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Abstract
Not a year goes by that we don’t hear of another hazing scandal in a higher education institution. Many researchers took interest in this issue in order to understand its causes and consequences. They provided definitions and lead to prevent it. We found hazing in many social groups around the world, with different names, and under specific forms. This paper aims to better understand hazing and its actors, with a specific focus on hazing in higher education. We presented three definitions to offer several perspectives on hazing, and facilitate its apprehension. Our method was to analyze the relevant scientific literature with the intention of reflecting on its roots and representation among individuals. Results are an exposition of motivations from hazing’s actors, recommendations about how to define it and how to prevent derivations. Our main conclusions assume hazing is usually depicted as a deviant behavior, but it would appear to be a norm. Also, its core purpose would be the progression from newcomer to a group member. A lack of structure or meaning could lead to its misuse and facilitate outrageous events. In higher education, hazing seems to be used as a tool to integrate freshmen in their new institutional world. Scandals including violence, sexual and alcohol abuse could be a symptom of something deeper from hazing’s environment.

Keywords: Hazing, Higher education, Group Peers
Introduction

Hazing is a complex set of behaviors taking place during the integration process of newcomers in a coalitional group. Cimino (2013) defined the latter as a group where member generations overlap, have a past, and are expected to engage in cooperative actions for a long period of time. Several definitions relate to hazing. We present here three highlighted in the literature and which permit us to approach hazing with more than one point of view. The selection criteria were the size of samples of the studies and the purport of inclusivity in the definitions. In her national investigation on initiation rites in the national college athletics association in United States, Hoover (1999) attempted to make a distinction between initiations rites and hazing. The researcher defined hazing as: “any activity expected of someone joining a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses or endangers, regardless of the person’s willingness to participate. This does not include activities such as rookies carrying the balls, team parties with community games, or going out with your teammates, unless an atmosphere of humiliation, degradation, abuse or danger arises”. This definition included several dimensions such as: what is expected from the individual trying to integrate the group, the abuse or danger that comes along, and the (un)willingness of the individual to participate. It also raises the challenge to establish the end of the initiation rite and the beginning of hazing. Later, Allan and Madden (2008) cropped Hoover’s (1999) definition in their national survey on student’s hazing. In their proposal they avoided repetition and, we think, gained in definition inclusivity. According to those authors, more than half the population in higher education reported hazing experiences. These results suggest hazing should not be considered as a trivial matter. Other researchers gave definitions to the phenomenon. One of them was Nuwer (2001, quoted by Dias and Sá, 2012). He stated it as “an activity that a high-status member orders other members to engage in or suggests that they engage in in some way humbles a newcomer who lacks the power to resist, because he or she wants to gain admission into a group”. These two definitions partly meet. However, Nuwer included additional notions in his definition, such as the status of the person involved, and the authority relationship shared between newcomers and high-status members of the group. Cimino (2011) attempted to define hazing as “the generation of induction costs (i.e., part of the experiences necessary to be acknowledged as a “legitimate” group member) that appear unattributable to group-relevant assessments, preparations, or chance”. This definition seemed to us to be the most inclusive one as it could be used in many hazing contexts. Nevertheless, this

1 This investigation took place in the United States of America.
2 This investigation took place in the United States of America.
definition considered hazing only when activities are non-relevant to the group's field. This assumption is a debatable topic. Hazing practices may vary and, depending on the group, could stand from personal servitude to sexual humiliation, including callisthenic exercises and binge drinking (Waldron, and Kowalski, 2009; Cimino, 2013; Mikell, 2014).

Most of these definitions were set against hazing. Hoover (1999), Allan and Madden (2008) even included advice to prevent it. This position against hazing makes sense, since we cannot go through half a decade without another scandal or death from hazing practices (Hollmann, 2002). Nevertheless, another strand of the literature tends to be less against hazing, and also compares it to ritual initiation (Dias and Sá, 2012; Frias, 2002). Hazing seems to fit Van Gennep's (1924) definition of ritual initiation in three phases, separation, marginalization, and aggregation.

