

Hazing in the College Marching Band

Journal of Research in Music Education

2015, Vol. 63(1) 5–27

© National Association for

Music Education 2015

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0022429415569064

jrme.sagepub.com

**Jason M. Silveira¹ and Michael W. Hudson²**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate hazing in collegiate marching bands. Specifically, the researchers were interested in marching band students' experiences with hazing behaviors, to whom they were reported, attitudes toward hazing, and level of awareness of institutional hazing policies. Using a multistage cluster sampling approach, we distributed an online questionnaire to college marching band members attending National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I schools. Participants ($N = 1,215$) were representative of 30 different states and included college freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students. Nearly 30% of respondents indicated they observed some form of hazing in their marching band. The most common acts of hazing involved public verbal humiliation or degradation, which generally went unreported. Reticence to report hazing was largely due to fear of social retaliation or perceptions that the hazing behaviors were innocuous. The vast majority of participants had negative attitudes regarding hazing and most learned about their institution's hazing policy through a marching band orientation. Implications for the college marching band, contextualization of results, and future directions are discussed.

Keywords

hazing, marching band, abuse, college

The collaboration of sports and live music performances has been a long-standing tradition in colleges and universities throughout the United States. With the recent death of Robert Champion, drum major of the Florida A&M University Marching 100,

¹Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA

²University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA

Corresponding Author:

Jason M. Silveira, Department of Music, Oregon State University, 101 Benton Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA.

Email: jason.silveira@oregonstate.edu

there has been a renewed interest in investigating incidents of hazing in marching bands and developing prevention strategies to combat them (Alvarez & Brown, 2011; Carter, 2012). Yet, despite increased attention on hazing in marching bands, these incidents continue to occur, highlighted most recently with the suspension of the Texas Southern University's Ocean of Soul marching band (George, 2014) and allegations surrounding the "sexualized" culture of the Ohio State University marching band (Binkley, 2014). While no official agency is responsible for collecting statistics on hazing deaths, it has been estimated that there is on average one hazing death per year in the United States; however, researchers have arrived at differing conclusions regarding the exact number of hazing-related deaths over the years. Although the general public overestimates the number of hazing deaths each year on college campuses, one might conclude reasonably that even one death per year is too many (Nuwer, 2004).

In discussing hazing, it is helpful to note the differences between "hazing" and "bullying." While there does not appear to be a standard definition of bullying in the research literature (Harachi, Catalano, & Hawkins, 1999), generally speaking, bullying is characterized by an imbalance of power in which bullies use their power to control or harm others repeatedly in an attempt to ostracize those who are being bullied (Olweus, 1999; Stopbullying.gov, n.d.). Given the similar physical and psychological effects caused by bullying and hazing, some have even referred to hazing as "group bullying" (Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005). While the primary aim of bullying is exclusionary in nature, the purpose of hazing is to "legitimize" incoming group members through the generation of induction costs that are generally irrelevant to group membership (Cimino, 2011). Interestingly, even among those who have been hazed, there appears to be a discrepancy between the number of students who report experiencing hazing behaviors and those who define it as "hazing" (Allan & Madden, 2012). It has been suggested that the discrepancy exists because students accept the hazing/initiation culture of the group (Waldron & Kowalski, 2009) and because there is still confusion among students regarding the definition of hazing (N. Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Kittle, 2012). There are even differences in interpretation of what constitutes hazing among state laws (Crow & Rosner, 2002; Holmes, 2013; Parks & Southerland, 2013; Rutledge, 1998). Further confounding the reporting of hazing incidents is that various college groups have different perceptions about what activities constitute hazing (Drout & Corsoro, 2003; Ellsworth, 2004; Novak, 2000, cited in Ellsworth, 2004; Saunders & Benté, 2013; Wegener, 2001).

Psychological Perspectives

In an attempt to understand better why hazing occurs and why people choose to endure it, hazing has been viewed from a number of psychological perspectives. The severity-attraction hypothesis (Aronson & Mills, 1959) posits that the more effort one expends in achieving a goal (e.g., group membership), the more desirable the goal becomes. The severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis (Schachter, 1959) states that those who endure demanding or hostile environments will develop a bond with others who have endured similar situations. The relationship between hazers and moral disengagement

(Bandura, 1999) also has been examined as a means of attempting to explain why hazing occurs (e.g., McCreary, 2010). Within many of these psychological perspectives, researchers have suggested that individuals who are hazed endure the process because of a strong desire for the affirmation and approval of others to develop one's self-concept. Hazing may not be necessarily a case of immoral character; rather, it may represent the convergence of social interactions, definitions of situations, and the use of symbols (i.e., symbolic interactionist theory) as a means to manipulate new group members' definitions of self (Blumer, 1969; Sweet, 2004).

Much of the hazing research literature has focused on the varied outcomes of hazing practices, including physical and psychological effects of hazing. Indeed, some researchers have investigated why those being hazed choose to endure the discomfort. Some students have indicated that the pledge/initiation process is desirable (Cokley et al., 2001; Kimbrough, 2007). Among the perceived benefits of hazing are group solidarity and the selection of committed group members (Cimino, 2011); a way to preserve the power structure of the group (Waldron & Kowalski, 2009); development of camaraderie and respect among group members (Taylor, 2001); a fostering of organizational respect, discipline, loyalty, and team building (Campo et al., 2005); and a sense of belonging (J. Hoover & Milner, 1998). Additionally, hazing supporters have suggested that hazing "toughens up" new group members and "demonstrates a group's power and status; it teaches precedence as a way to subjugate the individual for the perceived good of the group" (Nuwer, 1999, p. 39). However, hazing behaviors are associated with a number of risks including decreased group cohesion (Van Raalte, Cornelius, Linder, & Brewer, 2007), depression, dissatisfaction with group membership, and loneliness among new group members, especially when more severe initiation rites are involved (Lodewijkx & Syroit, 2001). Other risks include traumatic injuries like alcohol abuse, physical abuse, and psychological damage (Finkel, 2002). Additionally, there is research to support that those who are hazed are more likely to haze future incoming group members, thus perpetuating a cycle of violence and degradation (Keating et al., 2005; Nuwer, 1990, 1999; Owen, Burke, & Vichesky, 2008; Sweet, 1999).

Sociological Perspectives

Group initiations have been a part of Western cultural practices since the time of the ancient Greeks and have been the topic of sustained investigation by social scientists for many years. Indeed, there are many social and cultural rites of passage in any community (Van Gennep, 1960). However, the point at which a rite of passage ends and hazing begins is an important point of distinction. Hazing has been a part of a number of organizations throughout history, including the military (Dornbusch, 1955; Østvik & Rudmin, 2001; Pershing, 2006; Winslow, 1999), athletic organizations (e.g., Fields, Collins, & Comstock, 2007), online communities (Honeycutt, 2006), fraternities/sororities, and religious and educational groups, including youth groups like the Boy Scouts and Future Farmers of America (Nuwer, 1990, 1999). Additionally, hazing in education is not limited to college campuses. Hazing in middle schools and high

schools has become an increasingly pervasive problem over the past two decades (Gershel, Katz-Sidlow, Small, & Zandieh, 2003; Guynn & Aquila, 2004; Nuwer, 2000). In the realm of education, the two groups that have received the most attention regarding hazing investigation and prevention are athletics and Greek organizations.

