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Emerging strategies for hazing prevention

In an effort to contribute to building an evidence base for hazing prevention, beginning in 2013 StopHazing partnered with eight universities (Cornell University, Lehigh University, Texas A&M University, University of Arizona, University of Central Florida, University of Kentucky, University of Maine, and the University of Virginia), to form the Hazing Prevention Consortium (HPC). In the HPC, university staff receive technical assistance to develop comprehensive hazing prevention initiatives tailored to their unique campus culture. The HPC serves as a testing ground for design and evaluation of effective prevention strategies to inform the development of a hazing prevention framework. Members receive training in all aspects of the SPF and use the social ecological model to develop integrated initiatives using a combination of core prevention strategies that have been tested in other prevention fields, including:

Visible campus leadership anti-hazing statement: Development and widespread dissemination of statements from leadership regarding anti-hazing position and positive institutional values and mission that supports a safe campus climate.

Example: President of the college or university provides public statement to make it clear that hazing is not an acceptable practice and not in alignment with the mission of the institution. The

What key ingredients should inform campus public statements & social messaging on hazing?

Here are 10 principles of effective messaging:

1. Reflect the language of the target audience
2. Speak to the audience’s core values
3. State facts and statistics
4. Use a positive message
5. Be action oriented and offer solutions
6. Tell a story
7. Promote positive social norms
8. Highlight power dynamics and abuse of power hazing
9. Present hazing as a community problem, not an individual problem
10. Don’t underestimate the power of social media

Adapted from National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2015
statement is presented as part of new student orientation and included on campus hazing website along with hazing policies and procedures for reporting and enforcement.

**Coalition-building:** Establishment of a hazing prevention coalition or team with stakeholders from across multiple divisions and levels of the organization (including students), with a mandate to lead institutional efforts in hazing prevention, including oversight of campus climate assessments, stages of planning, design, implementation and evaluation of prevention strategies, and sustainability of prevention efforts.

*Example:* A campus hazing prevention coalition is established, with members appointed by the institution’s President or executive level leadership, with meetings on a monthly basis of entire group, as well as monthly meetings for subgroups focused on Assessment and Evaluation; Coalition Capacity Building; Policy and Procedures Review; Educational Program Design and Implementation; and Sustainability.

**Policy and protocol reviews:** Regular review and refinement of institutional policies on hazing and procedures for addressing hazing incidents, with emphasis on widespread dissemination and accessibility, confidential reporting, consistent response protocols, referral systems, professional staff roles and transparency.

*Example:* Based on a review of hazing incidents and interviews with Student Conduct staff and a search of other campus resources, campus stakeholders collaborate on revising a hazing policy handbook and website to include a clear definition, statement of policy, resources on prevention, information on reporting, protocols for enforcement, response, and accountability, and a list of staff contacts for referrals and questions.

**Hazing Prevention Trainings:** Programs, presentations, and activities to educate and engage stakeholders in building knowledge and awareness of hazing and skills to prevent it.

*Example:* A campus with a strong student leadership tradition includes trainings on ethical leadership and hazing for all incoming students, with regular update trainings for students in group leadership positions that emphasize strategies and skills for identifying group values, developing positive group bonding activities, and bystander intervention.
Social norms messaging: Dissemination of research-based information regarding institutional or campus hazing norms, addressing misperceptions regarding prevalence of values, beliefs and engagement related to hazing, with focus on positive norms that counteract and are alternatives to hazing.

Example: Based on survey data, a campus stakeholder group that includes students develops a social norms poster campaign reporting on the percentage of students who believe it is not cool to use coercion or abusive behavior to initiate new members, with posters placed in residence halls, on computer screens, in cafeteria table settings, and on bookstore bookmarks, and complementary discussions and/or workshops run jointly by staff and student leaders about positive group norms.

Bystander Intervention: Education, training programs and social norms messaging supporting students, staff, parents, and others to develop skills to intervene as bystanders to prevent hazing.

Example: As part of student organization and athletic team orientation activities, student leaders are trained to facilitate discussion on the five stages of bystander intervention--1) Notice behavior; 2) Interpret behavior as a problem; 3) Recognize one’s responsibility to intervene; 4) Develop skills needed to intervene safely; and 5) Take action – and engage group members in role-play exercises and follow-up discussions about their roles as bystanders (Berkowitz, 2009).

Communication to broader campus community: Development and dissemination of information on hazing and hazing prevention efforts to stakeholders outside of immediate institution, including online resources, newsletters, trainings and other programs targeted to alumni, family and parents, and other people and organizations in local community.

Example: Drawing upon available campus resources and data, student affairs staff and senior administrators host and circulate a bi-monthly online newsletter to parents regarding hazing and hazing prevention activities, including the definition of hazing, explanation of hazing policies and reporting procedures, information on how to be a parent bystander, and ways to be involved in campus prevention efforts.

Members of the HPC continue to identify countless lessons learned through the prevention efforts in progress on their campuses. A preliminary selection includes:
- **Role of senior administrators.** Having high level support and engagement from administrative leaders is essential to generating institutional will, momentum, legitimacy and sustainability of hazing prevention initiatives.

- **Prevention staff positions.** Campuses that create permanent staff positions to oversee hazing prevention efforts have greater capacity to leverage momentum and make progress. Staff on campuses where hazing is folded into other “wellness” initiatives and prevention efforts (such as those for sexual assault and substance use) typically don’t have sufficient time to address hazing in a comprehensive way because of competing demands on their time.

