

Socialization Among Fraternity Men and Sexual Assault Prevention

A dissertation presented to

the faculty of

The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Fumiko (Hope) Brinkmeier

April 2022

© 2022 Hope Brinkmeier. All Rights Reserved.

This dissertation titled
Socialization Among Fraternity Men and Sexual Assault Prevention

by
FUMIKO (HOPE) BRINKMEIER

has been approved for
The Department of Counseling and Higher Education
and The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education by

Peter Charles Mather
Professor of Higher Education

Sara Helfrich
Interim Dean, The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education

Abstract

BRINKMEIER, FUMIKO (HOPE), Ph.D., April 2022, Higher Education

Socialization Among Fraternity Men and Sexual Assault Prevention

Director of Dissertation: Peter Charles Mather

Sexual assault is prevalent on college campuses all over the world. Male fraternal settings have historically been a source of high levels of sexual violence. In fraternal settings, often times, partying and alcohol use are contributing factors to sexual assault and many studies have examined these issues (Annan, 2009; Banyard et al., 2003; Berkowitz, 2002; Cantalupo, 2010; Flood, 2005; Muehlenhard, 1996; Orchowski, 2013). However, another probable contributing factor to high levels of sexual violence in fraternal organizations is the socialization processes among fraternal men. This study examines the relationship between socialization processes between men, various training approaches on sexual misconduct, and the general treatment of women among fraternity members.

The study employed the Male Peer Model as a theoretical framework. The results of this study aligned with different tenets of the Male Peer Model including the connection between sexual misconduct and alcohol consumption, all-male membership, hypermasculinity, absence of deterrence, and group secrecy. The findings uncovered insights that would be useful to training efforts. For example, behaviors towards women are intimately tied to the foundation of fraternity affiliation—that is, relationships among members. Training is effective when it capitalizes on value of relationships among brothers and women in sororities, also the self-image of the fraternity has a significant influence on discourse and behaviors. Treatment of women can be leveraged by

highlighting respect as a hallmark and indicator of fraternal reputation. These findings offer insight on fraternities, all-male settings, and informal training which may be leveraged in creating future curriculum in sexual assault prevention efforts.

Dedication

This is dedicated to all victims of sexual misconduct and professionals who are constantly researching ways to mitigate sexual violence.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to acknowledge all the fraternity members who agreed to participate in this study. This was a controversial and sensitive topic and their vulnerability and honesty will make an impact in future sexual assault prevention training efforts, and for that I am truly grateful. Thank you also to my members of my committee; Dr. Tamarine Foreman for reinforcing the potential of my research, Dr. Tom Vander Ven., thank you for all the wonderful feedback you have given to improve this study. Dr. David Nguyen, thank you for developing me into an expert researcher on this topic, and to my chair Dr. Peter Mather, who contributed to my development as a scholar, professional, and person. To all my dear family and friends who have shown support. Additionally, to my colleagues and instructors who made my higher education experience meaningful and full of discovery including: Dr. Shah Hasan, Dr. William Pasewark, Dan Steinberg, and Erin Morgenstern. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge all the survivors of any form of harassment or misconduct. It is with your strength and perseverance that allowed me to bring more awareness and hope of mitigating rape and sexual violence on higher education campuses.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Abstract..... | 3 |
| Dedication | 5 |
| Acknowledgments | 6 |
| List of Tables..... | 9 |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 10 |
| Introduction | 10 |
| Conclusion..... | 16 |
| Definitions..... | 17 |
| Chapter 2: Review of the Literature | 18 |
| Fraternity Affiliation on Campus | 18 |
| Prevalence of Sexual Misconduct | 19 |
| Consequences of Sexual Assault in Higher Education..... | 26 |
| Approaches to Sexual Assault Prevention | 28 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 48 |
| Chapter 3: Research Methodology | 54 |
| Qualitative Research Design | 54 |
| Data Collection..... | 57 |
| Data Analysis | 61 |
| Limitations | 62 |
| Who I am as a Researcher..... | 63 |
| Trustworthiness and Credibility | 65 |
| Conclusion..... | 66 |
| Chapter 4: Results..... | 67 |
| Participant Profiles | 67 |
| Cross Case Analysis | 71 |
| Conclusion..... | 146 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion | 148 |
| Summary of Findings..... | 148 |
| Male Peer Model | 150 |
| Implications for Practice | 161 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Implications for Research | 164 |
| Personal Reflection..... | 166 |
| Conclusion..... | 169 |
| References | 171 |
| Appendix A: Interview Questions..... | 196 |
| Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Letter | 200 |
| Appendix C: Coding Sheet | 202 |

List of Tables

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 1 Private University Participant Profiles..... | 69 |
| Table 2 Public University Participant Profiles..... | 70 |
| Table 3 Fraternity and Men's Codes and Themes..... | 202 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Reports of sexual assault are increasing at higher education institutions as demonstrated by daily statistics and the rising incidents reported in the media. “There has been a 205% increase in reports of sexual assault while other crimes have decreased” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016, para 2). The Office of the Press Secretary (2014) published a memorandum by Barack Obama stating that one in five female students will experience sexual violence before graduating (Office of the Press Secretary, 2014, para 1). Sexual assault continues to receive considerable attention; notably, there is substantial research on the prevalence of rape on college campuses (Banyard et al., 2003; Berkowitz, 2002; Franklin et al., 2012; Orchowski, 2013).

In addition to tracking reporting of sexual violence, a number of research initiatives shed light on different dimensions of sexual assault-related issues on college campuses. For instance, research studies have focused on gender roles, rape myths, sexual assault in the media and how it pertains to college men, the role of alcohol in sexual assault, and effective training methods to reduce sexual assault on campus (Annan, 2009; Banyard et al., 2003; Berkowitz, 2002; Cantalupo, 2010; Flood, 2005; Muehlenhard, 1996). As research indicates, sexual assault affects multiple aspects of the victims’ lives, including mental health and relationships. Sexual assault can also prevent students from being successful in their education. Jordan et al. (2014) found that sexual assault can be a predictor for lack of commitment to victims’ education. Aside from hampering the survivors’ educational attainment, sexual violence may affect students’

social life related to participation in extra-curricular activities and membership in student organizations. This is due to psychological triggers from the assault which “can lead to an individual not wanting to partake in the in the events that led up to their sexual assault post trauma because of the fear it evokes within them” (Decou, 2017, p. 166). There are statistics illustrating the prevalence of sexual violence on campus. “Female college-aged students (18-24) are 20% more likely than non-students of the same age to be a victim of rape or sexual assault” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014, para 3). Additionally, Cantor et al. (2015) reported moderate percentages (27%) of senior college women reported experiencing some sort of unwelcome sexual contact by being incapacitated.

