STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-

2021

An Exploration of Campus-Wide Pauses of Fraternity and Sorority Communities: Utilizing a Four Frame Approach

Corey Esquenazi
University of Central Florida

Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020- by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Esquenazi, Corey, "An Exploration of Campus-Wide Pauses of Fraternity and Sorority Communities: Utilizing a Four Frame Approach" (2021). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-*. 676.
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020/676

AN EXPLORATION OF CAMPUS-WIDE PAUSES OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY
COMMUNITIES: UTILIZING A FOUR FRAME APPROACH

by

COREY ESQUENAZI
B.S. University of Central Florida, 2011
M.A. University of Central Florida, 2013

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Educational Leadership & Higher Education
in the College of Community Innovation and Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2021

Major Professor: Thomas D. Cox

ABSTRACT

In recent years universities have tried to address fraternity and sorority drinking and hazing culture by utilizing pauses on fraternity and sorority activity. This study of this phenomena appears to be absent from the extent literature on prevention strategies. The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the phenomena of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The two cases examined were at large public research institutions with robust fraternity and sorority communities. Analysis occurred through a process of open coding, theoretical propositions, derived from Bolman and Deals organizational frames and cross case analysis. Data was collected through a series of semi-structured interviews and documents collected through a combination of web searches, public information request and provided by six interviewees across both institutions. Analysis revealed several themes associated with the strategies used during a campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority communities including policy, people, and message. The study also revealed that campuses engaged some of Bolman and Deals organizational frames more than others. Finally, the study exposed the perceived results of a campus-wide pause which aligned into four categories, attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle.

Keywords: Fraternity and Sorority, Organizational Framing, Intervention Method, Hazing, College Alcohol Use, Campus-wide pause

In dedication to all the university administrators who work to ensure their students' safety and security.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My academic journey has not always been a priority to me, and yet here I am completing a doctoral dissertation. I assume this acknowledgement section will be full of clichés, platitudes, and redundancies, but much like my attitude early in my collegiate career I could care less. I have come a long way from entering the University of Central Florida in 2007. Now 14 years, 7 cities, 5 Jobs and many memories, my academic journey is ending, or is it just beginning? Some say that once you earn a PhD it is your duty to continue to produce academic knowledge and add to the extensive bodies of literature in your area of specialty. I am sure I will take this challenge up in due time, but maybe a short break to breath and enjoy the moment. But I digress. There are many to thank for my success, and I am sure I will miss someone. I will try my best to acknowledge those who have inspired, assisted, or provided guidance along the way.

First, I would like to acknowledge myself, as I am the one who put in the work to accomplish my academic goal of obtaining a PhD. It may seem silly, but we must be comfortable, confident, and proud of oneself. My mother taught me this lesson, and it has stuck with me. I am proud of my determination and stubbornness to not give up even when I took a leave of absence at the start of the dissertation process. Second, I would like to thank my partner Corrinna, as she was the constant bug in my ear pushing me to not get complacent. I would also like to thank my dog-child Corduroy Jones, thanks for being such a ray of light during much of this dissertation journey. Your cuteness provided me the pick me up to push through the more monotonous points of the writing process.

Next, I would like to thank my parents. From my dad I gained a tireless work ethic, and from my mom an eternally positive outlook on life.

My brothers Brandon and Seth were also a part of this journey. Whether it was bouncing ideas off them or their constant reminders to get working and to keep writing, I am thankful for their support. I know they are proud of me and I, in turn am proud of their successes. My close friends, thank you for being a source of encouragement and a dose of the world outside of the academic bubble, I look forward to you each reading this paper cover to cover. My friends in my Doctoral cohort, thank you for being there with me in our classes and on our joint academic pursuits it has been much easier with you along for the ride.

One of the blessings of being a student at UCF was having the opportunity to work within the LEAD Scholars Academy. It was here I was able to teach, participate in collaborative research and ultimately be inspired to conduct the research that I have currently completed. Dr. Malaret, Dr. Graham, Dr Bingham, Mike, Dee and Jax, you each played a pivotal role in my development, and I cannot thank you enough for being excellent mentors and colleagues. I would have not been able to achieve what I did without you.

To the University Administrators that were so gracious enough to let me gain your perspective on campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities, thank you for the part you played in making this happen.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my Doctoral Dissertation Chair Dr. Thomas Cox, and the other members of my committee for their work in helping me complete this paper. Dr. Cox, I know you have had a lot on your plate, but I am thankful for the time you took to make sure I made it through in one piece. There are many more I would like to thank so if I missed you thank you for making me the person I am today. I am excited to see where the rest of my

academic journey takes me, and I know that I will continue to have an amazing support system to

help me along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BGLO – Black Greek Letter Organizations

DGC – Diversified Greek Council

IFC – Interfraternity Council

MGC – Multicultural Greek Council

NIC – North American Interfraternity Conference

NPC – National Panhellenic Conference

NPHC – National Pan-Hellenic Council

PAN- Panhellenic Council

PWI – Predominately White Institutions

SGLO – Social Greek Letter Organizations

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

There is a continuous entanglement between fraternities and sororities and American higher education since the American Revolution in 1776. The founding of Phi Beta Kappa, the first social fraternity at the College of William and Mary (Baird, 1912), initiated centuries of ambivalent relationships between universities and Social Greek Letter Organizations (SGLO). On the one hand, social fraternities have provided numerous positive benefits to both students and universities alike. Social Greek Letter Organizations have long provided housing for the student body (Flanagan, 2014), where otherwise universities would not be able to provide housing. In the form of donations, alumni support is higher among SGLOs than their non-affiliated peers (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020). Furthermore, SGLOs provide an excellent retention tool for universities, as students cite wanting to find a home away from home and a family as the main reason they join a fraternity or sorority (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020).

Alternatively, fraternities and sororities afford excellent opportunities and benefits to their members. Social Greek Letter Organizations accelerate students' involvement in leadership opportunities. One of the more commonly cited positive benefits of membership in a fraternity or sorority is leadership opportunities (Pike, 2003). Fraternities and sororities raise tens of millions of dollars annually for local, national, and international nonprofits (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020). Additionally, SGLOs give back to their community, with groups logging millions of community service hours annually (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020; National Panhellenic Conference 2020; National Pan-Hellenic Council 2020). In an increasingly more divisive racial climate, Black Greek Letter Organizations (BGLOs) create spaces for black

students and students of color to find a haven at predominately white institutions (PWI) (National Panhellenic Conference, 2020).

Positive returns on investment do not end after students graduate from their respective college or university. Membership in SGLOs is considered a lifetime commitment. BGLOs and organizations encompassing the National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) and the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) operate alumni chapters and organizations for individuals after graduation (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020; National Panhellenic Conference, 2020; National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2020). Outside of the in-college benefits, fraternities and sororities are a gateway for upward mobility, status, and prestige. Nearly half of the United States presidents were members of fraternities during their time in college. Outside of the presidency, fraternity and sorority members have large numbers in both the House and Senate (Becque, 2012). While the list of the political influence of members of SGLOs is extensive, members of fraternities and sororities also tend to excel in all areas of life after college (Pike, 2003).

Fraternities and sororities are more known for deviant behaviors than the positive influence on their members. Two of the most common deviant behaviors associated with fraternities and sororities are hazing and high-risk alcohol consumption. Studies have found that alcohol and partying are a salient aspect of social life among SGLOs (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Beebe, 2002). Members in these organizations are at greater risk to engage in high-risk drinking (Alva, 1998; Ashmore et al., 2002; Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Dorsey, Scherer, & Real, 1999; Gibson, Matto, & Keul, 2017), and experience more negative outcomes (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020b) than their non-affiliated peers. Nearly 2,000

students die of alcohol-related injuries each year (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020); therefore, with the increased risk of adverse outcomes associated with being a member of an SGLO, there is an inherently more significant risk of deaths among fraternity and sorority members.

Another salient experience among members of fraternities and sororities is the act of hazing. Hazing is defined as "the generation of induction cost, i.e., part of the experience necessary to be acknowledged as a legitimate group member, that appear unattributable to group relevant assessments, preparations or chance (Cimino, 2011, p. 242). Studies have found that more than half of students who join a club or organization have experienced some form of hazing to become a member (Allan & Madden, 2012; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Owen, Burke, & Vichesky, 2008). This number increases when considering fraternities and sororities. A national study conducted by Allan and Madden (2012) found that almost three in four students experienced at least one form of hazing while joining an SGLO (2008). The adverse outcomes of hazing can be severe. There has been at least one hazing-related death each year since 1959, and over the past decade alone there have been 55 deaths associated with hazing (Nuwer, 2020).

In the past ten years, public interest has peaked related to the issues of fraternities and sororities since their inception. Headlines and exposés have become increasingly critical, especially after a hazing or alcohol-related injury or death. For instance, the headline from 2016 found in the Washington Post: Time to dismantle fraternities and the sexism, rape culture and binge drinking they encourage (Dvorak, 2016). A more recent article from the Los Angeles Times states, After freshman's death, San Diego State cracks down on fraternities and sororities (Robbins & Winkley, 2020). The call for reform and intervention reached a reckoning during an

extremely deadly period during the 2017 academic school year. Four highly publicized and tragic deaths related to hazing and alcohol consumption of men seeking to join college fraternities galvanized higher education. The deaths of Tim Piazza, Maxwell Gruver, Andrew Coffey, and Matthew Ellis marked a landslide of legislation, public discourse, and university action on the nature, purpose, and reform of college fraternity and sorority culture (Reilly, 2017).

In the following years, this wave of attention intensified as universities struggled to keep their organizations under control and implement reforms. The microscope placed over fraternities, and sororities has only strengthened during the global Covid-19 pandemic and the crescendo of racial inequities following the deaths of black men and women at the hands of law enforcement. Many campuses had to place large portions of the fraternity and sorority communities into quarantine due to contact tracing. This led to some campuses suspending fraternity and sorority operations all together. The highly publicized deaths of black citizens also caused many to critically investigate systems that have upheld racial inequity. Adding to the call for reform, the "Abolish Greek Life Movement," which started early in 2020, is a student-run initiative seeking to address the negative culture of fraternities and sororities by current members disbanding from the organizations within the larger fraternal sphere. As the call for reform and intervention comes from internal and external audiences, universities have taken unprecedented measures to apply punitive sanctions for students who do not follow the rules of conduct (AFA, 2020).

A plethora of examples is evident, denoting the salient nature of high-risk drinking and hazing among SGLOs and universities' attempts to address these behaviors. A particular trend that appears to be absent from the literature but prevalent among public discourse and

professional practice is the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activity in response to high-risk drinking and hazing-related incidents. Campus-wide pauses tend to be temporary moratoriums on specific fraternity and sorority activities initiated by campus administrators. As early as 2012, universities have utilized this response method after a campus crisis (Giordano, 2014). Some states have also sought to pass laws that intended to address student behavior. While the intervention method appears to be a common practice (Zamudio-Suaréz, 2017), the phenomenon and their implications lack substance. As universities address this pressing issue, a more in-depth understanding is needed in order to appropriately manage student safety concerns.

<u>Problem Statement</u>

This study addressed the absence of research on campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Additionally, this research examined the structural, human, political, and symbolic leadership frames most engaged when institutions implement a campus-wide pause. There is extensive research on alcohol (Huchting, Karen, Lac, & LaBrie, 2008; Martinez, J. A., Johnson, & Jones, 2015), hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008; Cimino, Aldo, 2013; Hoover & Pollard, 1999) and the appropriate interventions (Allan, Payne, & Kerschner, 2018; Caudill et al., 2007; LaBrie, Hummer, Neighbors, & Pedersen, 2008; McCreary, 2012). While these studies have shaped the field of prevention and intervention science and professional practice, there appears to be no empirical research on campus-wide pauses utilized to address high-risk drinking and hazing in fraternities and sororities. Investigating the effects of campus-wide pauses may be crucial to university administrators, policy development, and professional practice. An essential

task in addressing high-risk behaviors in fraternity and sorority communities is shifting negative aspects of the culture through appropriate intervention methods.

Taking a multi-perspective approach provided a deeper understanding of campus-wide pauses. Noted organizational researchers Bolman and Deal (2017) state that utilizing a multi-frame approach will help leaders form a deeper understanding of complex problems and provide a framework to address issues appropriately. This study sought to address the lack of empirical research on the widely utilized intervention method of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity. Furthermore, this multiple case study research uncovered the strategies, leadership frames and results of instituting a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community.

Purpose Statement

Current research and data indicate that high-risk drinking is commonplace across college student populations (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020; Willis, Adams, & Keene, 2019). Furthermore, participation in fraternities and sororities amplify this phenomenon (Alva, 1998; Ashmore et al., 2002; Cashin et al., 1998; Dorsey et al., 1999; Gibson et al., 2017). Additionally, and closely related to high-risk drinking, is the unethical behavior of hazing. Numerous studies address the extent to which students experience hazing on college campuses (Allan & Madden, 2012; Calderón & Allan, 2017; Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005; Hoover & Pollard, 1999). Like high-risk drinking, fraternity and sorority members experience hazing to a greater extent than their non-affiliated peers. While fraternities and sororities also have higher drug use rates and are more likely to be associated with sexual assault, this study

will focus on the two most salient behaviors related to campus-wide pauses. High-risk alcohol consumption and hazing sometimes present extreme negative consequences to students, organizations, universities, and other campus stakeholders.

Universities have attempted to address alcohol misuse and hazing utilizing several intervention strategies, including educational sessions (Caudill et al., 2007), campaigns addressing normative beliefs (LaBrie et al., 2008; Waldron, 2012), online modules (Wall, 2007), and a plethora of other intervention techniques. One such intervention technique that universities implement is the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority communities. For the purposes of this study a campus-wide pause was defined as, temporary moratoriums on specific fraternity and sorority activities, that impact all Social Greek Letter Organizations, initiated by campus administrators. The literature and empirical research on this intervention method seems to be underdeveloped.

Current research in intervention methods for high-risk behaviors in fraternity and sorority communities focuses mainly on the efficacy and refinement of current methods. While there is some promising research on generating a hazing prevention framework (Allan et al., 2018), there are no studies focused on campus-wide pauses as intervention methods to address high-risk drinking and hazing in fraternity and sorority communities to date. Additionally, there is a lack of understanding of the strategies, leadership frames or implications of campus-wide pauses in current empirical research. To address these high-risk behaviors' adequately, universities should work from a shared understanding of the strategies, leadership approaches and implications of campus-wide pauses.

7

The purpose of this multiple case study was to understand the nature of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Furthermore, the multiple case study sought to uncover the strategies utilized by campuses during campus-wide pauses. The leadership frames, i.e. structural, human, political, and symbolic that these strategies align. Finally, the implications campuses face after enacting a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority community. This study documented the enactment of campus-wide pauses on two larges four-year public institutions of higher education. Additionally, the study sought to provide context to each campus-wide pause; therefore, a thick description of the years proceeding and following the campus-wide pauses was provided. This study contributes to the existing body of literature on intervention methods of high-risk drinking and hazing in fraternities and sororities by understanding the nature, strategies, and implications of campus-wide pauses. Specifically, the study provided a deeper understanding by exploring the enactment of a campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activity at two large public institutions.

<div align="center">Significance</div>

This study's fundamental role was to provide a deeper understanding of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities—furthermore, the study endeavors to identify the strategies, leadership frames and implications of implementing a campus-wide pause. As far as the researcher can tell, there appears to be no empirical studies on campus-wide pauses as an intervention method. Thus, this novel research contributes to intervention research of high-risk behavior among fraternity and sorority students. Moreover, with the increasing usage of this

catch-all intervention method, spurred on by a global pandemic, the study assumed greater importance.

The research's practical objective is to provide a framework for the future use of campus-wide pauses. Furthermore, the study sought to develop a broader understanding of the implications of utilizing such interventions to address high-risk drinking and hazing among fraternity and sorority members. In conducting the study, the researcher intends to influence policy creation at the university-wide level. Additionally, the research will lead to future studies on an underdeveloped topic.

<u>Definition of Terms</u>

The study provides definitions and delineations to provide clarity and accuracy to the research. Other terms are novel ideas and need further explanation. Accordingly, the following section contains descriptions of behaviors that plague fraternity and sorority communities, including hazing and high-risk drinking, and the terms or phrase fraternity and sorority community/life and Social Greek Letter Organization interchangeably. Finally, the paper defines the novel concept of campus-wide pauses as an intervention method.

Hazing

Hazing is the generation of induction cost, i.e., part of the experience necessary to be acknowledged as a legitimate group member, that appear unattributable to group relevant assessments, preparations, or chance (Cimino, Aldo, 2011).

Participating in calisthenics, forced alcohol consumption, and prolonged sleep deprivation are examples of experiences that appear continuously in hazing cases. These

examples meet the definition of hazing because they are not relevant to the social organization's aims. It does not prepare them to be contributing members of the organization, and it is unlikely the individuals joining would all be participating in calisthenics by chance.

High-Risk Drinking

High-risk drinking encompasses a range of drinking behaviors that fall above the moderate drinking levels defined by the Department of Health and Human Services as one drink per day for women and up to 2 drinks per day (Department of Health and Human Services, 2015). Behaviors encompassed in this definition include binge drinking (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020a), heavy alcohol use (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020), high-intensity drinking (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020), and extreme ritualistic alcohol consumption (Glassman, Dodd, Sheu, Rienzo, & Wagenaar, 2010).

Fraternity

It is defined by (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020) as a "group of people associated or formally organized for a common purpose, interest, or pleasure: such as a men's student organization formed chiefly for social purposes having secret rites and a name consisting of Greek letters."

Sorority

It is defined by (National Panhellenic Conference, 2020) as "a women's student organization formed chiefly for social purposes and having a name consisting of Greek letters."

Interfraternity Council or (IFC)

IFC is a term representing the association with the national umbrella organization National Interfraternity Conference. It is usually associated with historically white fraternities, predominately single-sex organizations (National Interfraternity Conference, 2020).

Panhellenic Council or (PHC or NPC)

NPC is a term representing the association with the national umbrella organization National Panhellenic Conference. It is usually associated with historically white sororities, predominately single-sex organizations (National Panhellenic Conference, 2020).

National Pan-Hellenic Conference (NPHC)/Black Greek Letter organizations

NPHC is a term associated with the confluence and membership with a group of fraternities and sororities whose membership historically has been of black members and other marginalized populations. The National Pan-Hellenic Council consists of nine organizations whose mission is to provide a space for Black voices and advocacy on campus and in local communities (National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2020).

Social Greek Letter Organizations

Social Greek letter organizations consist of groups of individuals, usually students on a university campus, who operate for primarily social reasons. These groups include fraternities and sororities who are members of IFC, NPC, and NPHC groups. Furthermore, other ethnic and cultural fraternities and sororities met primarily social reasons for Social Greek Letter Organizations.

Campus-Wide Pause

Many campuses use interventions to limit or address student behavior, such as drinking and hazing. Community interventions are "actions that address social problems or unmet human

needs and take place in a neighborhood, community, or another setting (Maya-Jariego &

Holgado, 2019). College campuses administer a stoppage of all activities and operations

associated with fraternity and sorority involvement. The prescription of a "pause" can come in

the form of one organization, multiple organizations, and relevant to the definition used for this

proposed study, all social Greek letter organizations on a given campus.

Theoretical Framework

The proposed study will be guided by a theoretical framework, utilizing the four

organizational frames, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic outlined by Bolman &

Deal (2017). Framing, or a way in which to examine a phenomenon, is useful for this proposed

study because there are multiple lenses through which to view the concept of campus-wide

pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The theoretical framework is directly aligned with

research question number two but also provided context to the research's findings and analysis.

Organizational Frames

The theory guiding the research is the concept of organizational frames and reframing.

Bolman and Deal present the idea of looking at organizations and organizational problems in

four different ways or through four different lenses (2017). This concept contends that various

frames help provide differing insights into the same situation. Framing is defined as "a mental

model or set of assumptions, that individuals use to navigate and negotiate a particular territory

or organizational problem" (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 10). Furthermore, framing provides

context to a situation and better understand opportunities for growth and areas of success. This

12

theory argues that utilizing multiple frames allows individuals to develop a diagnosis and provide guidance to move forward and address a problem.

Four frames constitute the study's theoretical framework, including the structural, human resource, political and symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 2017). A detailed table connecting the frames to the research question is found in chapter three. Each frame encompasses different central concepts, which, when viewed together, helps elaborate and create a complete picture of a situation, problem, or solution. This theoretical framework provides a basis for research question number two which addresses the frames most engaged when implementing a campus-wide pause. Also, this framework was used to provide theoretical prepositions to the data collection process. Furthermore, the framework institutes a model through which to analyze the data collected during the project. Finally, this framework helps situate the findings in a multi-frame approach. Ultimately, using the Bolman and Deals Organizational Frames provided a better understanding of an understudied topic.

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the proposed study:

1. What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?

2. What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?

3. What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human resource, political and symbolic, are most engaged by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?

<u>Limitations</u>

The proposed study has the following limitations:

1. Information obtained on the general nature of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities will come from a combination of internet searches, interviews with campus administrators, and document analysis. There may be information missing due to the confidential nature of student and university records.

2. As no students and or fraternity or sorority national offices were interviewed their perspectives and the context, they may have provided are absent from this study.

3. The sample of selected universities is not representative of the numerous institution types across the United States; therefore, results may not be generalizable to all higher education institutions.

4. Since the study sought to examine multiple cases of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities, there may be cross-case analysis and depth limitations (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

5. As the study focused on cases that have occurred in the past, some participants are no longer employed at the universities being studied.

To mitigate these limitations, the researcher kept notes and digitally recorded future interviews, ensuring enough information was gathered in written form and audio recordings to avoid bias.

Delimitations

The study's delimitations provide a deeper understanding of a community-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activities in response to high-risk drinking and hazing activities. To understand the full extent of the implications of the pause on fraternity and sorority activity, the institutions selected for the study instituted their pauses over five years ago. This timetable is appropriate to limit the possibility that any students who attended the university at the time of the pause are still students. The selection of the universities does not allow the researcher to explore pauses at other institution types. Furthermore, while campus-wide pauses are not uncommon, there universities may employ different types then the pauses studied. As there appears to be very little literature on campus-wide pauses, the proposed study intends to explore a common example of a campus-wide pause.

Another delimitation for the study is the participation of only current and past vice presidents of student affairs/dean of students, campus-based fraternity and sorority professionals, and other senior administrators. These individuals serve as the university's internal and external faces of the fraternity and sorority community and had intimate knowledge and perspective of cases studied. Furthermore, these individuals provided a broad view of the phenomena and served as many different stakeholders' touchpoints as possible.

Assumptions

The study included the following assumptions: (a) the participants selected to participate for each institution generally represent the institution's perspective on each unique case; (b) the participants selected understood the aims and purpose of the study and answered the questions with honesty and transparency; (c) the selected participants provided any documents that are shareable and presented their recollection of events as they experienced them; (d) documents and other forms of data collected through internet searches represents a multi-perspective view on the unique cases at each institution; (e) the interpretation of the data collected accurately represents the views of the participants and presents the cases in an unbiased perspective.

Organization of Study

The dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the background of the study, problem statement, the purpose statement, the significance, the definition of terms, theoretical framework, research questions, limitations, delimitations, and the assumption of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature, which includes an introduction to the chapter and background of the problem, high-risk alcohol consumption among college students and Greek letter organizations, interventions for high-risk alcohol consumption, hazing amongcollege students and Greek letter organizations, interventions for hazing, and the limited knowledge on campus-wide pauses in fraternity and sorority communities. Chapter 3 describes the methodology for the study. It includes the design, a detailed description of the selected institutions, a comprehensive description of the participants, measures to ensure validity and reliability, data collection and analysis methods, ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the current study. This section includes an overview of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. It also includes an in-depth profile of each case university, and findings presented for each research question. Chapter 5 represents a discussion of the findings, implications and recommendations for future research and practice. Additionally, this chapter includes limitations, and conclusion.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Universities and the common student experience are synonymous with high-risk behaviors such as drinking, partying, drug use, sexual assault, and hazing. Some students feel that partying is expected of them because they believe that most students engage in this behavior as part of the socializing process (Willis et al., 2019). Students feel an intense social pressure to drink but also think that while they may get pressure from peers, they ultimately have a choice on whether to decline (Willis et al., 2019). Students come to college with varying exposures to alcohol, drugs, sexual assault, and hazing. Experimentation and exposure to high-risk behaviors do not magically start when students step onto a college campus; however, exploration and experiences with high-risk activities drastically increase upon matriculation. This escalation in high-risk behaviors may be, in part, due to the saturation of events that include alcohol and drugs (Willis et al., 2019).

The literature rarely discusses the frequency in which college students partake in behaviors that increase the likelihood of negative consequences to themselves or others. Students point to having discussed these risks in high school and not wanting to interfere in other people's lifestyles (Willis et al., 2019). Even if students do not talk about specific behaviors' adverse outcomes, most students have experienced these choices' ramifications (Caron, Moskey, & Hovey, 2004). The social environment, peer pressure, and the positive association students have with the college lifestyle outweigh the harmful effects (Willis et al., 2019).

Students are exposed and experience opportunities to engage in high-risk behaviors in different ways. Parties in residence halls, off-campus parties, fraternity and sorority parties, and campus bars are salient environments across institution types where students engage in high-risk

behaviors (Harford, Wechsler, & Seibring, 2002). Students' engagement in these behaviors is only a small part of understanding the relationship between college students and high-risk behaviors. The most salient aspect of the college student experience is the consumption of alcohol. As the amount of alcohol consumed increases, so does the likelihood of negative behaviors, including but not limited to blacking out, drinking, and driving (Voloshyna et al., 2018). Increased alcohol use also increases delayed risk response (Franklin, 2016), having multiple sexual partners, and drug use (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, & Castillo, 1995). Finally, increased alcohol use leads to increased sexual assault (Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt, 2012; Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, & Wechsler, 2004).

There is no shortage of research on high-risk behaviors and college students. A prominent theme throughout this area of study is gender differences. College men seem to be the foci of much of this research. Societal expectations of college men tend to carry negative associations. These expectations include drinking to excess, doing drugs, having meaningless or competitive sex with many women, and breaking the rules (Edwards & Jones, 2009). Some men tend to see college as a time to let loose and conform to these expectations, while others feel pressured to conform to the party lifestyle to fit in (Sweeney, 2014). Students who adhere to society's expectations of gender tend to congregate together in groups. Examples of groups that adhere to society's expectations are athletics, fraternity and sorority life, and other student organizations (Loh, Gidycz, Lobo, & Luthra, 2005).

College students, specifically those who associate in groups, tend to conform to group norms. Social identity is a strong predictor of individual behavior (Graupensperger, Benson, & Evans, 2018). While high-risk behavior is prominent across the college student experience, there

are some groups where the frequency and intensity of these behaviors are greatly magnified (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Fraternities and sororities typify groups that value group cohesion, where the group's norms influence individual decision-making (Larimer, Mary E., Turner, Mallett, & Geisner, 2004); therefore, understanding how college students, in particular fraternities and sororities, present these behaviors is imperative to accomplishing many universities primary goal, which is keeping their students safe and limiting adverse outcomes of high-risk behaviors.

The following pages include a review of relevant literature examining high-risk behaviors in college students, particularly fraternities and sororities, and strategies universities employ to curb adverse outcomes associated with these behaviors. First, the chapter explores the most prominent feature of the student experience, which is high-risk drinking. After, the review explores hazing and the college student, which plays a large part in understanding campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities. The last sections of the literature review present the theoretical framework through which the study examined the research questions.

<u>High-Risk Drinking and the College Student</u>

There has long been an association between colleges and universities in the United States and a drinking and partying culture. Research states that alcohol, drinking, binge drinking, and partying are a common aspect of the college student experience. Partying plays a central role in many students' experiences, particularly with college groups or teams (Ashmore et al., 2002). Adding to this assumption, Durkin, Wolfe, and Clark found:"Binge Drinkers were more likely than other students to associate with peers who also engage in this behavior," and "differential

peer associations were the best predictor of binge drinking" (2005, P. 269). Before traversing the extensive literature on high-risk drinking in college students, it is imperative to have common language and definitions on what constitutes high-risk drinking behavior.

<div align="center">Definitions of High-Risk Drinking</div>

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) defines binge drinking as (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020):

> "A pattern of drinking alcohol that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08 percent - or 0.08 grams of alcohol per deciliter - or higher. For a typical adult, this pattern corresponds to consuming five or more drinks (male), or four or more drinks (female), in about 2 hours."

The NIAAA also provides information on heavy alcohol use, defined as "more than four drinks on any day for men or more than three drinks for women" (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020). Outside of the more common terms binge drinking and heavy alcohol use, the NIAAA explains high-intensity drinking as "alcohol intake at levels twice or more the gender-specific threshold for binge drinking. This dangerous drinking pattern means eight or more drinks for women and ten or more drinks for men on one occasion" (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020). Other researchers have used the term "extreme ritualistic consumption" or ERAC, to describe the same phenomena (Glassman et al., 2010). Extreme ritualistic alcohol consumption is known to occur before sporting events, particularly before college football. Throughout this section of the literature review, the term high-risk drinking will encompass these terms unless a term is needed to make a particular argument.

Alcohol Consumption

Among college students, high-risk drinking is a common everyday occurrence. According to data obtained by the NIAAA, nearly thirty percent of college students reported binge drinking in the past two weeks (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020). Years of academic research confirm the magnitude of the issue, with some studies placing the number as high as fifty percent (Huchting, Karen, Lac, & LaBrie, 2008; Martinez, J. A., Johnson, & Jones, 2015). The pervasiveness of high-risk drinking among college students is unquestionable. Looking at Gender differences in high-risk drinking provides an expanded view of the problem.

Gender Differences and High-Risk Drinking

Drinking among college students is expected; however, there are noticeable differences when considering the issue through a gendered perspective. Male college students consistently score higher on all scientific alcohol consumption measures than their female counterparts (Brown-Rice, Kathleen & Furr, 2015; Huchting, Karie K., Lac, Hummer, & LaBrie, 2011; Larimer, M. E., Anderson, Baer, & Marlatt, 2000). The fact that males drink alcohol more than females has stayed true over many years of study. While drinking rates have declined for men over the years (Grucza, Norberg, & Bierut, 2009), drinking rates are still much higher for men than women. Alternatively, some studies have pointed to an increase in women's drinking rates (Elias et al., 2001). Nevertheless, scholars must recognize differences in drinking based on gender.

Drinking, Age, and Year in School

College is a time for taking risks and drinking to excess for large swaths of student demographics. Prior research has found that students come to college with varying degrees of exposure to alcohol consumption. A generally understood fact among researchers is that matriculation into the college environment coincides with an abrupt rise in all drinking measures (Nguyen, Walters, Wyatt, & DeJong, 2011). This rise in drinking measures could be due to various factors, such as the prevalence of alcohol, increased partying rates, and the general expectation that college is a time to let loose and experiment with drugs and alcohol. Age seems to correlate with binge drinking levels. Students under the age of 24 tend to have the highest binge drinking rates (Zakletskaia, Wilson, & Fleming, 2010). Some studies show that as age and year in school increase, binge drinking rates and drinking to excess decrease (Capone, Wood, Borsari, & Laird, 2007; Caudill et al., 2006). This hypothesis contrasts with other studies that show binge drinking levels being high at all age groups and years in school (Brown-Rice & Furr, 2015; Glassman et al., 2010). Many studies focus on drinking in fraternity and sorority life.

Fraternity and Sorority Status and Drinking

Fraternities and sororities are known to be the bastions of the college partying culture. Numerous studies have found that fraternity and sorority membership was associated with increased alcohol use levels (Alva, 1998; Ashmore et al., 2002; Cashin et al., 1998; Dorsey et al., 1999; Gibson et al., 2017). Fraternity and sorority members also show higher rates of binge drinking (Chauvin, 2012) and drinking more on a typical drinking day when compared to non-members (Scott-Sheldon et al., 2008). The gender differences found in nonmembers is similar

among fraternity and sororities, with fraternity men drinking more than sorority women (Alva, 1998).

Many scholars believe that drinking levels in high school are a strong predictor of drinking levels in college. Important to note for the proposed study is that there seems to be a link between students who have high drinking levels, binge drinking levels, and other risk factors which eventually go on to join fraternities and sororities (Larimer et al., 2000; McCabe, S. E. et al., 2005). Scholars explain this phenomenon as a selection and socialization effect of Greek membership (Capone et al., 2007; Park, Sher, & Krull, 2008). Furthermore, continued involvement in fraternity and sorority life increases student risk factors related to high-risk drinking.

