate in everything.”

The participants had made a clear distinction in their own minds that these kinds of activities were not hazing, even if they did not particularly like what was planned. The activities were simply opportunities to spend time together and develop relationships among members of the team and were viewed as voluntary and even if they choose not to participate, they still believed that purpose of the activity was to have fun. While the majority of the participants had not experienced an activity with their team that they did not join in with, they all felt very confident that they could choose not to participate without damaging their relationships with their teammates.

Research Question #3: How do college student athletes receive education and training on the topic of hazing?

Participants discussed the many different avenues where they received information about hazing and the expectations placed on them about it. There were four distinct ways that participants learned about hazing as it related to them; their exposure to hazing before they came to college or some level of Precollege Awareness, education from the institution’s Athletic Staff, the materials and information they received directly from the NCAA, and finally through various media source. All of these sources combined to give the athletes’ their understanding of hazing and how to recognize it.

Precollege Awareness

The participants all had some degree of exposure to the concept of hazing prior to coming to college but it was not consistent. They often had little to no real education about hazing, and it was often described to them as more of an issue in college,

something that was not of any real concern for them while in high school. Suzanne explained that she had learned very little information about hazing in high school and only started to really learn more about it when she became an athlete in college. The information she received in high school was that the college athletes would all attend a meeting about hazing once a year where the administration explained to them what hazing was. Sammie explained that while she had heard about hazing in high school, every time hazing was brought up, they were talking about college hazing incidents and never high school. She specified that in high school, the athletes talked about how they “knew when they got to college it [hazing] is one of those things that was going to be part of the college experience”.

Hope explained that before coming to college she “Didn’t believe she actually had any professional or formal information” about hazing. She shared that if she did have any kind of training or education about it in high school, then it was “just a box to be checked off” of what they were supposed to cover and that she did not remember learning anything of worth. Before coming to college, Hope did not understand what hazing was and what hazing does to a team. Devin actually had the most information before college and described learning about hazing from a family member. He said that his cousin was a college athlete and hazing was happening at their institution. Devin said he learned about the seriousness of hazing because his cousin ended up quitting due to the hazing that occurred.

Athletic Staff

The participants share that they have learned about hazing from coaches as well as other administrative officers in the athletic department who provided additional

knowledge to add to their understanding of hazing during their time in college. Four out of the five student athletes all mentioned that they had learned information surrounding hazing from their current university and college staff. Hester expressed that the first time she heard about hazing was at the beginning of the year at the beginning of her time in her sport. She described where she attended a meeting with the athletic director and compliance director and all the athletic teams at her institution. She explained that “they talked about hazing and how it's not allowed, not only on our school, but through NCAA.” Hester expanded on this by saying the administration stated clearly that hazing is not appropriate and they gave examples of what hazing is. Hope recalled the same meeting as Hester and shared that they were “all there are one big group with one person speaking to them, but all athletes and coaches were together.” Sammie discussed how at the beginning of the year the institution’s athletic department went in depth about what hazing is at this meeting,

They have whole presentations on it, about what it is, what it feels like, what counts as hazing, what doesn't count as hazing. So that's basically how I kind of got my true understanding of what it was just from getting into[my sport]. And them really beating it into our heads about what to, and what not to do.

Suzanne explained that her coaches made sure to address hazing to the athletes personally. She said that the coaches took a lot of time to explain to the athletes what hazing is and what consequences there are for engaging in hazing behaviors.

Only one student athlete mentioned that they did not receive any information about hazing from their coaching staff. Devin expressed that the coaches “never really talked talk to us about it.” Devin discussed that he felt that there was no need for the

coaches to talk about hazing because everyone on his team understood there was no tolerance for hazing to happen. Devin clarified that he had never heard about hazing from any individuals in the athletic department. Devin talked about how there was never any incidents of hazing on the team, so the topic did not come up with the coaches on staff.

NCAA Materials

Athletes do gain information from their coaches, administration and pre-college experiences, but they also learn about it from the NCAA and how the professional associational provides the athletes with information on many subjects, including hazing. The participants indicated that some of the hazing information they received from the NCAA was more in depth than what their university gives them and gave them a better understanding of the subject.

Hester discussed how the very first time she learned about hazing was when she signed her commitment letter and she “got a little booklet from NCAA. I feel like I've learned more about hazing through [the] NCAA than the institution.” Hester also explained that the NCAA materials explained that “you're not allowed to force someone to do something that they don't want to do.” They materials described what is illegal under NCAA guidelines and how the risk of hazing damages the athlete and the sport. Hester shared that the materials she received talked about how hazing is “more common” in college athletics and that was why they were providing this information to the athletes.

Suzanne mentioned that there was a “training or like a form or something they had to read and go through, that talks about hazing and what it is.” Suzanne expressed that the athletes do have to look at information in regards to hazing and the NCAA. This

was a time for Suzanne to digest the information she received to see if she understood the information she learned. Hope also talked about how she also read the “NCAA student code of conduct” and the process if she had any follow up questions about it. Sammie expressed that the NCAA also has “Its own guidelines for hazing, but also the school has its own consequences for hazing.”