Statistics in literature surprisingly illustrate men admitting they have committed some kind of sexual assault. “Twenty-five percent of college-aged men reported engaging in at least one instance of sexually aggressive behavior after age 14 (i.e., attempted or completed sexual contact—ranging from un- wanted contact to rape—without full female consent)” (Abbey & McCauslan, 2004, p. 750). Koss et al. (1987) reported that eight percent of a male sample admitted engaging in behaviors that met legal definitions for rape.

While sexual assault can happen in virtually any social context on campus, there is considerable literature that points to issues associated with Greek-letter organizations, or social fraternities (Boeringer et al., 1991; Cleveland & Koss, 1999; Franklin et al., 2012; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Seabrook et al., 2018). Sexual misconduct is widespread across campuses but when looking through a narrower lens, there is a higher probability of being sexually assaulted in a fraternity setting which is

supported up by literature (Boeringer et al., 1991; Cleveland & Koss, 1999; Franklin et al., 2012; Foubert, 2006; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007).

Despite the current volume of research, Mellins et al. (2017) proposed that there should be further investigation of cultural dimensions of Greek life that may foster an environment where abuse against women may be accepted. In the past few years, countless fraternities have closed due to sexual assault allegations. There were 133 fraternal chapters at 55 universities sanctioned in a single semester. Penalties included chapter expulsions, probation, and other implications. Seabrook (2016) stated that “Despite consistent evidence that fraternity membership is associated with sexual violence, less is known about why fraternity membership is related to greater acceptance and perpetration of sexual violence” (p. 3). Due to the significant statistics surrounding Greek life and sexual assault, the complexities of social processes within Greek organizations, and limited research concentrating on the socialization of fraternity members regarding sexual assault, it is essential to examine how Greek fraternal organizations learn about sexual misconduct and sexual assault.

Sexual assault is an issue that has been extensively researched, as noted by the review of the literature. This research is different from previous studies in the following ways. First, there is an absence of qualitative studies that take an in-depth look at how fraternity members make sense of issues of sexual misconduct. One of the most well-known studies was completed by Franklin et al. (2012). A survey of 300 male participants focused on measuring the incidents of engaging in sex while inebriated. The researchers’ goals also centered around predictive statistics by asking questions about the

level of pornography consumption, drug use, and the participation in all-male groups, and how it affects sexual self-control. The current study employed a qualitative method to examine the likeliness of committing sexual assault when engaging in the various behaviors of watching pornography and consuming large amount of alcohol or drugs.

A study by Foubert et al. (2006) employing focus groups of fraternity men assessed the relationship between alcohol use and consent in sexual encounters. In these focus groups, participants were asked a series of questions that gathered their observations on the role of alcohol in gaining consent before engaging in sexual encounters. Some questions included how they could tell if a woman was drunk, conditions which one would be intimate with someone if alcohol was involved, and how consent should be discussed when alcohol was involved. Foubert et al. (2006) found the themes below:

...asking for consent during intimate encounters ruins the moment. ...consent is not clear with women you do not know. With women you do know...consent is very clear. There is much more clarity in what constitutes as consent. Rape prevention programmers should approach their chapters when trying to educate them on alcohol related sexual assault. (Foubert et al., 2006, p. 368)

Most of these studies are quantitative in nature and the majority of these studies measured the campus climate of sexual assault, and factors contributing to sexual assault including alcohol use (Boeringer et al., 1991; Cleveland & Koss, 1999; Franklin et al., 2012; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Seabrook et al., 2018). Previous studies did not go into what fraternal men learn from their peers, what their interactions

with women look like, and what these men took away from their university's sexual assault prevention training.

There is potential to add to the understanding of the phenomenon of sexual assault on college campuses. Porta et al. (2020) completed a study and their goal was to identify opportunities for university staff and faculty to collaborate with members of sororities and fraternities to reduce sexual violence in the party environment. Data were collected by holding focus groups with both men and women. In these groups, the individuals were asked questions regarding parties and risk factors like location and reasons for the party; however, information on male engagement was not investigated. Specific to fraternities, "Fraternity or institutional-level factors are understudied and less understood despite their being significant influence of party environments and outcomes" (McMahon et al., 2019, p. 275). My study is different because it will include the voices of fraternity members regarding sexual violence. It is imperative to understand how men engage in fraternity life and how they make meaning of sexual assault. It is also important to understand related training approaches.

Purpose

The increased reports of sexual assault involving fraternity members at Greek events demonstrate the need to better understand the socialization of fraternity members and how these fraternity members learn about sexual assault and misconduct. I sought to understand how fraternal men are socialized about sexual misconduct and assault. This included investigating whether there were member guidelines with training initiatives. I

wanted to learn what kind of training fraternal men were receiving and whether the fraternity brothers found the training valuable.

The knowledge and insight garnered from this research may be utilized to identify best training practices to support fraternal organizations in their role as mentors of fraternal men regarding sexual assault and misconduct. At best, higher education leaders may gain a clearer understanding of sexual socialization in fraternal organizations, thereby providing a possibility of how to better equip fraternal organizations with better training for their pledges related to sexual misconduct and sexual assault. This hopefully will result in a decrease in sexual assault and misconduct from fraternity members. Ultimately, I sought to provide higher education officials with the knowledge to support a reduction in the number of sexual crimes on campus from fraternity members.