Immediate exposure to fraternities and sororities upon a student's matriculation into the college environment has a multiplying effect on high-risk drinking measures. Students who are new to fraternities and sororities consume significantly more alcohol than their nonmember peers (Elias et al., 2001). Moreover, one study found that "Affiliated first-year students binge drinking was 1.8 times greater than their unaffiliated peers" (Asel, Seifert, & Pascarella, 2009, p. 9). Increased drinking measures hold steady throughout the student's direct exposure to fraternity and sorority life. Wherefore, affiliated seniors have a "2.4 times increased likelihood" of binge drinking than their non-affiliated peers (Asel et al., 2009, p. 9). Encouragingly, these increased drinking measures seem to decline post fraternity and sorority involvement and post-college years (Park et al., 2008).

Logically one can conclude that being involved in fraternity and sorority life in college increases high-risk drinking. Extrapolating further, the more involved students are in these

organizations, the greater the risk of high-risk drinking. A study conducted by Cashin et al. found that "among fraternity men, increasing levels of involvement with fraternity life corresponded with increasing levels of alcohol" (1998, p. 65). The same study found that increased involvement in sorority life did not correspond with an increased risk of high-risk drinking. Plucker and Teed replicated these earlier studies' findings, confirming that sorority women's increased involvement did not fit with increased high-risk alcohol (2004). Nevertheless, fraternity and sorority involvement seem to be a strong predictive demographic linked to high-risk drinking in college students.

Summary of Alcohol Consumption

Alcohol is a dominant aspect of the college experience for undergraduate students. Studies have found that high-risk drinking is related to gender (Hummer, LaBrie, Lac, Sessoms, & Cail, 2012; Litt, Stock, & Lewis, 2012; McCabe, B. E., Lee, & Viray, 2019; Wechsler et al., 1995), fraternity or sorority status (Hummer et al., 2012; McCabe et al., 2019; Wechsler et al., 1995), and age (Litt et al., 2012). Another demographic factor not mentioned in the prior sections is ethnicity or race. Many studies have found that whites students are at an increased risk for binge drinking more than any other students (Glassman et al., 2010; LaBrie, Hummer, Kenney, Lac, & Pedersen, 2011; McCabe et al., 2019; Wechsler et al., 1995). In summary, these demographic factors, coupled with studies that have found that increased high-risk drinking led to various adverse outcomes among fraternity and sorority students, place fraternities and sororities central to concerns when addressing high-risk drinking among college students.

Frequency of Student Drinking

Some scholars believe that as students mature, high-risk drinking decreases, known as the maturing out hypothesis. Determining when students drink during their college careers has various risk mitigation implications. Many studies have explored this construct, leading to a deeper understanding of student drinking patterns. Countless students come to college having had previous exposure to alcohol. While the number of students exposed to alcohol has decreased over the past decades, the number is still high (Caron et al., 2004; Hoover & Pollard, 1999). Drinking drastically increases upon a student's arrival at college. Studies have found that the first week of school is a particularly poignant example of this increased drinking among college students (Nguyen et al., 2011).

Furthermore, studies point to a steady increase in drinking levels and drinking occurrences from the beginning to the end of the first college semester (Caron et al., 2004; Haas, Smith, & Kagan, 2013). Scholars point to alcohol availability as an additive factor in increased drinking (Park, Sher, Wood, & Krull, 2009). An encouraging finding from studies is that students who have high drinking levels early on in their college careers tend to show smaller increases in drinking than students who had lower initial drinking levels. Alternatively, and relevant to the current proposed study, students who join fraternities early on in their college careers show a more significant increase in drinking levels than their non-affiliated peers (McCabe et al., 2005; Park, Sher, & Krull, 2009).

<div align="center">Drinking Across Days</div>

Few studies explored drinking across days of the week. Maggs, Williams, and Lee, in their survey of first-year college students, found that students consumed alcohol to a greater degree on weekends than on any other day during the week (2011). In fact, including Thursdays, weekends accounted for 77% of the total number of drinks consumed in their study. The authors did note that this study only accounted for a particular population and could not be generalized to all college campuses. Variance in drinking culture across campuses is a generally understood topic. Still, it is possible to deduce that students would drink more on weekends than weekdays due to class and work obligations. The study also found that students who had stronger social motivations or were involved in high-risk groups were at greater risk for weekday drinking (Maggs et al., 2011). Particularly apparent were students involved in fraternities and sororities and males, were more likely to drink during the week. In an earlier study by Caudill et al., researchers found that over 76% of members were weekday drinkers among a single national fraternity, replicating earlier studies. Nonetheless, both studies demonstrated variability across individual factors and college campuses (2006).

<div align="center">Frequency of Drinking</div>

Students tend to have at least one heavy drinking day per week, with a range of three to five such days per month (Iwamoto, Derek Kenji, Corbin, Lejuez, & MacPherson, 2014; Park et al., 2009; Zakletskaia et al., 2010). The frequency of drinking days increases when studies have factored in fraternity and sorority affiliation. Fraternity and sorority students are twice as likely to have a heavy drinking day during a typical week than other students (Huchting et al., 2011;

Plucker & Teed, 2004). These findings add to the importance of interventions focused on students in college fraternities and sororities.

<div align="center">Drinking on Special Occasions</div>

Several studies focused on incidences that students drank to excess. A common thread throughout these studies was students drinking behaviors during home football games. Students exceeded binge drinking on these drinking occasions and entered what scholars deem extreme ritualistic alcohol consumption (Willis et al., 2019). In a study that focused on drinking behaviors during football games, students were twice as likely to report heavy episodic drinking than during other average drinking days (Glassman et al., 2010). Research also points to gender differences, such that males drink more than females (Ragsdale et al., 2012). Students involved in fraternities and sororities were also twice as likely to engage in extreme ritualistic alcohol consumption on game days than their non-affiliated peers (Glassman et al., 2010); therefore, interventions to address high-risk drinking may need to account for occasions that students engage in problematic drinking behaviors. Furthermore, targeted interventions for a student involved in fraternities and sororities may be beneficial.

<div align="center">Pregaming</div>

Another component of student drinking behavior is pregaming. Pregaming is "drinking while waiting for people to gather for a social event, drinking to get buzzed before going to a party or function where alcohol will be expensive (e.g., at a bar or a club), or drinking before entering a social situation where alcohol would be difficult to obtain (e.g., a school function)" (Zamboanga et al., 2011, p. 342).

<div align="center">28</div>

Pregaming is common among college students, with one study finding nearly seventy percent of students had participated in pregaming within the past month (Read, Merrill, & Bytschkow, 2010).

On average, students tend to pregame between two and six days per month, with students under the legal drinking age being twice as likely to pregame than students above the legal drinking age (Read et al., 2010). This difference in pregaming could be because students under the legal drinking age may have a more challenging time obtaining alcohol if they attend an event where students must present identification before being provided alcohol. Pregaming rates between men and women tend to be equal; however, men tend to consume more alcohol than women during a pregaming occasion (LaBrie et al., 2011). Pregaming also seems to correspond with high-risk factors such as blacking out. One study found that nearly half of the participants who reported blacking out had participated in pregaming on that occasion (LaBrie et al., 2011). Of particular interest to the proposed study, students involved with fraternity and sorority life are more likely to pregame during their most recent drinking occasion than their non-affiliated peers (Haas et al., 2013).

<u>Summary of Frequency of Student Drinking</u>

Student drinking patterns vary from institution to institution and between individual demographics. Students arrive at college with different alcohol experiences, but generally, drinking escalates upon arrival at a university (Nguyen et al., 2011). Throughout the first semester, one could expect students to have high exposure to situations involving alcohol.

Undergraduates who join a fraternity and sorority early on in their college career tend to have the highest drinking rates than non-affiliated students (Caudill et al., 2006).

Students tend to drink more on weekends than weekdays. Although, studies have found that members of Greek-letter organizations are more likely to drink during weekdays when compared to their non-affiliated peers. This "Greek effect" also holds when examining drinking frequency. Members of fraternities and sororities are twice as likely to drink in a typical week (Huchting et al., 2011; Plucker & Teed, 2004). Additionally, students' drinking habits increase on occasions, such as home football games, and many students engage in pregaming before events. Addressing high-risk drinking is not limited to understanding who drinks and when and where students engage in these behaviors.

Location of Alcohol Consumption

As college administrators attempt to address high-risk drinking among college students, they must understand how institutional factors impact student drinking outcomes. Researchers have determined that institutional characteristics are associated with high-risk drinking among college students (Wells et al., 2014). Moreover, students may select institutions because of their reputation as party schools (Park et al., 2009). As members in fraternities and sororities are at greater risk for high-risk drinking, university administrators should also consider fraternity and sorority houses. One study found that campuses with unrecognized off-campus fraternity and sorority houses corresponded with greater alcohol use among students. Students are not just drinking in fraternity and sorority houses, but in various other locations as well.

Common Locations Students Drink

College students consume alcohol at both on and off-campus locations. Locales include off-campus parties (Juhnke, Schroat, Cashwell, & Gmutza, 2003; Paschall & Saltz, 2007); off-campus bars (Caron et al., 2004; Juhnke et al., 2003; Paschall & Saltz, 2007); fraternity and sorority parties (Caron et al., 2004; Juhnke et al., 2003; Paschall & Saltz, 2007); residence halls (Juhnke et al., 2003; Paschall & Saltz, 2007); and outdoor settings and campus events (Paschall & Saltz, 2007). Drinking variables fluctuate across locations; however, throughout various studies, the most prominent theme was that all high-risk student drinking variables were higher at fraternity and sorority parties and houses than all other locations.

Fraternity and Sorority Parties/Houses

Students have many choices on locations where they may decide to drink. Campus setting and the social environment at each school often influence the drinking culture. Across many campuses, fraternities and sororities limit the number of students attending their social functions; however, students who attend events hosted by social Greek letter organizations tend to be the heaviest drinkers (Harford et al., 2002). Moreover, students who attend parties hosted by Greek letter organizations obtain some of the highest levels of intoxication found on college campuses (Glindemann & Geller, 2003). These higher levels of intoxication lead to increased incidents of adverse outcomes. Membership status notwithstanding, the environment of these parties, many of which are on-campus or off-campus environments, seem to play a large part in the increased high-risk drinking among college students.

Some students decide to attend individual universities based on their reputation as a party school. Studies have also found that heavy drinkers in high school self-select into the fraternity and sorority system (Park et al., 2009). This self-selection into the fraternity and sorority system does not hold when looking at differences in drinking statistics across housing status in the fraternity and sorority community. Gender differences were apparent when studies factored in Greek-letter organization housing status. One study found that members who live in fraternity houses have higher drinking scores than those who do not (Crosse, Ginexi, & Caudill, 2006). Across studies, men tend to drink in fraternity houses more than women in sorority houses (Ragsdale et al., 2012). This increase in drinking for women may be a result of many sororities implementing "dry" homes where alcohol is not allowed to be stored or consumed in these places of residence. While some fraternities also have similar policies, sororities tend to have lower consumption levels related to residence status (Brown-Rice & Furr, 2015).

For students who are members of fraternities and sororities, drinking also tends to be high in off-campus residences (Caudill et al., 2006). The physical environment of these locations seems to influence the culture of high-risk drinking. Many fraternity residences have alcohol-related items as prominent features of the house or individual members' rooms (Kuh & Arnold, 1993). The environment varies from a fraternity house to a fraternity house and a sorority house to a sorority house. Furthermore, researchers can characterize an organization into high and low-risk homes. These characteristics are where some organizations separate themselves from one another (Park et al., 2009). The apparent connection between fraternity and sorority culture and high-risk drinking cannot be understated. This correlation extends to the outcomes associated with high-risk drinking.

<u>Outcomes of High-risk Drinking</u>

There is a plethora of adverse outcomes that are associated with high-risk drinking among college students. According to NIAAA's most recent data, nearly 2000 college students die from alcohol-related injuries each year. Additionally, about 700,000 students experience some form of assault by students who have been drinking. Outside of physical violence, drinking can lead to sexual violence, with nearly 100,000 students experiencing sexual assault and partner violence related to alcohol each year. Academically, students face the consequences of high-risk drinking as well. Almost one in four students report academic effects from overconsumption. Binge drinking and high-risk drinking also correspond with adverse outcomes such as conduct-related issues, vandalism, and hazing (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020).

The three categories that researchers categorize drinking outcomes into are external harms, internal harms, and related harms. External harms include missed work shifts (Nguyen, Walters, Wyatt, & DeJong, 2013), injured another person or oneself (Juhnke et al., 2003; Nguyen et al., 2013; Wells et al., 2014), fighting ,; getting into trouble with the police (Glassman et al., 2010; Nguyen et al., 2013), and being taken advantage of sexually (Glassman et al., 2010; Juhnke et al., 2003; Nguyen et al., 2013). Internal harms include getting a hangover (Boekeloo, Novik, & Bush, 2011; Nguyen et al., 2013), passing out (Boekeloo et al., 2011; Nguyen et al., 2013), and blacking out (Boekeloo et al., 2011; LaBrie et al., 2011; Nguyen et al., 2013; Voloshyna et al., 2018). Blacking out was the most common internal harm experienced by students. Finally, students experience various relationship harms from high-risk drinking. The most common was driving after drinking (Nguyen et al., 2013). Years of efforts to curb the

activity seem to have had a mild effect. The impact of ride-sharing services on drinking after driving has yet to be studied. Year in school appears to have an effect, whereby as the student's year in school increases, so do risk factors for certain risky behaviors like drinking and driving (Nguyen et al., 2013). Even with all the potential adverse outcomes from high-risk drinking, students, particularly fraternity and sorority members, continue to engage in this behavior at an elevated rate.

Antecedents of Students Drinking

Students drink for a variety of reasons. The NIAAA lists preexposure to drinking, more leisure time, availability, inconsistent enforcement of policies, and limited interaction with adults as contributing factors to high-risk drinking (The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2020). Environmental and group-level factors also play a dominant role in high-risk drinking. The overabundance of reasons students drink makes tackling the issue difficult. As administrators attempt to curb high-risk student drinking, it is essential to have a breadth of understanding of the many reasons for student drinking behaviors. The following sections provide an overview of the motives for high-risk student drinking.

Individual and Attitudinal Factors

Individual characteristics and attitudinal measures can be unique predictors of students' drinking behavior. One study found that students' value placed on religion was a determining factor in drinking behaviors. Students who placed high importance on faith had lower drinking scores than those who did not value religion (Wechsler et al., 1995). This difference in drinking scores may be because religion recognizes high importance on values that would steer students

away from problem drinking. Another predictive factor was the mental health problems. Students experiencing a history of mental health problems were at greater risk to participate in high-risk drinking (Martinez, H. S., Klanecky, & McChargue, 2018). Outside of these factors, the individual aspect of self-consciousness is related to high-risk drinking.

Students who were self-conscience were less likely to engage in high-risk drinking (Park, Sher, & Krull, 2006). Gender differences also impacted self-consciousness, as did fraternity or sorority status. In fact, (Park et al.) found that having high self-consciousness may be a protective factor for fraternity men (2006). Additionally, this self-consciousness may lead fraternity men to evaluate their behavior against internal and external standards (Park et al., 2006). Alternatively, fraternity men low in private and public self-consciousness may continue their risky drinking habits due to their positive beliefs about alcohol consumption (Park et al., 2006). A variable that seems to be salient across studies is fraternity and sorority membership. Affiliation status is a direct predictor of increased risky drinking among college students (McGinley, Rospenda, Liu, & Richman, 2016).

Past Drinking experiences

Studies have found that past alcohol use is positively associated with consuming alcohol (Litt et al., 2012). Moreover, binge drinking habits in the last year of high school were a robust predictor of college drinking habits (Wechsler et al., 1995). That is to say that all things constant, students who were drinkers in high school will continue to drink. Therefore, curbing drinking efforts when students arrive at college may be futile if students have built up habits before arriving. Students choosing to attend a university because of its party school reputation amplifies

35

the problem (Willis et al., 2019). For some students, drinking patterns materialize upon admittance to a university (Elias et al., 2001).

Students who embrace the "party culture" lifestyle may be at greater risk for high-risk drinking. One study found that students who think partying is essential were three times more likely to drink than their peers who did not embrace this lifestyle (Wechsler et al., 1995). At particular risk for binge drinking are students involved in fraternity and sorority life. Not only are students in SGLOs at a higher risk for social problems and adverse outcomes (Huchting et al., 2011), but students with more robust precollege drinking habits were more likely to join fraternities and sororities (Park et al., 2009). This self-selection into riskier groups may be because students who want to enjoy their college experience see fraternities and sororities as their only social outlet. Discouragingly, even students with low drinking scores before college who join fraternities and sororities seem to assimilate into group drinking norms shortly after joining (Park et al., 2009).

<div align="center">Culture and Environmental influences on drinking</div>

Environmental and cultural factors also influence drinking habits. Students who join groups that encourage high-risk drinking are more likely to adapt to that culture (Ashmore et al., 2002). Groups such as fraternities and sororities are considered high-status groups. Studies have found that this influence and popularity corresponded with heavy drinkers' confluence (Phua, 2011). Studies have also found that interacting more in social groups leads to higher alcohol consumption (Dorsey et al., 1999). Furthermore, as more students who have higher drinking scores before entering college congregate together in groups such as fraternities and sororities,

there seems to be a reciprocal influence process (Capone et al., 2007). Students entering a culture seem to influence that culture and vice versa.

Encouragingly, high-risk drinking may be a learned behavior (Durkin et al., 2005). A few factors may lessen cultural and environmental factors linked to high-risk drinking among college students. Students' age and interaction with adults and family members may lead to decreases in drinking levels (Wells et al., 2014). Moreover, SGLO environments and cultures' impact on individual drinking habits interacts with individual levels factors (Park et al., 2006). As administrators address high-risk drinking in fraternities and sororities, they will need to manage the environments and culture that perpetuate these behaviors.

<center>Normative Influence on High-Risk Drinking</center>

Peer norms on drinking behaviors seem to have one of the strongest influences on college students' drinking behaviors. If students believe that their peers encourage binge drinking or find it commonplace, they are more likely to engage in the action. This influence tends to impact white students disproportionately more than other ethnicities or races (McCabe et al., 2019). The power of group norms tends to be a better predictor of students' drinking behavior than individual-level factors (Trockel, Wall, Williams, & Reis, 2008). Therefore, differences between group norms among fraternities and sororities need to be accounted for when addressing high-risk drinking in fraternity and sorority communities. Members in fraternities and sororities are at greater risk of injunctive norms, the belief of how things ought to be or found acceptable, and its influence on drinking behaviors. Numerous studies have confirmed that the perceived

acceptability of high-risk drinking among fraternities and sororities correlates with short- and long-term consequences of this behavior (Larimer et al., 2004).

Not only do injunctive norms predict student drinking behavior, but descriptive standards generally follow patterns (Larimer et al., 2004). For example, suppose a student joins a particular organization known for high-risk drinking. In that case, one can assume that a pattern of high-risk drinking will accompany that student's admittance into that organization. Alternatively, students' need to belong has a mediating factor in normative perceptions. Students who want to fit in and belong to a particular group are more at risk of high-risk drinking (Litt et al., 2012).

Additionally, social norms are also a strong predictor of high-risk drinking among college students (Chauvin, 2012). This reliance on social norms can be demonstrated by how students perceive drinking levels among certain groups. If students perceive others to drink more heavily, they are more at risk to do so as well (McCabe et al., 2019). Other studies have found reflective norms, or perceptions of the opposite gender's expectations, for reasons for drinking (Hummer et al., 2012). Regardless of the type of example, students' normative beliefs about drinking have a strong influence on their drinking behavior. Fraternity and sorority members seem to be at the most significant risk to normative influences.

<div align="center">Expectancies and High-Risk Drinking</div>

Expectations of drinking behaviors is another predictive factor in high-risk drinking among college students. Students who regard high-risk drinking positively or perceive their peers too are at a greater risk to also binge drink (Durkin et al., 2005). Expectancies are also strongly linked to normative beliefs, whereby students who believe their peers drink more are more likely

<div align="center">38</div>

to have positive associations with high-risk drinking (Tyler, Schmitz, Adams, & Simons, 2017).

It is no surprise then those high-risk drinkers tend to have more positive associations with binge

drinking than they do negative expectancies (Durkin et al., 2005). Studies have found that

students in Greek-letter organizations tend to have more positive alcohol expectancies than their

non-affiliated peers. Some positive expectancies fraternity and sorority members have about

drinking are that alcohol enhances social activity, facilitates bonding, and increases one's

perception of the opposite sex (Alva, 1998). Gender also plays a significant role in students'

drinking behaviors.

Gender Roles and Norms Influence on High-Risk Drinking

An emerging research area in understanding college students' high-risk drinking

behaviors is the confluence of masculinity and gender roles and alcohol consumption. Across

several studies, researchers have found that "men who adhere to masculine norms are more

likely to drink to intoxication and to experience alcohol problems" (Iwamoto, Derek Kenji,

Cheng, Lee, Takamatsu, & Gordon, 2011, p. 909). Masculine norms also have a tangential

influence on women's interaction in binge drinking situations. Changing gender expectations and

the male dominant drinking culture on some college campuses may influence binge drinking

(Young, Morales, McCabe, Boyd, & D'arcy, 2005). One of the most widely used tools to

understand masculinity is the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI-46). The scale

assesses conformity to nine masculine norms; winning in general (i.e., winning at all costs);

emotional control (i.e., controlling the expressions of one's emotions); the importance of work

(i.e., working being central to one's life and identity); risk-taking, (i.e., putting oneself in

generally understood risky situations); violence, (i.e., the acceptance of violence in various cases); heterosexual self-presentation, (i.e., not wanting others to think of you as gay); playboy (i.e., desiring multiple sexual partners); Self-reliance, (i.e., not wanting to ask for help) and, power over women, (i.e., the perceived notion one has control over the women in their lives) (Parent & Moradi, 2011).

Studies utilizing the CMNI-46 have found that the masculine norms playboy, risk-taking, and winning are strongly correlated to risky drinking, alcohol expectancies, and adverse outcomes (Iwamoto et al., 2011; Iwamoto et al., 2014; Wells et al., 2014). Furthermore, men who generally accept violence also frequently engage in heavy episodic drinking (Wells et al., 2014). While masculinity measures tend to be used to understand men's behaviors Iwamoto and Smiler found that women's conformity to risk-taking was also associated with more alcohol consumption (2013). Studies also found that men who have greater control over their emotions, who care what others think of their sexual orientation, and who value the primacy of work tend to consume alcohol at lower levels than their peers that endorse other masculine norms (Iwamoto et al., 2011; Iwamoto et al., 2014). Additionally, many of the masculine norms' measures were associated with alcohol-related problems, including playboy, winning, self-reliance, risk-taking, and violence.

The public has viewed fraternities as bastions of hegemonic masculinity. As studies have shown, there are many adverse outcomes associated with student's conformity to masculinity. Therefore, fraternities and fraternity men who adhere to society's expectations may be a more significant risk for drinking and alcohol-related problems. In his study of a single national fraternity, McCready found that "collective masculine norm climates of chapters were better

predictors of members alcohol consumption than chapter demographic characteristics" (2019, p. 9). Interestingly, this study also found that the heterosexual presentation climate in this national fraternity was a strong indicator of alcohol consumption. This indicator differs from the individual level factor of heterosexual presentation. Perhaps this difference may be a result of groups of men wanting to express their manhood with the reputation of drinking, equating to being more manly. Nonetheless, university administrators should develop interventions that address masculinity and gender norms concerning student's high-risk drinking.

Summary of Antecedents of Student Drinking

College students participate in drinking for various reasons. Scholars point to individual and attitudinal factors to explain drinking (Litt et al., 2012). Students who are predisposed to drinking or who join fraternities or sororities early in their college career tend to drink at more excellent rates than their peers (Huchting et al., 2011). Other scholars point to cultural and environmental factors that influence students' drinking behaviors. Some of the strongest predictors of high-risk student drinking tend to be normative beliefs, alcohol expectancies, and conformity to gender roles norms (Iwamoto et al., 2011; Iwamoto et al., 2014). As university administration develops interventions to address high-risk drinking and the adverse outcomes associated therewithin, they should pay essential attention to the rationales for student drinking behavior.

Strategies to Address High-Risk Drinking

University administrators, health professionals, and various other campus stakeholders have used varying intervention strategies in response to high-risk student drinking. These

strategies include but are not limited to education on protective behavioral strategies, norms-based interventions, expectancy bases interventions, online modules, environmental processes, and policy-based and consequence-based approaches to varying degrees of success. The following section includes recommendations from scholars and research that examine the validity of alcohol interventions on college campuses.

Research suggests that universities implement regular screenings of students for alcohol consumption during visits to campus wellness centers (Zakletskaia et al., 2010). This process could help trace trends on the campus and support target interventions toward students. One of the most at-risk groups for high-risk drinking is white males (Glassman et al., 2010). Members of fraternities and sororities are also at an increased risk for high-risk drinking. Universities have used alcohol-free fraternity and sorority housing policies with limited success (Crosse et al., 2006). While specific procedures have shown limited to no success, research recommends crafting interventions targeted at fraternities and sororities. Another common theme in studies on high-risk drinking prevention is utilizing a harm reduction approach rather than an abstinence approach, as students are at an elevated risk for drinking (Boekeloo et al., 2011; Pedersen & Feroni, 2018). A common focus of studies on alcohol consumption interventions is when to administer interventions.

<div align="center">When to administer an intervention</div>

Many students come to college with drinking habits already formed. Other students develop those habits early in their college careers. Interventions targeted at students before arrival may help decrease incoming students' drinking rates (Larimer et al., 2000; Nguyen et al.,

2011). Scholars also point to interventions targeted at high school students. Regardless, attempting to limit students drinking upon arrival may be futile (Park et al., 2009). Students involved in fraternities and sororities seem to be at an increased risk for elevated drinking upon coming to college. Some universities delay the recruitment or admittance into Greek letter organizations to limit peer pressure and the impact of social norms that promote at-risk drinking (Kuh & Arnold, 1993). While universities across the country widely adopt this strategy, research shows that the influence of fraternities and sororities on student high-risk drinking habits has a multiplying effect no matter when a student joins.

<div align="center">Protective Behavioral Strategies</div>

A typical intervention tactic utilized in the harm reduction approach to alcohol consumption on college campuses is encouraging protective behavioral strategies (PBS). Defensive behavioral strategies are "tactics that one can use while drinking alcohol to decrease negative alcohol-related consequences and possibly limit alcohol consumption including but not limited to determining not to exceed a certain number of drinks, alternating between alcoholic and nonalcoholic beverages, stopping drinking at a predetermined time, avoiding drinking games, and using a designated driver" (Madson, Arnau, & Lambert, 2013, p. 566). Research shows that protective behavioral strategies decrease alcohol's negative consequences (Caudill et al., 2007). Specific demographics use PBS at a higher rate than their peers. For example, women use PBS more than men (Nguyen et al., 2011), and older students use PBS more than younger students (Nguyen et al., 2013).

Studies have conflicting findings within the demographic of fraternities and sororities. Some studies found that students involved in Greek-letter organizations used protective behavioral strategies more than their non-affiliated peers (Soule, Barnett, & Moorhouse, 2015). Other studies found the opposite, where nonaffiliated students used PBS at a greater rate (Barry, Madson, Moorer, & Christman, 2016). Regardless of affiliation type, students who drink more often and in higher quantities tend to use less PBS (Killos & Keller, 2012). Importantly, students who experience a negative consequence of their drinking tend, at least in the short term, to plan to use PBS in a future drinking situation (Barry et al., 2016; Nguyen et al., 2013). Interventions encouraging PBS use among college students may be one way to reduce the negative consequences of high-risk drinking.

<center>Norms Based Interventions</center>

Research demonstrates that students' normative beliefs on peer drinking and alcohol consumption, in general, are strong predictors of high-risk drinking behavior. Universities have employed different strategies to change student's perceptions of drinking. One popular approach is the social norms approach, which attempts to address students' misperceptions of alcohol consumption (Durkin et al., 2005). Studies have found that interventions focusing on changing students' perceptions of drinking have had moderate success (LaBrie et al., 2008). Many campuses use campaigns and other passive and active messaging to influence student behavior. While research recommends such measures, universities are still having a hard time curbing students' high-risk drinking habit.

<center>44</center>

Online Modules and Student Drinking

A cost-effective intervention that many universities employ to combat high-risk student drinking is short online alcohol intervention modules. These modules have been in wide use since the early 2000s when one of the first such programs became widely utilized. The impact of such interventions has had mixed results. A comprehensive study comparing the effectiveness of these interventions (Hennessy, Tanner-Smith, Mavridis, & Grant, 2019) concluded that while many of these interventions show promise at reducing alcohol consumption measures in the short-term, the same is not so for the long-term success of the same interventions. The researchers recommended utilizing BASICS intervention for universal prevention and using the brief alcohol intervention E-Chug for specific groups. Again, even with these measures in place, universities still experience high alcohol consumption levels among their student populations.

Environmental and Cultural Interventions

Environmental and cultural influences have a profound impact on student drinking behaviors. Some students choose universities for their party school reputation. Other student groups, such as fraternities and sororities, promote high-risk drinking through their actions and their social influence on their members. Studies suggest that universities may mitigate student drinking by focusing on the environmental and group-level predictors of high-risk drinking (Pedersen & Feroni, 2018). Multifaceted approaches that focus on environmental factors such as alcohol availability could also be beneficial (Park et al., 2009).

Furthermore, when universities and the communities in which they are situated work in tandem to address high-risk student drinking, research points to some success in decreasing

severe consequences and adverse effects (Wolfson et al., 2012). Alternatively, universities may struggle with mitigating off-campus influences because they have little control over the community's rules and regulations (Harford et al., 2002). Central to the current study are interventions employed across fraternity and sorority communities to mitigate negative group behavior. While universities may use this tactic as a quick fix to address problems at the group level, new research points to the differences across Greek letter organizations and debunking the assertation that all fraternities and sororities are monolithic in their drinking behaviors (McCready, 2019).

<div align="center">Consequence Based Interventions</div>

As universities employ various risk mitigation strategies to combat high-risk student drinking in fraternity and sorority communities, an approach that has been used by numerous universities is consequence-based interventions. In their study on a large national fraternity, Caudill et al. found that sanctioned chapters had lower drinking levels but only marginally better than unsanctioned chapters (2006). Furthermore, stressing the drinking's adverse outcomes does not influence groups' drinking levels with high-risk drinking culture (Elias et al., 2001). Universities have also utilized interim suspensions of single organizations, encompassing bans of fraternity and sorority life, to address this behavior. In a thorough review of the literature, there appear to be no empirical studies exploring this phenomenon and its impact on the problems it intends to mitigate.

Efficacy and Limitations of Current Interventions

Universities have employed a multitude of interventions to address high-risk drinking in college students. Administrators have paid close attention to mitigating these behaviors in fraternities and sororities. Research has demonstrated that no one program, or intervention will completely change student drinking behavior. More comprehensive approaches are needed(Caron et al., 2004). Policies, such as minimum age drinking laws, have shown to have little to no effect. Binge drinking occurs in more significant amounts for students under the legal minimum drinking age (Mohler-Kuo et al., 2004). As fraternities and sororities are known to be the upholders of drinking culture on many campuses, it is understandable that universities have gone to great lengths to focus their attention on these high-risk groups. Most institutions' current approach is creating and enforcing policies to limit high-risk drinking in their fraternity and sorority communities. Unfortunately, procedures such as alcohol-free housing have little to no impact on drinking among students in social Greek letter organizations (Brown-Rice & Furr, 2015; Caudill et al., 2006; Crosse et al., 2006)

Alcohol-free policies may have an alternative effect of pushing alcohol consumption off campus (Crosse et al., 2006). Furthermore, studies have pointed to the need for more comprehensive measures addressing alcohol availability, on and off-campus to students and the community, and targeted group interventions (Crosse et al., 2006; Saltz, Paschall, McGaffigan, & Nygaard, 2010). A critique of current approaches to limiting student alcohol use is that universities create policies and interventions that try to distance the university from liability while addressing student culture. By distancing themselves, universities restrict their ability to effectively shift student drinking culture (Elkins, Helms, & Pierson, 2003).

47

Other intervention methods include brief alcohol interventions administered online, educational sessions administered by professionals and peers, feedback provided to groups of students on drinking norms and expectancies, social skills training, and other campus measures such a campus-wide closures of Greek communities. Similar results were found throughout the literature on interventions to address high-risk drinking among students in Greek-letter organizations. For brief alcohol interventions administered online, there is some promise of decreasing positive associations with alcohol and decreasing some adverse outcomes. Still, the effect size is minimal and only has an initial impact, which wanes over time (Wall, 2007). For these types of interventions, time seems to induce a moderating effect where after administering the intervention, students regress to the mean level of alcohol consumption (Hennessy et al., 2019; Voogt, Poelen, Kleinja, Lemmers, Lex A. C. J., & Engels, Rutger C. M. E, 2013).

Educational sessions are a common intervention tactic to address a range of high-risk student behaviors, including alcohol consumption. Across several studies, the effectiveness of such interventions was mixed. While some interventions did show promise in reducing drinking behavior (Brown-Rice, Kathleen A., Furr, & Jorgensen, 2015; Caudill et al., 2007; Hennessy et al., 2019; Larimer, M. E. et al., 2001; Voogt et al., 2013), the effect size was small, and students still participated in high-risk drinking behaviors and experienced a range of negative consequences as well.