Media Influences

While many of the sources that athletes learn about hazing from are through the university or NCAA, athletes do learn about hazing from outside sources as well. All five of the athletes discussed how they learned about hazing from TV, news, movies or Social Media. Suzanne mentioned that she had heard about hazing from social media outlets, typically reading news alerts on Facebook and Twitter. She explained that she heard about hazing a little bit through formal or official news sources, but shared that she typically receives most of her news from social media. Sammie also heard about hazing happening through the “news and she has seen it on social media.” Hester described that she “feels like hazing is really common from where she is from (the West Coast) and there are more stories on the TV” than she sees here. She also mentioned that she saw an article about hazing that went “viral” on Twitter last year about a student dying from hazing in their college sport.

Hope talked about hearing about hazing incidents when they were reported on the news. She saw stories about it usually “when it's the hazing has gone bad type of situation.” Devin also mentioned hearing about a school on the news getting in trouble when a coach was disciplined for hitting some of his athletes. Hester expressed that she had heard about athletic hazing through some of the articles she had read online. She

described that she feels like she has learned about a lot of information about hazing through the news.

Movies and TV shows were another way that the participants shared that they had heard about hazing and what it actually was through its representation in entertainment. Hope's primary source of information on hazing outside of the college was through the movies she watched about students in college. The movies gave her another perspective on what hazing is perceived to be in college. Hope explained that the perception was that hazing was going to happen to her college due to her watching those movies.

Devin was in a similar situation to Hope when he reflected on learning about hazing through a segment on TV called 'Open Court'. Devin admired the all-star NBA athletes who were on the segment and they were all talking about their experiences of being hazed as rookies. In this segment Devin explained that "the athletes were saying they had to bring donuts to the veteran players or do whatever the veteran athletes told them to do." Devin understood hazing at a very basic level by getting to see people he looked up to talk about hazing but in a very non-judgmental or negative way.

Research Question #4: What do college student athletes consider to be their role and responsibility when they encounter situations of hazing in their teams?

When discussing how they would respond to an incident of hazing occurring in their presence, the majority of the participants indicated they would not intervene or take action. The reasons included a lack of understanding about what constituted hazing, a lack of personal willingness to confront the behavior and risk the social consequences of not going along with the activity, or simply a belief that hazing is not a real issue for

athletes and their team. Communication among team members also played into this belief as the participants shared that they did not talk about hazing with teammates.

Lack of Understanding of What Constitutes Hazing

Some of the athletes did not know whether a particular situation was hazing, or did not believe it was hazing, to lack of understanding of the technical definition of hazing. Sammie discussed how she did not recognize a situation of hazing happening on her team because she did not understand what hazing actually was. Sammie shared “I did not know that it was hazing at the time, [not] until after it happened”. Sammie then explained that she didn’t do anything because she didn’t know what to do and thought it was a situation that was beyond her ability to resolve or take responsibility for, so she simply did not do anything. Sammie also talked about how the particular hazing incident “kinda got tricky” as a result of her not fully understanding that what she was witnessing was in fact hazing.

Hope expressed that she did not expect that she would act in such a situation. She regarded her own likelihood of intervening with a hazing situation among her teammates as low. She indicated that she has “Never has been in a situation like that, so I think I would just be a witness to seeing it.” She said as a result of her having no experience with seeing hazing that she was certain about, she did not feel comfortable determining what could constitute hazing despite the training and information provided to her by the institution and the NCAA.

Suzanne expressed that she had heard of hazing situations with other people, teams, and groups but that nothing like that has occurred on her campus that she was aware of, at least not among the athletes. She expressed that the only time she hears about

hazing incidents is “When a situation goes really bad, like someone is injured or extremely hurt.” This led to her perception that unless that occurs, it is not hazing in her judgement. Similar to Suzanne, Hester also felt like she understood or learned about hazing more through her other roles on campus, most specifically in a leadership role much more than her in her role as a student athlete. Hester described her experiences with hazing outside of athletics, “In my leadership role, we talked about hazing and [I] was able to kind of understand what hazing was.” Hester expressed that in her previous role as an RA she would feel comfortable confronting a hazing situation but based off the knowledge she has as an athlete, she would most likely not intervene.

Lack of Personal Willingness to Confront

Several of the participants indicated that stepping in to address such a situation as hazing was outside their personal comfort level. Suzanne explained that she would “not want to get involved at all” and then explained that she would hope that at some point in the future, when she was more confident in herself in these situations, that she would feel comfortable enough to stand up to the individuals engaging in hazing behavior and put a stop to it. Hester discussed how if she were in a position where she would see a situation of hazing occur, that she would want to be able to be blunt and say something about the situation. She said, “it's not right and you're just as guilty if you're just going to stand there and watch it happen.” But Hester also discussed how while she would want to take those actions if she were ever in that situation, she recognized that right now she did not think that she would actually do so. Instead she admitted that she would most likely simply be a witness the hazing incident and not step forward to take any affirmative action to stop it.