Significance

Greek organizations play significant roles in higher education institutions. Greek membership represents a positive role in the community surrounding the university or college. Feldman and Astin (1994) found that the Greek experience provides students the opportunity for development and growth, the ability to interact with peers, and fraternal and sororities are associated with higher giving rates by alumni. Kelly (2008) similarly found that Greek involvement can help students develop into leaders. Researchers and journalists asserted that the image of Greek organizations and higher education as a whole is tarnished as illustrated by several incidents reported in the media (Carone, 2014; Clark, 2014; Hartocollis, 2019; Valenti, 2019). The university is responsible when sexual assaults occur. When the university is not held responsible, the opportunity for higher

education institutions to fulfill their mission of educating students is compromised.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to understand how fraternal organizations socialize their members about sexual misconduct and assault. The following research questions will guide this research:

1. How do fraternity members' relationships with male peers shape their perceptions and treatment of women?
2. What kinds of informal and formal training do fraternity members receive surrounding the treatment of women? What did they take away from these experiences?

Conclusion

According to Seabrook et al. (2018), “few studies have examined objectification of women as the mechanism by which fraternity membership is associated with acceptance of sexual violence” (p. 5). Upon examining existing research surrounding the objectification of women, there was an extensive number of scholarly articles focusing on attitudes towards sexual violence, rape myths, the perception of the victim after a sexual assault (Berkowitz, 2002; Casey & Lindhorst, 2009; Gidycz et al., 2011; McMahon & Barnyard, 2011; Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998; Murnen et al, 2012; Peacock & Baker, 2014; Stathopoulos, 2013), but not in the context of fraternities.

In summary, sexual assault is an issue that has been extensively researched, as noted by this review of the literature. Most of these studies are quantitative in nature and the majority of these studies measured the campus climate of sexual assault, and factors

contributing to sexual assault including alcohol use. To improve the college landscape regarding sexual assault, numerous training models are being created and utilized including, the public health, social norms, and bystander. However, it is important to understand men's socialization processes and how they pertain to sexual assault because this will add knowledge to improve education programs.

Definitions

Rape: "The nonconsensual oral, anal, or vaginal penetration of an individual by another person with a part of the body or an object, using force or threats of bodily harm or taking advantage of the individual's inability to give or deny consent" (APA, n.d., para 1).

Sexual Assault: "Violent sexual penetration of an individual. It includes forced vaginal, oral, and anal penetration" (APA, n.d., para 1).

Sexual Harassment: "Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature" (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d., para 1).

Sexual Misconduct: "Includes harassment, unwanted touching, exposing oneself, undertaking sexual acts in public, forcing another to commit unwanted sexual acts, and otherwise causing offense or harm to another person for purposes of sexual gratification" (U.S. Legal, Inc., n.d., para 2).

Sexual Violence: "A sexual act that is committed or attempted by another person without freely given consent of the victim or against someone who is unable to consent or refuse" (Center for Disease Control, n.d., para 1).

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The literature review begins with an exploration of fraternity affiliation and the motivation for students to join Greek organizations. Second, I discuss the problems associated with the phenomenon of sexual assault in higher education institutions including consequences of rape on campus. Then, I present an overview of sexual assault prevention programs, past and current. Lastly, I examine men's role in preventing sexual assault.

Fraternity Affiliation on Campus

There are several reasons why men join fraternal organizations. "The main reasons why men join fraternities are to gain acceptance, to build their resume, to gain leadership experience, to avoid the feeling of being left behind, to meet women, and finally, to party" (Daly, 2011, p. 10). It is widely understood that alcohol is extremely accessible at higher education institutions, especially in fraternal settings. "Extreme drinking, drug use and bad behavior... have become all too common at the party school, endorsed by a prominent party subculture that encourages and rewards extreme routines, rituals, and risk-taking, while providing the rationales that defend it all" (Weiss, 2013, p. 147). Alcohol is not the only defining element in fraternities, but the close-knit group of men is what makes a fraternity.

Because of the large number of men within close proximity to each other, their frequent interactions with women, and the presence of alcohol, the potential for sexual violence is heightened. Sanday (2007) and Kimmel (2018) sought to understand if all-male organizations were more inclined to engage in sexual violence against women.

According to Murnen and Kohlman (2007), organizations that foster all-male membership, such as fraternities, tend to endorse violent actions against women.

Additional studies have shown how fraternity membership is associated with sexual assault (Boeringer et al., 1991; Cleveland et al., 1999; DeKeseredy, 1990; Franklin et al., 2012; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Swartout, 2013). Many of these studies included elements of sexual aggression among men towards women.

Sexual aggression is defined as “a person engaging in sexual behavior with someone who does not or cannot consent to engage in that behavior” (Basile & Saltzman, 2002, p. 11). Martin (2016) concentrated on all-male groups and how that may promote certain types of masculinity that may make their members more prone to committing sexual assault. One reason for this may be due to shared values and expectations of other male peers. Numerous studies (DeKeseredy, 1990; Kanin, 1967; Martin & Hummer, 1989) proposed that formal all-male groups (such as fraternities and athletic teams), conditioned ideologies of rape-myths and rape culture, prompting male members to find it appropriate to commit sexual misconduct. There is limited research of sexual misconduct and how it pertains to Greek life.

Prevalence of Sexual Misconduct

Campus sexual assault has been a topic of research since the 1950s. Campus sexual assault research began with a study completed by Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957). Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957) distributed questionnaires to 291 college females inquiring if they have ever had experience with sexual male aggression in dating relationships and asked the women whether they have felt offended by certain actions. These researchers

explored attitudes and reactions of those involved and the characteristics of the women being offended. These questionnaires uncovered that there was a “pattern of exploitation, involvement, ambivalent resistance, awareness of shared stigma, and reduced reliance upon institutional controls with corresponding stress on control within the dyadic relationships” (Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957, p. 58). DeKeseredy et al. (2017) reported that it was the study completed by Koss et al. (1987) that gave more national attention to rape on campus in higher education settings. In this study, The Sexual Experiences Survey was distributed to 6,159 college students. The survey was a way for participants to self-report various degrees of sexual aggression and victimization. Koss et al. (1987) found that 44% of women reported unwanted sexual contact and 2% of women experienced coercion of unwanted sexual intercourse. Conclusively, this study uncovered that there were high rates of rape and sexual aggression on college campuses. DeKeseredy et al. (2017) asserted that the two studies conducted by Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957) and Koss et al. (1985) were the first studies that brought attention to sexual assault in higher education settings.