There were various critiques of the current approaches. One study found that students are worried about getting themselves or their friends in trouble when calling for help in an alcohol emergency (Blavos, Glassman, Sheu, Diehr, & Deakins, 2014). Another study on the efficacy of interventions targeted at Greek letter organizations found that students had reached a saturation

of alcohol use information. The same study also found that students in Greek organizations believe that their drinking mirrors the general student body. Students also stated that data is not credible if it is coming from a professional source.

Furthermore, the study found that individual factors had more of an impact than group-level factors. While many of those concerns are contrary to alcohol use among fraternity and sorority students, it is still telling those students hold these alcohol use beliefs. Finally, and crucial to the current study, there seems to be no empirical research on campus-wide pauses to Greek Activity as an intervention method to address high-risk drinking among affiliated students.

Summary of Interventions to Address High-Risk Drinking in Fraternities and Sororities

Countless studies have provided recommendations to curb high-risk drinking among fraternity and sorority communities. Other studies have attempted to determine the efficacy of such interventions. Researchers have found that while there seems to be a limited impact on all alcohol measures, these gains among students regress to the mean over time. Furthermore, as universities implement campus-wide pauses of Greek life as an intervention method, research is needed to understand better how universities execute this intervention and the efficacy and impact on the fraternity and sorority community.

Hazing and the College Student

Much like high-risk drinking, hazing is a negative behavior that plagues college campuses. Studies have found that nearly half of students who join clubs or organizations on college campuses experience at least one form of hazing behavior (Allan & Madden, 2008). Amplification of this problem occurs in college athletics (Hoover & Pollard, 1999) and

fraternities and sororities (Allan & Madden, 2008). In their national study, Allan and Madden found that nearly three in four students joining fraternities and sororities experienced an activity that would be considered hazing (2008). Not only is the problem pervasive on college campuses, but incidents of hazing garner national attention and illicit responses from colleges and universities. One such answer is the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activity. To fully understand hazing and the reactions universities take, scholars have attempted to define hazing and the typical behaviors.

<div align="center">Hazing Defined</div>

There are nearly as many definitions of hazing as there are universities in the United States. Universities approach definitions of hazing from the people's perspectives, creating them from their hazing experiences (Feuer, 2019; Parks & Spangenburg, 2019). One of the first national studies conducted to explore hazing in college athletics defined hazing as "any humiliating or dangerous activity expected of you to join a group regardless of your willingness to participate" (Hoover & Pollard, 1999, p. 6). Another national study, which is widely cited and utilized by universities when creating hazing policy on campus, defines hazing as "any activity expected of someone joining or participating in a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of a person's willingness to participate" (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 2). The two definitions are similar in that both attempt to put boundaries on behaviors or emotions that are hazing outcomes. Furthermore, they both put the acts within a group context and note that even if the individual willingly participates, the action could still be considered hazing. There are some glaring deficiencies within these definitions.

The previous definitions state outcomes or emotions of the acts. Where this causes a problem is that individuals interpret or respond to behaviors in many ways. For example, while one person may find doing calisthenics dangerous, another person may find it fun. Alternatively, making someone dress in unflattering clothing can be considered fun by one person and degrading or humiliating by another. Noting the deficiencies and ambiguity in these definitions, Aldo Cimino defines hazing as "the generation of induction cost, i.e., part of the experience necessary to be acknowledged as a legitimate group member, that appear unattributable to group relevant assessments, preparations or chance (Cimino, 2011, p. 242). This definition can be utilized across groups and does not leave the delineation of the act up to the individual experiencing the behavior. While this definition has its strengths, University administrators prefer more explicit definitions. Colleges usually rely on sets of behaviors to define hazing.

Insomuch, researchers have found common behaviors across hazing experiences and people's perceptions of the experience. Hazing activities can be physical, emotional, psychological, or alcohol-related (Ellsworth, 2006; Gregory S. Parks, Rashawn Ray, Shayne E. Jones, & Matthew W. Hughey, 2014; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). It is a commonly held belief that hazing occurs on a continuum, with this continuum differing by those who define it (Owen et al., 2008; Strawhun, 2016). Some of the most common behaviors associated with hazing across groups, research studies, and periods of time are planned failure (Cimino, 2018), being yelled, sworn or cursed at (Allan, Kerschner, & Payne, 2018; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Silveira & Hudson, 2015), humiliation (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan & Madden, 2008; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Silveira & Hudson, 2015), isolation or associating with certain people (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Silveira & Hudson, 2015),sleep

51

deprivation (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Ellsworth, 2006; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Silveira & Hudson, 2015), alcohol consumption (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Campo et al., 2005; Ellsworth, 2006; Finkel, 2002; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Lafferty & Wakefield, 2018), sex acts (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Ellsworth, 2006; Finkel, 2002), and physical activities that can induce injury or harm (Ellsworth, 2006; Finkel, 2002; Gregory S. Parks et al., 2014; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Tokar & Stewart, 2010). This list is not exhaustive but represents behaviors common across studies. While many of these behaviors seem to be hazing, there are many hazing misperceptions among college students.

<div align="center">Misperceptions of Hazing</div>

Students hold many misperceptions of hazing. A large majority of students, when presented with a list of activities that would constitute hazing on many campuses, indicate they have participated in some of these acts, but are unwilling to define such actions as hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Campo et al., 2005; Ellsworth, 2006; Finkel, 2002; Gregory S. Parks et al., 2014; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Massey & Massey, 2017; Silveira & Hudson, 2015; Tokar & Stewart, 2010). Another common misperception among students is that just because something is not mandatory does not mean the act is not hazing (Waldron, Lynn, & Krane, 2011). Finally, there is a common belief that if people inform individuals about the groups that haze, it will deter people from joining. Many students know about hazing activities before joining or immediately after joining (Gregory

S. Parks et al., 2014). Definitions of hazing, common hazing behaviors, and misperceptions of hazing inform the public discourse around hazing.

<div align="center">Public Attitudes</div>

Hazing seems to be considered a part of the campus culture. The public nature of hazing and the extent to the exposure of this behavior influences public perception of hazing. Moreover, the generally accepted nature of hazing may be due in part because of students' beliefs that adults or those in charge, like university administrators, parents, and coaches, know about the behavior and do nothing to deter students from acting out these behaviors (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008). While there are plenty of students who hold that belief, fraternities and sororities seem to be impervious to those external to their organization's attitudes and beliefs. This lack of influence is particularly problematic when trying to address these dangerous behaviors. An acutely poignant quote from noted hazing researcher Stephen Sweet (1999, p. 355) illustrates this point entirely:

> Studies reveal that Greek subculture places a high value on secrecy and autonomy. This aspect of Greek society is especially problematic for college advisors and administrators because fraternities and sororities are not receptive to sharing their secrets with outsiders. Fraternities and sororities are also not receptive to intrusion into what they perceive as internal affairs because college authorities do not constitute a salient reference group for Greek members and advice from advisors or administrators can go unheard.

Students' and administrators' attitudes that hazing is ambiguous and complicated to address shapes public discourse on hazing (Crow & Macintosh, 2009; Fuer, 2019). The definitions and

attitudes that shape hazing on college campuses is only one part of understanding how to address the behavior. Another part is understanding where and in what groups we see hazing occur.

<div align="center">Groups that Haze</div>

Hazing occurs across a large cross-section of students and student groups at colleges and universities. Studies show that nearly 56 percent of students experience at least one form of hazing activity when joining a club, team, or organization while at college (Allan & Madden, 2008). Groups where studies have found students experience hazing, including varsity athletics, club sports, intermural teams, military groups, recreation clubs, service organizations, arts organizations, academic clubs, and fraternities' sororities (Allan & Madden, 2012). Out of all student groups, the most likely groups where students may experience a hazing-related behavior are within athletic groups and fraternities and sororities (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Campo et al., 2005; Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Keating et al., 2005). Students are generally aware of the hazing that occurs on their campuses (Allan & Madden, 2008). There also seems to be other defining characteristics of students' experiences with hazing. One such characteristic is students' experiences with hazing before entering college.

Numerous studies have found that students come to college having experienced hazing in high school (Allan & Madden, 2008; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Reid, Holt, Felix, & Greif Green, 2019). Individuals may even experience hazing in lower grades (Gershel, Katz-Sidlow, Small, & Zandieh, 2003). These experiences with hazing may make students desensitized to some of the more benign forms of hazing they experience when they get to college. While many students experience hazing in high school and college, there seem to be apparent gender differences with

<div align="center">54</div>

hazing-related experiences. Male students are more likely to have experienced hazing in high school athletics (Allan & Madden, 2008).

Male students are more likely than female students to experience hazing across numerous studies (Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Calderón & Allan, 2017; Gregory S. Parks et al., 2014). Male students are also more likely to experience more risky and dangerous hazing (Hoover & Pollard, 2000), be more accepting of hazing behaviors (Allan et al., 2018; Strawhun, 2016), have alumni be involved in their hazing experience (Allan et al., 2018), and desire more severe forms of hazing (Cimino, 2013). Apart from gender differences and group affiliation, one is most likely to find hazing among fraternities and sororities. In their landmark study on hazing on college campuses, Allan and Madden found that nearly 75 percent of students experienced at least one hazing-related behavior when joining a fraternity or sorority (2008)—placing SGLOs at the forefront of risky groups among college students.

<u>Negative Outcomes of Hazing</u>

While there appears to be a normalization of hazing among college students, with many of the behaviors being non-threatening and innocuous, hazing can have serious adverse outcomes. Students perceive that hazing has positive outcomes, like group solidarity, cohesion, and bonding among new members (Allan & Madden, 2008). Outcomes of hazing may include feeling stress (Allan et al., 2018; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009), having trouble with academics (Allan et al., 2018; Hoover & Pollard, 2000), experiencing psychological or emotional distress (Allan et al., 2018; Calderón & Allan, 2017; Gershel et al., 2003; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Keating et al., 2005; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009), and physical pain or bodily harm (Allan et al.,

2018; Calderón & Allan, 2017; Gershel et al., 2003; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Keating et al., 2005; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). One of the most severe hazing outcomes that one can experience is death. One death is far too many, but there has been an uptick in hazing-related deaths among fraternity and sorority communities in recent years. At least one hazing-related death has occurred each year since 1959, and over the past decade alone, there have been 55 deaths associated with hazing (Nuwer, 2020). Hazing deaths are a prominent feature among community-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities. Even with the increased level of harm, students continue to participate and haze others.

Motivations and Indicators of Hazing

There are countless reasons students enact hazing in their groups. Generally held beliefs among students and scholars are that hazing generates group solidarity, is an expression of dominance, and weeds out uncommitted members (Cimino, 2013). The following sections explore the rationalizations for hazing commonly held among students and the theories presented by numerous hazing researchers on why this behavior persists among student groups.

Rationalizations

One of the most utilized justifications for hazing among college students is that hazing builds group unity and cohesion. Students justified hazing others across numerous studies because they believed it would bring them closer together (Allan & Madden, 2008; Campo et al., 2005; Massey & Massey, 2017). While this rationalization is understandable, some students have alternative feelings (Fuer, 2019). Furthermore, administrators point to an opposing view that hazing builds mistrust and resentment between members. Studies indicate that this rationalization

that hazing builds solidarity is nothing more than a myth (Johnson, 2011). Outside of being seen to build group cohesion and solidarity, students point to hazing as being fun or exciting as a reason they participate in it (Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Keating et al., 2005; Massey & Massey, 2017; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). This attitude of perceiving hazing to be fun may be in part because of the generally accepted nature of hazing in American culture.

Other rationalizations students use for hazing or participating in hazing themselves include gaining group relevant skills (Fuer, 2019) and the notion that if it did not cross a perceived line, it is ok (Roosevelt, 2018; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). Also, students haze to exert dominance over new members (Waldron et al., 2011) and weed out uncommitted members (Crow & Macintosh, 2009; Montague, Zohra, Love, McGee, & Tsamis, 2008; Pershing, 2006; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009); however, this last rationalization seems like a legitimate and altruistic reason for committing hazing; how groups enact does not align with group tasks germane to the organization. Rationalizations aside, there are some other preeminent indicators and motivations of hazing in college students.

<u>Individual and Group Predictors</u>

Hazing is a cyclical process that involves those who experience hazing becoming the hazers themselves. The more exposure to hazing one receives, the more they build up positive associations to the act itself (Owen et al., 2008). Moreover, as the number of hazing activities undertaken while joining a group increases, the likelihood of perpetrating acts as an active member increases (Hamilton, Scott, LaChapelle, & O'Sullivan, 2016). Additionally, having the positive association that hazing builds group cohesion increases the likelihood of identifying as a

hazer or being hazed (Campo et al., 2005). Besides several hazing activities experienced and positive associations being predictors of hazing, students who envision themselves as part of "strongly cooperative, enduring coalitions" are more likely to desire severe forms of hazing (Cimino, 2013, p. 31). A prime example of these strongly cooperative coalitions is fraternities and sororities. Students who identify closely with their fraternities or sororities are more likely to participate in hazing than those who do not (Richardson, B. K., Rains, & Hall-Ortega, 2019). This increase in likelihood also extends to students' participation level in the organization, with high contributing members more likely to participate than less engaged members (Cimino, 2013).

Automatic Accrual Theory

Another interesting theory that was first introduced by social anthropologist Aldo Cimino is the Automatic Accrual Theory. This theory asserts the following:

Automatic Accrual theory instantiates a set of adaptive responses to new coalition members, among them anti-exploitation responses (e.g., an initial reduction of trust and entitlement). Furthermore, hazing may exist in part to prevent newcomers from successfully free riding on coalition benefits. Specifically, those benefits are freely consumable upon group entry – automatic benefits – most at risk of exploitation (e.g., status, group protection, common property). In contrast, benefits with a slow or costly accrual period – non-automatic benefits – are at little risk of exploitation (e.g., knowledge of difficult, specialized skills). (Cimino, 2011)

One can easily apply this theory to the group central to the current study, fraternities, and sororities. As fraternities and sororities have high status on many campuses, they also have many automatic benefits, including group protection and common property (Greek houses, alcohol), they are likely to employ hazing to eliminate this freeriding of their benefits.

In a series of experimental studies, Cimino can confirm this theory and conclude the following: (a) non-automatic benefits explain no unique variance in desired hazing severity; (b) participants desire more severe hazing as high contributors; (c) the more severe the desired hazing, the greater the desired pressure; and (d) a significant relationship exists between automatic benefits and desired hazing severity (Cimino, 2011; Cimino, 2013).

Peer Pressure

An alternative to other theories presented, some researchers avow that the group's norms predicate hazing and the pressure asserted by compatriots to either haze someone or accept hazing. Students may feel this pressure from older members within groups or peers within the new members experiencing the hazing (Lafferty & Wakefield, 2018). Students seem to conform to the group's norms, where that if hazing is generally accepted, it will be more likely that new members will embrace pro-hazing attitudes. This acceptance of peer norms is evident in athletic groups and fraternities, and sororities (Tingley, Crumb, Hoover-Plonk, Hill, & Chamber, 2018; Waldron et al., 2011). Furthermore, as the desired hazing severity increases, the greater the pressure to haze increases (Cimino, 2013; Keating et al., 2005). Thus, a student group's norms directly influence its members' hazing attitudes (Waldron, 2015).

Moral Disengagement

Another explanation for hazing behaviors is the concept of moral disengagement. Albert Bandura posits the following:

> Moral disengagement may center on the cognitive restructuring of inhumane conduct into a benign or worthy one by moral justification, sanitizing language and advantageous comparison; disavowal of a sense of personal agency by diffusion or displacement of responsibility; disregarding or minimizing the injurious effects of one's actions; and attribution of the blame too, and dehumanization of victims, (Bandura, 1999)

Therefore, hazing in fraternities and sororities can be explained through the lens of moral disengagement by the rationalization of members that hazing is a worthy cause because it roots out unmotivated members. Also, hazing is justified as it builds group cohesion, and it may be fun or exciting. Hazing is also compared to making cuts on athletics teams or rigorous training in the military and justified by individuals blaming the group at large or the campus culture. Finally, some justify hazing by the idea that no one was harmed or utilizing language such as pledge or using pledge nicknames to dehumanize the individuals enduring the punishment.

Studies utilizing the theory of moral disengagement have found that students with higher moral disengagement levels were more likely to view hazing as acceptable (Strawhun, 2016). Additionally, increases in moral disengagement are related to increases in hazing behaviors perpetrated (Hamilton et al., 2016). Finally, fraternities and sororities had higher levels of moral disengagement than their non-affiliated peers (McCreary, 2012), thus increasing the likelihood of finding supportive hazing attitudes among fraternity sorority communities.

Rites of Passage

Another dominant theory of hazing behavior within college students, particularly fraternities and sororities, is that hazing is a rite of passage in becoming an entirely accepted member within a group. A rite of passage can be considered a tradition or source of legitimacy in becoming a group member (Fuer, 2019; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). Sweet (1999) uses a symbolic interactionist perspective to explain hazing as a rite of passage in fraternities. He suggests that hazing is a

> confluence of symbols manipulated identities, and definitions" packaged in the context of initiation rites. Furthermore, through the process of "pledging or becoming a member of a fraternity or sorority, individuals are stripped of their identities, given new social relation definitions and shift their self to a collective group identity. (p. 360)

Through this process, individuals have a hard time separating themselves from the dangerous behaviors of hazing. Thus, members accept hazing as a rite of passage for future group members.

Climate and Dominance Theory

A final set of theories used to explain hazing in fraternities and sororities is through the lens of social dominance and hierarchical attitudes, and climates infused with ideas of masculinity. Researchers believe that groups enact hazing to perpetuate their ideals of older, more senior members having more status (Fuer, 2019; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009; Waldron et al., 2011). More senior members enact this power through dominance over the newer members. Through this dominance process, new members fear older members and "learn" their

organization's place. Unfortunately, this has become a cyclical process; wherein new members come to haze incoming members as they are trying to uphold a group formed hierarchy.

Closely related to dominance and hierarchy are a group's climate and cultural impact on hazing attitudes and behaviors. In a series of studies utilizing the lens of masculinity to understanding hazing in college fraternities, McCready found positive correlations between masculine climates and hazing attitudes and behaviors (McCready, 2018; McCready, 2019a). Certain masculine climates related to a group's endorsement of hazing include risk-taking climates and playboy climates, or climates where students are willing to engage in risky behavior, and climates where students endorse sleeping with many sexual partners. Interestingly, McCready found that violent climates, or climates where violent attitudes are supported, negatively correlate with social dominance hazing (McCready, 2018). This difference in correlation is because groups realize that social dominance hazing may increase new members' uprising, throwing off the balance of power within the organization.

Furthermore, individual-level variables related to masculinity correlate with hazing motivation (McCready, 2019) positively. In his study of individual and group level variables that predicate hazing in college fraternities, McCready found that white students, students living in chapter houses, and larger organizations have positive correlations with hazing motivations. These findings, taken together, should play a significant role in how universities address hazing within college fraternities and sororities (McCreary, 2012).

Summary of Why Students Haze

In summary, many theories attempt to explain hazing in college fraternities and sororities. Researchers have postulated that students haze because they try to eliminate freeloaders, as in automatic accrual theory (Cimino, 2011). An alternative hypothesis is that hazing relates to peer pressure and group norms (Tingley, Crumb, Hoover-Plonk, Hill, & Chamber, 2018; Waldron et al., 2011). Moral disengagement, or the process through which one rationalizes their abhorrent behavior, was presented (McCreary, 2012). This section also explored hazing as a rite of passage that has been adopted by groups as a reason students haze (Sweet, 1999). Finally, individual and group level factors and climates may influence group members' hazing attitudes and behaviors (McCready, 2018; McCready, 2019a). As universities attempt to address hazing behaviors within college fraternities and sororities, understanding the many different rationales behind them may help in crafting appropriate interventions to stamp out these behaviors.

Strategies to Address Hazing

Hazing in fraternities and sororities is a problem that has persisted throughout their existence on college campuses. University administrators and hazing researchers have attempted numerous methods to combat the problem and have offered up even more suggestions on approaches that may work. Hazing is a complex problem that replicates a campus or group's culture, climate, and characteristics; therefore, there is no one best approach to address the issue (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). Furthermore, stakeholders must not simplify the problem for any meaningful change and seek to address it with quick solutions (Parks & Spangenburg, 2019). Even with a renewed interest in hazing and its impact on college campuses,

many colleges still only utilize a hazing is not tolerated approach, with limited exposure to other methods of preventing this act (Allan & Madden, 2012; Allan & Madden, 2008). Scholars agree that universities must take a more comprehensive approach to make any change in limiting this behavior (McCready, 2019; Richardson, D. C., 2014). Although comprehensive approaches are needed, scholars also recommend a series of other solutions to combat this problem.

Other recommendations in preventing hazing include changing the narrative and addressing what students hope to achieve with hazing. By engaging them in authentic conversations and not punitively sanctioning them, scholars believe it will help students realize they can accomplish more without hazing (Richardson, 2014; Roosevelt, 2018). Alternatively, encouraging students to have more than one peer group may be an effective deterrent to hazing. One study found that students said they would be more likely to walk away from hazing if they had more peer relationships (Campo et al., 2005). Scholars also believe that understanding the climate and culture on campus and fraternities and sororities are essential in crafting hazing interventions (McCready, 2019). Much like alcohol interventions, social norms approaches may be vital in the prevention puzzle (Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). Finally, punitive actions, policies, and laws may also play a crucial role in eliminating hazing from college fraternities and sororities (Owen et al., 2008). University administrators need to take a multi-lens approach to address this complex problem with many intervention methods.

Hazing Law and Policy

An area of prevention that has gained more traction to curb hazing behavior is hazing laws and policies. This increase in attention is partly due to recent high-profile hazing incidents

that have gained national attention (Salinas & Boettcher, 2018). Furthermore, there is an expectation that states, and institutions should handle hazing law and policy, as there is no federal hazing policy guidance (Salinas & Boettcher, 2018). Currently, 44 states have hazing laws, with 22 using a similar definition of hazing (Salinas & Boettcher, 2018). Many of these laws and policies are reactive and do not address the problems before they start but merely provide an avenue by which universities and victims can act. Additionally, research is not considered when crafting law and policy (Parks & Spangenburg, 2019). While university administrators generally agree that hazing laws and policies are needed and play a part in addressing the issue (Richardson, 2014), there are some glaring deficiencies in the effectiveness of laws and policies.

First, studies report that students have little awareness of hazing law or policy, even on campuses that attempt to make them aware, or have students sign agreements saying they have read the policy (Allan & Madden, 2008; Crow & Macintosh, 2009; Richardson, 2014). Furthermore, how university administrators interpreted campus policies is mainly based on their personal experiences with hazing and vary significantly even within institutions. It is incredibly apparent that even with the extensive amount of attention paid toward hazing law and policy, these initiatives have little impact on student behavior (Salinas & Boettcher, 2018).

Reporting

Another issue with attempting to address hazing within college fraternities and sororities is reporting the behavior to authorities and others. Many students comment that they do not want to get anyone, particularly their team or group, in trouble when prompted on why they do not

65

report hazing (Johnson, 2011). There is an underreporting of hazing due to fear of social isolation and retaliation. Research tells us that one aspect of hazing is that these individuals who experience hazing have their identity tightly entwined with the group. By reporting hazing, they risk isolation from the group and retaliate physically, emotionally, and socially (Richardson, B. K., Wang, & Hall, 2012; Silveira & Hudson, 2015).

Additionally, students often perceive hazing behaviors as innocuous, in that no one was injured or there was little if any negative consequences (Allan et al., 2018; Allan & Madden, 2008; Silveira & Hudson, 2015). Other reasons why students did not report hazing the perceived severity of the incidents (Richardson et al., 2019) and the perceived attitude of administrators and university officials, where that if students perceived that administrators did not hold hazing in a negative or serious light, they would be less likely to report the issue (Kowalski & Waldron, 2010). As universities design platforms and opportunities for students to report hazing, they must be aware of why students fail to report.

<center>Comprehensive Approaches to Address Hazing</center>

There are two comprehensive approaches to addressing hazing prevention cited in the literature. Below is an overview of these approaches and the recommendations they outline to address hazing comprehensively.

<center>66</center>

Langford Approach

Langford suggests that "hazing is caused by the convergence of numerous factors across multiple levels of influence" (2008, p. 2). Insomuch, it is essential to address the issue in numerous different ways. Furthermore, Langford recommends that administrators understand factors contributing to these behaviors that are campus and context-specific when developing interventions. Additionally, successful interventions will include: (a) addressing attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions; (b) supporting healthy group norms; (c) conveying clear expectations; (d) disseminating comprehensive policies; (e) providing support services; and (f) establishing comprehensive drug, alcohol, and hazing prevention programs (Langford, 2008). Without the support and connection of multiple stakeholders, any comprehensive hazing prevention effort will be ineffective.

Allan Approach

A recent development in hazing prevention is Elizabeth Allan's work and her associates in the Hazing Prevention Consortium. Through their efforts working with universities across the country, they have developed standards and best practices backed by public health approaches to prevention science (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). Their hazing prevention framework (HPF) includes (a) commitment; (b) capacity; (c) assessment; (d) planning; (e) evaluation; (f) cultural competence; (g) sustainability; (h) and implementation. Below is a description of the recommendations for each area of the hazing prevention framework.

Commitment involves visible and tangible endorsement from multiple key stakeholders, especially those with perceived high standing at a university. This endorsement also involves the commitment of human, structural, and political capital to be invested in preventing hazing at the campus level. Furthermore, this must be a broad campus effort, with no specific community carrying the work or effort (Allan et al., 2018). Another aspect of the (HPF) is capacity. Capacity includes the development and implementation of human and structural capital to assist in hazing prevention efforts. Additionally, this involves educating critical stakeholders on pressing the campus and devoting the needed amount of time, energy, and resources to address hazing and other high-risk behaviors (Allan et al., 2018).

The HPF also includes using multiple assessment forms to understand the scope and depth of hazing issues on a college campus. For assessment to be practical, it must be timely and be shared widely to inform and create a culture of accountability within the campus community (Allan et al., 2018). Planning is closely tied to assessment. This HPF area is about making data-driven decisions based on context and crafting measurable goals that the campus aims to complete (Allan et al., 2018).

The Hazing Prevention Framework also addresses the areas of evaluation. The consortium advances the idea of evaluation as "the formal documentation of the process and impact of prevention strategies as a means to measure and promote strategies with evidence of efficacy" (Allan et al., 2018, p. 418). By understanding what worked well and what did not, campuses can adjust and advance the cause of hazing prevention. Cultural competence is also necessary when addressing hazing on college campuses. This competence relates to understanding the groups' sociopolitical nature on campus, society's context, and the campus

where the prevention efforts are taking place. Without understanding all contexts of a situation, prevention efforts may be ineffective in changing group behaviors.

The final two areas of the HPF are sustainability and implementation. These two aspects are closely related, as for prevention efforts to be successful, they must be continuous and adjust as needed. Furthermore, as institutions implement their hazing prevention efforts, they should foster positive, proactive learning environments antithetical to a hazing culture (Allan et al., 2018). All these areas of the HPF interact and work to create a successful prevention effort.

<p style="text-align:center"><u>What is Missing from the Literature: The case for Campus-Wide Pauses</u></p>

To address both high-risk drinking and hazing within college fraternities and sororities, universities have utilized many different approaches. For both hazing and high-risk drinking, universities have crafted policies and utilized laws to address the issue. Furthermore, there have been attempts to change the normative beliefs of students and organizations. Campuses have tried to implement online training and educational sessions to drive down these behaviors. Finally, campuses have tried to use punitive actions to mitigate hazing and high-risk drinking. Through all these efforts, students continue to engage in these high-risk behaviors. One area that appears to be absent from the literature is the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activity to address high-risk drinking and hazing. The current study endeavored to explore campus-wide pauses, explain how universities implement them, understand the leadership frames, i.e., structural, human, political, and symbolic most engaged during their implementation and the implications of implementing this strategy to address high-risk behaviors in fraternities and sororities. The current research utilized Bolman and Deals four-frame approach.

Theoretical Framework: Bolman and Deal

The theoretical framework that guided the implementation of this study is the theory of organizational frames. Respected organizational theorists Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal created the four-frame approach to help understand organizations' nature and the problems they encounter. Table 1 below provides a brief snapshot of the four frames used to guide the study, adapted from Bolman & Deal's 2017 publication (2017, p. 2).

Table 1 Organizational Frames adapted from Bolman and Deal

Frames				
	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Metaphor for organization	Factory or machine	Family	Jungle	Carnival, temple, theater
Supporting disciplines	Sociology, management science	Psychology	Political science	Anthropology, dramaturgy, institutional theory
Central Concepts	Roles, goals, strategies, policies, technology, environment	Needs, skills, relationships	Power, conflict, competition, politics	Culture, myth, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes
Image of Leadership	Social architecture	Empowerment	Advocacy and political savvy	Inspiration
Basic Leadership Challenge	Attune structure to the task, technology, and environment	Align organizational and human needs	Develop an agenda and power base	Create faith, belief, beauty, and meaning

The following sections provide a more in-depth overview of each frame's central assumptions, tensions, and dilemmas. Furthermore, how each frame relates to the central concepts of the current study will be presented.

Structural Frame

Organizations have many forms, structures, and processes that influence how they function and operate. The structural frame in the proposed model reflects "confidence in rationality and faith that a suitable array of roles and responsibilities will minimize distracting personal static and maximize people's performance on the job" (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Furthermore, this frame posits that structuring and placing people in the right places will support individual goals and differences. Bolman and Deal suggested six main assumptions that guide the structural frame. Organizations' existence is based on their utility to meet mutually agreed upon aims and formulate plans to accomplish these intentions (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this way, universities establish processes to limit hazing and high-risk drinking in college fraternities and sororities.

Organizations are multidimensional and increase efficacy by creating areas of specialization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In the context of campus-wide pauses, one may accomplish this by leaving planning and implementation to a group of individuals who specialize in the advisement and oversight of fraternity and sorority communities. Structural aims are accomplished by effectively coordinating and controlling individuals and groups (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As universities attempt to address hazing and high-risk drinking, they must coordinate with distinct groups of people and various stakeholders to influence change in a meaningful way. Within the structural perspective, individual agendas and outside pressure directly impact rationality and the efficacy of the organizational aims (Bolman & Deal, 2017). This outside pressure provides a difficult challenge to overcome within the context of campus-wide pauses, as there is a multitude of stakeholders with often conflicting agendas and motives.

Organizations must account for the environmental, technological, workforce, and strategical context when designing an appropriate organizational structure (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Considering these factors allows universities to design appropriate structural imperatives in addressing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity. The final structural assumption is that organizations must be willing to restructure when performance suffers, or an intervention's efficacy comes into question (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this way, there is not a universally appropriate approach to campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities.

Within the structural frame, two main concerns inhibit successful organizational alignment: allocating work and coordinating diverse efforts after parceling out responsibilities (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Universities run into these two tensions in their attempts to address high-risk drinking and hazing in fraternity and sorority communities. First, on many campuses with large fraternity and sorority systems, offices with oversight of SGLO communities are staffed with only a few professional staff. While they provide general oversight and advising to these individual groups, the impact of hazing and high-risk drinking involves many different campus areas, including housing and residence life, campus security, health services, student conduct, academic services, and psychological services. These issues may also impact the local community and other stakeholders, such as the international organizations that govern fraternities and sororities. Thus, allocating work within the context of a campus-wide pause becomes daunting. The coordination of these stakeholders with competing interests becomes even more complicated once work is delineated.

Outside of the assumptions and tensions, many dilemmas accompany viewing campus-wide pauses through the structural frame. Bolman and Deal advanced eight dilemmas common in

72

structural framing, including (a) differentiation versus integration; (b) gap versus overlap; (c)

underuse versus overload; (d) lack of clarity versus lack of creativity; (e) excessive autonomy

versus excessive interdependence; (f) too loose versus too tight; (g) goal-less versus goal-bound;

(h) irresponsible versus unresponsive (2017). Each dilemma relates to campus-wide pauses of

fraternity and sorority communities in different ways. The current research sought to address

these to develop a baseline understanding of how these dilemmas materialize in the studies

context.

Since there are many different organizations, stakeholders, and individuals involved in

campus-wide pauses, coordination is complex and requires time, energy, and commitment.

Without coordination and role differentiation, any attempts at intervention may be unsuccessful.

Interventions can also be unsuccessful if there is a lack of clarity or, conversely, if there is a

redundancy in efforts. As institutions design campus-wide pauses, they must ensure that there are

delineated aims and objectives. Alternatively, if people are overworked, they may falter in their

efforts, or some crucial element of an intervention may get missed. Another dilemma that

universities may encounter in campus-wide pauses is a lack of clarity on the aims of the pause

and staying rigidly within the confines of defined aims. This problem can also multiply if

universities try to hold too much or too little control of the organizations. Too much control can

hold fraternities and sororities back from making meaningful change; too little control and the

organizations can feel they have no direction on where to go.