Hope shared that she has personally never seen a situation where she observed any form of hazing occurring. Because of that, she did not feel comfortable with the idea that she had a responsibility to confront those doing the hazing or taking action to stop it from happening. She said, "I have never been in a situation like that, so I think I would just be a witness to seeing it." Her recognition of her own unwillingness to act was tied to her lack of confidence about how to act in that kind of situation without understanding of the proper way to intervene. Sammie discussed that with the situation of hazing she witnessed "it was kind of a public thing and there was a lot of people there." There were a lot of people involved in that particular situation and it was overwhelming to say something in front of the other athletes. The ability to be part of a crowd or to expect that others would act gave Sammie the ability to avoid personal responsibility for acting in that situation.

Devin was the only participant to express that he felt that he would actually intervene to stop hazing from occurring if he was present and aware of it. Devin expressed that if he saw someone "getting bullied, or hazed, it's not going to be tolerated and it's not what we do on this team." The negative impact of hazing on the team was a key factor in Devin's attitude towards hazing and his perception of it was that it actually damaged relationships among teammates when things got out of hand. Devin talked about how sometimes "athletes joke around too much and they can cross a line." He then continued to talk about how with some people "they can't really be joked around with because they get real sensitive. Others you can joke with because they won't take it personal." He described how some athletes know it is just jokes, but how he has to watch who he is joking with and how they are going to handle it.

Denial that Hazing is an Issue

A common element of the participants' lack of willingness to confront hazing was the belief that hazing is not actually a real issue that they are likely to encounter. Hope explained that she never hears about hazing as a problem, but when she does, her talks about hazing almost exclusively deal with hazing in Greek Life. She explained that that "athletic hazing is never really discussed." The idea that hazing is something that happened in other groups allows her to consider it a non-issue for her and her teammates.

Hope expanded on this idea by saying "Most people talk about it with sororities or fraternities over sports, but maybe some schools do haze the athletes, but none that I've ever heard of." Hope was willing to acknowledge the possibility that athletes may face hazing, but almost immediately dismissed it or considered it the problem of other schools, not her own. Hester shared that she has never heard of an incident of hazing happening at her university but what she does hear she "hears more about it in the fraternity and sorority areas, not as much into athletes."

Suzanne has not seen anything with her sport in particular or with other sports at her institution, sharing that she has "heard about hazing, but not with my sport." Suzanne shared that she has heard very little information about other campuses having a problem with hazing, and shared it was only if it was a big deal, "it makes the news, [that] is when I hear about it from other campuses."

Teammate Communication

Some of the common concerns with four out of the five athletes are that as teammates, they do not talk about hazing as a team. The participants shared that it was

not a topic or issue of concern among the student athletes and was not raised by anyone outside of the formal training they received each year. Suzanne shared that “As far as teammates talking with each other about it [hazing], it's not talked about much.” This idea of not needing to talk about it was based on the assumption and belief by the students that it just was not as much of an issue as it was made out to be by others. Hope reinforced this idea when she shared that her team never talks about hazing when it's just the athletes together, they only discussed it when coaches or the athletic administration raised the issue each year and it was quickly forgotten.

Devin echoed this sentiment by saying that his teammates do not talk about hazing when they are together. He mentioned that something that his teammates do is joke around with each other and clarifying that the team does not consider this kind of behavior to be hazing, so they do not feel a need to address it or talk about it as a group. Sammie expressed that while her team currently does not really talk about hazing, they actually have in the past. The team talked about the difference between bonding and hazing in the context of team activities and clarified that while those activities were “a team tradition, but if someone didn't want to [participate] we would talk about that.” When a teammate did not feel comfortable, then the team would then take a pause and try to evaluate if they were crossing a line or not.

Hester shared that her team does not talk about hazing because they see no reason to. She shared “to be very honest, we have not talked about hazing at all. We kind of looked at it as like common sense. Like we're not going to make someone do something so they can do whatever.” She mentioned that if teammates have questions about hazing, then they are more than welcome to discuss it with other teammates, but she

felt that her team sees the teams' interactions with each other as just a matter of "being a decent person" and not hazing someone.

Overall, these athletes had a hard time of putting in words what they viewed as their role if they were confronted by hazing with most coming up with some variation of witness or bystander. Most of them know that hazing happens to students in some context, but they do not feel like they have clear enough knowledge surrounding what constitutes hazing or that there is not enough communication between their teammates about hazing so it is 'out of mind'. The overall belief they all shared was that hazing is not really an issue in athletics, at least on their campus, so that they do not need to worry about it.

Summary

Through this research study and from the research questions asked during the interviews, a variety of themes were found because of the responses from the participants. This chapter gave structure to the themes found based on the research question. The participants examined how they define hazing, what a bonding activity is, how athletes are educated about hazing and what their role is surrounding hazing. In chapter five, the findings will be examined including recommendations for student lobby groups and suggestions for future research.