- **Building a hazing prevention coalition takes time.** Creating an effective coalition and generating buy-in from key stakeholders takes time, extensive and continual relationship building, clear incentives and a strong mandate from leadership. Effective coalitions establish regular, frequent and sustained meeting schedules and typically create subcommittees to lead various aspects of a comprehensive approach. Irregular schedules, infrequent attendance of members at meetings, and changes in personnel slow momentum and focus.

- **Relationship building and collaboration.** Staff leading hazing prevention efforts who build strong relations with executive leaders as well as to directors of departments where hazing often takes place – e.g. residential life divisions, Greek Life, athletics, etc. – have greater success getting buy-in and collaborating with key staff leaders to communicate clearly and regularly with students about hazing. Strong joint engagement among leaders conveys institutional commitment and deepens messaging and potential impact of hazing prevention efforts, while also elevating visibility of staff who can be resources for students when incidents of hazing occur.

- **Widespread and diversified staff engagement.** Maintaining momentum on hazing is challenging when campus stakeholders who need to be involved are already devoting time and energy to other pressing demands and health issues (e.g., sexual violence, alcohol, and mental health). Synergy among campus prevention efforts and careful planning around staff responsibilities is essential to maintaining strong, consistent and well-rounded representation across stakeholder groups.

- **Development of hazing evaluation is on-going and takes time to test.** Establishing a rigorously conducted evidence base is a long-term process. Most
evaluation approaches--such as surveys, focus group protocols, and use of experimental and control groups to assess impact--take multiple iterations to test and refine. Evaluation may thus best be thought of as an ongoing process to inform continual improvement and impact assessment. Incremental growth of knowledge about hazing and hazing prevention efforts on a campus is an instrumental part of capturing high-level buy-in and support for comprehensive prevention.

- **Focus on proactive trainings that are skill-based.** Engaging students in evaluating their culture, traditions, and practices in a low pressure environment (e.g., one separate from intensive efforts to react to hazing incidents) is best for helping them think about and generate buy-in for reducing risk factors and boosting protective factors in their organizations, groups, and teams. It is vital to create space and provide support for students to lead the development of healthy traditions and non-hazing alternatives to building group cohesion. It is also essential for professional staff to work with students to ensure they acquire and practice new skills that will help them to be change-agents.

- **Balance of focus on both high and low risk student groups.** Hazing prevention focused on high-risk groups such as athletics and Greek Life is necessary and strategic initially, but is insufficient for building sustained and comprehensive prevention. Building on data about where hazing occurs, initiatives should expand to target a broader spectrum of groups as well as the general population of students.

- **Documentation of the hazing prevention process.** Because hazing prevention is a long-term commitment, documentation of the process is essential to learning and improvement--including identification of lessons learned, establishment of best practices and measurement of impact. Engaging key stakeholders in reflecting on accomplishments and how the process has progressed is essential for identifying next steps and assessing how goals are being met in order to sustain momentum.

- **The starting point is wherever you are.** Every institution has to assess where they can best begin and who should best be involved to initiate concerted efforts to address hazing. And just as hazing is a reflection of campus culture, the hazing prevention process will likewise be a reflection of institutional assets as well as barriers. Real movement forward requires solid grounding in the realities and character of each campus.
• Clearly defined milestones, structures, and timeframes help institutions stay on track and move forward. Because it is easy for staff who oversee hazing prevention efforts to get side tracked by other demands on their time, being responsible to complete and report out on a progression of pre-defined tasks helps them maintain focus and a steadier pace than might otherwise be possible. Some campuses generate their own plans, while others work with outside organizations to get assistance defining and meeting milestones. Whichever approach an institution chooses to take, the importance of establishing a plan of hazing prevention activities and timeframes for delivery, evaluation, and reporting cannot be underestimated. In addition to defining a trajectory for moving forward, clearly defined plans allow those involved to measure how and when they are reaching stated goals, to be clear about when goals need to shift, and to mark hard-won accomplishments.

• The prevention process is not linear. Comprehensive hazing prevention is a necessarily iterative and synergistic process, one that is neither linear nor predictable. A prevention strategy may be piloted and, based on evaluation data, revised, but then reformulated again based on a change in staffing or organizational structure. Evaluation tools may be tested and go through numerous refinements before they seem to work effectively. And by then, new data may call for new tools. With so many variables at play, the process of tracking lessons learned and maintaining flexibility to adapt to changes of circumstance, staffing, and climate is essential.

• Comprehensive prevention is the goal but emergent prevention is the norm. Despite the many guidelines presented here for broadly based and far reaching hazing prevention, in reality, most campuses move forward on multiple fronts, but do so unevenly and with constant awareness that there is more that could and should be done. None of the campuses in the HPC are moving forward with all core strategies, or evaluating every prevention strategy, or working across all levels of their social ecology. Rather, each deals with complex contingencies, establishes priorities that necessitate holding off on addressing certain domains, and moves forward as best they can. So while a synergistic, integrated and systematic approach on all levels of the social ecology, utilizing all elements of the SPF is an ideal, in practice, campus professionals are working with limited resources to move hazing prevention forward as effectively as possible while tracking lessons learned along the way.
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