Finally, if goals are too rigid, there is no room for creative problem-solving, and if there

is a lack of goals, fraternities and sororities may become frustrated in the campus-wide pauses'

purposes. Furthermore, if universities relinquish managing high-risk drinking and hazing within

fraternity and sorority communities or implementing interventions, a pervasive uncontrolled culture may materialize. Thus, through the structural lens, one may understand campus-wide pauses related to the strategies, goals, roles, and other vital tenants explored above.

<div align="center">Human Resource Frame</div>

Universities deal in the commodity of people. Additionally, fraternities and sororities' very purpose comes down to the idea of people congregating together in a familial style to accomplish common aims. The next frame in the four-frame model advanced by Bolman and Deal is the Human Resources frame. The human resources frame is the idea that organizations consist of people who have unique needs, and for organizations to operate efficiently, they must address those needs (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As that relates to campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities, universities deal with people, in this case, fraternity and sorority members, who have unique needs. Within this frame, there are four main assumptions.

The primary purpose of organizations is to meet human needs (Bolman & Deal, 2017); therefore, campus-wide pauses intend to meet the needs of key stakeholders, students, and university employees. This frame propagates the idea that organizations, in this case, universities and fraternities and sororities, need people (Bolman & Deal, 2017). The people in the scenario of campus-wide pauses are fraternity and sorority members, university administrators, and other community members directly impacted by hazing and high-risk drinking. Another assumption relating to the human resources frame is that fit between people and organization is essential. Both may suffer, be exploited, and become the victim if there is not alignment (Bolman & Deal,

<div align="center">74</div>

2017). A demonstration of this misalignment is the relationship between fraternity and sorority communities and the campuses that house them.

The final assumption is that if organizational needs and human needs align, both will benefit. Additionally, individuals will prosper and add value to the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As this relates to campus-wide pauses, if an institution implements a pause with individual and organization needs in mind, both the campus and the fraternities and sororities will benefit. The central tension and dilemma highlighted in this frame is the misalignment between organizational and human needs. This misalignment may materialize in the proposed study on campus-wide pauses of fraternities and sorority communities in various ways. The nature in which universities arrive at deciding on implementing a pause may be partly due to a misalignment of needs between the university and fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, if institutions do not address the needs of those involved during implementation, the pause's aims may not be practical. The human resources frame provided a lens through which to view the human element of the campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities in the current study.

<u>Political Frame</u>

One can also use the political frame to address organizational issues. Bolman and Deal describe this frame as "roiling arenas, hosting ongoing contests arising from individual and group interests" (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Five significant assumptions guide the political frame. First, organizations comprise unique coalitions of competing and conflicting interests (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Evident in the proposed study on campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority

communities, there are multiple coalitions with sometimes competing interests. For example, fraternities and sororities want to congregate and function, sometimes outside the confines of university control. This congregation outside of university control may lead to high-risk behaviors, such as drinking and hazing. Alternatively, universities want groups to stay within the bounds of university policy and guidelines to ensure student safety. Naturally, these are competing interests of a coalition of people.

Another guiding assumption within the political frame is that members within these coalitions have differences in several different areas, including: (a) values, (b) beliefs, (c) information, (d) interests, and (e) perceptions of reality (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Universities and fraternity and sorority communities may share individuals' commodities, but they may have vastly differing views on the above areas. This tension is crucial to understanding the nature, form, and implications of campus-wide pauses. When viewed through a political lens, critical decisions involve allocating scarce resources (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In the current study, understanding the scarcity and allocation of resources provided a deeper understanding of the problem. Power is also the most important asset within the political frame. This importance is in part due to conflict created by scarce recourses and differences within coalitions. This assumption sought to provide insight into the struggle for power and administrative control evident within stakeholders of a campus-wide pause.

The final assumption guiding the political frame is that objectives and decisions materialize through a combination of negotiation and brokering (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Stakeholders must work towards a mutually beneficial conclusion, or parties must come to a concession or compromise. This relationship could play a large role in the decision-making

76

process if and how an institution implements a campus-wide pause. This frame's apparent

tension is jockeying for power and creating coalitions to levy that power to obtain individual or

organizational goals. In this way, one may view campus-wide pauses as a way of instituting

power over fraternity and sorority communities.

Symbolic Frame

The last frame in the four-frame model is the symbolic frame. This frame places a large

emphasis on meaning, belief, and symbolism. Further, within the symbolic frame, organizations

are viewed outside of what may be seen as rational, specific, and apparent (Bolman & Deal,

2017). This frame helps one view an organization or a problem through the eyes of those

intimately involved in the situation; therefore, the multiple case study research benefited from

understanding the form, function, and implication of campus-wide pauses through the lens of

those involved in each unique case. This understanding was accomplished through interviews

with administrators and through reviewing documents that document peoples, beliefs, feelings,

and understanding of the situation as it unfolded.

Like the other frames in the four-frame model, the symbolic frame's five significant

assumptions guide this model. First, what something means is more important than what happens

(Bolman & Deal, 2017); therefore, the perspective-taking of those involved in a particular

scenario is vitally important in understanding the situation from the symbolic perspective. In the

current study, how individuals perceive and made meaning of the campus-wide pause sought to

help understand the situation from the symbolic perspective. Furthermore, the symbolic frame

assumes that the meaning and activities ascribed to them are loosely coupled (Bolman & Deal,

77

2017). The loose coupling of these two concepts means that there are varying interpretations of the same problem. The researcher addresses this concern in the current study by deciphering the meaning ascribed to campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities from multiple perspectives.

Symbols play an essential role in resolving confusion, uncertainty, and ambiguity. They may embolize and influence hope, faith and provide direction (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Symbols are ascribed meaning through active, intentional ways, but also passive means. Viewing the current case studies through a confluence of symbols and meaning can provide insight into the different perspectives of the nature of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity. Bolman and Deal also state that "events and processes are often more important for what they express or signal than for their intent or outcomes" (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As such, campus-wide pauses may express or signal more to those involved than they intend to accomplish. Additionally, viewed through the symbolic lens, campus-wide pauses may include or induce myths, heroes, and stories to explain the pause and make sense of this particular period within the university and fraternity and sorority communities' history.

Inside the symbolic frame, culture is embedded throughout the organization, people, and the context in which they are situated (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Understanding a campus culture and climate is essential to understanding campus-wide pauses through the symbolic lens. It is an essential component and aim of the symbolic perspective to create faith, meaning, and belief to accomplish an intended goal. Through the symbolic frame, the current multiple case study research sought to understand how universities generated faith and goodwill to accomplish the aims of the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority activity. In sum, the four-frame

approach sought to provide a framework to understand the strategies, leadership perspectives and implications of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities.

Summary

This chapter presented the context and extent to the problems of high-risk drinking and hazing in college students, focusing on the pervasiveness of these issues in fraternity and sorority communities. Next, the concepts and strategies to confront these behaviors were addressed. Throughout the literature, the efficacy of current practices was addressed. Further, the literature review covered recommendations advanced by scholars on how to address these issues successfully. The chapter addressed the literature gap and the need for research on campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity. Finally, the chapter outlined the theoretical concept of organizational framing that guided the current study. Ultimately, the chapter aimed to provide the context and foundation for better understanding campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity as a prevention method to address hazing and high-risk drinking.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Organization of the Chapter

The current study's primary goals were to provide a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities as an intervention method for high-risk drinking and hazing. The study also sought to explore the strategies and leadership frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) universities utilize when implementing a campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority communities. Finally, the research sought to explore the influences these pauses have on fraternity and sorority communities. The research utilized multiple data collection methods to provide context to these aims. This chapter presents the methodological procedures used in the current study. Chapter organization is as follows: (a) study design strategy, (b) sample and sampling technique, (c) data collection strategy, (d) data analysis, and (e) validation and data security.

Research Questions

A literature review reveals an absence of research associated with campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities in response to high-risk drinking and hazing. Using a multiple case study method of research, this current study endeavors to develop and expand an area of lacking research. The research questions that guided this study are:

1. What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?

2. What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?

3. What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human resource, political and symbolic, are most engaged by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?

The rationale for Qualitative Research

The methodological approach used for this study was qualitative research. Creswell, states: "If a concept or phenomenon is needed to be explored and understood because little research is available, then it merits a qualitative approach." (2014) Furthermore, qualitative research intends to understand problems through meanings ascribed to them by individuals and groups of people (Creswell, 2014). Accordingly, qualitative research is the appropriate approach for this study because there is a lack of knowledge, understanding, and meaning ascribed to the intervention method of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The proposed theoretical framework helped provide context and develop an understanding of an intervention method that has yet to be studied. Qualitative methods rely on different data collection methods to understand a topic (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Consequently, as the current topic requires a complete understanding, multiple methods were utilized to situate the study's findings.

Design Strategy

The current research employs a multiple case study approach. Scholars contend that case study research is an appropriate methodological approach when studies seek to explore "how"

and "why" questions, the topic of interest is contemporary, the researcher has little to no control over the phenomena at study, and "the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be evident "(Yin, 2018). Furthermore, the phenomena within a particular context are of utmost importance (Yin, 2018). Multiple cases help present generalizable conclusions to explore a similar phenomenon (Yin, 2018).

Fittingly, the current multiple case study sought to answer "how" and "why" institutions employ campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activity and provide an in-depth understanding of the implications of these pauses. Additionally, the study's phenomenon is contemporary, being that it has been utilized in great frequency over the past ten to fifteen years. Moreover, the boundaries between the phenomena and the context are ambiguous. This ambiguity is due to the interconnected nature of the context, location, timeline, public discourse, and opinion of those involved in the campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority communities. Thus, understanding the situational context of campus-wide pauses is of the highest importance.

Study Sample

The sample for this current study consisted of two universities classified as four-year institutions, which have a large undergraduate enrollment and with public control. The Carnegie classification system provides parameters for the study samples. Furthermore, the institutions host fraternity and sorority communities consisting of more than 30 organizations and over 4000 students. The selected universities have implemented a campus-wide pause to their fraternity and sorority community within the past ten years. The study also included university personnel employed at the time of the pause or currently at the selected universities. Furthermore, the

participants had direct oversight over the fraternity and sorority community or the campus-wide pause's decision-making process. Finally, the documents used to contextualize the specific cases were related to the university or surrounding community.

<div align="center">Sampling Technique</div>

The current research employed a typical case approach to selecting incidences of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Gerring contends that "in order for a focused case study to provide insight into a broader phenomenon, it must be representative of a broader set of cases" (2007). Furthermore, in selecting typical cases, researchers utilize a standard of descriptive characteristics to select and probe for causal relationships. Insomuch, the researcher employed a purposive sampling method to select specific cases of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. First, the universities must be: (a) four-year institutions, (b) have large undergraduate populations, (c) publicly controlled, (d) have Greek systems with 30 or more organizations, consisting of over 4000 students, (e) have implemented some form of campus-wide pause of their fraternity or sorority system in the past ten years, and (d) have implemented a pause due to either a student death or issues about high-risk drinking and hazing.

The following criteria were utilized in a selection of study participants for interviews and documents to analyze: (a) the participants must have been employed during the time of the campus-wide pause or are currently working at the university, and (b) have direct oversight over the fraternity and sorority community or have control over the decision-making process to implement the campus-wide pause. Lastly, the documents must: (a) be affiliated with the university where the campus-wide pause took place, which can be in the form of emails,

websites, marketing materials, and notices, and (b) or news articles, opinion pieces, journal articles, websites, blogpost, and other forms of media from the surrounding community.

To participate in this study, universities met all six criteria. Furthermore, participants met both criteria to be selected to participate in interviews. Lastly, the documents met at least one of the criteria listed. Universities, participants will be asked to participate, and other documents will be selected, based on meeting all criteria set by the researcher.

Study Sites, Administrator and Document Profiles

The universities, interviewees and documents selected were based on the criteria listed above. Upon approval by the dissertation committee and the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the current research limited the study sites to two universities, three administrators per institution and multiple document types per institution. The pseudonyms used for each case, participant and document and description of each will be provided in this section. Institution 1 (I1) is a large public four-year institution with a fraternity and sorority community consisting of over 30 chapters and over 4000 students. Institution 1 implemented a campus-wide pause within the past ten years. Data collected to inform the case study of Institution 1 was gathered through interviews with three administrators who worked at the institution during the time of the pause and documents collected through an internet search and provided by the Administrators.

Rocky: was a senior level student affairs professional with direct oversite of the fraternity and sorority community during the time of the campus-wide pause. Rocky started at I1 shortly before the campus-wide pause was implemented. Rocky worked at I1 for three years after the

campus-wide pause was implemented. Rocky is a member of a SGLO and currently works for the national fraternal office they are affiliated with.

Causey: was an executive level student affairs professional who had Rocky in their supervision portfolio during the time of the campus-wide pause. Causey had worked at I1 for nine years prior to the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Causey was promoted to the executive level role prior to the campus-wide pause. Causey currently still works in this executive level role at I1. Prior to arriving at I1, Causey worked at another large public institution but never directly supervised a fraternity or sorority community. Causey is not a member of a SGLO but has six children who are members of SGLO's.

Bruin: was an executive level student affairs professional who directly supervised Rocky during the time of the campus-wide pause. Shortly before the campus-wide pause Bruin was promoted to this role full time but previously held the role occupied by Rocky and a crossover of the executive level role. Bruin worked at I1 for 11 years prior to the campus-wide pause and worked there for 19 years. Bruin currently serves at another large public institution in an executive level role and has been in this role for a little over a year. Prior to arriving at I1, Bruin directly supervised a fraternity and sorority community at another large public institution. Finally, Bruin is a member of and SGLO.

The documents compiled to inform Case 1 at I1 were collected through public record request, internet web searches using search terms provided in Appendix A and provided by the three administrators at I1. The documents included four conduct documents provided by university administration, four emails sent by university administrators, one external advocacy group newsletter, an external consultant report, one external email, one facilitation guide, 17

85

internal documents which included planning documents, reports, notes and yearly reports, and meeting agendas, 11 local or university news articles, one student petition, two presentations, and website information.

Institution 2 (I2) is a large public four-year institution with a fraternity and sorority community consisting of over 30 chapters and over 4000 students. Institution 2 implemented a campus-wide pause within the past ten years. Data collected to inform the case study of Institution 2 was gathered through interviews with three administrators who worked at the institution during the time of the pause and documents collected through an internet search and provided by the Administrators.

Richey: is a senior level student affairs administrator with direct oversight of the fraternity and sorority community who was not at I2 during the first campus-wide pause but was there during a second pause that happened at I2. Richey has worked at I2 for over 4 years. Prior to working at I2, Richey worked at another large public university and had direct oversight over a fraternity and sorority community. Richey is a member of a SGLO and is active in supporting their group and volunteering in the larger fraternity and sorority community.

Bowie: is a senior executive level administrator at I2 and has worked at I2 for seven years. While, Bowie does not have direct oversight over the fraternity and sorority community, they were instrumental in implementing the campus-wide pause. Bowie at I2 previously served at multiple large public institutions at the senior executive level and has a career spanning over 40 years in senior executive level roles. Bowie is a member of a SGLO and is a prominent voice and figure in the larger higher education landscape.

Wally: is a senior level student affairs administrator at I2 and has worked at I2 for 30 years. Wally has served in their role for the past 11 years and has had fraternity and sorority life in their portfolio for that amount of time as well. Wally is not a member of an SGLO.

The documents compiled to inform Case 2 at I2 were collected through public record request, internet web searches using search terms provided in Appendix A and provided by the three administrators at I2. The documents included conduct history, three emails sent by university administrators, an external advocacy newsletter, five external university emails and press releases, 12 internal documents including, planning documents, notes, meeting agendas, website information, presentations, and yearly reports, 15 local or university news articles, and one consultant report.

Data Collection and Management Plan

After IRB approval and participant selection, the researcher began the study. First, documents were be obtained through internet web searches, or provided by participants, or requested from the participating universities where community pauses took place. These documents were one way to inform and answer the research questions. With approval, all semi-structured individual interviews were conducted via Zoom, instead of in person, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Interviews also helped inform all research questions. The researcher recorded and transcribed all Zoom interviews, and the researcher also kept notes during the interviews. All documents collected and interviews transcribed were saved in a password-protected computer system to ensure confidentiality.

<u>Documents and Archival Data</u>

The first form of data that the researcher collected for the current research were documents and archival records. Yin states on data needed for case study research, "evidence can come from at least six sources: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant- observation, and physical artifacts" (2018). Thus, the current study utilized a combination of documents and archival data to answer the stated research questions. Documents are useful forms of data when completing qualitative research because they allow researchers to utilize common participant language when writing up the results, are easily accessible, are essential to the participants, and can be utilized as evidence (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Utilizing documents also meets the requirement of conducting high-quality case study research (Yin, 2018).

There are multiple forms of documents and archival data that scholars recommend for completing case study research. Yin suggests the collection of emails, memoranda, letters, and other personal documents, such as calendars and notes; agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other reports of events, administrative documents, such as proposals, progress reports, and other internal records, news clippings and other articles appearing in the mass media or community newspapers (2018). While there are many strengths of using archival data and documentation, there are some inherent weaknesses. Some of the weaknesses include: (a) reliability, (b) biased selectivity, (c) reporting bias, and (d) access (Yin, 2018). The researcher addresses issues of reliability and validity in a later section of the methodology.

Archival data and documentation play an essential role in completing the case study research. These documents help corroborate information gained from other sources, provide

common language used at the research site or sites, and provide direction of new inquiry lines during interviews or other data collection methods (Yin, 2018); therefore, the current case study research utilized multiple forms of documentation and archival data to help situate and triangulate the findings.

<u>Document and Archival Data collection Protocol</u>

The first part of the data collection process for the current multiple case study research was to obtain documents and archival data. Yin recommends internet searches before fieldwork because "an internet search can produce invaluable preparatory and orienting information" (2018). After selection of the sample and sample sites, the researcher completed a preliminary internet search for the following documents about the current research question: agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other reports of events, news clippings and other articles appearing in the mass media or community newspapers. The search terms for this portion of the data collection process are in Appendix A of this current study. The researcher used internet storage files to hold this data. Each case site had its own file storage system to keep data organized.

During interviewing of the selected participants, the researcher asked for their consent to share documents and archival data to help situate the findings. The researcher stored the data in the same manner as the primary documents obtained during the original search. Finally, the researcher used institutional research information requests for data that was not readily available through a general search and obtained through participants.

<u>Interviews</u>

The second form of data that the researcher used in the current case study was interviews with participants with detailed knowledge of the study phenomenon. Interviews are a crucial part of case study research (Yin, 2018). Understandably, interviews help provide context to the case study and provide detailed accounts from the participant's perspective. Yin recommends that case study interviews follow two important rules: (a) follow your line of inquiry, as reflected by your case study protocol, and (b) verbalizing your actual (conversational) questions in an unbiased manner that serves the needs of your line of inquiry (2018). To that effect, interview questions and protocol remained fluid throughout the research project to adjust to case study research's changing and fluid nature.

Moustakas recommends using broad, open-ended questions to facilitate obtaining "detailed, vital, substantive descriptions of the phenomenon" (Moustakas, 1994). Furthermore, interviews are useful when an observation is not possible when historical context is needed and gives researchers more control over the questions (Creswell, 2014); therefore, questions were developed in such a way that it allows participants to elaborate on the given case. Interview questions aided in informing the outcomes of the current case study. The researcher must create a sense of rapport to ensure that they obtain the most accurate information. In doing so there is a mutual understanding of trust between the researcher and the participant (Spradley, 2016).

<u>Interview Protocol</u>

The second form of data collection for this current study was semi-structured individual interviews. Participants were interviewed either once or twice to ensure saturation of information

to inform the case study research. The researcher made sure the interviewees provide consent before conducting the interview. With IRB approval, the researcher conducted interviews through Zoom, an online video conference software. Interviews were semi-structured, providing guidance to the interview from the researcher, and allowing the researcher to ask additional or follow up questions, as necessary. A full breakdown of the protocol and questions used in the interviews is in Appendix B. Participants' responses from the interviews helped create a case study of the site and the phenomena in question.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

The current case study incorporated multiple data analysis forms to answer the stated research questions surrounding campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The first analytical technique was open coding. Open coding occurs through the process of pouring over data and noticing themes. This process allowed the researcher to develop themes based on patterns that emerge and correspond with evidence from data sources used in the research (Creswell & Poth, 2018). For this process of analysis, the researcher used a modified version of Colaizzi's method. First, the researcher thoroughly read all documents to understand the data collected in the initial document accrual. After, the researcher picked out the most critical information. Following this step, the researcher made meaning of the data and organized them into themes. Last, the researcher made thick descriptions of the data and reduced to decrease redundancy. As the first step in the research was to collect documents, there were no participants to check the data (Colaizzi, 1978).

The second step in the data analysis process was relying on theoretical propositions. The propositions derived from Bolman and Deal's organizational frames helped organize the analysis of interviews and documents collected at each study site. They helped direct the researcher to pertinent contextual conditions and explications (Yin, 2018). The last step in the analysis process was a cross-case analysis. The researcher accomplished the analysis by creating institutional profiles and thick descriptions of individual cases of campus-wide pauses. Then the researcher compared and synthesized any within-case patterns across the cases (Yin, 2018).

Data Collection and Analysis by Research Question

Table 2 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures by Research Question

Research Questions	Data Collection Method	Justification	Analysis Method
What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?	Individual semi-structured interview (Questions 4 & 5) Documents Including personal documents, reports of events, and news articles	researchers to understand experience when it cannot be observed (Creswell,2014) Helps Corroborate information gained in interviews (Yin, 2018)	Combination of open Coding to recognize patterns and themes common to multiple campus-wide pauses, cross case analysis, and coding based on theoretical propositions

Research Questions	Data Collection Method	Justification	Analysis Method
What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?	Individual semi-structured interview (Question 11) Announcements and minutes of meetings and other reports of events; Administrative documents, progress reports, and other internal records; News clippings and other articles appear in the mass media or community newspapers.	Researchers to understand experience when it cannot be observed (Creswell, 2014) Helps Corroborate information gained in interviews (Yin, 2018)	Combination of open Coding to recognize patterns and themes common to multiple campus-wide pauses, cross case analysis, and coding based on theoretical propositions
What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human, political, and symbolic, are most employed by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?	Individual semi-structured interview (Questions 6 - 10) Personal documents, Announcements and minutes of meetings, and other reports of events; Administrative documents, such as proposals, progress reports, and other internal records; News clippings and other articles appearing in the mass media or community newspapers.	Researchers to understand experience when it cannot be observed (Creswell, 2014) Helps Corroborate information gained in interviews (Yin, 2018)	Combination of open Coding to recognize patterns and themes common to multiple campus-wide pauses cross case analysis, and coding based on theoretical propositions

After the researcher collected data through the initial search for documents and news

articles, the researcher coded and identified themes within each of campus-wide pauses of

93

fraternity and sorority communities. This coding helped answer research questions one through three. The researcher will also use coding based on theoretical propositions and cross-case analysis to answer questions one through three. A cross-case analysis is a process of synthesizing results from multiple situations. Creswell and Poth recommend "a case-based approach; the goal is to retain the integrity of the entire case and then to compare or synthesize any within-case patterns across the cases" (2018).

Trustworthiness and Validity

One of the qualitative research critiques is that it is hard to trust and confirm results when the researcher or participants are the instruments. Qualitative research requires multiple strategies to address validity and trustworthiness (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The researcher used the elements found in Table 3. A summarization of the strategies is below, adapted from Creswell & Poth, 2018.

Table 3 Validation Strategies

Validation Strategy	Definition & Relation to Current Study
Triangulation	Corroborating evidence through multiple sources of data. In this study, this was in the form of documents and interviews.
Member Checking	This process involves taking information and analysis back to the participants, and they judge the accuracy of the account. In this study, participants did this during the interview process to confirm accuracy.
Generating a detailed, thick description	The researcher allows readers to make decisions regarding transferability by being expansive in descriptions of the case. This process is inherent in a case study where context is important.

<u>Ethical Considerations</u>

Vital to the process of conducting case study research is making sure to acknowledge and address the ethical considerations inherent in qualitative research. Creswell and Poth recommend addressing ethical considerations at each phase of the research process (2018). Table 4 summarizes the strategies the researcher used to address the ethical considerations in the current research. A summarization of the strategies is below, adapted from Creswell & Poth, 2018.

Table 4 Strategies to Address Ethical Considerations

Timing During Research Process	Type of Ethical Issue	How to Address the Issue
Before conducting the study	• Seek college or university approval • Gain local access permissions • Select a site without a vested interest in the outcome of the study	• Submitted IRB Approval • Went through local approvals for the site and participants and find a gatekeeper to help • Selected sites that do not raise power issues
Beginning to conduct the study	• Disclose the purpose of the study • Refrain from pressure for participants into signing consent forms	• Contacted participants and informed them of the general purpose of the study • Assured participants of voluntary participation
Collecting data	• Respect the study site and minimize disruptions	• The researcher did not visit the sites • Some data is publicly available
Timing During Research Process	Type of Ethical Issue	How to Address the Issue
Analyzing data	• Avoid siding with participants and disclosing only positive results	• Report multiple perspectives • See Confidentiality section

	• Respect the privacy of the participants	
Reporting data	• Avoid falsifying authorship, evidence, data, finding, and conclusions	• Report honestly

The researcher discusses the ethical consideration of protecting the study site and the interviewer's identity in the following section.

Confidentiality

There were two aspects that the researcher addressed in terms of confidentiality. The first is the confidentiality of the study sites used in the case study research. To mask the participating institutions' identity, the researcher provided the pseudonym "Institution 1, Institution 2." Furthermore, the researcher did not use any identifiable information related to location and study phenomena, which is a campus-wide pause fraternity and sorority activity. The research also included interview participants; the researcher provided them the Pseudonyms used in the study. Additionally, the researcher removed all identifiable information from the final report.

Summary

The current study explores the strategies, organizational frames, and implications of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The researcher selected participants and study sites based on a predetermined criterion. There were two stages of the research process; the first was searching for documents and archival data about campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The second was interviews with participants from study sites. Additionally, the chapter discussed the data analysis process for the current study. Finally,

the chapter discussed how the researcher ensured validity, reliability, and ethical considerations

while completing the current case study research.

CHAPTER 4: CASE PROFILES AND FINDINGS

<u>Introduction</u>

This chapter includes in-depth descriptions of the two case studies explored in the current research. Interviews with university administrators who had insider knowledge of the case university decision to enforce campus-wide pauses on their fraternity and sorority communities inform each case. Additionally, data from various documents and archival data helped triangulate data and situate findings within a given context. During the participant interviews, the researcher checked the accuracy of the information collected by asking interviewees for clarification and confirmation of their answers to interview questions. The presentation of each case is presented so that there is ample context to situate the phenomena in each context. As such, the cases begin with narratives before the campus-wide pause, during the campus-wide pause, and the years following the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. The cases include the strategies used during campus-wide pauses, the organizational frames most engaged during the campus-wide pauses, and the perceived impact of the pause on hazing and alcohol use within the fraternity and sorority community. The answers to the research questions emerged from the interviews and document analysis.

This chapter presents the cases so that the answers to the research question emerge from the case study descriptions. As this is a multiple case study approach, a cross-case analysis helped synthesize results and compare any within case results between both cases; therefore, the chapter presents the answers to the individual research questions following the descriptions of each case. Common themes found across cases are presented, and relationships to each

organizational frame are explored. Finally, the chapter ends with a summary of findings for this multiple case study.

Case 1

Background and Contextual Factors Pre-Pause

Institution 1 is a large public institution with a considerable undergraduate student population. Institution 1 is one of several large public institutions in its state. The fraternity and sorority community on campus consisted of around 47 organizations across four different governing councils. The community included over 6000 undergraduate students, while a large number was a small percentage of the student body. The fraternity and sorority community has been present on the I1 campus starting around the institution's founding, which was in the middle of the 20th century. The institution had several properties located on campus owned and managed by the individual fraternity or sorority chapters, and in which the university played a limited role in managing. The university did own several properties previously occupied by fraternities that the campus removed a few years before the pause. These houses were owned and operated by the university, governed by university policy, and had university residence life personal living within the facilities. It is important to note that not all fraternity and sorority chapters had living arrangements on campus; some had properties privately owned off-campus, and others did not have common property associated with their organization. Many of these were BGLO's or other multicultural organizations.

In the years preceding the pause on fraternity and sorority life, I1 had started becoming more prominent both at the state and national levels. There had been significant achievements athletically, academically, as well as burgeoning partnerships with the local community. Rocky illustrated the positive momentum and press experienced by I1, saying:

> Institution 1 had a lot of positive energy, you know they built this Research Park, they were the premier partnership University in the area, you know they were growing online presence, enrollment was skyrocketing there's a lot of positive energy around this time that Institution 1 had done a lot to build up.

The positive press and energy were not always reflective of the fraternity and sorority community. Causey recalled an incident that occurred a decade before the campus-wide pause where there had been a student death associated with a fraternity hazing ritual. In the years following this student death, the campus removed several organizations for situations related to hazing, alcohol misuse, or other conduct issues.

According to data provided by Rocky, Causey, and Bruin, there were conduct-related issues across all governing councils in the years preceding the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Data collected showed that in the three years preceding the Institutions decision to pause fraternity and sorority activity, over half of the organizations had an active or completed conduct-related case. Many of these cases involved the use and misuse of alcohol and allegations of hazing. A salient theme expressed across all interviews and other data points was the pervasive problems associated with excessive alcohol consumption, hazing, and other conduct-related issues. Administrators at I1 agreed that issues had been going on for years and affected many fraternity and sorority communities. The issues facing the fraternity and

sorority community started reaching a tipping point in the years preceding the pause, as illustrated by Bruin:

It reached a point where it was a crisis mode when you've got over half of your community involved in a conduct case of some kind. And it's hitting every council, you can't just say oh, this is an IFC or Panhellenic issue; it was a Greek-wide issue.

Institution 1 had taken many different approaches to address these issues facing the community in the years preceding the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. One strategy utilized included administrative suspensions for groups found in violation of the student code of conduct. A suspension consisted of limited to no activity affiliated with the fraternity and sorority community, including but not limited to "council events, on or off-campus social events, mixers, intramural competitions, receptions, recruitment, homecoming." Institution 1 would also place pauses on group organizational meetings and new member education events while the campus investigated wrongdoing. The removal of groups from campus could occur for several years, which was assessed based on recommendations from the office of student conduct. Institution 1 also sanctioned groups with warnings and probation, which were symbolic, with the only consequence being more closer monitoring by the institution. Groups were also given educational sanctions based on the type of infraction. Most of the accountability was coming from the university with limited peer-to-peer accountability among the governing bodies. Furthermore, several organizations removed from campus in the years preceding the campus-wide pause would later sell their on-campus properties to Institution 1.

Institution 1 had also taken several proactive steps to address the issues of the community. A document provided by Bruin listed the alcohol and hazing educational initiatives that institution one had implemented in the two years before the campus-wide pause. These initiatives included infusing discussions about hazing into meetings with student leaders, providing a transparent reporting process to student leaders, restructuring policies related to hazing, and raising awareness through a hazing prevention week. Additionally, initiatives include developing an anti-hazing website and committee, bringing in national speakers to address hazing and alcohol use, and providing alcohol awareness training through an online module (a university-wide initiative). Institution 1 had also taken other significant steps to address the problems in the community. First, the institution had implemented a cross-departmental task force to address alcohol misuse in the greater campus community. In a proposal for funding document provided by Bruin, the task force aims to include:

> Recognition by the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) that the division needed to address an increase in alcohol-related transports, mixed messages across the university regarding drinking legally and responsibly, and to find options/strategies for staff intervention with respect to student risky behaviors.

The second major initiative that I1 undertook was contracting out a national consulting group to evaluate the community's needs. This process was to get underway the year the institution implemented the pause. Institution one introduced a moratorium on events for the first six weeks of the fall and spring semester associated with alcohol because of an uptick of incidents during this time. The VPSA had also taken an increased interest in the issues facing the community, even going as far as to set up meetings with student leaders to address the issues.

Causey elucidated this point by saying, "You know, at some point the VPSA said they were spending, you know, 40 or 50% of their work time on Greek life during this during this phase, and you know that is not reasonable for the Vice President."

The university also reached out to the national organizations and the larger fraternity and sorority governing boards for help shifting the culture. According to data shared by Causey, I1 had brought several international organizational partners to campus to brainstorm ways to communicate better and partner together. There seemed to be little progress from these meetings, and there seemed to be a lack of trust between the institution and national partners. Rocky summed this up saying:

> There was really this feeling among the senior administration that there was not a lot of trust with the general headquarters leadership. A few years ago, they had had everyone on campus, and they had kind of had an "alright, let's come together, and you know," bring all the representatives from all that international organizations, come in and kind of have a retreat to talk about how we could bridge gaps and work together. Out of that, I really didn't feel like that there was a lot of movement, so.