A part of the literature has been focusing on the devastating effects of hazing on hazees. For instance, Castaldelli-Maia, Martins, Bhugra, Machado, Guerra de Andrade, Alexandrino-Silva, Baldassin, and Côrrea de Toledo Ferraz Alves (2012) found that cues of depression increase among medical student hazees. Another wave has been centered on the group's adaptive dynamic (Tooby, Cosmides, and Price, 2006). In the same trend, Cimino (2013) understanding is to consider it as an adaptive mechanism aimed to ensure group survival.

Hazing is encountered in many parts of the world (Dias and Sá, 2013) and organizations, and is known under several terms. Each region and group has its own specificities but the main hazing dynamic remains the same, namely abusing the newcomers. Therefore, we assumed hazing from different groups and areas was comparable to some extent. Literature recorded hazing in many socialization groups, such as work place (Josefowitz and Gadon, 1989), primary and secondary school, higher education (Allan and Madden, 2008), and athletic groups (Johnson, 2011). Dias and Sá (2012) formulated a non-exhaustive list of the terms used to designate it in several languages. In this list we could find the following: ragging, fagging, fooling, bastardisation, badness, baptême, doop, bizutage, ontgroening, mopokaste, iesvētības, novatada or rahnong. It could be added praxe from continental Portuguese and trote from Brazilian Portugese. These words are often used to refer at thematics such as religion, naïvety, status, and initiation. However, the practice is way older than its wording. In fact, hazing could be as far back in history as the first coalitional groups (Delton and Cimino, 2013).

We also took interest in hazing's representation. We hear from hazing mostly when it goes wrong and gets highly publicized (Cokley, Miller,
Cunningham, Motoike, King, and Awad, 2001). Hazing would be the visible part of a larger set of the group's activities (Frias, 2002). It could be interesting to look at hazing practices and processes without preconceived ideas. According to Cimino (2013), while studying introduction of a hypothetic hazing situation, 84%⁴ of participants from a representative sample of the population chose to haze at least a little.

This article focused on hazing in higher education. We described it and tried to integrate various perspectives on the topic. We emphasised by looking at the newcomer, the veteran, the group, and hazing's consequences for each of these instances. Finally, we discussed limits of our work and scientific literature.

**Newcomer**

Many reasons may explain newcomers' will to enter in a group. Along with the access of resources, protection (Cimino, 2013), and status (Johnson, 2011), one's needs to belong can be high (Baumeister and Leary, 1995). In his attempt to integrate the group, an individual could accept to achieve exhausting tasks to prove his commitment to the group (Cimino, 2013a), and feel pride through his ordeal achievement (Dias & Sá, 2013). Among youth, a will to enter rituals when integrating a group has been reported (Johnson, 2011). This will could be related to a lack of ritual initiation in our modern societies, their trend to emerge among groups⁵. Nowadays, without rituals of transition to mark each stage of life, it can be complex to define when adolescence ends and when adulthood starts. Dias and Sá (2012) hypothesized that hazing in higher education could assume this role. The same authors recorded that most of freshmen perceived hazing as some sort of obligation, specifically when entering the university world. Aside from brutal accident, violent behavior, and death, hazing reported as well some devastating effects on an individual's wellbeing and self-esteem (Mikell, 2014; Castaldelli-Maia et al., 2012). On the other hand, according to Dias and Sá, (2012) hazing could act as a catalyst to identity building, and ignite affiliation towards the group. The newcomer would conform himself to what appears to being the prototypical group member⁶ in order to reduce the stress of being a stranger to the university world (Dias and Sá, 2012).