Linder et al. (2020) examined ten years of research, 540 scholarly articles, about campus sexual violence. Using a content analysis method, the researchers found that 27% of the research centered around victim risk factors. Barrick et al. (2012) defined victim risk factors as elements that make someone at risk for becoming a victim of sexual violence. Linder et al. (2020) also found that many of these articles, the researchers reported findings in a way which unintentionally places blame or responsibility for ending sexual violence on the potential victims, versus the potential perpetrators. Within

the content analysis, 55% of the research had an implicit and/or explicit concentration on the victims. Linder et al. (2020) reported that only 4.6% of the articles had to deal with male engagement meaning, how men are engaged during training and sexual assault prevention.

Another theme in literature that was common surrounding sexual assault at higher education institutions, was the role of alcohol as it pertains to sexual assault. Linder (2020) found the second most studied topic was alcohol and how it pertains to sexual violence.

Influences

There were numerous studies addressing alcohol and drug consumption between perpetrators and victims (Abbey et al., 1996; Flack et al. 2007; Krebs et al., 2009; Mousilo et al., 2012). Abbey et al. (2001) noted, “Alcohol consumption by the perpetrator, the victim, or both, has consistently been linked to sexual assault” (p. 43). Koss et al.’s (1987) study at a higher education institution found that “74% of the perpetrators and 55% of the victims of rape had been drinking alcohol prior to the [sexual assault] incident” (p. 55). Similarly, Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) completed a study and found that “sexually assaultive dates were more likely than non-assaultive dates to involve heavy alcohol consumption by the man and the woman” (p. 34).

Another study conducted by Abbey et al. (1996) examined alcohol as a risk factor for sexual assault among college aged women. This study consisted of 1,160 women participants who were enrolled at a university and they were distributed a survey asking questions about sexual assault experiences and risk factors, most commonly, alcohol

consumption. Abbey et al. (1991) found that alcohol can increase the level of friendliness of the perpetrator and victim, and the perpetrator can misperceive this social openness as consent and would allow the man to feel more comfortable forcing themselves on a woman.

Mousilo et al. (2012) completed a study with 319 first year college women examining the relationship between their alcohol use and sexual assault. This study concluded that "...more than 31% of women who reported weekly heavy episodic drinking reported a sexual assault in their first year of college" (Mousilo et al., 2012, p. 90). Within this sample of first-year college women, heavy drinking was a strong predictor of sexual assault. Another study that supported the finding that heavy drinking was associated with sexual misconduct was conducted by Krebs et al. (2007). These researchers collected self-reported data from 5,446 college women. Through this web-based survey, Krebs et al. (2007) found most of the sexual assaults reported occurred after women voluntarily consumed alcohol.

Flack et al. (2007) conducted a study that examined if alcohol use was a risk factor for unwanted sex. These researchers examined the relationships among the victim and perpetrator during the self-reported instances of unwanted sexual behavior, the types of social situations in which such events occurred and various elements that contributed to those encounters (e.g., alcohol, convenience, physical pressure). There was a sample of 178 students and from this sample, "23% of women reported one or more experiences of unwanted sexual intercourse and 78% unwanted fondling incidents occurred at parties and bars" (Flack et al., 2007, p. 139). Flack et al. (2007) concluded that the largest reason

for unwanted sexual intercourse was impaired judgment due to alcohol. “Students who reported unwanted intercourse or unwanted fondling also reported higher frequencies of drinking. Impaired judgment because of alcohol intoxication was the most frequently endorsed of the top three reasons for the occurrence of unwanted intercourse and unwanted fondling” (Flack et al., 2007, p. 139). Previous studies have shown the strong relationship between alcohol and sexual assault. The next topic I analyzed was the role of negative peer support regarding sexual assault.

The definition of negative peer support highlighted in literature is “strong support that is hostile to women or is intimate partner violence espousing” (Capaldi et al. 2012, p. 3). There were studies surrounding negative peer support among males and sexual assault (Boeringer et al., 1991; Cleveland & Koss, 1999; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016; Franklin et al., 2012, Koss & Gaines, 1993; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Swartout, 2013). Franklin et al. (2012) hypothesized that membership in all-male groups would directly predict abusive attitudes and behaviors like pressure for sex, gender role ideology, excessive alcohol and drug usage, and group secrecy. The researchers gathered data from 304 male undergraduates. Franklin et al. (2012) concluded from the results that men in fraternities were significantly more likely to report sexual assault as compared to their counterparts who were not involved in a fraternity or an all-male social group. According to Franklin et al. (2012), “Fraternity men were significantly more likely to receive informational support from their friends to use adverse and abusive tactics to gain sexual access” (p. 1467).

Franklin et al. (2012) reported that men in fraternities received more peer pressure to have sex.

In another study, Swartout (2013) examined how all-male peer networks may influence sexual aggression. In this study, 341 college-aged men completed a questionnaire and participants reported previous sexual behaviors, attitudes towards women, and peers' attitudes of rape and of women. The results found that peer rape-supportive attitudes influenced individuals' negative attitudes towards women. The most common rape supportive attitudes were "rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence" (Burt & Albin, 1981, p. 216). "Individuals in high-density, low-hostility peer groups had the lowest average levels of hostility toward women. Male peers that hold negative beliefs of women strongly influence individuals' attitudes concerning violence and hostility toward women" (Swartout, 2013, p. 165).

DeKeseredy et al. (2017) also conducted a study examining the relationship between peer support and sexual assault. In this study, 5,718 students completed a questionnaire and this tool measured the number of incidences of sexual assault and the frequency of interactions among abusive peers. DeKeseredy et al. (2017) found that abusive peers engaged in behaviors that included physical forcing themselves on women, using violence, and insulting others. Results concluded that more than half of the respondents had peers that engaged in one or more of the three abusive behaviors listed above. In addition, 30% of the men in the sample asserted that they had friends who committed at least one of the abusive behaviors. This study concluded that "women who received such support were three times more likely to have been sexually assaulted and

women with attachments to abusive peers were nearly 3.2 times more likely to have been sexually assaulted” (DeKeseredy et al., 2017, p. 185).