Chapter V

Discussion, Recommendations, Conclusion

This research study used qualitative semi structured interviews to look at athlete's perceptions of hazing at a mid-sized Midwestern public institution. The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand student athletes' perception of hazing. Five students who had been involved with college athletics were interviewed and asked questions (Appendix A) around the following research questions: (1) How do college student athletes define hazing? (2) How do they distinguish it from healthy team-building and other activities designed to establish camaraderie among players? (3) How do college student athletes receive education and training on the topic of hazing? (4) What do college student athletes consider to be their role and responsibility when they encounter situations of hazing in their teams? This chapter discusses the findings of the study, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Discussion

Across the research questions and themes found, some clear conclusions can be drawn from the results. Athletes do not define hazing due the way that colleges and the NCAA does, despite regular training and materials provided to them. Instead, they appear to link 'real' hazing to involving someone getting severely injured or even dying. The difficulty lies in the fact that athletes are getting information about hazing from outside sources, as well as the university, and these sources often contradict or confuse them. The athletes are able to articulate what the NCAA and their university is teaching them, which shows that they pay attention and remember the information provided to

them, but it is not sinking in nor does it appear to motivate them to act. While having all of this information, the athletes indicated that they do not feel comfortable stepping in and stopping a hazing situation due to their lack of confidence with such an act and their confusion and lack of real understanding of what hazing actually is. Finally, the athletes appear to have a disconnect in believing that hazing can actually happen in their sport or in athletics in general, instead seeing it as a problem for others.

Defining Hazing

Overall, there was a disconnect between what the athletes are learning about hazing in official settings and how they understood what hazing is in real life. These participants were able to articulate how the NCAA defines hazing through the trainings they went through, or the information they received from their university, but they did not fully agree with the definition of what hazing is by these sources instead preferring their own version. Some of the definitions or incidents that the participants discussed as not being hazing were in fact hazing activities using formal definitions, but the participants did not agree that those situations should be classified as hazing.

This study showed that the participants did not want to embrace the school's definition of hazing, instead preferring their own. Even though they understood that hazing is dangerous and something that should be actively opposed, and that it should not be happening within their sport, their unwillingness to see actual examples of hazing made their ability to prevent it significantly limited.

Personal Responsibility

There was a lack of personal responsibility for the athletes to act in a hazing situation in regards to them looking for someone in authority or “more adult” to step in to act. This can be seen in Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1981) theory which was adapted by R.H Hersh surrounding how student’s development of moral responding happens as well as how ethical decision are being made. Baxter Magolda’s (2001) self-authorship theory goes hand in hand with the athletes looking for an adult figure and not taking authorship for their action surrounding hazing. This was especially clear when looking at how athletes viewed intervening in a situation of hazing or realizing what their role in hazing should be.

There was little to no communication going on between teammates on the subject of hazing. While all of the participants mentioned that they would be comfortable talking about hazing to their teammates if necessary or if the other athletes had questions surrounding hazing, they indicated that it was not actually happening. To the athletes, there was simply no need to discuss hazing because they felt that hazing does not happen in their sport, so teammates do not have to talk about it. Hazing was a problem for others, so it was not something that they needed to be prepared to confront.

This lack of active talking about it could indicate that part of the unwillingness to act may be the result of fear of how others on the team would interpret their interference and risk losing social standing with their teammates or being seen as not part of the group. Greater communication could be a method where some of the stigma associated with hazing could be removed allowing for more confidence in the idea that stepping in would be seen as admirable. There needs to be more comfort in having conversations

about hazing among the student athletes to create an environment where hazing is not only rejected as an acceptable form of team activity, but that the responsibility for preventing it is accepted by the students themselves. Creating this new norm about hazing will allow the students to feel empowered to stand up and stop hazing if it occurs.

There was also a lack of willingness by the participants to step in when there was an act of hazing occurring or even when they considered a hypothetical case of it happening. These athletes did not feel comfortable, or educated enough, to see themselves with the confidence to step in to stop a hazing situation occurring within their team. Many of these participants explained that while they would like to step in to stop it at some point in the future, knowing that doing so was the correct thing to do, they still did not feel that they were ready to do so at this time. Many of the athletes also felt that there was not a real a need to step in due to any incidents that did occur not being severe enough to warrant action or that it was the responsibility of others to do so. The only hypothetical situation where they did feel that they might step in was if the hazing incident was really putting another athlete in severe danger.

Educating Athletes

Understanding how athletes are educated about hazing is important to understand because of how thoroughly it affects the athletes' view of what hazing is and the impact that it has both on individuals and the team. This study focused on athletes' perceptions of hazing in their sport and what they perceived to be their responsibility when they encountered it happening in their presence. To understand how hazing affects athletes, and how they think and talk about with others, it is critical to understand that they are

getting information and opinions about hazing from more than just official sources with a consistent message.

Additional education with a more engaged element could help the athletes feel more confident with their role in hazing. One suggestion for improvement is providing a role-playing type of activity that allows the athletes to practice interventions during their training with the university or the NCAA. This would be beneficial to the students as it would help the athletes understand hazing does happen in their sport, that there are other hazing situations that do not end up in injury or death and learn how to actually step in if it happens. While doing this role play, it would be also be the time to discuss with the student athletes what can be considered as positive bonding experiences and how something could easily cross the line into hazing. This kind of activity would also have the added benefit of encourage athletes to talk about it simply by talking about the role-play experience.