Furthermore, hazees tended to label hazing as a positive experience and link it with feelings of enjoyment and pride (Dias and Sá, 2013), which could be to a cognitive dissonance. According to Festinger (1957, quoted by
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⁴ This investigation took place in the United States of America.
⁵ See available online: http://tigger.uic.edu/~huk/Gang%20History/fightingfire.html
⁶ See Burke and Stets, no date. Retrieved from: http://wat2146.ucr.edu/papers/00a-alt.pdf
Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones, 2007), when an individual holds elements of knowledge relevant but inconsistent to each other, it would induce a state of mental discomfort. The mind would then rationalize in order to avoid this discomfort. Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones (2007) listed three subcategories of cognitive dissonance that could explain in different ways what happens in a hazee's mind when facing hazing.

In the first place, the induced compliance (Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones, 2007). Following Festinger and Carlsmith (1959), dissonance occurs when an individual acts not accordingly to his thoughts. In a hazee's case, it would drive the newcomer to consider ordeals as less painful than they might seem. In the case of higher education the goal of a newcomer is the membership. We assume the hazee keeps on in order to obtain access to the benefits of being a legit group member. Because the hazee followed petty commands and coped with anxiety during the short integrative period, he could be tempted to consider this period to be less horrible, as he has been awarded for it. In terms of time, hazing period may vary from an organization to another. According to Cimino (2013a), it could be spread from weeks to years. In higher education, hazing is based on the institution's calendar. Thus, it would be fair to assume hazing ends before students need to focus for exams. Or, whether hazing is in several stages, the first part at least would end before the exams period. Induced compliance could explain why hazees tended to understate negative aspects of hazing.

The second subcategory is the effort justification (Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones, 2007). Aronson and Mills (1958) suggested that the individual tends to give more value to a reward when it has been difficult to get. It is probably the reason for a recently joined member to value greatly his new status. If a hazee feels he dedicated a lot of time and furnished serious effort in order to obtain his membership, it is logical he tends to value it more. It seems common sense to assume that hazing would differ among organizations. Indeed, according to Frias (1998b, quoted by Frias, 2002), the number of hazing groups in higher education tended to grow. This caused them to differentiate themselves from one another in order to keep their original identity. Some hazing group are known to be harsher than others. From Walker’s (1968, quoted by Cimino's 2013a) work, it appears that it would be directly in relation to the group's prestige. The more prestigious they are, the more difficult they are to integrate. This information could contribute to the effort justification point, even if counter examples exist, such as Lodewijks and Syroit's (1997), where the severity of hazing was positively linked to a feeling of loneliness, depressed mood and decrease of group liking among hazees. The effort justification could explain hazees' trend to describe hazing as positive and enjoyable.

The third subcategory Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones (2007) listed
was the free choice paradigm. According to Brehm (1956), when individuals were given a choice with similar outcomes, they tended to give higher rates to the outcome they had chosen, afterward. These results suggested that if a hazee stopped or never started the hazing period, he would tend to speak against the phenomenon. There is a lack of scientific work on this matter in the higher education hazing context.

Furthermore, the Stockholm syndrome could explain why a hazing’s victim is eager to bond with his tormentor after becoming a legit group member. According to Baron (2001), in a coercive situation, individuals tend to identify and rely on any strong authority figure. The proposal of a hazee getting emotionally linked to his hazer makes sense. Especially if the hazer fits the prototype group member, since when depersonalization occurs in a group, an individual tends to behave as the salient group prototype. Plus, according to Schachter (1959, quoted by Ellsworth, 2004), in a stressful situation, an individual often seeks the company of others. It is likely that the hazee would bind ties with his companions who have gone through the same ordeal. Since veterans were once newcomers, and veterans always remind newcomer hazing is not personal (Cimino, 2013a), it is slightly possible that after getting their memberships, individuals feel closer to their former tormentors. Some other confusing and stressful situations with strong authority figures met similar ends. As an example we could point the training of a pet, or even the relationship between parents and their children. Indeed, as stated by Keating, Pomerantz, Pommer, Ritt, Miller, McCormick (2005), when punishment and reward come from the same source, it facilitates social dependency. The authors gave examples, such as situations where fear and relief are involved, which tends to promote social compliance from the target (Dolinski, Ciszek, Godlewski, and Zawadzki, 2002), and to enhance conformity, because acceptance relieves from distress (Galanter, 1999).