All the administrators agreed that the international trade organizations also were of little support or help at the local level.

Institution 1 also enacted recommendations through an assessment conducted several years earlier. As Institution 1 brought in risk management speakers, there was programming and regularly conducted risk management training. Everything the institution was doing had little to no impact on the risk management issues pervasive among the fraternity and sorority community. Another commonalityexpressed by the administrators was that there was a lack of

trust and dishonesty among fraternity and sorority members and university administration. Bruin expressed their concerns regarding this mistrust, saying, "there was a level of dishonesty that was happening, people were sneaking and trying to hide things from administration, and it was show up on the front page of the newspaper…" This dishonestly only fractured the trust of the university administration more.

The lack of peer accountability and seeming lack of effort to make changes reached a boiling point at an annual leadership conference that I1 held for its organization leaders shortly before they decided to pause. Administrators at institution one brought up the concerns they had about the behavior coming out of the community. They warned students that if they did not change, the university would have to take drastic action, even going so far as saying they may have to pause all activities associated with fraternity and sorority life. Rocky explained this, saying to students at the leadership retreat:

> Universities were taking steps to halt/suspend; you know, reboot FSL activities. I want to put you on notice that there are some concerns amongst the university community, and I want to make sure that you're aware and understand that we want to do what's best, but safety, security, prevention, and care is always going to be the top priorities, and if issues continue along these lines, there will be possible sanctions to include suspensions.

Students did not seem to take these concerns seriously, as Rocky explains:

> So, I think I think that the message was heard. I got some, you know, surprised looks and some moans and groans, but as the conference went on, I think people kind of just moved forward and probably called the administration's bluff a little bit.

Outside of the community's internal problems, external factors played into the university's decision to institute a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community.

During the years proceeding to the I1 decision to institute a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority community, several prominent institutions made decisions to halt or pause some forms of fraternity and sorority activity. According to data provided by Causey, there were three institutional responses they borrowed. Furthermore, a nationally publicized hazing death in their state was on the back of their minds when deciding to institute a campus-wide pause. Causey explains:

> One of the other things that did happen around this time is when *the student at another university* died as a result of hazing, and that happened in the *same area I1 is located*, and that had a big impact on us; it like scared us.

Thus, when taken together, Administrators at I1 took many actions to influence change within the fraternity and sorority community and had not made progress they felt they needed.

<div align="center">Decision Making Process and the Campus-Wide Pause</div>

Institution 1was at a crossroads. Instances of alcohol use, hazing, and other violations of the student code of conduct were pervasive among fraternity and sorority organizations. Administrators repeated attempts at reform seemed to be making no sustainable progress. Furthermore, there was a threat to the positive press about the institution by the potential negative press an incident in the fraternity and sorority community could cause, left Administrators feeling they needed to take drastic action to initiate cultural change. Rocky remembered Causey saying:

I remember Causey mentioning that maybe it's time that we just take a pause. That you know, things are out of control, and everything's been building over the last few years to a point where it's not sustainable and that to get the attention of the community, we needed to halt fraternity and sorority operations.

Administrators interviewed in the current study shared this sentiment. After speaking to some colleagues and doing some research of peer institutions, Causey compared doing a pause to a parent giving a child a timeout:

From my point of view, the point of a pause is…it's kind of like…and I mean, I hate to use this example, but it's kind of like a timeout. You know when you think of raise…you know when you think of Managing your kid's behavior, you don't expect the time out to fix all their behavior, you hope that the timeout will give both of you some time to…to kind of think about what's been going on, and how can we go forward better together. Right as a parent, you need a timeout sometimes it just like…cool out I think that's the same here, you know we needed a minute to like get a sense of this thing…because the ultimate fear for an administrator is a death.

Ultimately, administrators at I1 were looking to prevent death or severe injury, or harm to their students.

By initiating a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, Administrators were trying to do three things. First, they were trying to prevent further injuries, death, or other harm to their students. Second, they were trying to get the students' attention because they had "called the bluff" of university officials until that point. Finally, the administrators were looking to pause and give administrators and fraternities and sororities time

106

to think of the best way forward together, or in other words, a chance to course recorrect and adjust to the culture of the organizations on the campus. The decision to take a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community had other defining features, including that the institution kept the discussions to a limited group of people who were exclusively internal to the institution. The decision to initiate a pause was a gradual process; there needed to be a plan for communication to the organizations and other stakeholders; and finally, the pause needed to target the areas of concerning behavior, and there needed to be a structured reinstatement process.

Administrators at institution one stressed that the decision-making process was limited to a small number of individuals or areas within the university. This decision was an internal decision-making process that did not include national organizations, trade organizations, students, or alumni. Initially, university administrators did seek advice from the national trade organizations but did not get the response they were looking for, Bruin explains:

> We reached out to national trade organizations and had actually asked them for help…
> And we didn't get the response I think we had hoped that we would get…they said, well each chapter has its own house board, and this and that, and it was a lot of rigmarole and running around, and we're like so if you're not going to give us the support we need, we just want you to know this is what we're about to do…we're going to give you a heads up, but we're not going to not do it.

On the decision-making processes being internal, Rocky explains, "The one thing you know… I think one thing that we have said is this; we must keep this on downlow because… We don't want this to get out early." Initially, the early discussions included the VPSA, members from

107

student conduct, Rocky, Causey, Bruin, but grew to include individuals from legal counsel, the university police department, the news and information department, and student housing. The individuals included in these meetings played a critical role in aspects of the fraternity and sorority community.

The importance of legal counsel being present at these meetings cannot be understated. Bruin expressed the role general legal counsel played, saying:

> We had a conversation with our general counsel about, you know…what can we do, they were registered student organizations at our university, and we made sure that we were… That we had the right to do what we were about to do and…we had every right to do it because they were associated with us…registered to the organization status, and so they gave us the right to halt at any time because it was written into the language…

Rocky spoke to the legal ramifications associated with the decision explaining:

> We now had legal counsel in the meeting, and *legal* were comfortable that you know we could do something if you know, there was due process, and it was equitable and that we. You know, again had a Quote unquote way forward.

Administrators felt that there was consensus that they had the right to do this and that there was support from the senior leadership at the university.

Administrators at I1 took a few meetings to decide on instituting a campus-wide pause. According to Rocky, there were at least three meetings at the beginning of the spring semester where they discussed the appropriate action before deciding to institute a campus-wide pause. Instrumental in the discussion was the communication plan letting the community and other stakeholders know what the process would entail and have a clearly defined set of talking points

to answer questions. Rocky explains, "we had to make sure to coordinate all this with the communication message that came at the same time, and so news and information was vital in that." Communication was essential to the success of the campus-wide pause and was a step-by-step process for different constituents.

First, the communication was internal and delivered confidentially to the different department heads in the student affairs division. Rocky shared the information with their staff in the fraternity and sorority life office to begin planning. Communication would go out on social media, and a crafted message would go to other media outlets. It was Rocky and Bruin's job to communicate the message and answer questions to and from the national partners and other external stakeholders. The messaging on social media and university students went out simultaneously. They communicated this message with chapter leadership and council leadership all at once, and it was their job to communicate it to their organizations. Once they communicated the message out, it made national news, and many media outlets picked it up. The response and implications of the campus-wide pause will be discussed in further detail in another section.

This section explores the various strategies used during the campus-wide pause and the reinstatement of the fraternity and sorority community. The strategies fell into three thematic categories, policy, people, and message. Also, there were various areas the campus-wide pause aligned with the four organizational frames. The first thematic category of the policy included several different tactics to address the most pressing concerns of I1, namely hazing, alcohol misuse, and other conduct-related issues. When the administrators announced the pause inactivity, they stressed it was not all activity; the only activity they had determined influenced

the culture they were trying to change. The pause's central policies were that all groups had to immediately pause all new member activity, any event or activity that was social and could not participate in intramural sports. Groups were allowed to have business meetings and could participate in philanthropic and service-based events, but the university must approve these in advance, and they must have an advisor present. Organizations were not removed from their housing, Rocky explains:

> No one had to move out, but it was made very clear that the university-owned houses… that you know the ra were going to manage everything. Other than be no social events, we would check the houses we didn't own. And some of the sororities, we just had increased presence of police.

The university decided on the suspension of these activities for several different reasons. First, as it relates to the pausing of all new member education, a document provided by Causey explains that administrators had identified risky behavior, including alcohol consumption and hazing, during this time, so this was an area they needed to address. Rocky did say they provided a window to initiate their new members, but not many groups took them up on this offer. Rocky explains:

> New member education was halted too, so all those individuals basically…That were going to join, then…were basically on hold; they were not part of the Organization. We see did we give them; we may have given them a short window to initiate if they wanted to; I remember advocating for that. But I don't think many…maybe a couple did, but I don't think many even took us up on that because it was just such shocking.

110

The next significant activity that was put on hold was that any social event in nature was no longer allowed for the pause duration. Again, the document provided by Causey explains that the university had determined that "binge drinking and dangerous behavior had become a staple of social events involving alcohol held by our Greek organizations," so naturally, they would want to stop these activities.

The other activity that the university prohibited the organizations from doing is competing in intramural activities. The rationale provided by administrators was that "that competitive behavior and lack of focus on true issues would not be beneficial at this time." While there were a few prohibited activities, the university did allow for groups to participate in philanthropic or social events with prior approval and host business meetings with advisors present. Another theme that emerged from the data collection as it relates to the campus-wide pause was people.

Other policies came as a direct result of the campus-wide pause. Some policies did not occur during the pause but immediately following the pause or the following years. As mentioned in a previous section, the university had contracted a consulting group to improve the fraternity and sorority community. The campus-wide pause coincided with the consultants who were supposed to meet with the students and administrators. The consultants moved their work to the summer because of this conflict. Another aspect of the pause was the pause timeline and how groups will be allowed to restart activities again. In total, the activities listed above were paused from the beginning of the spring semester to right before the spring semester ended, so no more than a few weeks. The way they messaged the pause and the interpretation will be explored further in this section.

Another policy or practice that the campus-wide pause instigated was forming a committee comprised of students, administrators, and national organization representatives who would use the consultant's recommendations to craft what the fraternity and sorority community would look like moving forward. This plan started in the summer after implementing the campus-wide pause, but some changes would not occur until the plan was finalized almost one year later. There was also a specific plan to structure messaging out to the fraternity and sorority community the coming fall. A large part of the campus-wide pause was the actual committee and planned to reinstate the organizations. Rocky explained that they did not know what the process for reinstalment was going to be, but their staff came together and decided they would tie the reinstalment back to the university's vision, mission, and values. Furthermore, they had a general idea of how long the pause would be but were not entirely sure. Administrator one explains:

> We did not exactly know when we were going to reinstate but we knew that we were
>
> going to have to have a process…and so you know one thing we had to do is…is figure
>
> that out, and quickly, my team and I decided that we were going to use *the vision, and*
>
> *values of I1* to help us build the recertification program…and basically you know we
>
> didn't have it all planned out, but basically all the organizations we're going to…it's kind
>
> of like a show cause…they're going to have to show why they should be able to come
>
> back to campus and to be in good standing with FSL.

The committee of individuals tasked with being a part of the reinstatement committee was selected from the different student affairs departments and was trained on the questions they would ask the organizations seeking reinstatement. In a document provided by Causey, the committee consisted of 25 student affairs professionals. These professionals met with student

112

groups in pairs over two weeks to determine strengths and weaknesses. The committee came together to decide the status of each Organization, and ultimately most of the organizations were allowed back on campus. A few organizations were not allowed to return due to ongoing conduct cases, and they asked several organizations to provide more detail on how they would improve their organizations once reinstated.

The structure of these meetings between the reinstalment committee members included several different components. Chapters had to answer a packet of questions centered around the themes of alcohol education, hazing prevention, and member accountability, all of which were tied back to the university's values. There was a time limit to the presentations, and only a limited number of individuals were allowed to present to the committee but must include executive board members, general members, and new members. Advisors were allowed to be present but were not allowed to present. After one of the first meetings with one of the groups looking to get reinstated went poorly, the committee readjusted:

> We kind of reframed, and basically, we did some training for the reinstatement committee to kind of preface things, and like we did not want there to be an adversarial component to it, we really wanted it to be about…like share the awesome things you do and what you want to commit to improving on…And so, we kind of reframed that, and so it was much, much less like…you prove to us…and you know we're going to hang this over you…and more like all right, tell us what you do, why you're doing it, and why it can be an asset to the to the community.

113

Another crucial component of the reinstalment process was that the fraternity and sorority life office were not making the final decision on the organizations; the committee of professionals was.

There were many people whom this pause impacted including, the members of the organization, the new members joining the organizations; the alumni and chapter advisors, the national offices, the parents of the students in these organizations, the national trade organizations, the university administrators directly and indirectly associated with the advisement of fraternities and sororities, the university administrators who helped with the reinstatement process, and the student body. Another aspect surrounding the theme of people was the new positions created to assist in the advisement and support of the fraternity and sorority community. Furthermore, how the university interacted with the fraternity and sorority community changed. Under the more prominent theme of people is how individuals responded to the campus-wider pause and how the pause uniquely impacted the organization of individuals. Also, as it relates to people, Rocky and Bruin were directly responsible for answering questions and communicating with stakeholders. Rocky still met with chapter leadership during the pause and tried to build trust and relationship, "my staff…we still met with you know chapter leadership, and you know still connected and tried to build a relationship."

The final theme that emerged from data collection was the messaging used by administrators and how multiple different stakeholders interpreted it. During the interviews with the administrators at I1, the purpose they gave for instituting the pause and the message they portrayed during the time of the pause was, for the most part, consistent. Administrators wanted to "be proactive," give groups "time to pause and realign values," "get students attention,"

114

"prevent a student from dying," and they wanted to give students and administrators the time to "think of the best solutions to improve the community." Local news articles and press releases collected from this time aligned with what I1 said about the campus-wide pause. One article stated that administrators said, "they wanted to send the clear message that I1 Greek culture needs to change before things turn tragic" and "we want to be ahead of the curve on this, we don't want to wait for a catastrophe to occur." Administrators would not give a specific timeline for when groups would return to campus but said it would probably last until the end of the semester.

An interesting analogy that is a central tension between the perception of the campus-wide pause that Causey and Bruin gave was that of a parent giving a child a timeout. Bruin explains:

It's like we need a timeout here…that's what parents give their kids…we needed a timeout so that we can try and figure out who would we want to be, how do we align our values, and who needs to be involved in that process to make sure that we get it right.

The messaging from the university and administrators was consistent, and they were clear with why they had taken these actions. As the university implemented this campus-wide pause and subsequently ended the pause, a few critical areas emerged: the reactions and interpretation from the different stakeholders, the short-term and long-term implications, and how the years would follow the campus-wide pause progress. The following section addresses these issues through the data collected during this current study.

Reactions, Implications, and Aftermath of a Campus-Wide Pause

When I1 implemented a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, various stakeholders had different reactions. When the students found out there would be a campus-wide pause, there was a range of emotions, including shock, anger, loss, activism. Rocky explains:

> And, and the students were very, very surprised very shocked, there was you know, a range of emotions from anger, frustration, there was some crying. You know the students were visibly upset…you know there were some I recall some student's kind of challenging you know pushing back.

Bruin elaborated on the sense of loss felt by the students saying:

> I think for some of our students being a member of the Organization has become their complete identity, so there was a huge sense of loss, there was a lot of breathing and there was a lot of threats and nasty emails.

The sense of loss felt by students was a big part of how they viewed the university's actions, so while the university paused only some parts of the fraternity and sorority experience, it felt like they shut down everything for the students. Some students continued to push back, with students calling for sit-ins to students and alumni looking for people to sign petitions. Administrators agreed that while students were upset, they felt like they had made the right decision.

There was also a strong reaction from parents after the university instituted the campus-wide pause. Many parents called in and wanted the administrators to know that they were ruining their child's college experience. As Bruin explained above, if students' identity and organization were linked, they felt like they lost everything; this was passed on to their parents.

Administrators were fielding calls from national organizations, and, in some cases, they were

doing the outreach. This was especially true for the BGLO and organizations associated with the

NPHC. Rocky recalls:

> I think I actually reached out to them (*NPHC*) just because I had not heard from them,
>
> and they were very respectful. You know the advisory dynamics and governance for them
>
> is also different…many of them are…it's not their full-time job it's a volunteer role, and
>
> so…You know…but I ended up talking to advisors and kind of up the chain folks and
>
> really did not get any pushback they just kind of listened. They understood. Was almost
>
> like this is like happened before, and they weren't really concerned about it.

Bruin remembers having tough conversations with many national offices and expressed

that some organizations reacted harshly. Rocky expressed how they first received calls from the

chapter advisors who wanted to know what was going on. Rocky expressed that they were upset

but wanted to know what they could do to help get things back to normal. Rocky and Bruin

remember getting a frantic and upset call from the head of two trade organizations, the NIC and

NPC. In short order, Rocky remembers getting calls from executive directors of the national

organizations giving some push back but ultimately understanding the decision. Bruin explained

that for the groups that the relationship was strong, the relationship endured, but for the groups

where there was a lack of trust, the reaction was an increase of distrust, "I would say that the

relationships that were strong survived and the relationships that weren't strong did not."

Administrators agreed that they received support internally from peers that understood

the institutional context of the situation. The administrators relied on those closest for support.

Externally, the event made national news with Bruin commenting on the national news

117

organizations righting stories about the incident: "Is it was breaking news, and it went national I mean we were on CNN or fox news I remember all of the reporters came…and I'm like oh my gosh we're just a small little community." The national exposure allowed from support or criticism from the public, some supportive and others not so much. A national association of lawyers who support the fraternity and sorority movement criticized the move saying the decision infringed on the freedom of association and due process of these organizations. While some immediate pushback, the Administrators agreed that groups just wanted to push for their organizations to be reinstated.

Outside of the reactions that different stakeholders had after the campus-wide pause, there were several implications, both short-term and long-term, that emerged from the data. One short-term implication was that new staff were hired, and staff responsibilities were rearranged to better support and address the needs of the fraternity and sorority community. Rocky was excited about the addition of a new staff member: "One of the good things come out of this is, I actually got funding for another position, and that was coordinator of risk prevention." Rocky goes on to explain how this would fill a communication gap between fraternity and sorority life and student conduct:

> And you know, that was a huge piece in building that relationship report with the office of student rights responsibilities to the student conduct, you know that was strange that talk about…no trust the *between* Greek community and student conduct…were at odds, so we're able to bridge some of those gaps.

Besides adding the new position, they were able to restructure when there were staff departures.

Rocky talked about the importance of having full-time personal solely focused on fraternity and sorority advising:

> We had an opportunity when a staff member left to restructure some things, and basically, instead of having a director of housing, that also helped fraternity and sorority life, were able to get another assistant director…so basically everyone was full time in providing support advising our organizations …right we had 50 organizations, so accountability was a big thing. So, getting a new position and having the two assistant directors was allowing us to hold our organizations accountable and allows us to advise…and giving me help to be transparent and have those conversations with headquarters.

The increased attention and support would allow the administrators to work with the community on making needed adjustments to the culture.

The campus-wide pause was also an opportunity for the administrators to get the student's attention and think twice about their actions and direction. Bruin talked about how this forced students to act" "We literally forced the students into a position where, if you love this and you care about it, you now need to give it the attention and due diligence." Bruin talks about how some students took this up to full force:

> And the people who were really serious about wanting to retain the integrity of the Greek community and make sure that the pillars that they subscribe to when they became a member of that Organization were upheld…really leaned in.

By taking the pause, administrators believed they were putting the problems front and center.
Taking the campus-wide pause also impacted many different relationships among the different
stakeholders.

One of the campus-wide pause positive results was that the relationships between
students and the different councils were strengthened. Administrators agreed that they saw the
groups come together to support one another. Bruin explains:

> They began to really partner with each other; we saw partnership start to form across
> councils where Panhellenic and IFC started to partner with DGC and NPHC, and in those
> things, they were very separate and apart, and we and we saw a little bit of Greek unity
> began to emerge.

While internally, administrators at I1were getting support from colleagues they were
taking as Bruin phrased it "taking body blows" from external partners, parents, and students.
Administrators recall the "nasty" emails and phone calls they received from students and parents.
The salient theme from these calls and emails was the sense of loss and the feeling that students
felt as their lives were taken away. Rocky recalled how an unintended repercussion from I1
taking a campus-wide pause was his staff not being allowed to work at the different fraternity
and sorority life conferences for the foreseeable future. The mistrust between the university and
the national trade organization was fractured more than it had been before the pause. In a
document provided by Causey and confirmed by the administrators, the trust would get rebuilt
over time, but at first, it was fractured.

Related to the body blows the administration took because of the campus-wide pause was the emotional toll this period took on them. Bruin talked about this unintended consequence saying:

Unintended consequences was, you know, disappointment from people…And the emotional toll that it took on administration, as well as the students, I would say is like you know loving people through a painful process is difficult, and it was exhausting.

While the process was complicated, the administrators agreed that it helped start some conversations and bring people to the table who had not been there before.

Another theme that emerged during data collection was the symbolism of the pause and how it was interpreted. As mentioned previously, students felt a sense of loss, mainly because the organizations had become part of their identity. Another salient nature was how the administration talked about the actions they were taking. Rocky expressed how they tried never to use the words suspended and were intentional about causing it a pause or halt, explaining:

We used these words with the understanding there's a way forward…there's not suspending the Organization's…we're halting them. In all honestly, some of that was guidance from legal counsel, right…So that's interesting to me, like symbolic of pause, restart, build trust.

While they were careful to use this language in their communication to student and national organizations, students did not interpret these actions as a pause or a halt. Rocky explains, "yeah, no, absolutely not, absolutely not, you know they (*the students*) were like their world was caving in you know… what do you mean … like this is a suspension we can't do anything." Bruin

explained this misinterpretation as students only can see what was right in front of them and not see from the administrator's perspective.

Another symbolic result of the campus-wide pause was the legacy effect that it had on some students. Causey and Bruin spoke to how students still talk about this time today and how students feel that the university could retake this action. The university was able to demonstrate control over the organizations through these actions. Rocky also discussed how as students leave and new students come into organizations every couple of years, the university is the "writer of history" and holds the "institutional knowledge" surrounding the events. Many students aren't thinking regularly about how the university could shut down their organizations if it did not happen recently.

Another common theme expressed by all three of the administrators during the data collection process was how the values of the institutions and the national fraternity and sorority organizations were misaligned. This misalignment emerged in how the pause was viewed and how it impacted each of the different stakeholders. First, all administrators agreed they were viewing the campus-wide pause from a student safety lens. They did not want any student to die on their watch, and they wanted to address the misuse of alcohol and hazing. According to the administrators, they viewed the national organizations, on the other hand, thinking about this from a monetary and membership side. Bruin articulated this point well, explaining:

> At the time, our student population was growing, we were bringing in new classes in the fall and the spring, and some organizations will even give permission to recruit in the summer. It was a huge moneymaker for national organizations and, I'm like, we don't care about the money. We care about the lives. Yeah, but again…it's sometimes they're

competing interests because you must look at the educational mission of higher

education. And yes, being a part of a club or organization is a part of that, but it's not the

entire experience.

Bruin continues:

It's quotas, quotas, quotas, and so you're allowing money to drive the agenda when you

should allow your values to guide who you let in, and I do think that you know…it's a

business for some people, and let me tell you, the business of fraternities and sororities

has been a big business for a long, long time…if you go and you look at some of these

national organizations have the mansion's, and it's big business.

With money driving the agenda, administrators believed that national organizations were not

putting time, energy, and resources needed to be partners in helping advise and support students.

In this way, the institutions were the ones who had the sole responsibility of shifting the culture

on campus.

Another result of the pause that administrators realized was an unintended consequence

was that the NPHC organizations were crippled financially. This financial burden was partly due

to their small numbers and that the groups did most of their recruiting of new members when the

campus-wide pause was active. Along with NPHC organizations, many panhellenic

organizations lost money they had used on down payments for events that semester. These were

things administrators had not considered when deciding to institute a campus-wide pause.

The final theme that emerged from data collection at I1 was the cyclical nature of the

problems facing the fraternity and sorority community. During the interviews, the administrators

were clear about the purpose of instituting a campus-wide pause. First, they wanted to save lives.

123

According to data collected, no students died during the period when the campus-wide pause. There have been no student deaths related to hazing or alcohol misuse at I1 in the years following the pause. Second, the I1 wanted to get the students' attention and bring the administration's concerns to the forefront. This directing of attention, as explained previously, was accomplished. Finally, the institution wanted to address the culture of hazing and alcohol misuse that was pervasive among the fraternity and sorority community. This objective has not had the lasting impact that administrators had initially hoped for. The behaviors were more than likely still happening during the pause as Rocky explained, "it didn't stop the partying you know…the partying still continued. I think people just were careful not to associate any gatherings (*with organizations*)…It didn't stop the social nature, and the social beast continued." While the issues still may have continued, there was a dip in conduct cases associated with hazing and alcohol misuse for a few years after the pause. Causey explained this by saying, "for the year or two after the pause things were a little better." This continuation of issues was confirmed with conduct data collected through the office of student conduct.

An analogy that fits well with the cycle of the conduct cases reappearing every few years was phrased well by Causey, "Gravitating back to the mean." Bruin explained that as new students entered the community, there was a continual need to reeducate:

I also know that some of those bad behaviors have also started to resurface, and so I think that everything is iterative…it's what I will say you've probably heard that word a lot as you're going through this process, but I do think that that ongoing training…that ongoing education is required because you're always bringing new people into the community, and so you cannot assume that they're going to know the rules of

engagement. You must teach them how you want them to behave and what is acceptable and what is not acceptable as a member of this community.

Causey also spoke to the idea that institutions do not want to continue to pause every few years. While this is what Causey said during the interview, I1 instituted a pause in activities several years after the campus-wide pause.

In the years following the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community at I1, several new policies were implemented to address the community's recurring issues. The institution kept the recertification program, and groups were completing a packet of information and presentation each year to determine areas of improvement. There was a moratorium placed on events with alcohol for the first six weeks of each semester. Another result of the campus-wide pause was increased attention, time, and resources directed at supporting the community. Finally, a strategic plan was created out of recommendations provided by the external consultant and the committee of students, staff, and administrators on all fraternity and sorority community aspects. This plan was linked to the vision, mission, and values of the institution. Further during this time, the administrators at I1 worked to rebuild trust with the students and the national offices.

A few things hindered the success of some of these new actions. First, there was turnover in staff that stymied the continuity of the rollout of the actions. Rocky also spoke to the ambitiousness of the plan, and they may have "bitten off more than they could chew." Another thing that emerged from the data was that the action items in the plan being used by administrators rolled out almost a year and a half after implementing the pause. Finally, as the memory of the campus-wide pause faded from students' memories, the behaviors started again.

Ultimately, I1 did a more targeted pause a few years later. This second pause of the community had a few defining features similar to and different from the campus-wide pause under study.

Unlike the first campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, this pauses targeted activities associated with alcohol. This "moratorium" lasted for about one year. Also, unlike the first pause, this was initiated in by student leadership and in conjunction with administration and advisors. The group worked together to create a new plan built of the plan created a few years earlier. The implementation of this plan began the following year, but there were similar obstacles that hindered the success of this plan, including staff turnover and new student leadership. According to Causey, student behavior had improved slightly after the pause, but right before the Covid-19 pandemic impacted the campuses, the institution had brought chapter leadership to warn them they were going down the wrong path. It was apparent through data collection that there was a clear cycle of behaviors reoccurring in the community.

It is important to note that administrators suspended several groups from campus for conduct-related matters between the first campus-wide pause and shortly after the second campus-wide pause. One group decided to operate independently from the university, and when their behavior got progressively worse, their national organization pulled recognition. Two of these groups decided to disaffiliate from the university and form their separate council supported by their national offices. According to data collected during interviews, these groups were still operating but were having trouble sustaining membership numbers. Administrators at I1agreed that these groups had little success at succeeding without support from the campus. Indeed, the first group to leave campus shortly after the campus-wide pause no longer exists off-campus.

126

Administrators all agreed that if they had to make the same decision again, they would indeed do so. Bruin explained:

> I do. I think that you know, we were able to reset the strategic direction of our Greek community, we came up with a strategic plan. There was a lot of alignment with our larger university plan, and so it was nice to see the alignment. You know, we were providing this holistic educational experience, which is what we set out to do, and so again, yes, I do think the pause was the right thing to do, and I do think it had the outcome we wanted. And yeah, I think we saved lives, and I think that we reset course.

Administrators agreed that how they communicated the message to students, advisors, national offices, and parents would have been different. Administrators felt that there would have been a lot less chaos if they had prepped the other stakeholders. Much like many institutions, I1 faces an unclear future following the pandemic. Universities must continue to work with stakeholders to address the continued alcohol misuse and hazing problems prevalent in fraternity and sorority communities.

Case 2

Background and Contextual Factors Pre-Pause

Institution 2 (I2) is a large public research institution with a fraternity and sorority community consisting of over 30 organizations across three councils. Institution 2 is a prominent institution in its state and has a relatively broad public presence nationally. The fraternity and sorority community, while relatively large, was not a large percentage of the total student population. There has been a long history of fraternity and sorority organizations on the I2

127

campus founded in the 19th century. Many houses were owned and operated by the fraternities and sororities at I2; the university controlled none in any way. At the same time, the university did not control the properties. The houses were adjacent to the campus proper. All the houses were organizations associated with the IFC and Panhellenic council. No houses were owned and operated by the NPHC or BGLO groups.

On the I2 campus, before the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, the groups belonging to the three governing councils of the IFC, Panhellenic, and NPHC were overseen by the office of student activities. This fact is important because there was no person dedicated solely to the advisement and support of the fraternity and sorority community. Also, during this time, they had an interim director of their student organizations office and an interim professional who was helping oversee some aspects of the fraternity and sorority community. Wally, a senior leader in student affairs, explained that the university was in a "time of transition in that area," suffice to say that the fraternity and sorority community was not getting much attention during this period.

Leading up to the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, several significant incidents related to hazing and alcohol misuse were gaining the local community's attention and senior leadership at the university. A few days before the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community, there were arrests of several new members from a fraternity on campus for underage alcohol consumption. This incident also had aspects related to hazing as well. The incident initiated a statement from the university president calling for a more rigid stance on alcohol misuse. This incident also led to sanctions enacted by the leadership of the IFC council. Some of the restrictions included a pause in the new member education process for that

group and banning them from participating in IFC-related activities or drinking in their house. During this period, a string of national tragedies was pushing fraternity and sorority life into focus.

A general theme that arose from data collected during participant interviews and through document collection was that the university was not spending much time and energy providing oversight and support to the fraternity and sorority community. As mentioned, several events were bringing the attention of senior administrators onto the fraternity and sorority community. According to data collected from university administrators and documents, the event that precipitated the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community was the death of a new member. This student was pledging a recently suspended fraternity, which still operated out of the fraternity house owned by the fraternity. This group also was suspended by their national headquarters shortly before the student's death. Wally explained the situation by saying:

> We've been having issues with that fraternity, we suspended the fraternity the weekend before, and the national headquarters followed suit and did a suspension also, but then the group of men continue to operate… but they were still hanging out together and living in a house together and doing everything together.

This narrative illustrates a problem many universities have where they suspend groups, but they continue to operate as "underground" or "unrecognized" groups. The situations prevalent on the I2 campus made it susceptible to problems. The following section addresses the impetus for the campus-wide pause, the decision-making process during the campus-wide pause, and a description of the strategies used during the campus-wide pause.

Decision Making Process and the Campus-Wide Pause

The event that initiated the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community at I2 was the death of a student pledging a fraternity that had recently lost its recognition from campus. The sentiment that this student died was the event that sparked the "moratorium," as the university called it, was shared by all the administrators interviewed at I2. Bowie, who was and still is senior leadership at I2, put it bluntly, saying, "we shut down because one of our one of our pledges died." This administrator also alluded to how the community was focusing too much on the social aspects of college life, saying, "We really felt that our, social life among fraternities and sororities was getting out of hand." This sentiment was shared by administrators and confirmed by data and news articles from that period. According to a news release collected during data collection, the university stated, "this moratorium is being put in place to ensure our student's safety." Student safety and concern for students' well-being were common themes that emerged from interviews with administrators at I2 as to why the institution instituted a campus-wide pause.

Another reason administrators decided to do a campus-wide pause was to get students' attention and help them realize they were going down the wrong path. Bowie and Wally also expressed how this would be an opportunity to refocus on the more positive values of the fraternity and sorority community. This campus-wide pause seemed very much to be reactionary, and the aim was mitigation of further risk or harm to the community. Richey explained why they delt universities institute campus-wide pauses as:

They (*administrators*) act because it makes us feel good, that we are responding to something in a relevant specific way and in a timely fashion. A lot of times, these are

130

reactionary, and so there's a death in the community or there's a major issue that's

bringing the university in the spotlight. You know, there's a lot of things, and so the

reaction is to make the stakeholders believe that we can do something… take a pause

so that we can mitigate risk of more issues happening and start making you know

some level of a response.

Indeed, the administrators at I2 felt like drastic action was needed to change the direction

the fraternity and sorority community were heading.

Once the student death happened, it sent the university administration into action and

started thinking about what action they could take to prevent more damage. According to

Wally university administrators convened several meetings the day following the student

death and decided to place a moratorium on fraternity and sorority activities. In deciding

what actions to take, university administrators did not look at what other campuses were

doing as Wally explained, "I mean, I mean I know we didn't consult or look at what was

going on at other campuses I mean it was this out campus and what's best for us." This

administrator also explained that they felt like the "guardrails" were not in place to stop a

student's death from happening.

Institutional leaders ultimately decided to institute a campus-wide pause of the

fraternity and sorority community; there were no students, alumni, or international offices at

the table for these discussions. Bowie, who spoke to who was in the room making this

decision, explained:

The dean of students, fraternity, and sorority life (*staff*), and then the provost or

academic officers. Vice president of community relationship, the person who telling

131

the story about the university, who felt that our story was being very muddied and so

they wanted to help us to rethink how we were doing this…so you know it was a

group of senior officers mainly those who are students centered and who have a stake

in that of our system.

While the administrators recalled the senior leaders being the ones who decided to institute a

campus-wide pause, in an email to students at the time of the pause, the university said, "I2 in

conjunction with IFC and Panhellenic is hereby placing all recognized fraternity and sorority

activities on a moratorium." What administrators recalled was also different than the message

released to the students at the time of the campus-wide pause. Further, the language included in

this press release made no mention of the BGLO organizations present on the campus at the

time. Several themes emerged from data, including policy, people, and messages related to the

strategies of the campus-wide pause at I2.

 The policies that characterized the campus-wide pause were almost all-encompassing.

Wally recalls:

Yeah, I mean, for example, I mean they wouldn't have been able to recruit. They

wouldn't have been able to hold social events. I don't believe we let them do community

service events or their philanthropy events. We would not have permitted them to go

through their initiation ceremonies at the end of the semester that typically take place. So,

you know, in effect, I mean everything stops except some meeting so anything and

everything that you think they might normally do; end of the Semester formals, nope, you

know, "we want to go on date parties," no, you know you can wear your letters and you

could…You know, have a meeting, you know, to discuss, you know, what's going on

132

around this, that makes sense, you know you could continue to live in your house. We

didn't kick people out of their houses or anything like that so, but it was it was. I mean, it

was a full stop.

This message of a complete moratorium was included in the messaging sent out at the pause

time. In an email to students provided by Wally, the message aligned with what they recalled

during the interview:

The moratorium requires that chapters discontinue all social events at any location. The

membership may not meet as a group, and all pledge activities and planned initiations

must cease immediately. Chapter meetings and philanthropic activities may only be

conducted if approval is obtained from the Office of Student Activities at least 48 hours

prior to the proposed event.

This same email stated, "the moratorium is effective immediately and remains in effect until

further notice." This message aligns with what was recalled by administrators during interviews.

The pause would be in place until administrators had figured out a way forward.

The campus-wide pause at I2 lasted from the middle of the fall semester through the end

of the academic year. The university eased restrictions on some activities at the beginning of the

spring semester, but most social activities were still on pause. Another strategy that I2 used was

hiring an outside consultant to discuss fraternity and sorority leadership and university

administration. This facilitator came to campus at the end of the fall semester and worked with

the administration and students on recommendations on moving forward and beginning

operations. Using the recommendations from these discussions, university administrators worked

in tandem with students to guide what stipulations fraternity and sorority organizations must

meet before being allowed to operate at total capacity. According to an improvement plan provided by Wally chapters:

> were free to hold chapter meetings, executive meetings, philanthropic events, and initiate their new members. Lifting of the recruitment/intake and social components of the moratorium will occur on a chapter-by-chapter basis, depending on when each chapter completes the necessary steps outlined below.

They provided the recommendations at the beginning of the spring semester, so when groups came back to full participation was up to them.

There were several requirements that groups had to complete before they were allowed to begin entire operations, including filling out update forms to the student activities office; providing plans for spring recruitment; planning of a dry event (event with no alcohol), and a philanthropic event; and attending several educational programs planned by the university.

Another theme was the messaging and communication used by university administrators during the campus pause. As mentioned before, the university used the word moratorium to describe the campus-wide pause. The language used in the messaging aligned with the temporary nature of the pause. Further, there was some misalignment on who had instituted the campus-wide pause mentioned above. They communicated the massaging to different stakeholders in different ways. Officially, the university released statements on its website and through local media.

Additionally, administrators sent emails to the student body with information surrounding the stipulations of the campus-wide pause. University leadership also communicated to the council leader, who then communicated the message to the different chapters. The data collected

134

does not appear to show the message was sent directly to the national fraternity and sorority

offices. Wally did express that the university did communicate broadly to their parents' group:

> We communicated loudly with parents…you know we've got a robust what, we call
>
> parents club, and 20 some 26,000 people are subscribed to a list serve. We communicated
>
> it to parents and I have no doubt that that they if they didn't hear from their own son or
>
> daughter, who was a member of the creek community, that someone died on this campus
>
> they heard it from us.

There were various reactions to the campus-wide pause and other implications impacting the

fraternity and sorority community moving forward in the coming years following the pause,

which the following section explores.

Reactions, Implications, and Aftermath of a Campus-Wide Pause

The campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community garnered a mixed

response from various stakeholders. The general student body was shocked about the student's

death. As Wally remembers, they were openly hostile to members of the fraternity and sorority

community: "It wouldn't surprise me that people are not wearing their Greek letters, as they once

were because students were openly hostile man, I do remember that because they were so angry

and hurt." Besides the students, Wally recalls alumni reaching out to offer their help to the

community. Bowie talked about the fraternity and sorority members being in the sense of shock

and feeling lost, "I think the downside is the fact that young people have a hard time

understanding why it is that they can't do X, Y or Z." Administrators recall students being angry

as well but understanding that there just had been a student death, so something needed to be

135

done. Bowie also recalled how parents were, for the most part, supportive of the response, "I think that parents were appreciative because I think they viewed it as a much safer approach to fraternity and sorority life by what we're doing."

Besides the response from the campus community, the alumni, and parents, the university received a varied reaction from international fraternal partners. An external fraternal legal advocacy group was sounding the alarm on the actions of I2, claiming they were infringing on student's 1st and 14th amendment rights. This group was worried that several campuses were instituting campus-wide pauses and ultimately harmed the students they seek to protect. Wally also recalled the mixed response they received from national partners:

I suspect all of those international headquarters thinking…Thank God it wasn't my fraternity on this campus this time…but everyone's had these awful deaths where they've had to talk to parents and it's a life lost that shouldn't have been lost right, and so, so I think short term, all of them understand it. Depending on the length and what the guidance is and what the rules are to reengage that's when there's a little bit more noise that comes along…we didn't do anything wrong…and a mix to that respect.

The national partners understood that there was a student death, and the university needed to respond.

Wally noted that the response of the international partners was shaped by how the fraternities and sororities on I2's campus had interacted with the national office in the past. Wally explains:

The international headquarters also know their chapters on their respective campuses. They know they have trouble with some of them, and so, sometimes they're quieter.

136

Because they know they have trouble, you know but, but not enough to stop things, and

then there are others who know they've got great advisors, great alums, great leaders, and

great mentoring and support at the local level, and they're a little less concerned versus

the ones where there's not good oversight, and I suspect again; International headquarters

know when they've got strong chapters and where they've got week chapters just by what

their interactions were.

Several other themes arose from the campus-wide pause outside of the reactions from different

stakeholders, including attention, relationships, and a cycle/reversion to the mean of behaviors

within the fraternity and sorority community.

The first theme that emerged from the data collection was attention. One of the most

significant results from the campus-wide pause was that the university started placing much

more attention on its fraternity and sorority community. Richey reflected on how this focus on

building up the support for the fraternity and sorority community started at the top:

After the (*first campus-wide pause),* the university decided to put more attention into

Greek life because there wasn't a standalone office, there wasn't a director, it was

advised out of student organizations and activities. And so, they realized, you know, it

really was the genius of our President, you know we're not putting enough attention on it,

that's why we're having these issues, so they created an inaugural director they wanted

somebody older with a doctoral degree…

Wally explained this staff reorganization as essential to changing the culture on campus:

Yeah, well, so I mean so, first of all, keep in mind, we developed out the Greek life

office, and so, when you have people that they wake up every single day, directors,

assistant directors, programmers, student workers, graduate assistants, who wake up

every single day and all they think about is Greek life and not only how do we do fun

things, but how do we keep them safe, that that that's a big part of culture change.

This renewed attention centered around the structural reorganization of how institution 2 advised

and supported their fraternity and sorority organizations. Wally stated that this process started the

following year when they hired a new director. Outside of the new staff and new office, the

institution implemented several new policies to direct the community in a different direction.

One of the first things the university did was that the fall after the campus-wide pause,

they pushed recruitment to a month into the semester. They postponed recruitment to give

students a chance to acclimate to the university before going through the recruitment process.

The university also increased the bystander intervention training provided to their organizations

and instituting an amnesty policy for students in case of an emergency. The university also began

providing more education to groups and advising them on better policies related to parties. A

significant change for the fraternity and sorority community came after the campus hired a new

director. The institution started holding organizations responsible for their actions and pushing

first-year students to join organizations their second semester or differed recruitment.

Another theme that emerged was relationships among the various stakeholders. One of

the first things that happened with the increased attention was that students and administrators

started interacting more. A news article from this period quotes a student as saying, "The old

system was kind of unmonitored and more of this kind of separate world where anything went.

And now there's complete oversight on multiple different levels." Administrators were meeting

with student leadership close to once a month working to rebuild these relationships. This

process of building up relationships would take time and would be interrupted by staff turnover. The new director stayed in their role for a little over a year. The campus hired a new director a few months after the first director left and had much work to build up relationships between administration, students, and different stakeholders.

When the new director of fraternity and sorority life arrived on I2's campus, there was much mistrust between the students and the administration. This mistrust was in part due to the strict approach that the institution had taken since the campus-wide pause. Richey explains:

> There was a lot of mistrust with the newly formed office of Greek life, so when I took over the first few months, I was relationship building, right I pulled in town halls with the students trying to figure it out, you know still understanding that there needed to be rules and law and order, but the way that we did it was different.

While there was progress made during this time and a decrease in conduct cases, as the years progressed, hazing and alcohol misuse cases started to increase again. This "reversion to the mean" was credited in part due to the influx of new students, as Wally explains:

> Every year, we have, you know, 25 or 30% of our student population is brand new. Right, and so, in four years, it's a whole new generation, and there is no institutional memory, except for the grown-ups, who around. But the students don't have that…you know…I'm sure you've got the senior…but what happened their freshman year is a blur, and you know…and the end, but you still have 75% of your campus who doesn't have the emotional field that may be a senior, or Grad student has when the tragedy happens…

There was a new student body, but there was a complete change in staff, which may have impacted the progress that was being made. A short time after Richey arrived on campus, the

139

cases continued to rise, and there had been some severe student injuries and allegations of sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol misuse, and it caused I2 to institute a second pause of the fraternity and sorority community.

This second pause, which occurred in the spring semester a few years after the first campus-wide pause, was more targeted. This pause was only directed at the IFC community, where the institution had so many problems. During this pause, groups were allowed to have business meetings, host philanthropy or service events, and hold brotherhood events. Richey explains the actions they took:

We wanted them to freeze, so we looked at the highest risk, and so we looked at new member education, which was really high risk, especially because we had a couple complaints of hazing, so we shut that down, so we said, you have a week to initiate them, they need to be initiated immediately. Then what we did was, say you can let them go, and they can come back next semester whenever this is over. Most of them initiated, but some let them go because they just weren't ready or whatever the case may be. We already had deferred recruitment, so that was not new. We raised the minimum to join the 2.75. We instituted a four-week new member maximum. We also created that working group of alumni, faculty, staff, students, and headquarters partners, and national consultants; we had a national president and chief operating officer of fraternity join us.

One of the most significant differences between this pause and the first pause was that it was only targeting the IFC community, and this working group of partners came together to provide recommendations for improvements to the community. This second pause had many implications for the administrators and the community.

140

The two main implications that emerged during interviews with administrators were first

how there was a lot of anger and hate directed at administrators from students and national

organizations. The other implication was that several groups that were handed sanctions after the

review by the newly formed committee decided to leave campus and disaffiliate with the

university. These actions were seen as short-sighted by the administration at I2:

> I'm not a fan of this disaffiliation because what I mean if you engage with us…together
>
> we'll figure it out, and you're not going to be 100% happy, and we're not going to be
>
> 100% happy, but can we both, at least you know, be moving in the same direction. We'd
>
> much rather work with those communities, and again marching bands and athletics and
>
> Greek community and any of those places where there's hazing or other types of deaths
>
> related that are preventable. Let us be a part of the conversation with you, rather than you
>
> are driving it underground and not including us, you know…and so…we've got to keep
>
> the conversations open and the communication lines open and you walk away from a
>
> college campus and it just…it's not good math because, I mean, I'm sad for going on at a
>
> Duke where a bunch just walked away…and it just it's not…it's not good, and again why
>
> the international headquarters and why the NIC and why the other governing groups, you
>
> know think that's it's the way to go, not for 18 to 22 year old…sorry.

Wally believes that what is driving this push to disaffiliate from campus is money:

> This is my cynical side…is it's all about money. Yeah, it's dollars and cents because
>
> they've got huge investments in houses, as well as their own, you know I mean…tells us
>
> on campuses that some of them own but also just their own financial well-being and so…
>
> and that's my cynical side of me. I'd like to believe that we have our students' interest

more in mind because we're with them every single day and are trying to help them build

great LinkedIn profiles and resumes and everything like that, whereas I'm not sure if the

international headquarters…If they might have it as a goal on their…on their big goal

list…but we're actively helping students move down the path for a better life.

The other administrators shared this view on the misalignment of the national organizations and

the campus administration's mission. Some of these groups that are disaffiliated from the

university have looked to rejoin the campus. Other groups have started to decline in the years

following this second pause:

The independent fraternities…but also indicated that they would lose all the privileges of

being under the umbrella of the university, as, as a matter of course. Basically, imploded

now, they are. They are very, very modest, two very small houses, and several of the

national fraternities now have approached us about recommitting themselves to our

fraternal system. I think that national fraternity are discovering it's better to play ball with

the person then to try to be independent.

The full ramifications from the efforts of I2 are still unknown, as a few years after the second

pause, the Covid-19 Pandemic impacted the country.

Reflecting on the campus-wide pauses implemented on their campus, administrators

agreed that they feel they served their purpose. The first common theme that emerged from the

data was that there was a course correction, and the university was able to start changing the

culture of the fraternity and sorority community. Secondly, administrators agreed that while the

community still had some issues with alcohol and hazing, they were making progress. Richey

summed this up well, saying:

142

And so, we've attracted a higher caliber student. We've had a significant decrease in risk management issues; it didn't solve all of them. You know, we still investigate certain things, but for the most part of it really challenged people to be creative. And what it did was it demystified new member education because that's always the shortest amount of time anyone has in our Greek experience, yet it gets the most attention. You know, so it's, which is an interesting you know the phenomenon, for me, but you know, I think that we definitely…it did what it was supposed to do, and it also showed. A lot of national organizations. That were when we say we're going to do something we're going to do it. So, we were bold, and we were able to make that change because we believe and still believe firmly that local oversight. From a university lens is the most relevant when it comes to making impact students, you know and changing a culture, so that's how we do it.

<p style="text-align:center;">Research Question Findings</p>

Using a combination of theoretical propositions derived from the theoretical framework, cross-case analysis, and Colaizzi's method of data analysis, seven themes emerged from the data collected during this current study. Each theme originated from a confluence of thoughts, ideas, or data present in both cases. The themes include several similar concepts that may have presented differently in either case but ultimately shared some defining feature. Each research question will explore similarities and differences. The seven themes that emerged through data analysis were: policy, people, message, attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle.

The policy theme indicates the strategies used and the structural changes made during or after the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. The people theme indicates the different stakeholders involved in the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community and their perspectives and reactions to the pause. The message theme denotes how the messaging surrounding the pause was implemented, received, and interpreted. The attention theme signifies how the campus-wide pause brought attention to problems facing the fraternity and sorority community and how the pause shaped the attention of the different stakeholders. The relationship theme indicates how relationships were impacted during and after the pause of the fraternity and sorority community. The symbolism theme relates to how language was essential to the different stakeholders and how individuals interpret the campus-wide pause over time. The final theme of the cycle relates to the cyclical nature of the issues facing the communities. Some of the themes intersect within each research question and theoretical framework.

Research Question 1

The first research question that this study addressed is: "What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?" This research question was answered by interview questions four and five. These interview questions allowed university administrators to elaborate on the strategies used during a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, the interview questions helped provide context to if the strategies were like other campuses' intervention methods. In addition to the interview questions,

144

data collected from documents provided by university administrators and retrieved from initial

internet searches assisted in answering research question one. During data analysis, which

included using a modified version of Colaizzi's method, theoretical prepositions, and cross-case

analysis, the themes of policy, people, and message emerged as relevant to this research

question.

The themes of policy, people, and message characterize the two institutions' strategies

when instituting a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority communities. Both

institutions had policies surrounding what fraternities and sororities could and could not do

during the campus-wide pause. At both I1 and I2, organizations could not host events with or

without alcohol, had to stop any recruitment events, could not host new member events, could

not participate in intramural sports, and did not have to move out of their houses. At I1,

organizations could host business meetings but with strict supervision from local alumni.

Alternatively, I2 did not let the groups have any business meetings. While I1 let the

organizations host philanthropic and service events with university support, most groups wound

up canceling all their events for the semester. Institution 2 asked groups to stop all activities,

including philanthropic and service-based events. Organizations on the I1 campus were given a

short window to initiate their new members. Many of the groups did not take the university up on

the offer. Conversely, I2 pushed of new member initiation until the following semester.

Both institutions had policies regarding how long the campus-wide pause would last,

with both indicating this was temporary. Institution 1's pause occurred over a few weeks, unlike

I2, whose pause lasted the better part of two semesters. Both institutions had a policy for

allowing groups back on campus. These policies differed because of how they were implemented

145

and who created them. University administration and campus partners created Institution 1's policy, and students had to answer several questions and create a presentation based on the university values. Institution 2 worked with students to develop a list of requirements they would complete before they were allowed back on campus. These requirements, including filling out paperwork, submitting rosters, attending meetings, and submitting recruitment plans, already happened on many campuses. Both campuses, policies allowed for groups to come back to entire operations on a case-by-case basis.

Both I1 and I2 brought in an outside consultant to help reform the fraternity and sorority community. Universities used these recommendations to create new policies, procedures that guided how the fraternity and sorority community operated. Closely related to the policy and people frame, both institutions instituted structural changes to the organization chart of the advisement of the fraternity and sorority community. At I1, an independent fraternity and sorority office advised organizations. The campus-wide pause prompted the institution to provide funding for a new position that focused on risk prevention. Institution 1 was also able to hire a new assistant director and a new coordinator when several staff members left. Unlike Institution 1, I2 did not have an independent fraternity and sorority life office, but the campus-wide pause instigated the university leadership to create an independent office and hire a new director who would hire more staff to support the community.

The theme of people related to the different people associated with the decision-making process of implementing a pause. At both I1 and I2, senior leadership decided to pause the fraternity and sorority community including, the senior student affairs administrator, the person who oversaw student conduct, and the individuals who advised the fraternity and sorority

146

community. I2 also included the university president in these conversations. In both instances, the universities did not include fraternal partners, students, or national offices in the decision-making process to pause the fraternity and sorority community. During the campus-wide pause, both institutions met with student leaders and answered calls from alumni, parents, students, national offices, and fraternal partners. The people responsible for deciding when students were allowed back on campus were different at each institution. At institution one, it was a committee of campus partners, whereas I2 only had the student activities office.

Each campus used different messages and forms of communication to announce the pause and the messaging they used during the pause. Institution 1 brought all the student leadership of the organizations together to announce the pause at once. This meeting was followed by messaging that went out in an email to the campus community and social media. Conversely, I2 sent out an email to the students and parents. Institution 1made an effort to contact the international offices and fraternal partners after the fact, whereas Institution two did not make the initial outreach. This difference may be in part due to I2 not having an independent fraternity and sorority office. Both institutions communicated to students throughout the campus-wide pause, but because of their increased resources directed toward the fraternity and sorority community, I1 could do this on a more frequent basis.

Both institutions had a senior administrator leading the campus-wide pause initiative. Messaging was organized and coordinated through a centralized university marketing and information team. Both institutions used language and messaging that ensured these actions would ensure student safety. One crucial difference to note was that Institution 2 said they decided for the campus-wide pause in consultation with the IFC and Panhellenic leadership;

147

NPHC was omitted, when in fact, students were not in the room making the decision informed after the fact. Each stakeholder reacted differently to this messaging based on the perspective they were taking.

<center>Research Question 2</center>

The second research question that this study addressed is "What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?" This research question was answered by interview question eleven. This research question helped prompt a line of inquiry into the results of the campus-wide pause from the university administrator's perspective. Additionally, data collected from documents provided by university administrators and retrieved from initial internet searches assisted in answering research question three. During data analysis, which included using a modified version of Colaizzi's method, theoretical prepositions, and cross-case analysis, the themes of attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle emerged as relevant to this research question.

The themes of attention, relationship, symbolism, and cycle characterize the administrators' perceived results at the two institutions that instituted a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority communities. Attention was a salient theme at both institutions. This theme was experienced in both similar and different ways at each institution. Administrators at both institutions hoped to draw student's attention to the problems the communities were facing by instituting a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Furthermore, both institutions were aiming to "course correct." Administrators at both institutions felt like they were able to do both things. An unintended consequence experienced by both institutions was the

<center>148</center>

media attention this garnered and the mixed reaction from the different stakeholders and the local and national media.

The attention was also related to the amount of time, energy, recourses, and focus the institutions and administrators directed to the fraternity and sorority community. This attention was experienced differently at both campuses. Institution 1 already had an independent fraternity and sorority office but could restructure and gain funding for additional employees. Additionally, I1 was able to restructure how they worked with other departments at the institution, including conduct and housing. Institution 2 created a separate fraternity and sorority life office and hired more staff to support the fraternity and sorority community. Both institutions increased the number of meetings with students, alumni, and national fraternal partners after the campus-wide pause. Finally, both institutions could push their senior leaders to play a more significant role in the fraternity and sorority community.

The theme of relationships emerged as a salient idea across I1 and I2. This theme was reflected in relationships formed, broken, strengthened, or renewed between various fraternity and sorority community stakeholders. In interviews with administrators at I1 and I2, both groups of professionals experienced shocked, angry, and frustrated emails and phone calls from students, parents, alumni, and national offices. At Il, administrators commented on how students felt "blindsided" by the actions. Some students at I1 and I2 pushed back immediately and demanded their organizations be reinstated, claiming "we did nothing wrong." Some students even threatened to disaffiliate from campus, with some leaving. At both institutions, administrators expressed how some groups and students responded in the complete opposite fashion, saying, "what can we do to help the community get back together." Administrators at

149

both institutions noted that during the time of the campus-wide pause and after they saw an increased level of students trying to help other students. Over time, administrators at both institutions agreed that they could start building trust with the students again. These relationships were new at Institution Two because administrators and students had a distant relationship at best.

Relationships between colleagues within each institution were highly supportive, with administrators at each institution commenting on how their colleagues helped them navigate this turbulent time. The support from the senior leadership helped the administrators at both institutions feel as they had made the right decision. For the most part, the relationships between the alumni and the administrators at both institutions were supportive, with administrators commenting on how alumni were just interested in helping right the ship and asking, "how could they help?" This helpfulness was not genuine with all alumni, depending on where they were receiving their information and their perspective. One administrator at Institution 2 shared how they felt that if alumni were shared only the negative things on campus, this shaped how they responded to administrators.

Some of the relationships most impacted by I1 and I2's campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community were those between the university and the national fraternal partners and some of the national organization's offices. Administrators at both institutions experienced pushback from the NIC and NPC. Both campuses did not hear much from the representatives of the NPHC governing board. On both campuses, they received pushback from a national fraternal advocacy group. Administrators at both institutions expressed how some national offices threatened legal action. Additionally, following the campus-wide pauses, many

national offices supported or even encouraged their local chapters to disaffiliate with the university. A common sentiment felt by administrators at both institutions was that the groups that had strong relationships with the institutions before the pause could survive, while the groups that didn't, their relationships suffered more.

Related to the theme of relationships are the concepts connected to symbolism. This theme emerged from the language and analogies that administrators used to describe the pause, the perceived results, and their thoughts on why these problems occurred. The resulting legacy of the campus-wide pause and the reactions of the different stakeholders contributed to the symbolism theme. Two administrators at institution one used the analogy of a "parent giving a child a time out." Administrators at Institution 1 explained that "when parents give children a time out, it is a way for them both to cool off and figure out the best way forward." Administrators at both institutions used language about "reframing" or "redirecting the culture" of the fraternity and sorority communities. Administrators at both institutions agreed that the campus-wide pause had allowed them to start that process.

The language was important in how administrators at both institutions talked about the campus-wide pause. At I1, they would use the word halt and pause, and at I2, they used the word moratorium. Both words were meant to symbolize the temporary nature of the campus-wide pauses. Indeed, one administrator at I1 said that universities were "the writers of the history" as students left after four years. In this way, the universities could help shape the legacy of the pause. The campus-wide pause was interpreted by students, alumni, and national partners shaped by what perspective they were taking.

One administrator at the institution talked about how students felt a sense of loss because "the fraternity had become their entire identity, and it was like losing a piece of themselves." Administrators at I2 said that many students understood why the university needed to act because there had been a student death on campus. Administrators on both campuses commented on how the legacy of the pause only lasted for as long as students who experienced it were on campus. As mentioned previously, several groups on each campus decided to disaffiliate from the campus to support fraternal partners and their national offices. Administrators viewed these actions on both campuses as short-sighted, a breach of trust, and centered around a misalignment of values and purely thinking about "dollars and cents."

Across all interviews, every administrator agreed that while institutions primarily cared about student safety, national organizations focused on membership numbers and the financial impact of the campus-wide pause. Administrators did believe national organizations cared about safety, but it was not "first on their goal list." Administrators attributed the lack of support from national organizations following the pause to the financial impact they faced because of the loss of recruitment numbers. The final theme that emerged as a perceived result of the campus-wide pause was that of a cycle.

The cyclical nature of the issues facing the fraternity and sorority community emerged as a prominent theme as administrators at both campuses talked about how the behaviors in the community reappeared every few years. This cycle was attributed to the campus's student population "turning over" every four years. This phenomenon was also credited to the lack of institutional memory that the organizations had, so the students who had experienced the campus-wide pause no longer influenced the culture of the new generation of students.

According to conduct reports and interviews of the campus administrators, conduct cases decreased for a year or two before appearing again. Students were leaving impact these behaviors, but the turnover in staff at both institutions was accredited to the lack of progress on the culture change. An administrator at Institution One summed this cycle up by saying a "reversion to the mean" after a campus-wide pause.

Administrators all agreed that the campus-wide pauses were needed but expressed that they would not suggest taking this action every couple of years. This conflicts with the reality that the two institutions in this current study instituted a pause, albeit a more targeted pause, only a few years after their original campus-wide pause. Although these problems arose again on both campuses, administrators ultimately agreed that while the behaviors are still occurring, they felt they saved the lives of more students getting injured or dying.

Research Question 3

Table 5 Leadership Frames Engaged Across Themes

Themes	Leadership Frames	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Policy		X		X	X
People			X		
Message					X
Attention		X		X	
Relationships			X		
Symbolism				X	X
Cycle					X

The third research question that this study addressed is "What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human resource, political and symbolic, are most engaged by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?" This

153

research question was answered by interview questions six through ten. These interview questions allowed university administrators to provide context about the campus-wide pause through different lenses. Additionally, data collected from documents provided by university administrators and retrieved from initial internet searches assisted in answering research question two. During data analysis, which included using a modified version of Colaizzi's method, theoretical prepositions, and cross-case analysis, the data suggested that all four leadership frames, structural, human resource, political and symbolic, were engaged when imposing a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community.

The four leadership frames of structural, human resource, political and symbolic emerge in the seven themes when answering research questions one and three. In research question one, the leadership frames structural, symbolic, and political were represented in the policy theme. The central concepts of roles, goals, strategies, policies, technology, and environment are at the foundation of the structural frame. These concepts emerged in the policy theme in several ways. The strategies used by I1 and I2 during the campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority community align with the concept of strategies and policies found within the structural frame. Additionally, the structural frames emphasize social architectures, and this appears in how both institutions reorganized how they advised the fraternities and sororities on their campus.

The pollical frame also includes the policy theme. The decision to pause on both campuses' fraternity and sorority systems reflected a shifting power dynamic between the university administration and the student organization. Additionally, how universities chose who would help decide to institute the campus-wide pause reflects the political savvy and calculations standard within the political frame. The conflict that resulted from the campus-wide pause

between the universities and other stakeholders aligns with the central concepts of the political frame. The last frame that emerged within the policy theme was the symbolic frame. How both institutions used language to shape the meaning of the campus-wide pause addresses many of the central concepts of the symbolic frame. Finally, the symbolic frame represents how students interpreted the meaning of the strategies used at both institutions. For example, while Institution 1 let its students participate in philanthropic events with university approval, many students interpreted the pause as a complete halt on all activities and canceled many of their events.

The human resource frame was reflected in the people theme. The central concepts of the human resource frame are needs, skills, and relationships. Both institutions strategically met or talked with different stakeholders during the pause. Administrators at both institutions emphasized the need to build relationships with students during this period. Administrators at both institutions acknowledged that they should have included certain people in the discussion, not including them harming their relationships. The symbolic leadership frame was associated with the message theme. The meaning ascribed to the different messages shared during the campus-wide pauses relates to central concepts of the symbolic frame. Additionally, how the institutions framed the pause, such as ensuring student safety and shifting the fraternity and sorority culture, align with how stories and culture are applied to the symbolic leadership frame.

All four leadership frames were connected to different themes across research question three. The attention theme included aspects of the structural and political frames related to the attention theme, how both institutions reorganized their advising structures and changed policies after the campus-wide pause aligns well with the structural frame. Another concept from the structural frame that emerged in the attention theme was how the environment, both physically

155

and through the media, factored into how the universities and students responded to the campus-wide pause. The political frame also emerged as it related to the attention theme. At both institutions, senior leaders who wielded both power and political influence played a large part in how universities directed their resources, time, and attention to the fraternity and sorority community.

The theme of relationships included only the human resource frame as it relates to the human resource frame. The theme relationships are characterized by how the relationships between the different stakeholders were impacted by the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community on both campuses. The needs of the stakeholders were addressed in how the institutions communicated with them. The symbolism theme included the symbolic and political frames. How the students, the alumni, and the national partners responded after the campus-wide pause relates to the meaning that these individuals ascribed to the university's actions. For example, some organizations decided to disaffiliate from the campus, and this was perceived by administrators as groups not wanting to work with the institutions.

Further, administrators at both institutions spoke about the legacy of the pause and how it has either lasted or faded from memory. These concepts align well with the symbolic frame. The political frame was also represented within the symbolism theme in how power shifted from student groups to universities. Politics also factored into how quickly how long the institutions paused activities on their campus.

Finally, the last theme that emerged in this study cycle was represented by the symbolic leadership frame. The central concepts that guide the symbolic frame are culture, myth, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, and heroes. The theme of the cycle was defined by the

cyclical nature of the student behaviors at both campuses. The culture on each campus was shaped by advising these groups and the impact the pause had on each new group of students that entered the fraternity and sorority system. Administrators at both institutions stated that while new students heard of these past campus-wide pauses, they were more of a myth than something could happen to them. When administrators shared how they felt the behaviors were cyclical and "reverted back to the mean," they used this metaphor to explain how the campus-wide pauses only had a limited impact on behavior.

In total, the symbolic frame was most engaged, being represented in four themes. The second most engaged leadership frame was the political frame that spanned three themes: research question one and research question three. The human resource frame and structural frame were tied for the least most engaged frames represented by two themes split equally across research question one and research question three.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter included comprehensive narratives of each case university, as well as the findings of this study. The case narratives help provide context and understanding of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. The chapter also presented themes derived from participant interviews and data collection and answered the research questions using multiple forms of data analysis. After data analysis, the following themes emerged related to campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities: policy, people, message, attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle. This chapter also explained the themes, how they were related to each research question, and how they help explain the phenomenon of a campus-wide

pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Finally, this chapter explored how the theoretical

framework that guided this study is connected to each research question.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>Introduction</u>

The current multiple case study was conducted to explore the phenomenon of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities, which are absent from extant literature. The data collection process, which included participant interviews and document collection, revealed several themes associated with the strategies used during a campus-wide pause of fraternity and sorority communities, including policy, people, and power. The study also revealed that campuses engaged some organizational frames more than others. Finally, the study exposed the perceived results of a campus-wide pause which aligned into four categories, attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle/reversion to the mean. The guiding theoretical framework was the four organizational frames offered by Bolman and Deal, including structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames. The research questions that guided this study were:

1. What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?

2. What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?

3. What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human resource, political and symbolic, are most engaged by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?

By analyzing participant interviews and documents collected or provided during the initial data collection stage, the researcher provided a complete understanding of the strategies and organizational frames used during a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, the analysis helped understand the perceived results of the two campus-wide pauses. The following chapter presents a discussion of the findings for each research question, its relationship to the theoretical framework, and a cross-case analysis of the findings. This section also presents implications for practice, recommendations for future research, and a conclusion.

<u>Discussion of Findings</u>

There is a glaring gap in the current literature and understanding of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities related to an institutional response/intervention associated with high-risk drinking and hazing. High-risk drinking (Alva, 1998; Ashmore et al., 2002; Cashin et al., 1998; Dorsey et al., 1999; Gibson et al., 2017) and Hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; Calderón & Allan, 2017; Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005; Hoover & Pollard, 1999) are salient experiences across fraternity and sorority communities. Current approaches to address these issues have had little to no success. One practice that universities enact is the campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Even though this practice has become a common practice, there appears to be no current empirical research examining this phenomenon or its impact on student behavior. The objective of this multiple case study was to explore a common phenomenon to shape research and practice. The following section presents a discussion of the findings and how they relate to the theoretical framework. Further, this section explores the more

160

significant themes that emerged and provides a cross-case comparison of the two cases under study.

<div align="center">Research Question 1 and Campus-Wide Pauses</div>

The first research question of this study is "What strategies do large public four-year universities utilize when instituting campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority activities to address high-risk drinking and hazing issues?" As addressed in the findings, the themes that emerged when conducting data analysis surrounding the strategies used at the two case institutions when instituting a campus-wide pause were policy, people, and message. One of the main components of the policy theme was that both Institution One and Institution Two placed a moratorium or pause on activities they deemed to be associated with hazing and alcohol misuse. For example, I1 required their fraternity and sororities not to host events such as "social events, mixers, or formals." Administrators had found these events were where much of the high-risk drinking was occurring. The no tolerance or abstinence policy does not align with policy recommendations from current research. Research suggests that a harm reduction approach is more appropriate for high-risk groups (Boekeloo et al., 2011; Pedersen & Feroni, 2018). Administrators at I1 stated that even though they had this pause on social events, they still believed students were drinking.

Similar to the policy of no social events, both institutions required that the fraternities and sororities stop their new member process, as there were multiple reports of groups hazing their new members. Research suggests that many universities only provide limited education on hazing and very modest hazing prevention approaches. Current literature on hazing does not

<div align="center">161</div>

recommend this quick approach to eliminate the problem by shutting down activities (Parks & Spangenburg, 2019). Both institution's fraternity and sorority cultures put priority on the social aspects of the organizations. Both institutions sought to address the problems facing individual members and chapters at the community-wide level. Taking a comprehensive approach is recommended by current research (McCready, 2019; Richardson, D. C., 2014).

I1 and I2 utilized some strategies during the campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority communities related to the people and message themes. The people theme included the people involved in the decision-making process, the people involved in the reinstatement process, and the people impacted by the campus-wide pause. The people theme was closely related to the message theme. This theme included how the campus-wide pause was communicated, who led the messaging, and the interpretation of the messaging. Current research on hazing prevention suggests that any prevention approach should include senior campus leaders and other stakeholders in the planning and implementation process of interventions (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). One thing both campuses did well was include senior leaders and other campus partners in the decision-making process and the reinstatement process. Conversely, both institutions did not include students, alumni, or fraternal partners in these discussions. When reflecting on how they might approach the situation now, one administrator at I1 said they would have made more effort to include students and fraternal partners in the process.

Current research also suggests that public awareness campaigns have shown modest success at changing student norms around drinking and hazing (LaBrie et al., 2008). Both institutions included all fraternities and sororities in the campus-wide pause. According to

162

administrators at both campuses, they had data to suggest that problems with high-risk alcohol consumption and hazing spanned both fraternity and sorority communities. Current research suggests that all-encompassing interventions may not be the best approach, as fraternities and sororities are not monolithic in their behaviors (McCready, 2019). Additionally, current research suggests that the population most at risk of hazing and alcohol misuse are college men (Brown-Rice, Kathleen & Furr, 2015; Huchting, Karie K., Lac, Hummer, & LaBrie, 2011; Larimer, M. E., Anderson, Baer, & Marlatt, 2000). A more targeted approach to specific organizations may have addressed both I1 and I2's problems in their fraternity and sorority communities.

Another component of the strategies that I1 and I2 utilized in their campus-wide pauses was not to remove the student groups from their houses. I2 did require that groups abstain from consuming alcohol in their properties during the pause, which one could associate with an alcohol-free housing policy. Current research suggests that alcohol-free housing only provides limited success (Crosse et al., 2006). The current study sought to provide insight into strategies public four-year institutions utilize when implementing a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Data collected during this study suggested that institutions use different policies, such as stopping new member education, disallowing social events, and even limiting in-person business meetings.

Further, both case institutions did not include students, alumni, or fraternal partners in the decision-making process to place a campus-wide pause on the fraternity and sorority community. Finally, both institutions used various messages to convey the campus-wide pause to the campus community. Both campuses used social media and emailed to communicate their message to their campuses and constituents. Institution 1 had a more robust advising network for their

163

fraternity and sorority community, making it easier to reach all stakeholders. This research provides a foundation for future research and practice on an area of campus-based interventions that had yet to be studied.

Research Question 2 and Outcomes of Campus-Wide Pauses

The second research question of this study is "What is the perceived result by campus administrators of campus-wide pauses on fraternity and sorority communities?" Through data analysis, the perceived results of the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority communities that emerged were attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle. The current study endeavored to explore campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Findings suggest that administrators directed more focus, resources, and time to support their fraternity and sorority communities following the campus-wide pause at both institutions. Research suggests that successful prevention efforts should include commitment and capacity (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). Institution 1 and Institution 2 were both successful in their commitment to and the capacity for implementing change on their campus. Both campuses saw progress slowed due to changes in staffing and the timing of each campus-wide pause.

The theme of relationships also emerged from the data analysis. Institution 1 and Institution 2 saw relationships with students, fraternal partners, and national offices strained in the aftermath of the campus-wide pause. Administrators accredited this to the lack of communication to or with campus stakeholders. Research suggests that successful prevention efforts include regular communication to partners and inclusion in pertinent conversations (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). In the years following the campus-wide pause, both

campuses attempted to repair relationships with national partners. These efforts garnered mixed

results, especially in the short term, as each institution experienced staffing turnover. The other

themes that emerged from data analysis were symbolism and cycle. Symbolism represents the

language used to describe the campus-wide pause: how different stakeholders interpreted the

pause and how individuals reacted. Both I1 and I2 used language to describe the pause as

temporary and noted that even though they made sure students knew that it was temporary,

students believed that the universities were attempting to remove them altogether. Research

suggests that prevention measures use clear expectations and accountability to address student

behavior (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). Both I1 and I2 students did not understand

the gravity of the situation or their role in instigating the campus-wide pause.

Related to the symbolism theme, administrators at both I1 and I2 expressed that those

national organizations and campuses had an adversarial relationship because they valued

different things. Where administrators suggested they value student's safety, they believed that

national organizations mainly cared about "dollars and cents." Research suggests that cultural

competence should guide prevention efforts. Cultural competence includes diverse perspectives

of stakeholders and an understanding of broader sociocultural identities (Allan, Payne, Boyer, &

Kerschner, 2018). Both institutions did not include fraternal partners in the decision-making

process, which may have impacted the effectiveness of the campus-wide pause by limiting the

diverse perspectives needed to address a complex problem.

The cycle's theme also emerged as relevant to the results of the campus-wide pauses at

both case institutions. In the years following the campus-wide pause, the fraternity and sorority

community's problems reappeared, and both campuses had to institute another more targeted

campus-wide pause. Research suggests that successful prevention efforts include sustainability. Sustainability includes continuous attention, efforts, and support to prevention efforts (Allan, Payne, Boyer, & Kerschner, 2018). Institution 1 and Institution 2 had campus-wide pauses that were temporary, but they had sustained follow-up. Data suggested that both institutions suffered from staff turnover that hindered their prevention efforts. Additionally, administrators noted that the student body was close to "75 percent new" every four years. This renewing of the student population presents a unique problem to universities seeking to address high-risk behavior.

<div align="center">Research Question 3 and Organizational Framing</div>

The third research question of this study is "What leadership frames, i.e., structural, human resource, political and symbolic, are most engaged by large public four-year universities when imposing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?" The data analysis revealed that all leadership frames appear across the seven themes, policy, people, message, attention, relationships, symbolism, and cycle. Each of the themes addressed central assumptions, tensions, or dilemmas associated with the four organizational frames, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. This section explores how each theme interacts with the organizational frame that is associated with them.

Structural Frame

Findings from the current study suggest that the structural frame was associated with both the strategies used and the results of campus-wide pauses of the fraternity and sorority community at two large public four-year institutions. Six assumptions characterize the structural frame. First, organizations create strategies to address established goals. Next, the efficiency of

organizations increases through specialization. Third, coordination and control are essential to an organization's diverse efforts. Fourth, rationality is more critical to success than personal agendas and external pressure. Another assumption is that structure and strategy should align with an organization's current situation. Finally, restructuring is needed if performance suffers (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 48). The central tension that emerges within the structural perspective is when structure and situation do not align. The two themes that emerged from the data analysis were the structural frame were policy, and attention.

The policy theme includes the strategies and the structural changes made during and after the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community at both campuses. The two case institutions sought to ensure student's safety by instituting a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. They used different strategies and policies to meet these goals. Institution 1 had a specialized workforce dedicated to supporting the fraternity and sorority community. Conversely, Institution 2 did not have a fraternity and sorority life office. At both campuses, administrators shared that they took these actions to ensure student safety. The administrators' actions are rational because the administrators associated the fraternity and sorority systems with problematic behavior, so they stopped that behavior with a campus-wide pause. Alternatively, the administrators at both institutions shared that local and national events shaped their decision-making process surrounding how they implemented their campus-wide pause. How the universities restructured during and after the pause reflects a vital imperative of the structural frame.

The attention theme aligned with the structural frame through restructuring of the fraternity and sorority community. At Institution 1this came in the form of hiring new staff

members and changing staff responsibilities. Meanwhile, I2 restructured their fraternity and sorority advising through moving these organizations from student activities into their own office with dedicated staff. Both institutions also devised new strategies and directed resources and time to meet the current needs of their institution. In both campus-wide pauses, the current ways in which the advising was structured did not meet the organization's needs. The campus-wide pause allowed both universities to restructure and realign to meet the needs of the community.

Human Resource Frame

Findings from the current study suggest that the human resource frame was associated with both the strategies used and the results of campus-wide pauses of the fraternity and sorority community at two large public four-year institutions. Four assumptions characterize the human resource frame. First, organizations exist to serve the needs of individuals. Second, there is a symbiotic relationship between people and organizations, and they cannot exist without each other. Next, the fit is essential, and misalignment can cause both organization and people to suffer. The final assumption is that both will benefit when organizations and individuals' needs and goals align (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 118). The central conflict associated with the human resource frame is the misalignment of needs, beliefs, and attitudes. Two themes were associated with the human resource frame, people and relationships.

The people theme indicates the different stakeholders involved in the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community and their perspectives and reactions to the pause. At both the case institutions, the people theme played an important role in how the institution's used strategies to address the campuses' concerns. Institutions viewed the actions of the campus-wide

168

pause as meeting the needs of the students. Conversely, the students felt as if their needs were not getting met. The discussions during the decision-making process at both institutions did not include students. Students at both institutions were using the fraternities and sororities as a social outlet. Administrators at both institutions believed that the fraternity and sorority system should have meant more to the students; this misalignment caused mistrust between students and administrators. There also appeared to be a misalignment of needs between the university and the national offices.

The relationship theme indicates how relationships were impacted during and after the pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Through misalignment of needs and attitudes, relationships suffered during and after the pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Administrators shared those students, alumni, and national offices had a harsh reaction to the campus-wide pauses. Before the pause, groups who had complex relationships with the university only drifted further apart from the university. Administrators shared that they spent several years trying to build back the relationships between the different stakeholders. Openly sharing and working toward a common goal of student safety has allowed some relationships to flourish.

Political Frame

Findings from the current study suggest that the political frame was associated with both the strategies used and the results of campus-wide pauses of the fraternity and sorority community at two large public four-year institutions. Five assumptions characterize the human political frame. The first assumption is that different coalitions make up organizations. Next,

169

these coalitions have competing interests and perceptions of reality; decisions on scarce resources are a central component of organizations. Fourth, at the center of organizations and organizational problems is conflict and power. Finally, Organizations and different stakeholders negotiate for their competing interests (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 184). The central tension within the political frame is that power can be concentrated in the wrong place or spread thin. The three themes that emerged from data analysis aligned with the political frame were policy, attention, and symbolism.

The policy theme indicates the strategies used and the structural changes made during or after the campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Administrators at both institutions sought to gain control or power back from the students in the fraternity and sorority community by instituting a campus-wide pause. Administrators shared how they felt that the communities had operated freely and needed the university to gain some influence over them again. By instituting the campus-wide pause, the campuses were shifting the balance of power back into their favor. The coalition the institution brought in to decide to pause the fraternity and sorority community also addresses a central assumption in the political frame. The attention theme signifies how the campus-wide pause brought attention to problems facing the fraternity and sorority community and how the pause shaped the attention of the different stakeholders. The resources allocated and how the institution decided to bring the fraternity and sorority community back align well with the political frame.

At Institution 1, administrators brought in different stakeholders, including alumni, students, national offices, to decide how the fraternity and sorority community would operate moving forward. Conversely, Institution Two mainly relied on a coalition of students and

170

university administrators to direct the reinstatement. Both institutions brought in an outside negotiator to help the students and university administrators work through competing interests.

The symbolism theme relates to how language was essential to the different stakeholders and the interpretation of the campus-wide pause over time. The competing interests of the national organizations and the campuses shaped the perspective of the university administrators. During interviews, administrators shared that the values of the university and those of the national organizations were at odds. Administrators explained they value student safety above all else, while national organizations were about "dollars and cents." Some organizations and national offices tried to gain power back from the universities by disaffiliating from the campus. In the end, this decision would cause the local organizations who disaffiliated to struggle to retain membership.

Symbolic Frame

Findings from the current study suggest that the symbolic frame was associated with both the strategies used and the results of campus-wide pauses of the fraternity and sorority community at two large public four-year institutions. Five assumptions characterize the symbolic frame. The first assumption of this frame is that meaning is more important than action. Second, actions and meaning are only loosely aligned as people view things from different perspectives. Third, symbols help individuals clear up ambiguity and confusion. Fourth, actions and processes are defined by what they signal or express rather than their outcome. Fifth, culture is the guiding force of all organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 243). The central conflict of the symbolic frame occurs when people act in bad faith, and a symbol or ritual loses its influence. This frame

171

included the most themes of any of the other leadership frames. The themes that emerged that are related to the symbolic frame are policy, message, symbolism, and cycle.

The policy theme was also associated with the symbolic frame. The action of pausing the fraternity or sorority community was shaped by the different perspectives of the individual stakeholders. The action by the administration was a signal to the campus and, in particular, the fraternity and sorority community that things needed to change. The university stopped specific activities that held meaning to the organizations. Administrators on both campuses shared that students felt a sense of loss. Students were placing much of their identity in the organizations. Both institutions did not set a timeline for when the groups would return; the national offices and fraternal partners interpreted this as a breach of due process. Once fraternal partners and national offices realized the campuses had a defined process, they went along with the process.

The message theme denotes how the messaging surrounding the pause was implemented, received, and interpreted. The language and symbols used by the case institutions relate to a general assumption of the symbolic frame: symbols, events, and rituals are of utmost importance. The case institutions used language like safety, care, and pause to signify how this pause was going to shape the culture of the campus. How the students and other stakeholders interpreted this message was different from the purpose the universities intended. Students felt that the university had overstepped and took away something that held value to them.

The symbolism theme relates to how language was essential to the different stakeholders and how people interpret the campus-wide pause over time. Over time the value and how students came to understand the campus-wide pauses changed. Furthermore, as some groups decided to leave campus and disaffiliate from the university, this signaled to administrators that

the national offices cared more about money and membership than they did about work toward a safer community.

The final theme of the cycle relates to the cyclical nature of the issues facing the communities. Some of the themes intersect within each research question and theoretical framework. The value of the campus-wide pause at limiting student misconduct waned over time. It lost its influence over student behavior as new students joined the community, and the history and legacy of the pause faded from memory. Administrators shared that they felt like they were in a repeating cycle and that after the campus-wide pause, behavior "reverted to the mean."

Limitations and Delineations

Numerous limitations and delineations were guiding the study. The delineations that the researcher imposed on the current multiple case study were: (a) only student affairs administrators were interviewed during data collection, (b) only two cases of campus-wide pauses were studied, (c) the campus-wide pauses occurred in the past ten years and were at large public institutions, (d) the fraternity and sorority community must have had comprised of over 30 organizations, (e) documents collected were either provided by the administrators, were compiled by an initial internet search, or were collected via a public records request.

There are numerous limitations to consider when interpreting the analysis of the data collected during this current study. First, since the scope of the study was limited to only two institutions with a similar classification type, results may not be generalizable to other institution

types. Second, the institutions studied did not have any local organizations that were specifically unique to their campus. As such, institutions with fraternal systems that include organizations with no national oversight might see different results to their campus-wide pause. Furthermore, the institutions were both publicly controlled and subject to more oversight and adherence to state and federal statutes protecting freedom of association and due process. Finally, as it relates to the institutions, both institutions have some national prominence, which may have impacted decisions made by university administrators in how they conducted their campus wide-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority communities.

Another limitation to the study was the time frame in which the campus-wide pauses were implemented before the Covid-19 pandemic, the push for racial justice after the death of George Floyd, the abolish Greek life movement, and various other social and societal events that have significantly impacted how universities respond to a crisis. The study is also limited to only one perspective, which was that of university administrators. The researcher did not interview other stakeholders to gain the perspective of groups impacted by a campus-wide pause of the fraternity and sorority community. Next, the study was conducted via zoom video conferencing technology which may have impacted the rapport between the participants and the interviewer. The final limitation was that the cases under study happened in the past; the interviewees may have lost context-relevance during the campus-wide pause. Although the limitations and delineations may have impacted the current study, the findings initiate the study of an understudied phenomenon.

<u>Implications</u>

The findings of this study have numerous implications for institutions that seek to address hazing and alcohol misuse in their fraternity and sorority communities. Further, this study provides institutions with information to make data-informed decisions when deciding if they should implement a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority community. The study also has numerous implications for the larger fraternal community, including national offices on how they can be better partners in supporting institutions to influence positive changes within their campus fraternal communities. While unique to each group, the implications have several suggestions that overlap that campuses should consider together. Institutions and university administrators should consider the findings of this study and apply them to their specific university context. Likewise, fraternal partners vary in how they govern, support, and place value on institutional partnerships and consider this when exploring these recommendations. This study was exploratory in nature and limited in scope. As such, institutions and fraternal partners should use this study as a foundational tool in understanding and utilizing campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities as an intervention method to high-risk behavior.

Findings from this exploratory reveal the possible strategies and perspectives to consider when instituting a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, this study presents the benefits and pitfalls two large public institutions experienced when implementing a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority communities. As institutions decide whether a campus-wide pause is an appropriate intervention for issues within their fraternity and community, they should consider the themes of policy, people, and message derived from the findings of this study. Conversely, national offices and fraternal partners should

175

vigorously address the themes of relationships, people, and attention when considering how to

engage campuses in meaningful partnerships. Also, institutions must understand how instituting

a campus-wide pause impacts policy, affects people and relationships, focuses attention, and how

messages and symbolism factor into their decision. Finally, both institutions and fraternal

partners must understand the cyclical nature of cultural problems facing fraternity and sorority

communities.

<u>Institutions and University Administrators</u>

As institutions and university administrators grapple with the pervasive problem of

alcohol misuse and hazing that afflicts fraternity and sorority communities nationwide, this study

provides insight into how two large public institutions implemented a campus-wide pause of

their fraternity and sorority communities. As noted in the findings, both institutions implemented

a pause on all activities they associated with problematic behaviors. Common to both

institutions, new member education, recruitment, and the social aspects of these organizations

were determined to be aspects of the fraternal experience associated with high-risk behaviors.

Institutions and administrators should consider what areas of the fraternal experience are

associated with high risk-behaviors and develop policies that address these behaviors. An

unintended consequence that emerged from participants' interviews at both campuses was how

specific policies, such as pausing intramural activities at I1 and stopping business meetings at

institution I2, drew student attention away from the intended purpose of the pause. Also related

to the policy theme, institutions should consider the timing during the semester if planning to

institute a pause, as both institutions had to delay the rollout of new policies because of winter or summer vacation.

Another consideration for institutions is how specific policies negatively impact their students operationally and financially. Findings from the I1 campus-wide pause indicate that BGLO's were disproportionally impacted by the pause because it occurred when many of these organizations recruited new members. Additionally, several panhellenic organizations had placed large deposits on reservations for philanthropic or service-based events and the pause forced the groups to cancel, costing the organizations thousands of dollars they had already committed. Findings also indicated that numerous people were involved in campus-wide pauses, and there was a severe impact on many relationships. Related to these themes, institutions should consider who is at the table when deciding to institute a campus-wide pause. Likewise, when deciding when to reinstate organizations and crafting a revised fraternity and sorority experience, institutions should consider including campus partners, national offices, students, and other stakeholders. Findings from both cases revealed that who is at the table drastically affects relationships and impacts the strength of the policy and practice recommendations moving forward.

The theme of attention merits special investigation when institutions and administrators are deciding the best approach to address difficulties within their fraternity and sorority community. Findings from both cases exposed the importance that time, resources, and attention factored into the success or failure of changing the fraternal culture at each institution under study. For example, once I2 moved fraternity and sorority life into its department, individuals were able to focus all their time on supporting the needs of the fraternal community.

177

Additionally, staff turnover can drastically impact policy and building relationships; therefore, the continuity of staff members is of utmost importance. One of the most important recommendations for institutions to consider is creating an office or department with adequate staffing and support to meet the needs of a high-risk community.

Furthermore, recruiting and retaining fraternity and sorority life professionals is crucial in initiating a cultural shift within a fraternity and sorority community. Finally, attention relates to the importance senior university officials place on fraternity and sorority communities. Findings also suggest that senior university officials should play a more significant role in leading cultural change within fraternity and sorority communities.

Another implication of the current study is how messaging, language, and symbolism factor into campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Findings suggest that the strategies used during a campus-wide pause may play a more significant part in how individuals interpret the action than the language used to describe the pause. As indicated in the findings section, students felt a sense of loss when the campus placed a temporary pause on fraternity and sorority activities. Even though both institutions used language indicating the temporary nature of the actions for students whose identities were tied to their organization, this pause was symbolic of the complete closure of something they held dear. Universities should consider how language and action will be interpreted by students when instituting a campus-wide pause. Findings also suggest a misalignment of values between national partners and institutions. This finding emerged from interviews at both institutions, where administrators felt that fraternal partners were more worried about "dollars and cents" rather than student safety. Institutions

178

should foster stronger relationships with national partners to help find common ground on which to work with the fraternity and sorority community.

The final implication of this multiple case study is that the problems afflicting both campuses fraternal and sorority community was cyclical and reappeared after most of the students had graduated who had experienced the pause. Further, both institutions implemented a second more targeted pause to address these issues. Institutions should consider the costs and benefits of implementing a campus-wide pause as findings suggest that a campus-wide pause had only a short-term impact on student misconduct. Institutions should consider using more targeted continuous interventions to address this culture, as the student membership changes almost every four years.

<u>Fraternal Partners and National Offices</u>

Universities are looking for ways to address fraternity and sorority cultures that are bastions of hazing and alcohol misuse. Increasingly institutions are turning to campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities to tackle these problems. Often, institutions are taking these actions with ought the support of fraternal partners and national offices. Additionally, as addressed in the findings, many fraternal partners and national offices feel blindsided by these campus-wide pauses. Implications for fraternal partners and national offices center around the themes of people, relationships, attention, and symbolism. First, fraternal partners and national offices should consider their allies or lines of communication on campus and among the various stakeholders in the local fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, national offices need to consider placing an individual responsible for communicating with

179

institutions. If national offices or fraternal partners have chapters on many campuses, they should consider hiring multiple people, so an adequate amount of attention is given to each campus.

Implications surrounding the themes of attention and relationships also guide fraternal partners and national offices. Findings suggest that campus administrators felt as if national offices did not provide enough time, attention, or resources to support the chapters on their campuses. While many national offices rely on volunteers to support the needs of local chapters, they should consider investing more resources and support to individual chapters. If national organizations already have this support in place, connecting campuses with those local support structures can alleviate any misperceptions by campus administration. Findings suggest that university administrators felt a sense of mistrust toward fraternal partners and did not involve them in conversations about instituting a campus-wide pause. National fraternal partners should consider spending time engaging and building solid relationships with campuses to build trust and be included in at least informed university decisions regarding the fraternity and sorority community.

The final implication for fraternal partners and national offices relates to the theme of symbolism. As noted in the findings of this study, university administrators believed there was a misalignment of values and a lack of trust as it related to national offices and fraternal partners. This lack of trust was exasperated by the language and actions taken by some national partners after the two institutions under study instituted campus-wide pauses of their fraternity and sorority community. Findings revealed that several fraternal partners and national organizations supported and even encouraged local chapters to disaffiliate from the university after implementing a campus-wide pause. This action may have symbolically proven to institutions

180

that fraternal partners and national offices do not have their students' best interests in mind. Fraternal partners and national offices should consider how supporting the disaffiliation of local groups impacts the perception and relationship of university administrators and institutions. Additionally, according to the findings, the groups who disaffiliated from the two case institutions struggled to recruit and retain membership without institutional support.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are many different avenues of future research to consider as they relate to the current topic of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Furthermore, as this is a novel area of study, there are many ways in which the current study could be modified and complemented with slight alterations to provide a more robust understanding of an understudied phenomenon. The following recommendations for future research present a small part of a potential larger research agenda centered around campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities and other larger-scale interventions seeking to address hazing, alcohol misuse, and other conduct-related issues.

1. The first recommendation for future research would be to expand the institutions' size, scope, and characteristics included in a future study. The current study was limited to large public institutions with fraternity and sorority communities comprised of over 30 organizations. Future studies should include private institutions, small and medium-sized institutions with varied-sized fraternities, and sorority communities. Additionally, the institutions included in the current study had a somewhat prominent reputation. In a

181

future study, researchers should include institutions with less name recognition. These adjustments would allow for more generalizable results and analysis.

2. The current study only utilized participant interviews from university administrators. The use of only administrators may have biased the findings to that of the university's perspective of the campus-wide pause. Future research should include interviews with students who were present enrolled during a campus-wide pause of a fraternity and sorority community. Additionally, including the perspective of fraternity and sorority partners would provide a broader perspective to the implications of instituting a pause and the effects it may have at curtailing hazing and alcohol misuse.

3. The current study sought to explore campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Additionally, the current study explored the administrator's perspective on the results of campus-wide pauses. To better understand the effectiveness of utilizing campus-wide pauses, future studies should utilize a correlational approach to see if there is a relationship between incidents of high-risk drinking and hazing and campuses that have instituted a campus-wide pause of their fraternity and sorority community. The current study found that while hazing and alcohol misuse incidents decreased immediately following the campus-wide pause, they slowly increased as new students entered the fraternity and sorority system. A longitudinal study may also help determine the impact of these pauses over time.

4. The current study was limited to two institutions that instituted campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities. Even though the results uncovered that the current institutions implemented targeted pauses around four years after instituting campus-wide

pauses, more research is needed to understand the similarities and differences. Future research should look to do comparative case studies of institutions that implemented campus-wide pauses and implemented more targeted pauses of several organizations or specific governing councils. This research could inform university administrators on which type of intervention is the best approach.

5. Another potential research area emerged from a suggestion from one of the university administrators during a participant interview. The current study included campuses with organizations that had many students per organization. Future research should investigate how organizational size impact's ability to curb hazing and alcohol misuses at the campus-wide level. Related to the organization's size, this administrator also suggested that by holding organizations accountable for individual member behavior, problem members may be ducking responsibility and avoiding accountability, thus impacting efforts to curb high-risk drinking and hazing.

6. Data collected during the current research uncovered how staffing and student population turnover impacted the effectiveness of the campus-wide pause. Future research should focus on comparing institutions with stable staffing situations and those with more frequent staff turnover and how this impacts culture change. Additionally, future research should explore how institutions shape culture change among fraternity and sorority communities with constantly changing membership.

7. Finally, this current research focused on institutions that implemented campus-wide pauses pre covid-19 pandemic. Future research will need to be conducted on how universities handle crisis may have changed since post-pandemic. Additionally, the

183

changing narrative around various social issues has ushered in a new era of holding

individuals and systems accountable. The changing narrative may also impact how

universities respond to institutional issues within their fraternity and sorority community.

Conclusion

The current multiple case study sought to explore campus-wide pauses of fraternity and

sorority communities as an intervention method to high-risk drinking and hazing. An extensive

review of current literature revealed no empirical studies on this phenomenon. As such, this

exploratory research provided insight into what strategies institutions used during campus-wide

pauses. The strategies aligned into three broad themes policy, people, and power. The study also

provided examples of which organizational frames were most engaged during a campus-wide

pause of a fraternity and sorority community. The study found that while universities engaged in

all four organizational frames, Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic, some were

more engaged than others. The implications of this were explored further in this chapter. Finally,

the study sought to understand the perceived result of the campus-wide pause from the university

administrator's perspective. The results from the campus-wide pause revealed several themes

related to a campus-wide pause including, attention, relationships, symbolism, and a symbolic

cycle/reversion back to the mean. This chapter also included recommendations for future

research and practice.

In an ever-changing campus climate, especially after the events of the past year and a

half, research on campus-wide interventions is needed more than ever. Current scholars alarm

the potential for an increase in alcohol misuse and hazing cases among fraternity and sorority

communities in the coming years. Furthermore, several student deaths associated with hazing have already started to occur as the academic school year winds down. Institutions must take immediate and lasting impacts on shifting the culture within the broader fraternal movement. Adding to the urgency and relevance of the current study, a regional institution recently announced the complete exile and recognition of all fraternity and sorority groups from their campus. The results of that move are yet to be revealed, but the continued need for empirical research on campus-wide initiatives can help shape how institutions respond to the pervasive issues within their campus fraternity and sorority system.

APPENDIX A: SEARCH TERMS AND PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL DOCUMENT AND ARCHIVAL DATA COLLECTION

This is a preliminary list and is subject to change throughout the initial phase of data collection.

- Greek Life Shut Down

- University Halts Greek Activity

- Fraternity and sorority Life suspended

- College pauses Greek life activity

- Universities crackdown on Greek Life

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Step 1: Gaining Access to Study Site and Participants

- After the study site for the current case study research was selected using the sampling technique and stated criteria, the researcher made initial outreach to the universities that were selected for the study.

- The researcher reached out to the current university administrator who directly supervises the fraternity and sorority community through email to gain access.

- In this email, the researcher stated the purpose of this outreach and asked to set up a time to speak for an initial introduction conversation.

- If the current university administrator was not at the university at the time of campus-wide pause, the researcher sought this information through the current administrator.

- After the appropriate participants were selected, the researcher asked for the participant's consent to participate in an interview conducted over Zoom.

The following section contains a list of questions that was utilized during the semi-structured interview.

Step 2: Interview Questions

1) What is your current role at the university, and what are some of your primary responsibilities?

   a. How long have you been at the university, and what is your background and experience?

2) Are you familiar with the concept of campus-wide pauses of fraternity and sorority communities?

    a. Were you at the current university when they instituted a campus-wide pause on fraternity and sorority life?

3) What are the reasons universities institute campus-wide pauses?

    a. What was the reason this university implemented a campus-wide pause?

    b. Were there other reasons the university implemented it?

4) In what ways was this pause implemented?

    a. Can you take me step by step through the process and what it entailed? This process can include policy or structural changes, expectations of people involved, stakeholders, and how their opinions were considered, and how did the university depict this to those involved?

5) Were the steps taken like other campus-wide pauses?

    a. As in are how this was implemented similar or based on research, or common practice?

6) What were the implications of this pause on the students, the university, and other key stakeholders?

    a. What were the short-term implications? Long term?

7) How did the campus-wide pause impact policy and procedure?

8) How did the campus-wide pause impact relationships between all stakeholders?

9) Were there any political implications?

10) How has the campus-wide pause been viewed over time?

11) Did the campus-wide pause have the intended consequences on the reason it was implemented?

12) Is there anything else you want to share about the incident and the ramifications?

13) Are there any documents pertinent to this case that I should be aware have, or can you

share them with me?

APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board
FWA00000351
IRB00001138, IRB00012110
Office of Research
12201 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3246

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

February 8, 2021

Dear Corey Esquenazi:

On 2/8/2021, the IRB determined the following submission to be human subjects research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Initial Study, Initial Study
Title:	An Exploration of Campus-Wide Pauses of Fraternity and Sorority Communities: Utilizing a Four Frame Approach
Investigator:	Corey Esquenazi
IRB ID:	STUDY00002710
Funding:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• HRP-251- FORM - Faculty Advisor Scientific-Scholarly Review fillable form copy (002).pdf, Category: Faculty Research Approval; • HRP-254-FORM Explanation of Research.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • HRP-255-FORM - Request for Exemption.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • Internet Search Terms.docx, Category: Other; • Interview protocol.docx, Category: Interview / Focus Questions; • Recruitment email Template.docx, Category: Recruitment Materials

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made, and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please submit a modification request to the IRB. Guidance on submitting Modifications and Administrative Check-in are detailed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.   When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request so that IRB records will be accurate.

If you have any questions, please contact the UCF IRB at 407-823-2901 or irb@ucf.edu. Please include your project title and IRB number in all correspondence with this office.

Sincerely,

Katie Kilgore
Designated Reviewer

Page 1 of 1

193

REFERENCES

AFA. (2020). An AFA resource: Abolish Greek Life.

Allan, E. J., & Madden, M. (2008). *Hazing in view: college students at risk*, 1-52

Allan, E. J., Payne, J. M., Boyer, A., & Kerschner, D. (2018). Hazing prevention toolkit: For Campus Professionals. *U.S. Official News*

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. J., & Madden, M. (2012). The nature and extent of college student hazing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 24*(1), 83-90. doi:10.1515/ijamh.2012.012

Allan, E. J., Payne, J. M., & Kerschner, D. (2018). Transforming the culture of hazing: A research-based hazing prevention framework. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 55*(4), 412-425. doi:10.1080/19496591.2018.1474759

Alva, S. A. (1998). Self-reported alcohol use of college fraternity and sorority members. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(1), 3. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1416092452

Asel, A. M., Seifert, T. A., & Pascarella, E. T. (2009). The effects of fraternity/sorority membership on college experiences and outcomes: A portrait of complexity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 4*(2), 1-11.

Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Beebe, M. (2002). "Alkie," "Frat brother," and "Jock": Perceived types of college students and stereotypes about Drinking1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(5), 885-907. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816. 2002.tb00247.x

Baird, W. R. (1912). *Baird's manual of American college fraternities* (8th ed.). New York, NY: College Fraternity Publishing.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193-209.

Barry, A., Madson, M., Moorer, K., & Christman, K. (2016). Predicting the use of protective behavioral strategies: Does fraternity/sorority affiliation matter? *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 53*(3), 294-304. doi:10.1080/19496591.2016.1165107

Basic classification description. Retrieved from https://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php

Becque, F. (2012). Sorority women and fraternity men in the white house. Retrieved from https://www.franbecque.com/u-s-presidents-who-belong-to-fraternities-and-first-ladies-who-are-sorority-members/

Blavos, A. A., Glassman, T., Sheu, J., Diehr, A., & Deakins, B. (2014). Using the health belief model to predict bystander behavior among college students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 51*(4), 420-432. doi:10.1515/jsarp-2014-0042

Boekeloo, B. O., Novik, M. G., & Bush, E. N. (2011). Drinking to get drunk among incoming freshmen college students. *American Journal of Health Education, 42*(2), 88-95. doi:10.1080/19325037.2011.10599176

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations* (6th ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass.

Brown-Rice, K. A., Furr, S., & Jorgensen, M. (2015). Analyzing Greek member's alcohol consumption by gender and the impact of alcohol education interventions. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education, 59*(1), 19. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1697448207

Brown-Rice, K., & Furr, S. (2015). Differences in college Greek members' binge drinking behaviors: A dry/wet house comparison. *The Professional Counselor (Greensboro, N.C.), 5*(3), 354-364. doi:10.15241/kbr.5.3.354

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

Campo, S., Poulos, G., & Sipple, J. W. (2005). Prevalence and profiling: Hazing among college

    students and points of intervention. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 29*(2), 137-149.

    doi:10.5993/ajhb.29.2.5

Capone, C., Wood, M. D., Borsari, B., & Laird, R. D. (2007). Fraternity and sorority

    involvement, social influences, and alcohol use among college students. *Psychology of*

    Addictive Behaviors, 21(3), 316-327. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.21.3.316

Caron, S. L., Moskey, E. G., & Hovey, C. A. (2004). Alcohol use among fraternity and sorority

    members looking at change over time. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education,* 51-66.

Cashin, J. R., Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P. W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow

    the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*(1), 63-70. doi:10.15288/jsa.1998.59.63

Caudill, B. D., Luckey, B., Crosse, S. B., Blane, H. T., Ginexl, E. M., & Campbell, B. (2007).

    Alcohol risk reduction skills training in a national fraternity A randomized intervention trial

    with longitudinal intent to treat analysis. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 68(3)

Caudill, B. D., Crosse, S. B., Campbell, B., Howard, J., Luckey, B., & Blane, H. T. (2006).

    High-risk drinking among college fraternity members: A national perspective. *Journal of*

    American College Health, 55(3), 141-155. doi:10.3200/JACH.55.3.141-155

Chauvin, C. D. (2012). Social norms and motivations associated with college binge drinking.

    Sociological Inquiry, 82(2), 257-281. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682x.2011. 00400.x

Cimino, A. (2011). The evolution of hazing: Motivational mechanisms and the abuse of

    newcomers. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 11*(3-4), 241-267.

    doi:10.1163/156853711X591242

Cimino, A. (2013). Predictors of hazing motivation in a representative sample of the United

    States. *Evolution and Human Behavior,* (34), 446-452.

Cimino, A. (2018). Fraternity hazing and the process of planned failure. *Journal of American

    Studies, 52*(1), 214-236. doi:10.1017/S0021875816001924

Cimino, A. N. (2013). *Hazing as a manifestation of evolved psychology* Available from Publicly

    Available Content Database. Retrieved from

    https://search.proquest.com/docview/1448529589

Colaizzi, P. F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. S. Valle, &

    K. Mark Eds (Eds.), *Existential phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48-71).

    New York: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches*

    (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among

    five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Crosse, S., Ginexi, E., & Caudill, B. (2006). Examining the effects of a national alcohol-free

    fraternity housing policy. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 27*(5), 477-495.

    doi:10.1007/s10935-006-0049-5

Crow, R. B., & Macintosh, E. W. (2009). Conceptualizing a meaningful definition of hazing in

    sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 9*(4), 433-451.

    doi:10.1080/16184740903331937

Department of Health and Human Services. (2015). Alcohol. Retrieved from

    https://health.gov/our-work/food-nutrition/2015-2020-dietary-

    guidelines/guidelines/appendix-9/

Dorsey, A. M., Scherer, C. W., & Real, K. (1999). The college tradition of "drink 'til you drop":

    The relation between students' social networks and engaging in risky behaviors. *Health*

    Communication, 11(4), 313-334. doi:10.1207/s15327027hc1104_1

Durkin, K. F., Wolfe, T. W., & Clark, G. A. (2005). College students and binge drinking: An

    evaluation of social learning theory. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*(3), 255-272.

    doi:10.1080/027321790518681

Dvorak, P. (2016). Time to dismantle fraternities and the sexism, rape culture, and binge

    drinking they encourage. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from

    https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/time-to-dismantle-fraternities-and-the-sexism-rape-

    culture-and-binge-drinking-they-encourage/2016/09/15/55dbc566-7b5d-11e6-bd86-

    b7bbd53d2b5d_story.html?utm_term=.c43fc4d7b377

Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(2), 210-228. doi:10.1353/csd.0.0063

Elias, J. W., Bell, R. W., Eade, R., Underwood, T., Winsky, K., Shonrock, M. D. Fiel, R. (2001). *"Alcohol myopia," expectations, social interests, and sorority pledge status.* Omaha, Nebraska:

Elkins, B., Helms, L. B., & Pierson, C. T. (2003). Greek-letter organizations, alcohol, and the courts: A risky mix? *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(1), 67-80.

Ellsworth, C. W. (2006). Definitions of hazing: Differences among selected student organizations *.2*(1), 46-60.

Feuer, E. (2019). Hazing definitions of students and administrators at two institutions using A four-frame approach. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 14*(1), 39-48.

Finkel, M. A. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 20*(3), 228-233. doi:10.1053/ajem.2002.32649

Flanagan, C. (2014). The dark power of fraternities. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/03/the-dark-power-of-fraternities/357580/

Franklin, C. A. (2016). Sorority affiliation and sexual assault victimization. *Violence Against Women, 22*(8), 895-922. doi:10.1177/1077801215614971

Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual assault on the college campus. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*(11), 1457-1480. doi:10.1177/0093854812456527

Fuer, E. (2019). *Understanding hazing perceptions of students and administrators using A four-frame approach.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University at Albany, State University of New York.

Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: Principles and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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*(5), 333-335. doi:10.1016/S1054-139X (03)00021-1

Gibson, S., Matto, H., & Keul, A. (2017). Should they stay or should they go: Greek housing on campus as substance use prevention? *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions, 17*(3), 307-325. doi:10.1080/1533256X.2016.1249574

Giordano, M. (2014). Clemson suspends fraternity activities after pledge dies. Retrieved from https://www.aol.com/article/2014/09/26/clemson-suspends-fraternity-activities-after-pledge-dies/20968307/

Glassman, T. J., Dodd, V. J., Sheu, J., Rienzo, B. A., & Wagenaar, A. C. (2010). Extreme

ritualistic alcohol consumption among college students on game day. *Journal of American

College Health, 58*(5), 413-423. doi:10.1080/07448480903540473

Glindemann, K. E., & Geller, E. S. (2003). A systematic assessment of intoxication at university

parties. *Environment and Behavior, 35*(5), 655-664. doi:10.1177/0013916503254751

Graupensperger, S. A., Benson, A. J., & Evans, M. B. (2018). Everyone else is doing it: The

association between social identity and susceptibility to peer influence in NCAA athletes.

Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 40(3), 117-127. doi:10.1123/jsep.2017-0339

Gregory S. Parks, Rashawn Ray, Shayne E. Jones, & Matthew W. Hughey. (2014). Complicit in

their own demise? *Law & Social Inquiry, 39*(4), 938-972. doi:10.1111/lsi.12075

Grucza, R. A., Norberg, K. E., & Bierut, L. J. (2009). Binge drinking among youths and young

adults in the united states: 1979–2006. *Journal of the American Academy of Child &

Adolescent Psychiatry, 48*(7), 692-702. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181a2b32f

Haas, A. L., Smith, S. K., & Kagan, K. (2013). Getting "game": Pregaming changes during the

first weeks of college. *Journal of American College Health, 61*(2), 95-105.

doi:10.1080/07448481.2012.753892

Hamilton, R., Scott, D., LaChapelle, D., & O'Sullivan, L. (2016). Applying social cognitive

theory to predict hazing perpetration in university athletics. *Journal of Sport Behavior,

39*(3), 255-256. Retrieved from http://www.southalabama.edu/psychology/journal.htm

Harford, T. C., Wechsler, H., & Seibring, M. (2002). Attendance and alcohol use at parties and bars in college A national survey of current drinkers. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol,* 726-733.

Hennessy, E. A., Tanner-Smith, E. E., Mavridis, D., & Grant, S. P. (2019). Comparative effectiveness of brief alcohol interventions for college students: Results from a network meta-analysis. *Prevention Science, 20*(5), 715-740. doi:10.1007/s11121-018-0960-z

Hoover, N. C., & Pollard, N. J. (1999). *Initiation rites and athletics: A national survey of NCAA sports teams.* 1-42.

Hoover, N. C., & Pollard, N. J. (2000). *Initiation rites in American high schools: A national survey.*

Huchting, K., Lac, A., & LaBrie, J. W. (2008). An application of the theory of planned behavior to sorority alcohol consumption. *Addictive Behaviors, 33*(4), 538-551. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.11.002

Huchting, K. K., Lac, A., Hummer, J. F., & LaBrie, J. W. (2011). Comparing Greek-affiliated students and student-athletes: An examination of the behavior-intention link, reasons for drinking, and alcohol-related consequences. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 55*(3), 61-81. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25698846

Hummer, J. F., LaBrie, J. W., Lac, A., Sessoms, A., & Cail, J. (2012). Estimates and influences of reflective opposite-sex norms on alcohol use among a high-risk sample of college

students: Exploring Greek-affiliation and gender effects. *Addictive Behaviors, 37*(5), 596-604. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.11.027

Humphrey, S. E., & Kahn, A. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape the importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1314-1322.

Iwamoto, D. K., & Smiler, A. P. (2013). Alcohol makes you macho and helps you make friends: The role of masculine norms and peer pressure in adolescent boys' and girls' alcohol use. *Substance use & Misuse, 48*(5), 371-378. doi:10.3109/10826084.2013.765479

Iwamoto, D. K., Cheng, A., Lee, C. S., Takamatsu, S., & Gordon, D. (2011). "Man-ing" up and getting drunk: The role of masculine norms, alcohol intoxication, and alcohol-related problems among college men. *Addictive Behaviors, 36*(9), 906-911. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.04.005

Iwamoto, D. K., Corbin, W., Lejuez, C., & MacPherson, L. (2014). College men and alcohol use: Positive alcohol expectancies as a mediator between distinct masculine norms and alcohol use. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(1), 29-39. doi:10.1037/a0031594

Johnson, J. (2011). Through the liminal: A comparative analysis of communitas and rites of passage in sports hazing and initiations. *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 36*(3), 199-227.

Juhnke, G. A., Schroat, D. A., Cashwell, C. S., & Gmutza, B. M. (2003). A preliminary investigation of college students' alcohol consumption at two universities with limited Greek systems. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling, 24*

Keating, C. F., Pomerantz, J., Pommer, S. D., Ritt, S. J. H., Miller, L. M., & McCormick, J. (2005). Going to college and unpacking hazing. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 9*(2), 104-126. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.9.2.104

Killos, L. F., & Keller, A. (2012). Hiding in plain sight: Low-risk drinkers in the Greek system . *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(6), 846-850. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0084

Kowalski, C., & Waldron, J. (2010). Looking the other way: Athletes' perceptions of coaches' responses to hazing. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 5*(1), 87-100. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.5.1.87

Kuh, G. D., & Arnold, J. C. (1993). Liquid bonding: A cultural analysis of the role of alcohol in fraternity pledgeship. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(5), 327. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1295115198

LaBrie, J. W., Hummer, J. F., Neighbors, C., & Pedersen, E. R. (2008). Live interactive group-specific normative feedback reduces misperceptions and drinking in college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 22*(1), 141-148. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.22.1.141

LaBrie, J. W., Hummer, J., Kenney, S., Lac, A., & Pedersen, E. (2011). Identifying factors that increase the likelihood of alcohol-induced blackouts in the Pre-partying context. *Substance use & Misuse, 46*(8), 992-1002. doi:10.3109/10826084.2010.542229

Lafferty, M., & Wakefield, C. (2018). Becoming part of the team: Female student-athletes'

    engagement in initiation activities. *The Sport Psychologist, 32*(2), 125-135.

    doi:10.1123/TSP.2016-0115

Langford, L. (2008). *A comprehensive approach to hazing prevention in higher education*

    settings

Larimer, M. E., Anderson, B. K., Baer, J. S., & Marlatt, G. A. (2000). An individual in context:

    Predictors of alcohol use and drinking problems among Greek and residence hall students.

    Journal of Substance Abuse, 11(1), 53-68. doi:10.1016/S0899-3289(99)00020-6

Larimer, M. E., Turner, A. P., Anderson, B. K., Fader, J. S., Kilmer, J. R., Palmer, R. S., &

    Cronce, J. M. (2001). Evaluating a brief alcohol intervention with fraternities. *Journal of*

    Studies on Alcohol, 62(3), 370-380. doi:10.15288/jsa.2001.62.370

Larimer, M. E., Turner, A. P., Mallett, K. A., & Geisner, I. M. (2004). Predicting drinking

    behavior and alcohol-related problems among fraternity and sorority members. *Psychology*

    of Addictive Behaviors, 18(3), 203-212. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.18.3.203

Litt, D. M., Stock, M. L., & Lewis, M. A. (2012). Drinking to fit in: Examining the need to

    belong as a moderator of perceptions of best friends' alcohol use and related risk cognitions

    among college students. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 34*(4), 313-321.

    doi:10.1080/01973533.2012.693357

Loh, C., Gidycz, C. A., Lobo, T. R., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual

assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(10), 1325-1348.

doi:10.1177/0886260505278528

Madson, M. B., Arnau, R. C., & Lambert, S. J. (2013). Development and psychometric

evaluation of the revised protective behavioral strategies scale. *Psychological Assessment,*

25(2), 556-567. doi:10.1037/a0031788

Maggs, J. L., Williams, L. R., & Lee, C. M. (2011). Ups and downs of alcohol use among first-

year college students: Number of drinks, heavy drinking, and stumble and pass out drinking

days. *Addictive Behaviors, 36*(3), 197-202. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.10.005

Martinez, H. S., Klanecky, A. K., & McChargue, D. E. (2018). Problem drinking among at-risk

college students: The examination of Greek involvement, freshman status, and history of

mental health problems. *Journal of American College Health, 66*(7), 579-587.

doi:10.1080/07448481.2018.1432625

Martinez, J. A., Johnson, D. N., & Jones, J. A. (2015). A cocktail of extracurricular activities

(ECAs): Different ECA combinations and their association with heavy drinking in two

college cohorts. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(4), 392-396. Retrieved from

https://muse.jhu.edu/article/582174

Massey, K. D., & Massey, J. (2017). It happens, just not to me: Hazing on a Canadian university

campus. *Journal of College and Character, 18*(1), 46-63.

doi:10.1080/2194587X.2016.1260477

Maya-Jariego, I., & Holgado, D. (2019). Community interventions. In L. A. Jason, O. Glantsman, J. F. O'Brien & K. N. Ramian (Eds.), *Introduction to community psychology*

McCabe, B. E., Lee, D. L., & Viray, T. (2019). Does ethnicity moderate the link between drinking norms and binge drinking in college students? *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 17*(3), 493-501. doi:10.1007/s11469-018-0036-0

McCabe, S. E., Schulenberg, J. E., Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Kloska, D. D. (2005). Selection and socialization effects of fraternities and sororities on U.S. college student substance use: A multi-cohort national longitudinal study. *Addiction (Abingdon, England), 100*(4), 512-524. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005. 01038.x

McCready, A. M. (2018). *Relationships among fraternity chapter masculine norms, organizational socialization, and the problematic behaviors of fraternity men.* Available from Social Science Premium Collection. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/2031540662

McCready, A. M. (2019a). Fraternity chapter masculine norm climates as predictors of social dominance hazing motivations. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice,* 1-14. doi:10.1080/19496591.2019.1669455

McCready, A. M. (2019b). Relationships between collective fraternity chapter masculine norm climates and the alcohol consumption of fraternity men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 20*(4), 478-490. doi:10.1037/men0000180

McCreary, G. R. (2012). *The impact of moral judgment and moral disengagement on hazing attitudes and bystander behavior in college males* Available from ProQuest Central Student. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1101273405

McGinley, M., Rospenda, K. M., Liu, L., & Richman, J. A. (2016). It isn't all just fun and games: Collegiate participation in extracurricular activities and risk for generalized and sexual harassment, psychological distress, and alcohol use. *Journal of Adolescence, 53*, 152-163. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.10.001

Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 65*(1), 37-45. doi:10.15288/jsa.2004.65.37

Montague, D. R., Zohra, I. T., Love, S. L., McGee, D. K., & Tsamis, V. J. (2008). Hazing typologies: Those who criminally haze and those who receive criminal hazing. *Victims & Offenders: Controversial and Critical Issues with Crime Victims, 3*(2-3), 258-274. doi:10.1080/15564880802034943

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Drinking levels defined. Retrieved from https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/alcohol-health/overview-alcohol-consumption/moderate-binge-drinking

National Interfraternity Conference. About interfraternity Council (IFC). Retrieved from

    https://nicfraternity.org/about-interfraternity-council-ifc/

National Interfraternity Conference. (2020). Benefits. Retrieved from

    https://myfraternitylife.org/benefits/

National Panhellenic Conference. About the national panhellenic conference. Retrieved from

    https://www.npcwomen.org/about/

National Pan-Hellenic Council. About the NPHC

    . Retrieved from https://nphchq.com/millennium1/about/

Nguyen, N., Walters, S. T., Wyatt, T. M., & DeJong, W. (2011). Use and correlates of protective

    drinking behaviors during the transition to college: Analysis of a national sample. *Addictive*

    Behaviors, 36(10), 1008-1014. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.06.002

Nguyen, N., Walters, S. T., Wyatt, T. M., & DeJong, W. (2013). Do college drinkers learn from

    their mistakes? Effects of recent alcohol-related consequences on planned protective

    drinking strategies among college freshmen. *Substance use & Misuse, 48*(14), 1463-1468.

    doi:10.3109/10826084.2013.778278

Nuwer, H. (2020). Hazing deaths database. Retrieved from http://www.hanknuwer.com/

Owen, S. S., Burke, T. W., & Vichesky, D. (2008). Hazing in student organizations: Prevalence,

    attitudes, and solutions. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity*

    Advisors, 3(1), 40-58.

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2011). An abbreviated tool for assessing conformity to masculine

norms: Psychometric properties of the conformity to masculine norms inventory-46.

Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12(4), 339-353. doi:10.1037/a0021904

Park, A., Sher, K. J., & Krull, J. L. (2006). Individual differences in the "Greek effect" on risky

drinking. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 20*(1), 85-90. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.20.1.85

Park, A., Sher, K. J., & Krull, J. L. (2008). Risky drinking in college changes as

fraternity/sorority affiliation changes. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 22*(2), 219-229.

doi:10.1037/0893-164X.22.2.219

Park, A., Sher, K. J., & Krull, J. L. (2009). Selection and socialization of risky drinking during

the college transition. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 23*(3), 404-414.

doi:10.1037/a0016293

Park, A., Sher, K. J., Wood, P. K., & Krull, J. L. (2009). Dual mechanisms underlying

accentuation of risky drinking via fraternity/sorority affiliation. *Journal of Abnormal

Psychology, 118*(2), 241-255. doi:10.1037/a0015126

Parks, G. S., & Spangenburg, S. J. (2019). Hazing is "White" sororities: Explanations at the

organizational level.

Retrieved from

https://heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals/haswo&collection=journals

Paschall, M., & Saltz, R. (2007). Relationships between college settings and student alcohol use

    before, during, and after events: A multi-level study. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 26*(6), 635-

    644. doi:10.1080/09595230701613601

Pedersen, D. E., & Feroni, S. (2018). A quantitative exploration of alcohol-related regret among

    undergraduate students. *American Journal of Health Education, 49*(6), 335-340.

    doi:10.1080/19325037.2018.1516168

Pershing, J. L. (2006). Men and women's experiences with hazing in a male-dominated elite

    military institution. *Men and Masculinities, 8*(4), 470-492. doi:10.1177/1097184X05277411

Phua, J. (2011). The influence of peer norms and popularity on smoking and drinking behavior

    among college fraternity members: A social network analysis. *Social Influence, 6*(3), 153-

    168. doi:10.1080/15534510.2011.584445

Pike, G. R. (2003). Membership in a fraternity or sorority, student engagement, and educational

    outcomes at AAU public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development,*

    44(3), 369-382. doi:10.1353/csd.2003.0031

Plucker, J. A., & Teed, C. M. (2004). Evaluation of an alternative methodology for investigating

    leadership and binge drinking among sorority members. *Addictive Behaviors, 29*(2), 381-

    388. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2003.08.030

Ragsdale, K., Porter, J. R., Mathews, R., White, A., Gore-Felton, C., & McGarvey, E. L. (2012).

    "Liquor before beer, you're in the clear": Binge drinking and other risk behaviors among

fraternity/sorority members and their non-Greek peers. *Journal of Substance Use, 17*(4), 323-339. doi:10.3109/14659891.2011.583312

Read, J. P., Merrill, J. E., & Bytschkow, K. (2010). Before the party starts: Risk factors and reasons for "Pregaming" in college students. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(5), 461-472. doi:10.1080/07448480903540523

Reid, G. M., Holt, M. K., Felix, E. D., & Greif Green, J. (2019). Perceived consequences of hazing exposure during the first year of college: Associations with childhood victimization. *Journal of American College Health, 67*(5), 402-409. doi:10.1080/07448481.2018.1484363

Reilly, K. (2017, 'Those families are changed forever.' A deadly year in fraternity hazing comes to a close. *Time Magazine,* Retrieved from https://time.com/5071813/fraternity-hazing-deaths-2017/

Richardson, B. K., Rains, S., & Hall-Ortega, C. (2019). Joining in, blowing the whistle, or intervening: Examining the effects of severity and organizational identification on fraternity/sorority members' responses to hazing. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 14*(2), 20-38.

Richardson, B. K., Wang, Z., & Hall, C. A. (2012). Blowing the whistle against Greek hazing: The theory of reasoned action as a framework for reporting intentions. *Communication Studies, 63*(2), 172-193. doi:10.1080/10510974.2011.624396

Richardson, D. C. (2014). *University officials' perceptions about felony hazing laws.* Available

from ProQuest Central Student. Retrieved from

https://search.proquest.com/docview/1667768844

Robbins, G., & Winkley, L. (2020). After freshman's death, San Diego State cracks down on

fraternities and sororities. *The Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved from

https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-01-25/after-freshmans-death-san-diego-

state-cracks-down-on-fraternities-and-sororities

Roosevelt, R. W. (2018). De-conflating buffoonery and hazing: A two- factor model of

understanding maladaptive new member activities. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the*

Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 13(1), 16-31.

Salinas, C., & Boettcher, M. (2018). A document analysis of anti-hazing policy. *Oracle: The*

Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors 13(1), 32-50.

Saltz, R. F., Paschall, M. J., McGaffigan, R. P., & Nygaard, P. M. O. (2010). Alcohol risk

management in college settings: The safer California universities randomized trial.

American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 39(6), 491-499. doi:

10.1016/j.amepre.2010.08.020

Scott-Sheldon, L., Scott-Sheldon, L., Carey, K., Carey, K., Carey, M., & Carey, M. (2008).

Health behavior and college students: Does Greek affiliation matter? *Journal of Behavioral*

Medicine, 31(1), 61-70. doi:10.1007/s10865-007-9136-1

Silveira, J. M., & Hudson, M. W. (2015). Hazing in the college marching band. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 63*(1), 5-27. doi:10.1177/0022429415569064

Soule, E. K., Barnett, T. E., & Moorhouse, M. D. (2015). Protective behavioral strategies and negative alcohol-related consequences among U.S. college fraternity and sorority members. *Journal of Substance Use, 20*(1), 16-21. doi:10.3109/14659891.2013.858783

Spradley, J. P. (2016). *The ethnographic interview.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Strawhun, J. M. (2016). *Psychological factors that underlie hazing perceptions: A mixed-methods study.* Available from Dissertation Abstracts International. Retrieved from http://www.pqdtcn.com/thesisDetails/01EF0FE69C35743EBF450C60C54153B3

Sweeney, B. (2014). Party animals or responsible men: Social class, race, and masculinity on campus. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(6), 804-821. doi:10.1080/09518398.2014.901578

Sweet, S. (1999). Understanding fraternity hazing: Insights from symbolic interactionist theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 355. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1416093344

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2020a). *Binge drinking*

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2020b). *College drinking*. Piscataway, NJ: Alcohol Research Documentation. Retrieved from http://digitool.hbz-

nrw.de:1801/webclient/DeliveryManager?pid=3101492&custom%5Fatt%5F2=simple%5Fv
iewer

Tingley, K., Crumb, L., Hoover-Plonk, S., Hill, W., & Chamber, C. R. (2018). Sorority and

fraternity attitudes towards initiation and hazing. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the*

Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 13(2), 46-60.

Tokar, K., & Stewart, C. (2010). Defining high school hazing: Control through clarity. *The*

Physical Educator, 67(4), 204. Retrieved from

https://search.proquest.com/docview/847122862

Trockel, M., Wall, A., Williams, S. S., & Reis, J. (2008). When the party for some becomes a

problem for others: The effect of perceived secondhand consequences of drinking behavior

on drinking norms. *The Journal of Psychology, 142*(1), 57-69. doi:10.3200/JRLP.142.1.57-

70

Tyler, K. A., Schmitz, R. M., Adams, S. A., & Simons, L. G. (2017). Social factors, alcohol

expectancy, and drinking behavior: A comparison of two college campuses. *Journal of*

Substance Use, 22(4), 357-364. doi:10.1080/14659891.2016.1223762

Voloshyna, D. M., Bonar, E. E., Cunningham, R. M., Ilgen, M. A., Blow, F. C., & Walton, M. A.

(2018). Blackouts among male and female youth seeking emergency department care. *The*

American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 44(1), 129-139.

doi:10.1080/00952990.2016.1265975

Voogt, C. V., Poelen, E. A. P., Kleinja, M., Lemmers, Lex A. C. J., & Engels, Rutger C. M. E.

    (2013). The effectiveness of the 'What do you drink' web-based brief alcohol intervention in

    reducing heavy drinking among students: A two-arm parallel-group randomized controlled

    trial. *Alcohol and Alcoholism, 48*(3), 312-321. Retrieved from

    http://lib.cqvip.com/qk/71860X/201501/672372633.html

Waldron, J. J. (2012). A social norms approach to hazing prevention workshops. *Journal of*

    Sport Psychology in Action, 3(1), 12-20. doi:10.1080/21520704.2011.639854

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., & Kowalski, C. L. (2009). Crossing the line. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*

    Sport, 80(2), 291-302. doi:10.1080/02701367.2009.10599564

Waldron, J. J., Lynn, Q., & Krane, V. (2011). Duct tape, icy hot & paddles: Narratives of

    initiation onto U.S. male sports teams. *Sport, Education, and Society, 16*(1), 111-125.

    doi:10.1080/13573322.2011.531965

Wall, A. F. (2007). Evaluating a health education website: The case of Alcohol Edu. *NASPA*

    Journal, 44(4), 692-714. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1864

Wechsler, H., Dowdall, G. W., Davenport, A., & Castillo, S. (1995). Correlates of college

    student binge drinking. *The American Journal of Public Health, 87*(7). Retrieved from

    http://content.ub.hu-berlin.de/monographs/toc/ethnologie/BV013554916.pdf

Wells, S., Flynn, A., Tremblay, P. F., Dumas, T., Miller, P., & Graham, K. (2014). Linking

    masculinity to negative drinking consequences: The mediating roles of heavy episodic

    drinking and alcohol expectancies. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 75*(3), 510-

    519. doi:10.15288/jsad.2014.75.510

Willis, E., Adams, R., & Keene, J. (2019). If everyone is doing it, it must be safe: College

    students' development of attitudes toward poly-substance use. *Substance use & Misuse,*

    54(11), 1886-1893. doi:10.1080/10826084.2019.1618334

Wolfson, M., Champion, H., McCoy, T. P., Rhodes, S. D., Ip, E. H., Blocker, J. N, DuRant, R.

    H. (2012). Impact of a randomized campus/community trial to prevent High-Risk drinking

    among college students. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 36*(10), 1767-

    1778. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012. 01786.x

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.).

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, A. M., Morales, M., McCabe, S. E., Boyd, C. J., & D'arcy, H. (2005). Drinking like a

    guy: Frequent binge drinking among undergraduate women. *Substance use & Misuse, 40*(2),

    241-267. doi:10.1081/JA-200048464

Zakletskaia, L., Wilson, E., & Fleming, M. F. (2010). Alcohol use in students seeking primary

    care treatment at university health services. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(3),

    217-223. doi:10.1080/07448481.2010.502413

Zamboanga, B. L., Borsari, B., Ham, L. S., Olthuis, J. V., Van Tyne, K., & Casner, H. G. (2011).

    Pregaming in high school students: Relevance to risky drinking practices, alcohol

    cognitions, and the social drinking context. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 25*(2), 340-

    345. doi:10.1037/a0022252

Zamudio-Suaréz, F. (2017). What happened after three universities suspended Greek Life.

    The Chronicle of Higher Education,