Conflicting Information from Media

All of the participants discussed how they received most of their information about hazing through media sources and not the NCAA or the university. The information the athletes were getting about what hazing was focused mainly on severe, graphic, and large-scale hazing incidents at universities across the country. This sensationalized view of hazing skewed their perception of what hazing actually is because the only incidents that the news or social media were talking about were instances where athletes were dying or being severely hurt. As a result, the athletes concluded that if an incident was not on that level of abuse or harm, then it probably was

not actually hazing, despite the training and communication that they were receiving in the school meetings and trainings as being athletes.

Entertainment

Athletes discussed how they saw lot of information surrounding hazing presented through various entertainment mediums including movies and TV. One interview discussed how NBA athletes were reminiscing about being hazing as rookies and that it was “part of the tradition and culture”, this positive presentation about the ‘benefits’ of hazing added to the confusion of the athlete’s perception of hazing and his unwillingness to see it as a negative. To college athletes, this kind of representation skews their thoughts about hazing because they see hazing more as a norm in college athletics than an aberration. In movies, athletes are shown experiencing hazing and how going along with it is a way to earn their place on a team or in a Greek organization. These media influences of hazing as something acceptable affects athletes’ perception of hazing before they even get to college making the job of higher education professionals and athletic administrators more difficult.

Understanding this discord is important for professionals in higher education because these athletes’ lives are surrounded by information coming from a variety of sources from social media to entertainment that often present hazing as either limited to only extreme examples of behaviors that are outrageous due to death or injury or that they are acceptable and are in fact a fun and expected part of the athletic experience. The NCAA and colleges provide information to the contrary, something that the athletes all acknowledged, but it was not enough to counter the students’ existing beliefs and thoughts. The institution is giving the athletes accurate information, but others are

countering that perspective confusing the students and perpetuating a culture of acceptance among the students. Institutions need to help athletes truly understand when activities that are happening are, in fact, hazing. Finding ways to counter the cultural narrative that athletes are learning about hazing will take more than simply presenting information in a meeting or a pamphlet.

Peer Connections and Communications

There was a clear lack of communication among the members of the team about hazing and this reticence to talk about it with each other makes for an environment that allows hazing behaviors to continue to exist. Athletes need to be able to clearly distinguish what are acceptable bonding or relationship developmental activities. A part of healthy and useful activities to connect teams needs to include being able to talk about their own comfort level with any particular activity that may occur.

These participants discussed how there had been situations on their teams that would be classified as hazing, but they did not understand it was hazing until after the incident and an official has clarified that designation. Even then, after the incident occurred, the athletes did not discuss what happened with each other, rather the university explained what happened to them instead. The lack of engaged, two-way communication about hazing between the teammates significantly affected how they perceived whether hazing was actually happening within athletics or if the officials were simply exaggerating what had happened.

With no meaningful discussion about what is considered hazing, the athletes did not feel comfortable enough to talk about hazing with each and instead contributed to an

atmosphere that either it did not really matter, apply to themselves, or was truly dangerous as an activity. This lack of promoting and supporting peer communication on the issue made it nearly impossible for the students to see themselves as being strong enough to challenge someone hazing others. Instead, they would likely instead observe the situation and not intervene from a fear of getting it wrong or being judged by their teammates.

This lack of personal responsibility to step in can cause additional problems because students are not challenging each other with regards to hazing so that hazing stops. Athletes need to be able to understand they are in a hazing situation and when something crosses the line and becomes hazing. Without having the conversation about hazing as a team, it makes it extremely hard for the athletes to realize what healthy bonding is and how to properly do it as a team.

Recommendations for Higher Education Professionals

While the athletes are the ones who are participating in hazing, observing hazing, and are receiving the education about hazing, educational professionals are the ones who are giving them the information and helping them understand it. As such, these professionals can have a significant impact on helping these students build a positive environment where the athletes can have healthy bonding activities that do not cross the line to become a hazing situation. A key tool for professionals is to provide more appropriate bonding activities for the athletes to do in order to help the athletes experience a positive bonding experience and be able to distinguish the different as a result of the examples provided to them.

Student affairs and other higher education professionals can also provide information to the athletes to make hazing feel more real to the athletes. They can help these athletes have self-authorship for their actions regarding hazing and what their ignorance surrounding hazing can cause. Additionally, they can provide information and perspectives that counter the information they are getting from the media and entertainment that limit their understanding of hazing.

Finally, professionals can be a major source of support help athletes gain confidence in their own ability to know how to both address or stop hazing activities that are happening and have the confidence to do so when it happens. One way that they can do this by facilitating role-playing activities that allow athletes to practice interventions and build the athlete's confidence in their ability to know when and how to act. Helping the athletes see themselves as more than an athlete can help them step up as a leader and see that their actions, whether holding back or stepping forward, will still affect others. By giving these athletes the ability to trust in their ability to step in and confront these situations, athletes can better hold each other accountable and realize the depth and negative impacts hazing has that is often ignored or discounted. Not only will it improve the athlete's confidence, but it can encourage the athletes to discuss hazing more on a peer level and not as something that is solely the responsibility of the institution.