A number of research studies have focused on hazing in athletics and have indicated that a majority of student athletes experience at least some form of hazing (e.g., Allan & Madden, 2012; Campo et al., 2005; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009). N. Hoover and Pollard (1999) found that 80% of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) college athletes endured some sort of hazing during the time that they were members of a team. Authors of another study found that 45% of college student athletes indicated experiencing hazing either as the one being hazed or as the one doing the hazing (Campo et al., 2005). However, hazing in athletics is not limited to collegiate sport teams. Allan and Madden (2012) found that 47% of their respondents (college students) indicated that they were previously hazed while participating in high school sports and other activities; Gershel et al. (2003) found that as many as 17% of student athletes in grades 6 through 12 had experienced hazing. In a follow-up study, N. Hoover and Pollard (2000) investigated hazing in high schools and discovered that nearly half of their sample had experienced hazing behaviors, with 25% of their sample being hazed as part of a sports team. Alarming, about one quarter of their respondents indicated that they were hazed before they were teenagers. Further, when hazing deaths occur among athletes, it overwhelmingly has involved the use of alcohol (Hollmann, 2002; Nuwer, 1999; Rutledge, 1998). The prevalence of hazing among athletes is sometimes attributed to their need to have an initiation ceremony or rite of passage as a group bonding ritual, which functions as a transition experience that symbolizes a membership change from newcomer/outsider to member/teammate (Johnson, 2011).

The groups that have received the most attention with regard to hazing have been fraternities and sororities (e.g., Hollmann, 2002; Nuwer, 1990). College campuses across the United States are home to thousands of fraternities and sororities that regularly participate in events significant to the Greek social culture. Since their foundation, Greek organizations have used hazing activities in a variety of initiations and rites of passage (Nuwer, 1999), yet many of these dangerous initiation rites appear to be at odds with the founding principles of Greek organizations (Schultz, 2010). Much of the hazing that is likely to occur in these organizations includes sleep deprivation, alcohol abuse, and physical abuse (Jackson & Terrell, 2007; Sweet, 1999). Studies have shown that those most likely to commit acts of hazing were male upperclassmen, and members of fraternities have reported the highest levels of both hazing victimization and offending (e.g., Campo et al., 2005; Owen et al., 2008). While hazing is seen as a serious problem among members of fraternities and sororities, incidents of hazing often go unreported (Allan & Madden, 2012), especially those that do not include physical force or those for which newcomers give consent (Richardson, Wang, & Hall, 2012). Assault and battery and sexual assault are the most often reported liability claims among fraternity insurers, while hazing is the least reported (Flanigan, 2014). This statistic may reflect the significance of secrecy in hazing rituals among

fraternities. Hazing in Greek organizations has been associated with “groupthink,” in which members engage in negligent and dangerous activities while placing higher values on group practices above individual human rights. Groupthink, or “Greekthink” (coined by Nuwer, 1999), could explain why hazing in Greek organizations continues despite the dangers and legal ramifications associated with it (Perkins, Zimmerman, & Janosik, 2011).

In their landmark hazing study, Allan and Madden (2012) investigated hazing behaviors among a large number of college organizations. The researchers suggested that future studies address specific subsets of the larger college student population, including performing arts groups in general and marching bands specifically. The National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention (2010) has called on researchers to increase the number of studies that examine hazing practices, possible interventions, student attitudes toward hazing, and student awareness of institutional hazing policies. Recently, there also has been increased attention to hazing in bands, specifically marching bands (Carter, 2012; Holmes, 2013; Matney, 2011; Melton, 2012; Rhodes, 2011). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the possibility of hazing incidents in college marching bands. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed: (1) What are students’ experiences with hazing behaviors in college marching bands? (2) If hazing behaviors occur, to whom are they reported? (3) What are marching band students’ attitudes toward hazing? and (4) What are students’ levels of awareness of institutional hazing policies?

Method

Participants

We utilized a multistage cluster sampling approach (Patten, 2011). This type of sampling involves dividing the population of interest into clusters (i.e., colleges/universities), which then are sampled randomly. This method of sampling was chosen based on the “best-practices” recommendations provided by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), which suggests multiple sampling frames in instances where there may be incomplete or inadequate coverage of the population of interest (AAPOR, n.d.). The multistage method consisted of two Internet-based recruitment protocols. In Stage 1, the researchers distributed online notification to athletic band director subscribers of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) list-serv via e-mail. Those CBDNA members who indicated “athletic bands” as an area of interest received the online notification. The second stage included a random cluster sampling of NCAA Division I schools ($N = 116$). Athletic band directors who agreed to participate forwarded a standard recruitment message to the student members of their respective marching bands. In addition to the convenience of an Internet-based sampling approach, Internet-based sampling has the added advantage of a wider distribution of demographic characteristics (Krantz & Dalal, 2000; Reips, 2001).

Participants included marching band members ($N = 1,233$) from Division I schools of the NCAA. Given the prevalence of marching bands at collegiate football games,

NCAA Division I institutions were chosen specifically because the majority of Division I member schools had active football and marching band programs. The criterion for inclusion was that the member schools had a marching band (as opposed to a pep band) that was under the supervision of a faculty member employed by the university. Student-run ensembles were excluded from the sample. Among the original sample of 1,233 participants, 18 participants did not meet the criteria for inclusion because they either did not give their consent to participate or indicated that they were not a member of a marching band. Thus, the total sample of participants who completed the questionnaire was 1,215.

Participants included college freshmen ($n = 407$, 33.0%), sophomores ($n = 288$, 23.4%), juniors ($n = 244$, 19.8%), and seniors ($n = 249$, 20.2%), with a mean age of 19.7 ($SD = 2.0$). Additionally, 27 participants (2.2%) identified themselves as “other,” which included graduate students and fifth-year seniors. Participants were representative of a number of different marching band sections (see Table A in online supplemental materials available at <http://jrme.sagepub.com/supplemental>) and 30 different states. Participants included music majors ($n = 241$, 19.5%), music minors ($n = 106$, 8.6%), and nonmusic majors ($n = 868$, 78.4%); the sample included 552 (45.6%) males and 659 (54.4%) females.

Materials

The questionnaire items were included based on previous research conducted on hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; N. Hoover & Pollard, 1999, 2000; Sweet, 1999). There was a high level of agreement between two expert judges who grouped questionnaire items into themes. To determine the content validity of the questionnaire, each judge was provided with a written copy of the questionnaire items and was asked to sort items into five categories. The five categories were based on the research questions guiding the present study, and included the following: (1) What are students' experiences with hazing behaviors in college marching bands? (2) If hazing behaviors occur, to whom are they reported? (3) What are marching band students' attitudes toward hazing? (4) What are students' levels of awareness of institutional hazing policies? and (5) Does not relate to aforementioned research questions. We performed an interrater reliability analysis using the Kappa statistic to determine consistency among raters (Landis & Koch, 1977). Results revealed a very high-to-perfect level of agreement (see guidelines in Landis & Koch, 1977) regarding items designed to address Research Questions 1 ($\kappa = .87$), 2 ($\kappa = .80$), 3 ($\kappa = 1.0$), and 4 ($\kappa = .85$). Any items that were categorized by either coder as not relating to the research questions either were reworded or were deleted.