Koss and Gaines (1993) examined the associations of alcohol, athletics, and fraternities and how it pertained to sexual aggression. Sexual aggression included “uninvited sexual advances including wolf whistles or catcalls to women, unwanted sexual contact including unwanted touching of a woman's buttocks, breasts, or genital area, and sexual coercion” (Koss & Gaines, 1996, p. 98). The predictors of this behavior were athletic involvement and fraternity affiliation. Athletic involvement was measured by formal sports involvement (currently playing on a university team) or involvement in a club sports team. Fraternity affiliation was defined as those who have rushed but not pledged, those who have pledged but not yet become an active member, and those who were considered active members. This study concluded that the participants who showed formal sports involvement, particularly in the revenue-producing sports, were associated with sexual aggression. Regarding fraternity affiliation, the researchers were unable to “confirm a significant contribution by fraternity affiliation to the prediction of sexual aggression perpetration, although the two variables are correlated with each other” (Koss & Gaines, 1996, p. 100).

Murnen and Kohlman (2007) completed a meta-analysis regarding athletic participation and fraternity membership and sexual aggression among college aged men. During this meta-analysis, 29 studies were analyzed, and the study found that membership in each of these all-male groups were associated with rape-supportive attitudes and sexually aggressive behaviors. This meta-analysis demonstrated that the

membership of these all-male groups perpetuated hypermasculine attitudes and sexually aggressive behaviors.

Consequences of Sexual Assault in Higher Education

There are numerous and substantial negative consequences of sexual assault on college campuses. Sexual assault can prevent students from being successful in their higher education. “The freedom to learn depends upon appropriate opportunities and conditions in the classroom” (American Association of University Professors, 2016, para 3). The victims’ academic performance may be compromised in a variety of ways due to sexual assaults. Jordan et al. (2014) reported that students who experienced a traumatic sexual assault have lower academic performance and more absences than other students. This seems to be rooted in emotional problems growing out of the trauma, especially if they are not receiving psychological counseling. Research by Vogt (2015) supported Jordan et al.’s (2014) findings that survivors of sexual assault had lower GPAs than their counterparts. In addition, Vogt (2015) also found that sexual assault resulted in lower levels of college completion. Aside from the student, sexual assault negatively affects higher education institutions.

Sexual assault can bring financial implications which are expensive for colleges and universities. The National Sexual Violence Resource Center (2016) calculated that the cost of a rape is an average of \$151,423 per victim. There may be other financial costs to victims whether they report it or not, such as lost wages, medical expenses, and tuition loss if unable to continue with school. Additionally, the Accountability and Safety Act is a pending bill related to sexual assault on campuses. This bill states that higher

education institutions would be forced to pay a fine valuing a maximum of \$150,000 if there was an absence of proper documentation of the situation surrounding sexual violence. For those higher education institutions that do not follow the legislative bill, they could be fined a portion of the school's operating budget.

United Educators, the higher education insurance company, began offering insurance to cover sexual assault payouts and this appears to have become a disturbingly necessary cost of doing business in higher education. Between 2006 and 2010, the company has paid out \$36 million on behalf of its 1,200 member universities and 72% of the settlements were provided to parties suing the schools due to sexual assault incidents (Association's Committee on Women in the Academic Profession, 2012, para 3).

Clearly, sexual assault presents financial repercussions for universities.

The financial impacts universities experience correlates strongly to enrollment numbers. Dixon (2015) provided examples of how sexual assaults affect student enrollment. Dartmouth College experienced a 14% drop in new college enrollment applications following student protests against the administration's handling of sexual violence, harassment, and incidents involving hazing. The University of Virginia experienced its first decrease in college applications in 12 years following the discredited Rolling Stone (Erdely, 2014) article about rape on its campus. This lack of accountability caused embarrassment for the university and community which led to negative publicity. Ropp (2014) found that students, their families, and the public voices of strong

dissatisfaction of the administration may lead to fewer donations, less philanthropic engagements, and reduced support for the university.

A large part of university philanthropic participation and support are alumni of Greek organizations. Parker (2012) asserted that their participation not only boosted overall recruitment for the university, but Greek alumni provided viable resources for university students. Sexual assault can reduce support for the university, especially for Greek organizations. Greek alumni play a significant role in university philanthropy. Wunnava and Okunade (2013) completed a study that revealed the significance of male Greek alumni. They found that male alumni in fraternal organizations gave significantly more financial resources. Wunnava and Okunade (2013) found that Greek alumni increased donations nine percent more than their non-Greek counterparts. Parker (2011) asserted that positive solid relationships between university officials and members of Greek communities usually translate into an increased amount of university donor giving rates. Often, when there are major violations by fraternities, things like hazing, sexual misconduct, or academic dishonesty, there are university sanctions or fraternities are closed down.

Approaches to Sexual Assault Prevention

Sexual assault prevention can mean a variety of projects and initiatives, but most have some commonalities. Tracy and Wallace (2016) reported that the elements that make sexual prevention programs successful are “leadership involvement, peer to peer mentorship, education and training, accountability, organizational support, community involvement, deterrence, communication, incentives, and harm reduction” (p. 143). The

ACHA and CDC (2008) suggested a holistic approach for sexual assault prevention education. The CDC (2010) recommended that higher education institutions need a comprehensive education to prevent sexual violence and assist students in gaining skills to aid in the development of healthy and safe relationships and communities.

The ACHA and CDC (2018) contended that each sexual assault prevention education program should address the following learning goals: “1. consent, policy, and resources, 2. healthy relationships and sexuality, 3. roots of sexual violence, and 4. empowering actions” (Edwards, et al. 2018, p. 8). These were all important elements and with the existence of more sophisticated technology in place, the types of programs are much more varied and involved than years ago. Degue et al. (2014) recommended a three-tier approach when it comes to designing a program. These recommendations are based on an education program centering bystander intervention. This includes: empowering community members, creating messages relaying ways to reduce risk for example, ways in which members can help maintain personal safety. Lastly, there is education about consent, the verbal and nonverbal cues, and the definition of consent in the legal system.