From another perspective, the situation might explain the fact that a newcomer does not act against hazing practices. We know that in any given situation, social cues are crucial for an individual’s behavior (Conger, Conger, Costanzo, Wright, and Matter, 1980). During a hazing activity, not noticing any rebellions from their social environment could induce a passive behavior among newcomers. Further, in the context of higher education, the newcomer does not only face a group but the history and traditions of said group (Ellsworth, 2004). If we refer to authority theories, the status of veteran and the – sometimes long – story of a group may cause compliance within the newcomer. Previous researches such as Milgram’s (1974) remind us how eager to obey humans can be. As a reminder, Milgram proved that
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7 See Burke and Stets, no date. Retrieved from: http://wat2146.ucr.edu/papers/00a-alt.pdf
under certain circumstances, most humans would comply with authority. In his settings, he was able to conduct several individuals to – falsely – electroshock innocent people. The importance of the situation appears then, highly relevant.

Veteran

After a certain amount of time, a group member will become a veteran. It seems logical that this status would be acquired through time and experience. In the context of higher education, the system sounds mostly based on time and will. For instance, in the Portuguese *praxe*, a member could become an initiator only on his third year (Frias, 1998). An individual's motivation to haze could come from various sources. According to Price, Cosmides, and Tooby (2002), group members have a punitive sentiment toward free riders in order to protect the group's interest. It meets Delton and Cimino's idea (2013), which suggested humans have adapted in a way that they have a concept of newcomers. It means they would perceive them differently than a fellow member, and treat them differently as well. Probably to ensure they are there to benefit the group and not to exploit it (Buss and Duntley, 2008).

In the context of higher education, a significant difference between group member and non-group member concerns authoritarianism (Drout and Corsoro, 2003). Hence, we could refer to Haney, Banks, and Zimbardo's prison experiment (1973), which reported that under certain conditions, humans tend to behave following their role. In their experiment, half of the participants assumed the role of fictional prison wardens, and the other half were fictional inmates. After a while, the fictional wardens started to behave dreadfully against the fictional inmates. We postulate that while the veteran performs the role of hazer, he feels he should act as one. This would imply that his representative prototype of hazer has, as principal features, to incline to abuse of his authority and, to some extent, to sadistic behavior. Another explanation could be that regardless of the prototype of hazer, when an individual has a position of power, he tends to behave sadistically. In the same line, Castaldelli-Maia et al. (2012) reported that hazing tends to become worse each year. An explanation could come from the work of Bandura, Underwood, and Fromson (1975). They gave individuals the opportunity to behave punitively against humanized, neutral or dehumanized groups, under diffused of personalized responsibility for their actions. Results were that individuals tended to act more aggressively against dehumanized groups, and when their responsibility was diffused. This fits the situation of hazing in higher education, where hazers act as a group and hazees are dehumanized through degrading name-calling and behaviors. Darley and Latané (1968) showed that individuals take more time to assist
someone in need when other observers are present. This could explain why hazers do not stop each other when one of them misbehave, leading sometimes to injuries or even death.

Higher education hazing could be a specific case of event, because the current hazer was until recently still a hazee. The work of Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1963) could provide hindsight. The researchers demonstrated that violence tended to be imitated by children, if they witnessed an adult performing it. Hazing in higher education is away from their paradigm. However, we could remodel it by looking at the hazer as being an authority figure or role model. Plus, in the same line, according to Baron (2001), in a situation of coercion, individuals could tend to identify and seek to rely on authority figures. Thus, if the hazer lived as a victim of hazing and then was the witness of several hazing periods, he could repeat the schemes as he is assuming the hazer role. The hazer could be traumatized by some hazing episode. The former hazee could find a cathartic opportunity once he becomes a hazer (Johnson, 2011). He would then express his former repressed feeling against his own former hazer and let it out on current hazees. A trend illustrated with Tolentino’s poem (1895): “I suffered insults and wrong turns, I kept everything handwritten, and over the next novices, I trumped with usury”

Another idea was the apparent will from the hazer to conform the hazee (Klerk, 2013). And this, despite the fact that a new member could have a beneficial impact on the group and stimulate creativity (Rink, Kane, Ellemers and van der Vegt, 2013). This phenomenon could emerge from various origins. Perhaps it is a side effect of the selection which occurs when individuals try to integrate a group. While trying to assess potential new members, the hazer would reject the deviant from his norm, without realizing it. In this context, the killer of non-normal could be tradition (Ferraz de Siqueira, Gondin da Fonseca, Bastos de Sá, and Moreira Lima, 2012), and its lowly questioned discourse. On the other hand, it appears that hazing takes its inspiration and originality from its direct environment. According to Frias (2002), higher education group tended to use academic symbols such as discipline and hierarchy, and aimed to mock them in an irreligious way. If it is true, it could be a lead to inspire new values in hazing group, in order to avoid injuries and deaths.

Group

According to Cimino (2013), as long as it is wealthy, a group will tend to grow. Logically, it could either produce members from the inside, or acquire them from the outside. In the context of higher education, the second
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8 Translated from Portuguese.
modality prevails. Hence, several generations of members overlap in a coactional group. The group would need new committed members to attend to its needs, and it would try to select among the prospective newcomers by hazing them. Traditionally, in higher education, the bidding period on hazees starts at the academic year. And, as previously stated, bears various time lengths. This fact makes the higher education hazing group some sort of particular case. For any coactional group, it would be logical to wait for the need to arise in order to organize some kind of recruitment, where hazing would take place. In higher education, time is controlled by the academic year calendar and groups need to fit their integration process in this period, whether they need new members or not. This could explain some deviant behaviors, because there would be many newcomers at once, with limited initiators to handle them. Time pressure would lead to mistake, accident, and misbehavior through lack of control from the group peers.

According to Buss and Duntley (2008), humans tended to harvest resources by three great strategies: individually, cooperatively, and exploitatively. The first strategy appeared to be the riskiest one, and the second one seemed to be the most widely used by humanity. However, the last one illustrated the humans' will to avoid being exploited, while trying to exploit others. One could even argue that cooperation and exploitation are the same strategy, only unbalanced. In the specific context of higher education, main resources the group could offer are network and status (Dias and Sá, 2012), while allowing the newcomer to enter an entity with rich history and tradition (Honecutt, 2005; Frias, 2002). The first one can be achieved without the group's help, and the second does not motivate everyone. Thus, it could mean there is something more, known only by group members. This last argument seems weak. According to Hoover and Milner (1998), farther than tradition, hazing binds through shared and secretive experiences. Then, perhaps the newly created intimacy among hazees, that knits the group together, would be more relevant than the group history, or entry facts.

Before treating the third point, the history and tradition, it seems important to remind Van Gennep's (1924) three phases of the ritual initiation: separation, marginalization, and aggregation. During the first step, the newcomer is isolated from the rest of the world, sometimes physically (Essex, 2014). The aim is to draw symbolic separation from his former state (Van Gennep, 1924). In the marginalization step, initiators conform the initiated to the aimed status; in this case the ideal group member (Cimino, 2013). Finally, the aggregation step celebrates the acknowledgment of a new state. In this case, membership, by consolidating his new status (Van Gennep, 1924). An interesting parallel could be established between initiation and indoctrination. Schein, Schneier, and Barker (1961, quoted by
Baron, 2001), presented a three phase model of intense indoctrination, namely: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. The first step consisted in physical and psychological stress in order to weaken the individual. The second was aimed to change attitudes and beliefs through guilt, cognitive dissonance, and peer pressure. The last step stabilized the operated changes. The context is not completely alike. In higher education, the protagonists are students welcoming peers. However, they could be playing with matches; and according to Nuwer (1999), such comparison could be relevant.

About the history and tradition, the point could seem weak. Hazing in higher education is conducted by students. Therefore, when they leave the institution, they leave with the knowledge of tradition they may have acquired. Many reasons could motive their leaving: getting a diploma, reorientation, abandonment. Educational reforms such as the Bologna decree from 2004 could have impacted the trend as well, at least in Europe. Master’s degree veterans could be tempted to stop their contribution to initiation in order to focus on their last two years, including professional traineeships and master’s degree thesis. Thereby, if succeeding every year, the trajectory for a higher education hazing group member would be: first year, hazee; second year, watcher; third year, possible hazer. Then, fourth year would be an option, and fifth year appears to be out of the question, because of the master’s thesis and the work it represents. Hence, it is possible that significant parts of the tradition and its meaning are lost every year. It could explain why the discourse in higher education hazing groups tended to remain old fashioned and anti-deviant (Ferraz de Siqueira et al., 2012). On the other hand, it could explain why hazing tended to become more and more cruel with time (Castaldelli-Maia et al., 2012). According to Loriers (2009), initiation ritual could lose its purposes and become an empty frame. Thus, in the case of higher education, while the initial intention was to facilitate integration, initiate and bind the newcomers, if the knowledge is lost its practice could shift to degrading behaviors, where hazers could free aggressive pulsions.

Limitations of the studies about hazing

Several limitations could be mentioned. The studies are based on witnesses, field observations and questionnaires. However, if we consider as true the fact that hazing is only a visible part of a larger set of the group’s activities (Frias, 2002), it would mean we do not have all the information available in order to fully understand the phenomenon.

We used Cimino's (2011) definition in order to remain inclusive. However, the scientific literature has several ones, and it makes it even more
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difficult to know if we are talking about the same topic. Plus, hazing is often presented as a deviant behavior. Nevertheless, it has been recorded in many parts of the world (Dias and Sá, 2012), and bloomed in growing coalitional groups (Cimino, 2013a). According to Cimino's (2013) sample, 84%\textsuperscript{10} of participants chose to haze, even a little. Thus, it would be assumed as a normal behavior, which happens to have sporadic outrageous outcomes. The fact we usually hear about it when it goes wrong (Cokley et al., 2001) could alter our representation of the phenomenon.

The fact that every region and group type has its own specificities makes hazing even more difficult to understand and compare. Is it fully correct, for instance, to use the terms hazing and ragging indifferently? What about the baptême and the praxe? A lead for further researches could be to compare operationally behaviors occurring under one word and another, with a complete grid combining temporality, concrete content, and symbolic content for each activity taking place during the process' period. As stated, hazing is a complex set of behaviors. And its typicality from around the world, along with its relationship with cultural and traditional dimensions, makes it difficult to apprehend.

Conclusion

According to the scientific literature, individuals have a need to belong to groups (Baumeister and Leary, 1995) and in order to integrate the desired groups they would let themselves be hazed as a proof of their commitment to the aimed groups (Cimino, 2013). According to Johnson (2011), there is a will for an entry ritual, which may be explained by the lack of space for ritual initiation in our modern societies\textsuperscript{11}. For instance, there is no formal adulthood entrance ritual. According to Dias and Sá (2012), in the context of higher education, freshmen live hazing as inevitable. In addition, even if the same authors presented it as a catalyst in identity building, negative impacts on hazees are various (Mikell, 2014; Castaldelli-Maia et al., 2012). It appears to depend hugely on the situation and its actors. Harmon-Jones and Harmon-Jones (2007) provided elements to understand through cognitive dissonance the trend of hazees labelling hazing as a positive experience (Dias & Sá, 2012), despite its awful visible content. Baron (2001) added that, in a coercive situation, an individual will tend to identify and rely on any strong authority figure. This meets the Stockholm syndrome defined as when the victim bonds with its tormentor, which could explain the bond easily created between former hazees and former hazers. Another point of