Recommendations for Future Research

While there is a lot of information in the literature surrounding hazing as whole (Nuwer, 1990) there is a lack of information regarding athletes' personal perceptions on hazing. This study was an attempt to add to that literature, but there are a number of

additional studies that could expand our understanding about on how athletes perceive hazing and their role when faced with it.

This study was conducted at a midsized university the Midwest. Additional studies could be replicated at schools in different parts of the country, to see if there is a difference in regional perceptions as well as looking at athletes in different NCAA divisions.

Additionally, following participants throughout their journey in division 1 athletics from recruit to graduation, would allow for the exploration of any changes to attitudes and perceptions about hazing over an athlete's college career to see if their experiences and attitudes about hazing changes over time. This longitudinal approach may provide a different perspective in how the athletes' perspective changes as their social position within their team changes.

A second limitation with this study was that only one male participant was involved in this study and he was also the one in the contact sport. A study looking to determine any differences in male and female athletes' perceptions and understanding of hazing could be valuable. This study also did not investigate if athletes who identified as part of a minority population would have a different perception surrounding hazing than their majority peers.

Finally, in this study, only one of the participants was involved in a contact sport while the other four participants were in noncontact or individual sports. A study to see if there was any correlation between an athlete's perceptions of hazing and the nature of their sport might provide valuable insights on any potential differences in both the type of

sport played, contact or non-contact, and the nature of the sport, both team sports and those more individually oriented.

Conclusion

Hazing on college campuses has been widely researched and its origins and impact thoroughly studied. There is significant information about the negative effects hazing has on athletes, but very little research exists about the athlete's perceptions about hazing or their experiences with it as a team member. This study found that athletes are able to articulate the established definition of hazing, but they have difficulty in making the connections with that definition and the idea that hazing actually happens on their campus. This study also found that athletes struggle with the idea of personally confronting a hazing situation and telling other athletes to stop. This lack of confidence in their judgement and ability may be one of the reasons that hazing activities still happen.

Athletes enjoy and appreciate opportunities to bond with their teammates, but they do not feel confident that they know where the line between acceptable activities and hazing exists. This difficulty in comprehension for the student athlete is on both the mental and emotional levels and they struggle to comprehend that hazing occurs on different levels and manifests differently for individuals. Athletes need to understand that the damage that hazing does can be emotional, mental, or physical and while there are incidents where hazing creates severe outcomes such as physical injury or even death, there are also incidents where athletes are impacted less visibly.

This study found that there is a real disconnect between what the athletes are learning about hazing and what they actually believe or perceive hazing to be. There

needs to be opportunities for the athletes to talk about hazing and they should be encouraged to do so outside of once-a-year training sessions. Professionals need to be able to help student athletes see the different types of hazing that can exist and they, as athletes, can better understand and intervene when it happens. Higher Education needs to have promote open and honest conversations with athletes about hazing and continue to educate the athletes and encourage them to reach out if they have any question or concerns. The administration, campus staff, and NCAA need to provide trainings that help athletes understand both the severity of hazing and stress the importance of personal responsibility by using social media, role play activities, or programs to shed light on what hazing is and why they, as individuals, should step up if it happens.

Hazing is a problem that colleges have been dealing with for years and despite extensive training and education on the topic, it is still happening. Students do not lack information about hazing, in fact they are able to articulate the campus views and definitions but agreeing with them when they receive so much conflicting versions is the problem. Until students view hazing as dangerous in both the extreme examples and the minor ones, student athletes are not going to challenge those engaging in those behaviors and risk their relationships with their teammates. If eliminating hazing is truly the goal, then institutions must find ways to not just inform athletes about hazing, they need to change the students' perceptions and judgements about it, or it will continue to happen among students when coaches and professionals are not in the room.

References

- Allan, E. J., Kerschner, D., & Payne, J. M. (2018). College Student Hazing Experiences, Attitudes, and Perceptions: Implications for Prevention. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(1), 32–48. doi: 10.1080/19496591.2018.1490303
- Allan, E., & Madden, M. (2008). Initial findings from national survey of student hazing. Retrieved
- Baron, R. S. (2000). Arousal, capacity, and intense indoctrination. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 238–254.
- Baxter Magolda, M.B (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus
- Braun, v. and Clarke, v. (2006) Using Thematic analysis in ... (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2021, from <https://crispindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Using-thematic-analysis-in-psychology.pdf>
- Bryshun, J. (1997). *Hazing in sport: An exploratory study of veteran/rookie relations*. Calgary.
- Campo, S., Poulos G., & Sipple, J (2005). Prevalence and profiling: hazing among college students and points of intervention. *American Journal of Health Behaviors*, 29 (2).137-149.
- Clifford, N., Cope, M., Gillespie, T. W., & French, S. (2016). *Key Methods in Geography*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Cortez. (2020). What is the NCAA? Retrieved February 10, 2020, from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/ncaa-101/what-ncaa>