Based on pilot testing of the questionnaire ($N = 102$), completion time was approximately 10 min. This relatively brief time frame was desirable given the risk of psychological reactance and dropout rate (Reips, 2002). We conducted an item analysis using the data from the pilot study respondents. Based on the tally of responses from each section of the questionnaire, we determined that there were enough gradations of responses to allow for an accurate picture of incidents of hazing. Based on the pilot,

several questions in Section 2 (Where did hazing behaviors occur, and to whom were they reported?) were revised for clarity and to be more exhaustive regarding participants' choice of response.

Section 3 consisted of several attitudinal statements to which participants indicated their level of agreement or disagreement. Statements were designed to measure participants' attitudes toward the effects of hazing. We administered a set of trial items in the pilot and conducted an item analysis to address their validity. Item analysis was used to make the first item selection prior to factor analysis as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Statements designed to measure participants' attitude toward the beneficial and detrimental effects of hazing had strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .93$ and $\alpha = .95$, respectively). Only one item in either scale ("Those who are hazed look forward to their chance to haze new recruits/members") did not meet the item-total threshold for inclusion (i.e., >0.4) and subsequently was dropped from the questionnaire. Other than this item, all item-total correlations were greater than 0.6, indicating that items were contributing positively to overall reliability (Churchill, 1979; Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

We utilized an online questionnaire format designed by the researchers. The content and format of the questionnaire was modeled after previously published research investigating incidents of hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; N. Hoover & Pollard, 1999, 2000; Sweet, 1999).¹ Questionnaires used in previous studies have included items that investigated students' experiences with hazing, perceptions about hazing, understanding of institutional policies regarding hazing, consequences of hazing, and their experiences with hazing prior to college. Previous questionnaires have asked respondents to indicate which hazing behaviors happened to themselves and to others; however, these questionnaires did not include gradations of frequency regarding incidents of hazing behaviors. Rather, participants were provided a list of behaviors associated with hazing and were asked if they had ever encountered them but not to what degree. The present questionnaire added a level of discrimination not present in previous hazing research (e.g., Allan & Madden, 2012).

The online questionnaire, approved by the authors' institutional review boards, consisted of several sections designed to address the research questions and utilized a multipage design (Bosnjak & Tuten, 2001; Reips, 2002). In order to proceed to the questionnaire, participants had to give their informed consent, after which demographic information was requested. Demographic information included gender, level of schooling, age, instrumentation, major, the state in which the respondent's university is located, and whether or not the respondent held a leadership position in the marching band.

In Section 1, participants reported the frequency of occurrences of several hazing behaviors as defined in previously published research literature. Using a 5-point Likert-type scale (*never, rarely, sometimes, often, very often*), participants were asked to report frequencies of hazing behaviors from the perspective of both the one being hazed and the one doing the hazing. In Section 2, participants were asked about the context in which hazing behaviors occurred (e.g., in the presence of alumni, in public spaces, during the day, etc.) and to whom they were reported. In Section 3, participants

shared their attitudes about the effects of hazing by indicating their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert-type scale (from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*) to 24 attitudinal statements. Section 4 consisted of three questions asking participants how they learned of their institution's policy on hazing, how often they were reminded of the policy, and who reminded them of the policy. At the conclusion of the questionnaire, participants were provided with several hazing and counseling resources.

Given the sensitive nature of the content of the questionnaire, participants were asked somewhat limited demographic information (Patten, 2011), identifying information (e.g., IP addresses) was removed from their responses, and data were analyzed in aggregate to protect participants' anonymity and confidentiality. To further address the verisimilitude of the survey process, the "prevent ballot stuffing" feature was enabled in the online survey software, which prevents respondents from participating more than once. The online questionnaire was active for the months of November and December 2013. This time frame was chosen because it allowed participants to reflect on their entire marching band season since most marching bands end their seasons in late November or early December with the start of the Bowl Championship Series.

Results

The first research question guiding the present study concerned students' experiences with hazing behaviors in college marching band. Section 1 of the questionnaire was designed to address this first research question. Respondents were provided with a list of 23 hazing behaviors. Additionally, they were asked to indicate the frequency of each behavior from the perspective of both the one being hazed and the one committing acts of hazing. For each hazing behavior, the majority of participants indicated that they had never been forced to participate in the enumerated hazing behaviors (see Table 1). There were only four hazing behaviors in which more than 10% of respondents answered in the affirmative, indicating that they experienced the following: "Sing/chant by self or with select others in public in a situation that is not related to an event, rehearsal or performance" ($n = 236$, 19.5%), "Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at" ($n = 235$, 19.3%), "Associate with specific people and not others" ($n = 177$, 14.6%), and "Deprive yourself of sleep" ($n = 143$, 11.7%). When asked how often they forced others to participate in the enumerated hazing behaviors, here again the majority of participants selected *never* (see Table 2). The two behaviors that elicited the most affirmative responses were "Sing/chant by self or with select others in public in a situation that is not related to an event, rehearsal, or performance" ($n = 95$, 7.7%) and "Endure being yelled, cursed, or sworn at" ($n = 62$, 5%). No other hazing behaviors exceeded a 5% affirmative response.

Participants were then given the following definition of hazing:

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 equipment, class/ensemble parties with community games, or going out with classmates/bandmates, unless an atmosphere of humiliation, degradation, abuse, or danger arises. (Allan & Madden, 2012, p. 83; N. Hoover & Pollard, 1999, p. 8)

Table 1. Frequency (and Percentages) of Experiences With Hazing Behaviors as the One Being Hazed ("How often have others forced you to do the following:").