Men’s Presence in Sexual Assault Prevention Programs

Some people harbor the impression that sexual assault prevention programs are comprised of teaching women to defend themselves and fight off unwanted advances. While previously, sexual assault prevention programs may have focused on risk-reduction techniques, it is incredibly important that men are not neglected in these considerations. Degue et al. (2014) attested that previously, sexual assault prevention

programs were mainly targeted towards women. Chin et al. (2012) reported that the most common sexual assault prevention training are women's self-defense courses and teaching these women the warning signs of possible assaults including knowing the profile of perpetrators which is the most common type of prevention program. Chin et al. (2012) presented the reasons why this prevention program was ineffective. This was for a variety of reasons. First, these risk reduction techniques did not take acquaintance rape into account. Second, risk reduction strategies in rape prevention were almost always targeted to women. This made the double standard transparent. Third, they were individually targeted, and a bystander approach was not considered. It made resisting rape an individual activity; however, there was a growing awareness on campuses that men are vital to sexual assault prevention programs. Annan (2009) reported that there are more movements to engage college men as activists and allies in attempts to end sexual violence. Currently, more research is being focused surrounding men's participation in sexual assault prevention programs and the effects of these programs on college men's attitudes toward rape culture, gender inequality, women stereotypes, the treatment of women, and the misinterpretation of consent. Annan (2009) stated that there are several social movements and that more college men are acting as allies and acting as activists to end sexual assault.

The literature uncovered several reasons why involving men in sexual assault prevention programs has more of a positive effect on lowering sexual assault than if just a woman was involved. Casey (2010) observed that men experienced a sensitizing experience which positively impacted men's views on sexual assault. A sensitizing

experience is one that “raises a level of consciousness regarding issues of violence or gender inequity” (Casey, 2010, p. 953). This experience seemed to lay the groundwork for being open to involvement when an opportunity arose. This sensitizing experience usually involved someone they knew, whether it was an acquaintance or friend, sharing their experience with a sexual assault or their knowledge of someone witnessing it and not doing anything. This awareness created an emotional connection which was a critical component of men’s decision to devote their time to anti-violence work and engaging in a sexual assault prevention program. Wantland (2008) presented an example of an all-male study which was completed called the Fraternity Peer Rape Education Program. This program allowed fraternity members to receive class credit upon completion for this training. At the end of this training, fraternity members were certified to become peer rape educators.

Brecklin and Forde (2001) completed a study by conducting multiple meta-analyses. They found that a program presented to all-male audiences was more effective than audiences with both men and women. These researchers asserted that the engagement of men in sexual assault prevention programs may yield visible results of decreased sexual assaults. Several frameworks exist that offer options to those in the public and especially those in higher education. These frameworks, provided by the CDC (2015) for engaging men in a sexual assault prevention program included the public health model, the social norms model, and bystander models. All these frameworks had some kind of male participation.

Education Models. Three education models were most prominent in the literature: public health, social norms, and bystander.

Public Health Model. The public health model addresses the issue of sexual assault regarding the population versus the individual and is based on a public health prevention strategy. Brone et al. (2004) provided four health principles which include: the health of the public, data-informed approaches, cultural competency, and prevention. The public health model addresses the victim's and assaulter's health related issues. Data sources are varied and come from several sources including: the criminal justice system, hospitals, rape crisis surveys, general public surveys, focus groups, past community assessments, and interviews.

Data is important and applicable and can be used for delivery of prevention programs and tracking successes and problems, which is done over time. The data consists of the times and locations of the sexual assaults. The program details the attitudes of victims and perpetrators and elements in the environmental. This information is used to identify risk factors. This information is also used to improve future programs by documenting successes and failures, so the information is accurately disseminated. Also, cultural competency is a key factor. This means the "unique aspects of various populations and communities" (Brone et al., 2004, p. 15). This is relevant because this program focuses on the population's overall health. After the data is collected, intervention phrases are created. The phases of this prevention program include "...approaches that victims take before sexual violence that can prevent perpetration, immediate responses after sexual violence, the short-term consequences of violence, the

long-term responses after sexual violence, dealing with long lasting consequences of violence, and sex offender treatment interventions” (Brone et al., 2004, p. 15).

The public health model is defined by four phases: “defining the problem, identifying risk and protective factors, developing and testing prevention strategies, and ensuring widespread adoption” (Brone et al., 2004, p. 15). When educating men through the public health model, the first step is understanding the magnitude of this issue and how it affects women, psychologically and physically. The CDC (2015) keeps record of data including, the number of instances on a national level, trends, number of injuries, and instances of death. All this information is gathered through multiple channels including police reports, medical examinations, public surveys, and hospital data.

The second phase of the public health model is identifying and educating men about risk and protective factors. Risk factors are “characteristics that increase the likelihood of a person becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence” (CDC, 2015, para 6). Protective factors are defined as “characteristics that decrease the likelihood of a person becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence because it provides a buffer against risk” (CDC, 2015, para 6). Most importantly, the message that it is never the victim’s fault, no matter what risk factors may be involved, is communicated.

The third step of the public health model is developing and testing prevention strategies. The CDC (2015) reported that new literature, assessment data, community surveys, interviews with stakeholders, and focus groups are ways to develop and test new prevention strategies. Successes and failures with different prevention methods are documented and evaluated. This evidence can help with future planning efforts

surrounding sexual assault prevention efforts. This evidence-based approach can change how sexual assault is looked at and prevented.

The last step of the public health model is ensuring widespread adoption. This includes making sure program planning is done in a variety of settings including computer-based modules and community training. This step also entails defining dissemination techniques to promote sexual assault prevention to diverse populations. There are best practices for disseminating this information.

It is essential that core activities such as collecting and analyzing data, designing, and implementing programs, and determining what works be conducted within the context of the unique aspects of various populations and communities.

Guidance from the population is key in the design, implementation, and evaluation of a prevention program (Brone et al., 2004, p. 15).