- Crow, R., & Rosner, S. (2002). Institutional and organizational liability for hazing in intercollegiate and professional team sports. *St. John's Law Review*, 76, 87–114.
- Dixon, M. (2001). Hazing in high schools: Ending the hidden tradition. *Journal of Law & Education*, 30(2), 357-364.
- Finkel, M. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. Health Resource Library.
- Gershel, J.C., Katz-Sidlow, R.J., Small, E., & Zandieh, S. (2003). Hazing of suburban middle school and high school athletes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, (32), 333-335.
- Grinberg, E. (2019). Former LSU student convicted in fraternity hazing death. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/17/us/lsu-hazing-trial/index.html>.
- Harrison, Tori, "The Transition of Male Student-Athletes to a Division I College" (2019). Masters Theses. 4404. <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4404>
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184 –200.
- Institution A Sports. (2020). Retrieved July 30, 2020, from <https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/eastern-illinois-university/student-life/sports/>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.9.2.104>

Klinger, G. (2017, March 09). Hazing: Its beginning and evolution throughout history. Retrieved May 11, 2021, from <https://medium.com/@gavinklinger57/hazing-its-beginning-and-evolution-throughout-history-fee3cd68ca06>

Kmitch, J. (2018). Wheaton College Settles Football Hazing Case. Retrieved February 10, 2020, from <https://www.athleticbusiness.com/civil-actions/saddened-wheaton-college-settles-football-hazing-case.html>

Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R.H Theory into Praticce, Vol.16, No. 2, Moral
Development. (April., 1997), pp.53-59.

Learning, L. (2019). College Success. Retrieved October 8, 2020,
from <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/lumencollegesuccessxtraining3/chapter/socializing/>

Naveira, I. (2018). The Boomerang of Athletics: Hazing. Retrieved November 22, 2019,
from https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/law/academics/sportslaw/commentary/mslj_blog/2018/0423.html.

Nuwer, H. (2018). *Hazing: destroying young lives*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. (PAGE 165)

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of Passage: Fraternities, Sororities, Hazing and Binge Drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press

- Oates, K. (2019). Hazing goes beyond team bonding, pushing some athletes too far. Retrieved from <https://globalsportmatters.com/culture/2019/02/20/athletes-pushed-too-far-when-hazing-turns-deadly/>.
- Pollard, N. (n.d.). Who we are. Retrieved May 11, 2021, from <https://hazingprevention.org/home/about/who-we-are/>
- Press, A. (2017). Ex-Drury University swimmer says hazing ended athletic career. Retrieved November 16, 2019, from https://www.espn.com/college-sports/story/_/id/18496251/hazing-ended-athletic-career.
- Press, T. (2000, January 15). HOCKEY; Vermont CANCELS season in Player Hazing Scandal (published 2000). Retrieved May 10, 2021, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2000/01/15/sports/hockey-vermont-cancels-season-in-player-hazing-scandal.html>
- Rees, C. R. (2010). Bullying and hazing/initiation in schools: How sports and physical education can be part of the problem and part of the solution. *New Zealand Physical Educator*, 43(1), 24-27. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/211170054?accountid=10705>
- Sabo, D. (1987) - "Sport, Patriarchy and the Male Identity: New Questions about Men and Sport." *Arenu* 9(2): 1-30.
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (2nd Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Smokowski, P. R., & Evans, C. B. R. (2019). Bullying in Young Adulthood: College Hazing as a Form of Bullying. *Bullying and Victimization Across the Lifespan*, 151–166. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-20293-4_7
- STFBC & Tsialas family settle with Cornell, media reports. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2021, from <https://www.stfblaw.com/news/2020/december/stfbc-tsialas-family-settle-with-cornell-media-r/>
- Stuart, S. P. (2013). Warriors, machismo, and jockstraps: Sexually exploitative athletic hazing and title ix in the public school locker room. *Western New England Law Review*, 35(2), 377-424.
- Sussberg, J. A. (2003). Shattered dreams: Hazing in college athletics. *Cardozo Law Review*, 24(3), 1421-1492.
- Van Duuren, F. R., & Di Giacomo, J. P. (1996). Degrading situations and antisocial behavior: An experimental approach to delinquency. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 763–776.
- Waldron, J. J. (2015). Predictors of Mild Hazing, Severe Hazing, and Positive Initiation Rituals in Sport. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 10(6), 1089–1101. doi: 10.1260/1747-9541.10.6.1089
- Waldron, J. J. (2015a). Reducing Hazing in Sport Teams. Retrieved from <https://appliedsportpsych.org/resources/resources-for-coaches/reducing-hazing-in-sport-teams/>.

Wilfert, M. (2007n). *Building New Traditions Hazing Prevention in College*

Athletics. Building New Traditions Hazing Prevention in College Athletics (pp. 1–63).

NCAA Division 1 Handbook. (2018). Retrieved from

<https://www.ncaapublications.com/s-13-Manuals.aspx>.