Hazing behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1. Sing/chant by self or with select others in public in a situation that is not related to an event, rehearsal, or performance	979 (80.6%)	158 (1.3%)	53 (4.4%)	18 (1.5%)	7 (0.6%)
2. Participate in a drinking game	1,127 (92.8%)	51 (4.2%)	30 (2.5%)	7 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
3. Associate with specific people and not others	1,037 (85.4%)	100 (8.2%)	53 (4.4%)	18 (1.5%)	6 (0.5%)
4. Deprive yourself of sleep	1,071 (88.2%)	72 (5.9%)	43 (3.5%)	22 (1.8%)	6 (0.5%)
5. Drink large amounts of nonalcoholic beverage	1,154 (95.1%)	27 (2.2%)	17 (1.4%)	8 (0.7%)	8 (0.7%)
6. Endure harsh weather without appropriate clothing	1,098 (90.4%)	71 (5.8%)	38 (3.1%)	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.2%)
7. Drink large amounts of alcohol to the point of getting sick or passing out	1,194 (98.3%)	14 (1.2%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.2%)
8. Attend a skit/roast where other members of the group are humiliated	1,129 (93.3%)	54 (4.5%)	18 (1.5%)	7 (0.6%)	2 (0.2%)
9. Be awakened during the night by other members of the ensemble	1,154 (95.1%)	48 (3.9%)	12 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10. Perform or simulate sex acts with opposite gender	1,188 (97.9%)	16 (1.3%)	5 (0.4%)	3 (0.2%)	2 (0.2%)
11. Perform or simulate sex acts with same gender	1,197 (98.8%)	10 (0.8%)	3 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
12. Wear embarrassing clothes	1,106 (91.2%)	70 (5.8%)	26 (2.1%)	7 (0.6%)	4 (0.3%)
13. Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at	978 (80.6%)	151 (12.4%)	58 (4.8%)	15 (1.2%)	11 (0.9%)
14. Being tattooed, pierced, shaved, or branded	1,205 (99.3%)	6 (0.5%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
15. Participate in calisthenics not related to the class/ensemble	1,141 (94.3%)	39 (3.2%)	16 (1.3%)	10 (0.8%)	4 (0.3%)
16. Acting as a personal servant to classmates/ensemble members outside of class/rehearsal	1,181 (97.4%)	22 (1.8%)	4 (0.3%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
17. Deprive yourself of food	1,186 (98%)	19 (1.6%)	3 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
18. Consume extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	1,191 (96.6%)	17 (1.4%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Hazing behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
19. Destroy or steal property	1,190 (96.5%)	18 (1.5%)	4 (1.3%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)
20. Be tied up, taped, or confined in a small space	1,204 (99.1%)	10 (0.8%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
21. Be paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked	1,211 (99.7%)	3 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
22. Paddle, whip, or beat others	1,211 (99.7%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
23. Be kidnapped or transported and abandoned	1,202 (99.1%)	10 (0.8%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Participants were asked to use this definition to identify the amount of hazing they observed in their marching band. While the majority of participants indicated that they did not see hazing behaviors in their bands ($n = 864$, 71.2%), nearly 30% of respondents ($n = 350$) had observed hazing behaviors. Of those participants who reported observing hazing behaviors, 60% believed their teachers were aware of the hazing behaviors, 22% reported that alumni were present during the hazing incidents, and 46% indicated that the hazing took place on campus. Additionally, for those participants who observed hazing behaviors, 34% reported that the hazing behaviors occurred during the day, 38% reported that the hazing occurred in a public place, 19% reported that pictures of the hazing incidents were taken, and in those instances, 36% of respondents stated that the pictures were posted online. Finally, participants were asked if persons in their college marching band ever encouraged acts of hazing; 12% ($n = 146$) responded in the affirmative (see Table B at <http://jrme.sagepub.com/supplemental>).

To examine the second research question, we asked those who observed hazing behaviors if they ever reported fellow band members for hazing someone else. Only 8% responded that they reported any hazing incident. When the incidents were reported, they were reported to student leadership staff ($n = 6$), the head band director ($n = 5$), other marching band instructors (e.g., color guard instructor, percussion instructor; $n = 3$), assistant band director ($n = 2$), and school administration ($n = 1$). For those participants who observed hazing and did not report it, their stated reasons included the following: “I was afraid I would lose the respect of my friends” ($n = 21$), “I felt it would have a negative effect on my participation in marching band” ($n = 15$), “I didn’t want to lose my friends” ($n = 11$), “I was afraid I would lose the respect of my director” ($n = 5$), and “I felt ashamed” ($n = 3$). Additionally, there were 77 participants who selected the *other* option and provided a free response.

Two independent reliability observers coded and categorized the free-response data to identify emerging themes. Disagreements regarding coded data were resolved through discussion until consensus was achieved. Based on this analysis, the following

Table 2. Frequency (and Percentages) of Experiences With Hazing Behaviors as the One Doing the Hazing (“How often have you forced others to do the following:”).

Hazing behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1. Sing/chant by self or with select others in public in a situation that is not related to an event, rehearsal, or performance	1,118 (92.2%)	60 (4.9%)	29 (2.4%)	3 (0.2%)	3 (0.2%)
2. Participate in a drinking game	1,176 (96.9%)	21 (1.7%)	14 (1.2%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)
3. Associate with specific people and not others	1,179 (97.4%)	22 (1.8%)	7 (0.6%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
4. Deprive others of sleep	1,198 (98.8%)	13 (1.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
5. Drink large amounts of nonalcoholic beverage	1,196 (98.7%)	9 (0.7%)	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)
6. Endure harsh weather without appropriate clothing	1,196 (98.7%)	14 (1.2%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7. Drink large amounts of alcohol to the point of getting sick or passing out	1,200 (98.9%)	11 (0.9%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)
8. Attend a skit/roast where other members of the group are humiliated	1,183 (97.6%)	20 (1.7%)	7 (0.6%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
9. Be awakened during the night	1,186 (97.8%)	19 (1.6%)	8 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10. Perform or simulate sex acts with opposite gender	1,203 (99.3%)	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
11. Perform or simulate sex acts with same gender	1,206 (99.5%)	4 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)
12. Wear embarrassing clothes	1,168 (96.4%)	28 (2.3%)	13 (1.1%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)
13. Endure being yelled, cursed, or sworn at	1,152 (94.9%)	38 (3.1%)	16 (1.3%)	5 (0.4%)	3 (0.2%)
14. Being tattooed, pierced, shaved, or branded	1,213 (99.9%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
15. Participate in calisthenics not related to the class/ensemble	1,186 (98%)	14 (1.2%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
16. Acting as a personal servant to classmates/ensemble members outside of class/rehearsal	1,200 (99.1%)	5 (0.4%)	4 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
17. Deprive others of food	1,211 (99.8%)	3 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
18. Consume extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	1,206 (99.4%)	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
19. Destroy or steal property	1,207 (99.5%)	5 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Hazing behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
20. Tie up, tape, or confine others in a small space	1,211 (99.8%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
21. Paddle, whip, or beat others	1,207 (99.8%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
22. Force others to paddle, whip, or beat other members of the ensemble	1,213 (99.9%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
23. Kidnapped or transported and abandoned others	1,204 (99.3%)	8 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

themes emerged: The hazing was not severe enough (i.e., “no big deal”) to warrant reporting ($n = 39$); respondents were apathetic about the hazing ($n = 12$); respondents did not regard the behavior as hazing ($n = 7$); the hazing behaviors were “tradition” ($n = 7$); those being hazed could opt out ($n = 6$), fear of retaliation ($n = 5$), the hazing was reported by another individual ($n = 4$), respondents did not observe it firsthand ($n = 3$), someone intervened to stop the hazing behavior ($n = 3$); the director was already aware of the incident ($n = 2$), the hazing was deserved ($n = 2$), and there was “no proof” to report the incident ($n = 1$).

Participants also were asked if they considered themselves as having been hazed. Those who felt they had been hazed ($n = 53$, 4.4%) were asked if they reported the incident to someone. Only three participants (5.6%) indicated that they reported the hazing incident(s). When the incident was reported, it was reported to student leadership staff ($n = 2$), other marching band instructors ($n = 1$), and the head band director ($n = 1$). For those who did not report the hazing incident, their stated reasons included the following: “I was afraid I would lose the respect of my friends” ($n = 16$), “I felt it would have a negative effect on my participation in marching band” ($n = 13$), “I didn’t want to lose my friends” ($n = 9$), “I felt ashamed” ($n = 5$), and “I was afraid I would lose the respect of my director” ($n = 4$). There were 32 participants who selected the *other* option and provided a free response.

As before, two independent reliability observers coded and categorized the free-response data to identify emerging themes. Based on this analysis, the following themes emerged: The hazing was not severe enough (i.e., “no big deal”) to warrant reporting ($n = 15$), the hazing behaviors were “tradition” ($n = 8$), respondents did not regard the behavior as hazing ($n = 4$), respondents were apathetic about the hazing ($n = 3$), fear of retaliation ($n = 2$), respondents did not observe it firsthand ($n = 2$), those being hazed could opt out ($n = 2$), someone intervened to stop the hazing behavior ($n = 1$), and the director was already aware of the incident ($n = 1$).

Regarding the third research question, 24 questionnaire items (attitudinal statements) were designed to elicit information about respondents’ attitudes toward hazing (raw data are displayed in Table C at <http://jrme.sagepub.com/supplemental>). A factor analysis was conducted using oblique rotation and the principal components analysis

Table 3. Pattern Matrix of Reported Attitudes Toward Hazing.

Item	Factors		
	1	2	3
Factor 1 (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$)			
Being hazed makes people feel humiliated or degraded.	.777		
People can incur physical injuries by being hazed.	.689		
Being hazed can cause problems in relationships with others.	.681		
Being hazed makes it difficult to concentrate in other classes.	.658		
Being hazed makes people feel depressed.	.657		
Being hazed negatively affects grades in other classes.	.653		
Being hazed makes it difficult to sleep.	.592		.330
Being hazed makes people feel guilty.	.579		
Being hazed makes people feel in danger.	.461		.347
Being hazed makes people want to quit the organization/not enroll in the class again.	.440		.401
Being hazed makes people want revenge against organizers of the activity.	.435		.423
Being hazed makes people feel stressed.	.389		
Factor 2 (Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$)			
Being hazed makes people feel stronger.		.809	
Being hazed makes people feel a sense of accomplishment.		.806	
Being hazed helps people do better in class/ensemble.		.804	
Being hazed makes me feel more like part of the group.		.790	
Hazing helps members feel accepted by fellow band members.		.766	
Hazing is an important part of a band's tradition.		.734	
I feel that I would be willing to commit an act of hazing against a fellow band member in order to feel accepted by other fellow band members.		.662	
If I am hazed, I'm justified in hazing others.		.600	
Factor 3 (Cronbach's $\alpha = .88$)			
Being hazed makes people consider transferring to another college or university.			.860
Being hazed makes people feel like they don't want to live anymore.			.840
Being hazed makes people feel like they need to visit a health center, doctor, or counselor.			.724

extraction method to determine the content of the attitudinal scale. This rotation required 11 iterations to converge. As a result of the factor analysis (using a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0), three factors emerged accounting for approximately 57% of the systematic variance in responses (see Table 3). The emergence of three factors was confirmed via a scree plot, which showed the curve leveling off after three components. Variables with loadings less than 0.3 were considered to have a nonsignificant impact on a factor and thus were ignored (Field, 2009; Kline, 1994). Only one item ("Hazing is not a widespread problem") did not load significantly on any factor. The

majority of loadings exceeded 0.60, and only four cross-loadings exceeded 0.30. Additionally, there was strong internal consistency (Churchill, 1979; Gliem & Gliem, 2003) for each of the three factors ($\alpha = .94$; $\alpha = .91$; $\alpha = .88$).

The fourth research question concerned participants' level of awareness of institutional hazing policies. Participants were asked how they learned of their institution's policy on hazing by selecting all categories that applied. The category that received the most responses was marching band orientation ($n = 745$), followed by student handbook ($n = 495$), campus orientation ($n = 469$), "I am not aware of my institution's policy on hazing" ($n = 231$), special meeting on hazing ($n = 144$), school website ($n = 107$), other ($n = 87$), and special flyer/handout on hazing ($n = 81$). Two independent coders analyzed the free-response data (e.g., Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The coding resulted in the following additional categories being constructed: fraternity/sorority ($n = 30$), fellow band members ($n = 10$), band director(s)/instructor(s) ($n = 10$), other campus organization ($n = 8$), other non-marching-band students ($n = 3$), and "laws" ($n = 1$). Participants also were asked how often they were reminded of their institution's hazing policy and who reminded them of the policy. Most respondents indicated that they were reminded of their institution's hazing policy yearly ($n = 459$) and that the band director reminded them of the policy ($n = 800$). Results are displayed in Tables D and E (<http://jrme.sagepub.com/supplemental>).

Discussion

The primary purpose of the present study was to investigate hazing incidents in the college marching band. Specifically, the researchers were interested in the frequency of specific hazing behaviors, whether or not incidents of hazing were reported and why, participants' attitudes toward hazing, and their level of awareness regarding institutional policies on hazing. Results revealed that the most common acts of hazing experienced by the respondents were those that involved public verbal humiliation or degradation; however, these incidents were relatively infrequent. Nearly one third of participants reported an awareness of or involvement in hazing behaviors. If the goal among college campuses is to eradicate hazing entirely, one might conclude that even infrequent hazing is still a problem to be addressed. Those respondents who observed hazing behaviors (30%) generally did not report the incidents either because of fear of social retaliation or because the hazing behaviors were perceived as innocuous. Based on participants' responses, most band members learned about their institution's hazing policy through a marching band orientation and were reminded about it yearly or multiple times a year by their band director.

Allen and Madden (2012) reported that 56% of their participants experienced at least one hazing behavior in a performing arts organization, which they delineated as "e.g., marching band, chorus, theatre groups," and N. Hoover and Pollard (2000) found that 22% were hazed to join performing arts organizations (however, their sample was limited exclusively to high school students). In the present study, when participants were asked if they considered themselves as having been hazed, less than 5% indicated yes, which appears to counter these previous results. However, in examining

the 23 delineated hazing behaviors (Table 1), at least two behaviors (“Sing/chant . . .” and “Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at”) evidenced approximately 20% affirmative responses. This difference in percentages suggests a possible disconnect between how hazing is defined legally or institutionally and what students perceive as hazing. Hazing was legally defined over 25 years ago and its definition may not be fully understood. Additionally, college students have reported limited exposure to hazing prevention efforts (Allan & Madden, 2012; Kittle, 2012). Given the results mentioned above, students’ understanding of what constitutes hazing may be ambivalent in some cases, or participants are not willing to label their experience with the enumerated hazing behaviors as “hazing.” This phenomenon is confirmed by existing hazing research literature (Allan & Madden, 2012; N. Hoover & Pollard, 1999; Kimbrough, 2007).

Comparing the data displayed in Table 1 to the findings of Allan and Madden (2012), the results seem promising. Allan and Madden surveyed members of performing arts groups ($N = 818$) and found that five hazing behaviors exceeded 10% affirmative responses: sing/chant (25%), participate in a drinking game (23%), associate with specific people and not others (19%), deprive of sleep (17%), and drink large amounts of nonalcoholic beverages (12%). In the present study, only four hazing behaviors exceeded a 10% affirmative response threshold, and the percentages were smaller than those evidenced in Allan and Madden: sing/chant (20%); be yelled, cursed, or sworn at (19%); associate with specific people and not others (15%); and deprive yourself of sleep (12%). Additionally, the results displayed in Table 2 also appear promising in that only two behaviors (“Sing/chant . . .” and “Endure being yelled, cursed, or sworn at”) exceeded a 5% affirmative response when participants were asked if they forced others to engage in the enumerated hazing behaviors. These results could indicate either that the hazing culture within the college marching band is less severe than in performing arts organizations as a whole or that the results suffer from the threats of social desirability (i.e., respondents were not being truthful) and/or self-selection bias. Physical abuse and alcohol abuse have been reported as the most common type of hazing behavior in published research (Nuwer, 1999); however, here respondents reported public humiliation and degradation as the most common hazing behaviors.

Consistent with prior research, when students acknowledged having observed or participated in acts of hazing and did not report it, they indicated fear of social consequences (Allan & Madden, 2012; Kittle, 2012). Attempts to justify their participation in hazing behavior included minimization (e.g., “It was no big deal,” “I didn’t consider it hazing”), lack of awareness (e.g., “I didn’t know it was hazing until later”), and normalization (e.g., “It’s a tradition”). This appears to be consistent with both the severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis (Schachter, 1959) and the theory of moral disengagement (Bandura, 1999). Viewed through the lens of the severity-affiliation-attraction hypothesis, those who participated in hazing may have justified their actions as a means of developing a bond with others who endured similar situations. Similarly, hazers may have been morally disengaged by purposefully misrepresenting consequences (e.g., minimizing harm and accentuating benefits) and reconstructing their conduct as having a moral purpose (e.g., tradition), thus making the hazing behaviors less morally reprehensible.

However, results also appear to contradict previous findings regarding students' attitudes toward hazing. Much of the published research on hazing indicates that students recognize hazing as part of the campus culture; more students perceive positive rather than negative outcomes of hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; Kimbrough, 2007). In the present study, this was not the case. Examining this subset of the larger college population (i.e., marching band students), the results indicate the majority of participants viewed hazing and the outcomes of hazing primarily as detrimental and harmful (see Table C at <http://jrme.sagepub.com/supplemental>). Regarding the items that loaded onto Factor 1 (e.g., beneficial effects of hazing), the majority of respondents disagreed with these attitudinal statements. Conversely, the majority of respondents agreed with those statements that loaded onto Factor 2 (e.g., detrimental effects of hazing). These findings are encouraging given that one of the recommendations in the hazing research literature has been to refute the assumption that hazing can have certain positive benefits, such as improved group cohesion (e.g., Van Raalte et al., 2007).

A number of interesting findings emerged when investigating participants' attitudes toward hazing. The item "Hazing is not a widespread problem" did not load significantly onto any factor. It would seem that this item represents participants' perceptions of the prevalence of hazing rather than their attitudes toward hazing per se. Furthermore, it appears that there was less universal agreement with this item; half of the respondents indicated that they disagreed with this statement, and 20% indicated that they agreed. It could be that participants misinterpreted this item and responded in general terms rather than from the perspective of hazing in marching bands specifically. In future studies, researchers might consider rewording this item for clarity. Regarding the items that loaded onto the third factor (Table 3), there was less widespread agreement among participants, with more than one third of respondents indicating *neither agree nor disagree*. It is possible that this third factor was merely a bloated specific. Bloated specifics appear to be factors but are really only specific variance caused by writing items that are similar to each other (Cattell, 1978). The researchers suggest that these items be reworded in subsequent research to determine if an additional "social/emotional effects" factor emerges.

One of the more alarming findings from the present study was that approximately 12% of participants reported that individuals within the organization had encouraged acts of hazing. Students' experiences and attitudes can influence greatly others' involvement in hazing (N. Hoover & Pollard, 2000). With 12% of respondents indicating that some actor in the organization encouraged hazing, it appears that hazing education and prevention programs should be expanded, as perhaps should accountability measures. It could be that persistent hazing is due to consequences that are not commensurate with the offenses rather than a lack of education on hazing policies. Much of the hazing literature encourages dissemination of information from a variety of outlets both inside and outside the university. The majority of participants indicated that their band director made them aware of the school's hazing policy; such communication is promising. However, since the majority of those who encouraged hazing were other marching band students, additional hazing prevention programs might be

warranted beyond explaining the institution's policy. As Campo et al. (2005) explained, "education alone has not been enough of a deterrent on most campuses and needs to be coupled with enforcement and/or policy changes" (p. 147). Saunders and Benté (2013) provide useful guidelines and instruction regarding investigating hazing and providing educational practices for colleges and universities.

Some limitations are worth noting. As with any online questionnaire, self-selection bias remains a threat to external validity (Stanton, 1998; Thompson, Surface, Martin, & Sanders, 2003; Witmer, Colman, & Katzman, 1999). This possibility exists twofold since the marching band directors were the "gatekeepers" regarding distribution to the students enrolled in the class; those directors who chose to participate forwarded the questionnaire link on to their students. Therefore, caution is warranted regarding the generalizability of the results from this initial study. Certainly, additional research on this important topic will be needed before any definitive conclusions may be drawn regarding hazing in the college marching band.

Additionally, social desirability is a concern, especially when participants were asked questions about hazing others. It is also possible that the content and purpose of the questionnaire may have affected nonresponse error. For example, the leverage-saliency theory of survey response states that participants are more likely to respond if the surveyor makes the topic (i.e., hazing prevention) salient throughout the implementation process (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2008). It could be that the emphasis on this singular topic (hazing) was attractive to some potential respondents (e.g., those who wish to reduce incidents of hazing) but not others (e.g., those who are doing the hazing). Despite students' anonymity and confidentiality, it is also possible that students might not have been entirely forthcoming in their responses, especially if they feared scrutiny from outside entities. Secrecy traditionally has been a necessary component of hazing. Without further research in this area, it will be difficult to draw conclusions from this initial study regarding whether hazing incidents in the college marching band are idiosyncratic to particular institutions or are more pervasive throughout the United States.

Finally, the data collected were not analyzed on the basis of geographic region, students' socioeconomic status, cultural makeup, overall "status" or "prestige" of the marching band, or other sociocultural variables. For the purposes of this initial study, limited demographic information was recorded to protect participants' anonymity and confidentiality. However, differences might exist on the basis of such variables. For example, it is possible that more prestigious marching bands with well-established traditions might be more prone to hazing incidents. It is suggested that future iterations of this study investigate the possibilities of sociocultural influences on marching band culture, specifically, hazing in the marching band. Identifying those ensembles that might be more prone to hazing seems worthy of further study.