Taking all these elements into account, popular activities in the public health model include educational seminars, hotlines, professional training programs, tangible informational materials, training programs for students, campus personnel designed to reduce the number of potential incidents, and education about drugs that facilitate sexual assault.

As with any educational model, there are limitations. Implications of this approach are that it requires funding from the government. Puddy and Wilkins (2011) stated that the majority of funds originated from the Rape Prevention and Education grant program. The funds differ each year depending on perceived importance of the issue. Conclusively, the main highlights of this model are gender socialization, privilege,

sexual assault myths, sexual assault prevention techniques, and facts including rape supportive environments and how to support a survivor. The next model of sexual assault education that I discuss is the social norms model.

Social Norms Model. The social norms model (SNM) was created when colleges and universities wanted to reduce alcohol and tobacco use among their students. This theory of “social norms” is different from the public health model because the approach attempts to change social norms. According to Berkowitz (2002), this approach comes from the area of social sciences and includes: psychology, cognitive dissonance theory, and sociology. “SNM describes situations in which individuals incorrectly perceive the attitudes and/or behaviors of peers and other community members to be different from their own when in fact they are not” (Berkowitz, 2002, p. 163). The social norms framework is an intervention program that corrects misperceptions by revealing the healthier norm which will have a beneficial effect on their peers which can reduce their participation in negative behaviors. The main goal of this program is to “reveal and enhance already existing healthy norms that have been underestimated and weakened” (Berkowitz, 2002, p. 163). Social norms research suggested that most males have a misperception about other men’s attitudes and behaviors towards sex; however, men do not act or portray their discomfort because of the fear that other men do not feel the same. Based on this, men have a high probability of keeping their feelings to themselves. Men who engage in sexual violence may think this violence is acceptable because another man who is his peer stays silent when it happens, thus he continually practices this violent

behavior. A way to prevent this behavior is to encourage men to speak up and vocalize their belief of negative behaviors.

Duplaga (2019) proposed the three main ideas of SNM: collecting data (about perceived beliefs and attitudes, actual beliefs, attitudes, and healthy behaviors), marketing campaigns and lastly, feedback. Data is collected surrounding actual norms and perceived norms. The actual norms are then reported back to the target population. Duplaga (2019) also mentioned that if a man believes that his sensitivity to acts of sexual violence are not shared by his peers, he may be apprehensive to take action. Data that has been collected in the past include other men's perceptions of other men's sexual activities and beliefs, incorrect ideas about the support of rape myths, and assumptions about other men's comfort level with degrading language towards women. An example that Perkins (2003) provided was when a media campaign illustrated men's discomfort with other men degrading women. After the campaign, men reported that their misperception of other men's level of comfort with degrading language was reduced. In addition, there was a campaign surrounding men who indicated their feelings about stopping the first time on a date when the woman said no to sexual activity. The goal of the campaign approach was to promote awareness about sexual violence. It is important to cater this prevention campaign to the population you are targeting. O'Connell et al. (2009) presented the three types of prevention campaigns in the SNM. These were universal prevention, selection prevention, and indicated prevention.

Universal prevention is campus-wide and does not identify those at risk.

O'Connell et al. (2009) shared a case study for a universal prevention approach which

was based on issues relating to alcohol in 2003. Social marketing was utilized and after the campaigns ran, there was a 20% reduction in high-risk drinking rates within two years and 40% after four years. The second type of prevention campaign is selective prevention. This prevention method focuses on a particular group like Greek members or college freshmen. During the campaign, actual norms are discussed in small groups. The small group settings allow for a comfortable environment. The next prevention method is indicated prevention. Indicated prevention is an individualized social norms intervention.

Current literature provided program activities that fall under universal prevention, selection prevention, and indicated prevention. There are various activities that can be designed that fall under these types of prevention initiatives. Perkins (2003) proposed that men should anonymously describe what they feel if they witness a man verbally abusing a woman. This is completed by writing thoughts on individual note cards. Surveys can also be designed, collecting information on how men feel about different types of domestic and sexual violence towards women. Lastly, discussions are held in small groups surrounding men's ideas on what objectifying women looks like.

There are best practices that the SNM requires. One being that activities can be trained to university stakeholders and staff. This ensures proper implementation. Accurate data needs to be collected and discussion should be within the larger community. It is always important to assess before, during, and after your campaign. When you identify your campaign, make sure you know what students you are identifying with. When creating messages, make sure it is from a credible source and

supported by research. Even if best practices are implemented there are still limitations to the SNM.

Limitations of the SNM include implementation, messaging, and assessment of the campaign. Implementation can be difficult and requires preparation which takes time. This can range from choosing participants in focus groups and deciding which messages need to be addressed. Another challenge is knowing what messages are appropriate and who the target audience should be for prevention efforts. Program planners should consider whether prevention efforts should be towards a homogeneous or heterogeneous community. Messages of the campaign should also be clear. When a message is not believed, then the campaign's purpose is obsolete. The other limitation is assessing whether the program is successful or not. This data can be difficult to capture and the ability to replicate these efforts can be difficult. Even with these limitations, the SNM has been deemed effective in various situations.

Miller et al. (2012) completed a study on the effectiveness of the social norms approach involving a high school sports team. The program consisted of a 60-minute training session for coaches led by a trained violence prevention advocate and were given a kit which provided strategies for opening conversation about violence against women with athletes. Every week the coach led a 10-15-minute weekly discussion about violence against women throughout the entire sports season. The control group did not receive any education on violence against women. The outcome of the group with the training was that they recognized that they had increased their knowledge, attitude, and behavior outcomes. The players recognized the abusive behavior measured by using a five-point

Likert scale ranging from not abusive to extremely abusive. This group that received training also stated they were more likely to intervene when witnessing sexual violence. Miller et al. (2012) stated that the 'Coaching Boys to Men' approach was deemed successful and was an effective way to be proactive before attending a higher education institution.