NCAA Division 1 Handbook. (2007-2008). Retrieved from

<https://www.ncaapublications.com/p-3862-2007-08-ncaa-division-ii-manual.aspx>

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

We are going to start with some basic demographic questions about you before we get started, is that okay?

1. What year in school are you?
2. How would you describe your racial identity?
3. How would you describe your gender identity?
4. What is your major?
5. What college sport do you participate in?

Okay, now I would like to talk to you about your experiences with the team.

1. Can you tell me about the first time you remember hearing about hazing?
2. Prior to coming to this institution, what kind of information did you receive about hazing?
3. Once you came here, can you tell me about how the institution, administration, and coaches have talked about hazing?
4. How have your teammates talked about it?
5. Have you heard about hazing from any non-school affiliated sources?

News, tv, movies, etc.?

6. Does your team do any bonding activities as a team?
 - a. If so, what activities do you participate in?

- b. Are there any activities you don't feel comfortable participating in? Can you tell me about those?
- 7. How do you know the difference between hazing and a bonding activity?
- 8. Have you seen hazing occur within college sports?
 - a. If so, what did you do when you saw it happening?
 - b. If you have not seen hazing or participated in hazing activities have you heard about it happening on campuses?
- 9. If you have been in the presence of a hazing situation, what role did you play?
 - a. If have not been part of a hazing situation what role would you think you would play? (Ex: Witness, Bystander, Participant, etc.)
- 10. If you had to explain it to someone else, how would you define hazing?

Appendix B

First Email

Hello,

My name is Faith Bradbury and I am a graduate student in the College Student Affairs master's program at Eastern Illinois University. I am conducting research about student-athletes' perceptions around hazing. I am looking to interview upperclassmen who are current student-athletes at [Institution]. Participation in this study has been approved by the [Institution] Athletic Department.

If you are willing to participate, you will be asked to attend a virtual interview of approximately 45-60 minutes, to discuss your perceptions about hazing. If you are interested, please contact me to arrange a time. As a reminder, this would be a private interview and your identity and responses will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time and helping me complete this research.

-Faith Bradbury

fsbradbury@eiu.edu

Appendix C

Second Email

Hello,

My name is Faith Bradbury and I am a graduate student in the College Student Affairs master's program at Eastern Illinois University. I sent an email last week inviting you to participate in a study about student-athletes' perceptions around hazing.

I wanted to see if you are interested in this study as there are still opportunities to participate. Once again, participants must be of at least sophomore standing and be an active member of an [Institution] Athletics team.

The virtual interview will take place through either Zoom or Microsoft Teams and will take approximately 45-60 minutes. Participation in this study has been approved by the [Institution] Athletic Department. This is a private interview and your identity and responses will be kept confidential. If you decide that you would like to participate, or have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me via email. Thank you for your time and helping me complete this research.

-Faith Bradbury

fsbradbury@eiu.edu

Appendix D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Student Athletes Perception of Hazing

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by *Faith Bradbury*, from the *College Student Affairs Masters program* at Eastern Illinois University.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate. *Generally, the investigator and potential subject(s) read through and discuss the informed consent information together.*

You have been asked to participate in this study because *you are* a Division 1 (D1) college athletes that will be involved in any of the official sports teams at the institution including basketball, baseball, football, volleyball, swimming, and softball with at least one full year of experience at the institution and on the team.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this qualitative study is to understand the student athletes' perception of hazing. It is crucial to understand what knowledge the athletes have about hazing and to see if they have been given accurate information surrounding hazing and their roles and responsibilities when encountering it. By better understanding how student athletes are understanding the training and information they are receiving about hazing, higher education professionals will be better situated to help their students avoid the risks of this behavior as well as be actively engaged in eliminating it.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

You will be interviewed virtually using Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or other video conferencing software based on your preferences. Interviews will be scheduled for between 45-60 minutes each. The interviews will be recorded using the software's record feature as well as a separate device, with notification to the participants to ensure that they are aware that they are being recorded. The interviews will then be transcribed, and a copy will be sent to the participant to perform a member check to improve accuracy and provide any recommended changes.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

No risks are anticipated from this study. However, since the topic of hazing is one with potential for greater scrutiny, identifying elements of you will be limited to protect your participation in the study.

This could be an uncomfortable or triggering topic to talk about so there are resources on campus you can use. There is free counseling on campus.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will be receiving no direct benefits will be received by participants in this study other than your contributions to the field. Higher education professionals will hopefully have a better understanding of how students identify hazing and their role to better improve training and education efforts to address any potential gap.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

Confidentiality will be maintained by means of

You will be assigned pseudonyms to maintain your confidentiality during the interviews. This information will be kept on two password-protected USB drives and kept by me in a locked filing cabinet. After the study is completed, the transcriptions and recordings will be stored with me for three years before being deleted. The interviews will be videotaped with your approval to help me with the transcribing process.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Participation in this research study is voluntary and not a requirement or a condition for being the recipient of benefits or services from Eastern Illinois University or any other organization sponsoring the research project. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services to which you are otherwise entitled.

There is no penalty if you withdraw from the study and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer.