



**1,554** students participated in a 2012 hazing climate assessment in an effort to gauge hazing behaviors on campus and identify where prevention and education needed to focus. Below are a few highlighted findings.

## BELIEVES HAZING IS AN ISSUE AT LEHIGH



## REPORTED VICTIMS OF HAZING (at any point in their life)



To address the issue of hazing on campus, Lehigh joined The National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention. Additionally, a local hazing prevention coalition was developed to continuously evaluate the culture on campus as part of the larger Hazing Prevention Consortium project. As a first step, an assessment was conducted where five campus culture themes were identified.

# 5 campus culture THEMES



**ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE**



**GREEK LIFE & ATHLETICS**



**WORK HARD, PLAY HARD**



**SMALL CAMPUS**




**TRADITION & ROLE OF ALUMNI**

*“ I don't know if people would really know [that] what they see is hazing. I'm not even sure if I know... I think if anything, students would be really alarmed by what happens behind closed doors... — Focus Group Student A ”*

The second step involved six Greek-letter organizations to be part of a case study: two as a control group, two as Test Group 1 (T1), and two as Test Group 2 (T2). Each group was exposed to different interventions then assessed by a pre and post-intervention focus group.

## CASE STUDY DETAILS


**HYPOTHESIS: THE TOOL WILL HELP ORGANIZATIONS IDENTIFY WHAT A PRO-HAZING CULTURE LOOKS LIKE, INCLUDING THE RISK FACTORS.**




**FOCUS GROUPS WERE ADMINISTERED A SPECIFIC SET OF QUESTIONS TO TEST HOW MANY PRO-HAZING AND RISK FACTORS PARTICIPANTS COULD IDENTIFY.**

## CASE STUDY FINDINGS

**CHANGE IN IDENTIFYING FACTORS FROM PRE TO POST FOCUS GROUP**



**TEST GROUP 1 AND TEST GROUP 2...**



Our original hypothesis about how the tool could be used internally for organizations was not sufficient. Our next step is to rethink tool delivery and the implications for execution. Looking forward, we would like to revise the focus group questions to include distinction between risk factors and pro-hazing or instead focus on only one of the two aspects to prevent confusion. The next step is to administer the case study to athletes and student organizations in 2016.