\textsuperscript{10} This investigation took place in the United States of America.
\textsuperscript{11} See Pinnock, only available online: http://tigger.uic.edu/~huk/Gang%20History/fitningfire.html
view to explain the reason for newcomers to comply with hazing is that social cues appeared to be strong determinants of individuals' behavior (Conger et al., 1980). Thus, being an individual among many passive ones could drive each hazee to remain passive. Plus, humans tend to obey to authority figures (Milgram, 1974), and in the context of higher education hazing, hazers could represent a traditional authority.

After some time, members become veterans and can take an active role in higher education hazing groups. According to Price et al. (2002), group members have a punitive sentiment toward newcomers in order to demotivate free riders. This concept meets Delton and Cimino's (2013), which stated that coalitional group members acquired a concept of newcomers. They would perceive them differently than fellow members, and haze them to ensure their commitment while protecting the group's interest. Another perspective comes from works on authority status. While in the hazer role, the veteran could think he has to act as one (Haney et al., 1973). Nonetheless, this would imply his hazer prototype is cruel. Also, it could simply be that while in authority position, an individual tends to abuse it. Furthermore, higher education hazing group are a specific case, because current hazers were until recently still hazees. Finally, their hazing behavior could be explained through Bandura et al.'s (1963) social learning theory, or through a cathartic motivation as well (Johnson, 2011).

Hazing would be a mechanism intended to dismiss free riders and mold newcomers to be the ideal group member (Cimino, 2013; Klerk, 2013). In higher education, tradition could be the reason why hazing seems legit, and the hazer has authority over the hazee (Honeycutt, 2005; Frias, 2002). The short period of every hazer's activity as initiator could induce a loss in meaning in the initiation process (Loriere, 2009). A comparison between Van Gennep's (1924) threes phase initiation process and Schein et al.'s (1961, quoted by Baron, 2001) three phase indoctrination process could lead to think it is the same tool, but defined by different words.

About scientific literature's limits, the data source is perhaps the weak spot. Ethical limitations would forbid operationalization in a laboratory, or field infiltration. These limitations are a break to understanding the phenomenon. Nonetheless, results such as Cimino's (2013) appeared trustworthy and generalizable to some extent. Comparing hazing from different countries, based on scientific literature, could be problematic. In cultural and traditional matters, words can signify different experiences and may mask what real experience really is in each country. Finally, hazing is usually pointed out as deviant behavior, nevertheless, according to Cimino's (2013) results, 84% of participants would wish to haze a little, and we know the practice is present in many parts of the world (Dias and Sá, 2012).
Hazing could be a human behavioral norm, acquired by social learning (Bandura et al., 1963) or as an adaptative mechanism (Delton and Cimino, 2013). Hazing could be a tool subject to (mis)use in order to protect a group's interest, which could have dreadful consequences over its target, the hazee. In order to avoid injuries and deaths, there are several dimensions to explain. First, forbidding it does not appear relevant, mostly because it would remain hidden and thus would be more difficult to follow. Second, it would probably increase group cohesion against hostility (Murphy, 1957), even if it is on a symbolical level, and even if the hostility comes from the law. Third, in the context of higher education, the actors are presumably intelligent, scholar and cultivated. Thereby, it could be profitable to inform them about matters of violence and alcohol, making sure hazers and hazees understand they are responsible for their actions. Finally, if Frias (2002) was right, students tend to take their inspiration in their direct environment. Hence, the fact that students tend to use alcohol and violence during hazing (Waldron & Kowalski, 2009) could be taken as a symptom of our societies, and could invite us to rethink our values and educational habits.
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