Based on the findings, a number of future directions are recommended. In addition to their large sample size, Allan and Madden (2012) chose to incorporate a qualitative component to their study by making site visits to examine educational, training, and policy documents and to interview faculty, staff, and students. It is recommended that future studies on hazing in the marching band include a similar component. Doing so

would provide a holistic picture of the frequency and type of hazing behaviors in the college band and provide rich descriptions of institutional and organizational policies on hazing education and prevention. As mentioned above, one limitation was the threat of self-selection bias resulting in possible sampling error. The researchers felt it important to include the marching band directors as proxies for accessing the student population. An important part of hazing education and prevention is collaboration among researchers, organizational leaders, and students. While student participation was dependent on director approval, it seemed axiomatic not to include marching band directors in this study. However, authors of future studies might explore the possibility of obtaining student e-mail addresses directly from the institution to determine a response rate more accurately and to reduce the possibility of sampling error.²

Finally, since state laws and institutional policies are not standardized (Crow & Rosner, 2002; Hollmann, 2002), the researchers recommend an effort to standardize hazing education and prevention efforts at least among college marching bands. A majority of participants indicated that their band director informed them of institutional policies on hazing and hazing prevention. No doubt band directors play an influential role in hazing education and prevention. Given that a disconnect sometimes exists between what students perceive as hazing and how it is defined by law, it seems that hazing education is an area in need of continued development. Additionally, a large number of participants were not aware of their institution's policy on hazing ($n = 231$). The national honorary band fraternity, Kappa Kappa Psi, has been instrumental in documenting specific antihazing policies and procedures on its website. Additionally, hazing has been discussed at CBDNA Athletic Band Symposia; however, at present, there is no mention of hazing in the CBDNA College and University Athletic Band Guidelines or bylaws. Perhaps through the development of a task force within CBDNA, hazing prevention and education efforts could be standardized. In any case, it would seem wise to specifically delineate hazing behaviors and label them as such, especially given the differences in interpretation of various definitions of hazing (StopHazing.org, n.d.).

We suggest a number of additional recommendations to help college band directors and administrators prevent future hazing incidents. Providing students with a list of behaviors/examples that have been defined as hazing (even if they are perceived as innocuous) could be useful in helping students identify what specifically constitutes hazing, especially those behaviors that evidenced the most affirmative responses in the present study. Students also should be reminded that allowing new members to "opt out" of hazing behaviors is still considered hazing. Perhaps an on-campus hazing awareness week with workshops, special guest speakers, and opportunities for role-playing would be beneficial, as recommended by Saunders and Benté (2013). Finally, providing an anonymous reporting website for hazing hosted by the university also is recommended. Marching bands play an important role in the music and social education of many students. Further investigations into hazing practices as well as further campaigns to prevent hazing behaviors will encourage student safety and allow students the opportunity to flourish. These efforts are essential to continuing the marching band's role of conveying school pride, tradition, and music excellence.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. A complete copy of the questionnaire is available upon request from the corresponding author.
2. Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), student consent is not necessarily required for this type of “directory information” for the purposes of conducting research (34 CFR § 99.31).

References

- Allan, E. J., & Madden, M. (2012). The nature and extent of college student hazing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 24*, 83–90. doi:10.1515/IJAMH.2012.012
- Alvarez, L., & Brown, R. (2011, December 1). Student’s death turns spotlight on hazing. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/01/us/florida-am-university-students-death-turns-spotlight-on-hazing.html?pagewanted=all>
- American Association for Public Opinion Research. (n.d.). *Best practices*. Retrieved from http://www.aapor.org/Best_Practices1.htm#best4
- Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*(2), 177–181. doi:10.1037/h0047195
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193–209. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3
- Binkley, C. (2014, July 27). Ohio State’s marching band culture: Innocent fun or abuse? *Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2014/07/27/blurred-lines.html>
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bosnjak, M., & Tuten, T. L. (2001). Classifying response behaviors in web-based surveys. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6*(3), 0. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2001.tb00124.x
- 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*, 137–149. doi:10.5993/AJHB.29.2.5
- Carter, B. (2012). Take note: Hazing in the marching band. *Music Educators Journal, 98*(3), 3. doi:10.1177/0027432112438179
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioral and life sciences*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*, 64–73. doi:10.2307/3150876
- Cimino, A. (2011). The evolution of hazing: Motivational mechanisms and the abuse of newcomers. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 11*, 241–267. doi:10.1163/156853711X591242

- Cokley, K., Miller, K., Cunningham, D., Motoike, J., King, A., & Awad, G. (2001). Developing an instrument to assess college students' attitudes toward pledging and hazing in Greek letter organizations. *College Student Journal*, 35, 451–457.
- Crow, R., & Rosner, S. (2002). Institutional and organizational liability for hazing in intercollegiate and professional team sports. *St. John's Law Review*, 76, 87–114.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2008). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Dornbusch, S. M. (1955). The military academy as an assimilating institution. *Social Forces*, 33, 316–321. doi:10.2307/2573000
- Drout, C. E., & Corsoro, C. L. (2003). Attitudes toward fraternity hazing among fraternity members, sorority members, and non-Greek students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31, 535–544. doi:10.2224/sbp.2003.31.6.535
- Ellsworth, C. W. (2004). *Definitions of hazing: Differences among selected student organizations*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Maryland, College Park.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Fields, S. K., Collins, C. L., & Comstock, R. D. (2007). Conflict on the courts: A review of sports-related violence literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8, 359–369. doi:10.1177/1524838007307293
- Finkel, M. A. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 20, 228–233. doi:10.1053/ajem.2002.32649
- Flanigan, C. (2014, March). The dark power of fraternities. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/features/archive/2014/03/the-dark-power-of-fraternities/357580/>
- George, C. (2014). TSU's "Ocean of Soul" suspended over hazing report. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/article/Texas-Southern-s-Ocean-of-Soul-suspended-on-3900432.php>
- Gershel, J. C., Katz-Sidlow, R. J., Small, E., & Zandieh, S. (2003). Hazing of suburban middle school and high school athletes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32, 333–335. doi:10.1016/S0154-139X(03)00021-2
- Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). *Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert type scales*. Paper presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, Columbus, OH. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1805/344>
- Guyann, K. L., & Aquila, F. D. (2004). *Hazing in high schools: Causes and consequences*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Harachi, T. W., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, D. (1999). United States. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 279–295). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hollmann, B. B. (2002). Hazing: Hidden campus crime. *New Directions for Student Services*, 99, 11–24. doi:10.1002/ss.57
- Holmes, R. W. (2013). *How to eradicate hazing*. Bloomington, IN: Author House.
- Honeycutt, C. (2006). Hazing as a process of boundary maintenance in an online community. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00240.x
- Hoover, J., & Milner, C. (1998). Are hazing and bullying related to love and belongingness? *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 7(3), 138–141.
- Hoover, N., & Pollard, N. (1999). *Initiation rites and athletics: A national survey of NCAA sports teams*. Alfred, NY: Alfred University and Reidman Insurance Co. Retrieved from http://www.alfred.edu/sports_hazing/hazingpdf.cfm

- Hoover, N., & Pollard, N. (2000, August). *Initiation rites in American high schools: A national survey*. Alfred, NY: Alfred University. Retrieved from http://www.alfred.edu/hs_hazing
- Jackson, J. F. L., & Terrell, M. C. (Eds.). (2007). *Creating and maintaining safe college campuses: A sourcebook for evaluating and enhancing safety programs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Johnson, J. (2011). Through the liminal: A comparative analysis of communitas and rites of passage in sport hazing and initiations. *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 36*, 199–227.
- Keating, C., Pomerantz, J., Pommer, S., Ritt, S., Miller, L., & McCormick, J. (2005). Going to college and unpacking hazing: A functional approach to decrypting initiation practices among undergraduates. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 9*, 104–126. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.9.2.104
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2007). Why students beat each other: A developmental perspective for a detrimental crime. In J. F. L. Jackson, & M. C. Terrell (Eds.), *Creating and maintaining safe college campuses* (pp. 58–74). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kittle, P. R. (2012). *Assessing the efficacy of analytical definitions in hazing education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Krantz, J. H., & Dalal, R. (2000). Validity of web-based psychological research. In N. H. Birnbaum (Ed.), *Psychological experiments on the Internet* (pp. 35–60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*, 159–174. doi:10.2307/2529310
- Lodewijkx, H. F. M., & Syroit, J. E. M. M. (2001). Affiliation during naturalistic severe and mild initiations: Some further evidence against the severity-attraction hypothesis. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 6*(7), 90–107.
- Matney, M. M. (2011). Removing hazing: Replacing false ties with genuine accomplishment. In HazingPrevention.org (Ed.), *Connect the dots: Unite to prevent hazing* (pp. 31–32). LaGrange, GA: HazingPrevention.org.
- McCreary, G. R. (2010). *The impact of moral judgment and moral disengagement on hazing attitudes and bystander behavior in college males* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.
- Melton, C. J. (2012). *Facing the music: Student power relations in student leadership within high school band programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
- National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention. (2010). *National agenda for hazing prevention in education*. Orono: University of Maine.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nuwer, H. (1990). *Broken pledges: The deadly rite of hazing*. Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press.
- Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nuwer, H. (2000). *High school hazing: When rites become wrongs*. New York, NY: Franklin Watts.
- Nuwer, H. (2004). *The hazing reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Olweus, D. (1999). Norway. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 28–48). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Østvik, K., & Rudmin, F. (2001). Bullying and hazing among Norwegian army soldiers: Two studies of prevalence, context, and cognition. *Military Psychology, 13*, 17–39. doi:10.1207/s15327876mp1301_02

- Owen, S., Burke, T., & 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.
- Parks, G. S., & Southerland, T. F. (2013). The psychology and law of hazing consent. *Marquette Law Review*, 97, 1–54. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2235742
- Patten, M. L. (2011). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide* (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyczak.
- Perkins, A. B., Zimmerman, J. D., & Janosik, S. M. (2011). Changing trends in the undergraduate fraternity/sorority experience: An evaluative and analytical literature review. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 6(1), 57–73.
- Pershing, J. L. (2006). Men and women's experiences with hazing in a male-dominated elite military institution. *Men and Masculinities*, 8, 470–492. doi:10.1177/1097184X05277411
- Reips, U. D. (2001). The web experimental psychology lab: Five years of data collection on the Internet. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 33, 201–211. doi:10.3758/bf03195366
- Reips, U. D. (2002). Standards for Internet-based experimenting. *Experimental Psychology*, 49, 243–256. doi:10.1027//1618-3169.49.4.243
- Rhodes, K. (2011). Band brutality: One band member tells his story. In HazingPrevention.org (Ed.), *Connect the dots: Unite to prevent hazing* (pp. 33–34). LaGrange, GA: Hazing Prevention.org.
- 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, 172–193. doi:10.1080/10510974.2011.624396
- Rutledge, G. E. (1998). Hell hath no fury like a pledge scorned and injured: Hazing litigation in U.S. colleges and universities. *Journal of College and University Law*, 25, 361–397.
- Saunders, T. M., & Benté, C. M. (2013). *Hazing adjudication guide for colleges and universities*. Retrieved from <http://osc.umd.edu/Uploads/OSC/Hazing%20Adjudication%20Guide.pdf>
- Schachter, S. (1959). *The psychology of affiliation: Experimental studies on the sources of gregariousness*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schultz, A. J. (2010). Closing the gap: Historical values and modern characteristics of Greek-letter organizations. *Journal of Student Affairs*, 20, 48–55.
- Stanton, J. M. (1998). An empirical assessment of data collection using the Internet. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 709–725. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00259.x
- StopBullying.gov. (n.d.). *Bullying definition*. Retrieved from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/what-is-bullying/definition/index.html>
- StopHazing.org. (n.d.). *Hazing defined*. Retrieved from <http://stophazing.org/definition.html>
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sweet, S. (1999). Understanding fraternity hazing: Insights from symbolic interactionist theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 355–364.
- Sweet, S. (2004). Understanding fraternity hazing. In H. Nuwer (Ed.), *The hazing reader* (pp. 1–13). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Taylor, K. R. (2001). Is hazing harmless horseplay? *Education Digest*, 67(2), 25–30.
- Thompson, L. F., Surface, E. A., Martin, D. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2003). From paper to pixels: Moving personnel surveys to the web. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 197–227. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00149.x

- Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Raalte, J. L., Cornelius, A. E., Linder, D. E., & Brewer, B. W. (2007). The relationship between hazing and team cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 30*(4), 491–507.
- Waldron, J. J., & Kowalski, C. L. (2009). Crossing the line: Rites of passage, team aspects, and ambiguity of hazing. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 80*, 291–302. doi:10.5641/027013609x13087704028633
- Wegener, C. J. (2001). *Perceptions of hazing among Greek and ROTC students at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
- Winslow, D. (1999). Rites of passage and group bonding in the Canadian Airborne. *Armed Forces & Society, 25*, 429–457. doi:10.1177/0095327X9902500305
- Witmer, D. F., Colman, R. W., & Katzman, S. L. (1999). From paper-and-pencil to screen-and-keyboard: Toward a methodology for survey research on the Internet. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Doing Internet research: Critical issues and methods for examining the net* (pp. 145–161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Author Biographies

Jason M. Silveira is assistant professor of music education at Oregon State University. His research interests include teacher effectiveness, perception and cognition, affective response, and psychophysiological responses to music.

Michael W. Hudson is assistant professor of music education at the University of Kentucky. His research interests include sociology of music education, teacher effectiveness, and music perception.

Submitted February 26, 2014; accepted September 26, 2014.