An additional successful case study utilizing the SNM was the One in Four campaign. Foubert et al. (2009) created the One in Four campaign which was completed by 184 men. The first part of the program consisted of watching multiple DVDs and each DVD contained a scenario involving sexual violence. After watching the scenario, the men were taught how to support a rape survivor. When participants humanized victims through a guided imagery process, they were more likely to intervene in these situations. Their likelihood of intervening was also bolstered by introducing intervention strategies. Researchers then assessed the men's behavior and attitude changes two years after the program. At the end of their sophomore year, participants of the program were asked to respond in writing to measure what their attitudes about women were, if their attitudes were different than what they were before the program. The researchers also measured if any of the men's attitudes toward intimate sexual activity under the influence of alcohol differed as a result of participating in the One in Four program. The last part of the questionnaire asked if there were situations that the men ran into and if they behaved differently than before the program. More specifically, the researchers asked if there were any situations involving alcohol and potential/actual sexual activity where the

participants behaved differently as a result of seeing the One in Four program. Five main themes were found from the responses to these questions.

The first theme was the fact that alcohol is extremely dangerous in sexual situations. Miller et al. (2012) reported that 46% of the participants who showed attitude changes discussed changing the way they viewed the consumption of alcohol in social and intimate situations. One participant stated that the Men's Program allowed him to be more aware that alcohol may cause someone to do something they do not want to do, and the most appropriate behavior is to engage in sexual behavior when both parties are sober. The next theme that researchers found among the participants was that they considered rape a very serious act. Miller et al. (2012) reported that 25 percent of the participants who reported that the program prompted a better understanding of the seriousness of rape, and in particular a clearer understanding of the trauma women endure after an assault. Twenty percent of the participants also reported learning about the importance of communication and consent during sexual activity. Some of the participants recognized the relationship between alcohol and consent. Some participants realized that there may not be consent present and some male participants shared that they were more concerned with getting more definite consent before sexual activity. The participants reported that they communicated more during intimate situations with women. The last theme was that attitudes were reinforced when it came to how rape severely impacted a victim. The idea that the victim did not deserve the rape was strongly reinforced. Out of the research conducted, these case studies were the most well-known when studying areas of sexual violence, rape, and sexual abuse in higher education.

Colleges and universities are realizing the importance of taking a more active role with their students on sexual violence prevention. Koelsch et al. (2012) stated that the most common sexual assault prevention training model used in higher education was the bystander model.

Bystander Model. Berkowitz defined this model as “giving power to individuals to speak out against sexist language, jokes, or comments” (Berkowitz, 2002, p. 163). He stated that individuals can gain confidence by taking action when sexual violence occurs. By being an agent of change, there may be a reduction of incidences of sexual violence. Coker et al. (2011) explained that the bystander model considers all parties involved during the prevention process: the victim, perpetrator, and witness. The bystander model teaches an individual when and how to intervene. This approach strongly relies on the community for changing social norms to prevent sexual misconduct. McMahon and Banyard (2011) defined the three levels of prevention which include primary (before the assault), secondary (during the high-risk incident), and tertiary (after the assault occurs). This prepares students to be a proactive witness to fight sexual violence. This is an effective way of prevention but bystanders do possess some fears. They have a fear of their own safety, fear about reporting the incident, and possible ambiguity when handling the incident while it is occurring. Even with these concerns, bystander prevention is being widely used.

Bystander prevention programs have a strong appeal to students. "Rather than treating everyone as a potential rapist or rape victim, students are treated like allies who are empowered to step in" (Kingkade, 2016, para 5). According to Burn (2008), a study

of the impact of bystander prevention programs found that fraternity men who were trained in bystander intervention were 40% less likely to commit sexual violence.

Bystander intervention programs consist of different stages for the bystanders to go through in moving from inaction to action. These steps are: 1) noticing the event, 2) interpreting it as a problem, 3) feeling responsible for dealing with it and lastly, 4) possessing necessary skills to act (Gidycz et al., 2011, p. 742).

One of the main benefits of the bystander model is that it empowers individuals to prevent sexual violence by equipping those participants with tools which allow them to understand victimization. Banyard et al. (2003) reported that the knowledge that participants gain in the bystander program consists of risk factors, negative impact on victims, sexist behaviors, hostile attitudes towards women, rape myth acceptance, victim-blaming, and the ability to recognize dangerous violent situations as they occur. These knowledge areas are an essential element in any bystander program. Heisecke (2014) asserted that “changing attitudes...requires further education measures and deeper, long-term engagement” (p. 11). Bystanders are fully aware of their responsibility for intervening before, during, and after the assault.

In addition to equipping participants with knowledge, the program also informs individuals of risk factors. Banyard et al. (2003) reported that “bystander prevention addresses variables that have been shown to increase the likelihood of intervening, including, at the individual level, the participants’ sense of responsibility” (p. 16). McMahon and Banyard (2011) also proposed that bystanders are responsible for showing

empathy for the victims. A case study that illustrated the effectiveness of the bystander approach was the “Men’s Project” (Gidycz et al., 2007).

A case study of a men’s bystander prevention program titled “The Men’s Project” (Gidycz et al., 2011) engaged 685 participants over a two-year period. Men from different residence halls participated in a training session that lasted an hour and a half, as well as an additional hour for a workshop. Both men and women living in residence halls were offered separate sexual assault intervention training, and students living in control group residence halls completed questionnaires. Programs were conducted in separate locations for men and women. Some goals of the training were to have a better understanding of masculinity, consent in dating, and understanding of rape myths. The program was based on five elements including empathy, consent, perpetrators’ attitudes and beliefs, relationships with peers, and prevention strategies. The program allowed men to vent their concerns about dating and sex which allowed a deeper understanding of these issues. Four months after the initial program, the same men discussed in small groups whether they were able to use what they learned in the program over the last four months. Following this, they presented the discussion topics from their small groups to a larger group. After the four month follow up, participants in the training talked about their experiences of sexual aggression during those four months. After these discussions, the men attended a session where they reviewed program material. Seven months later, assessments were conducted on the program and the control groups.

Stewart (2014) found positive results for program participants over respondents in the control group.

Program group men evidenced larger decreases in associations with exposure to sexually explicit media relative to the control group. Program men also believed that their friends would be more likely to intervene when they witnessed inappropriate behavior in others compared with men in the control group (Stewart, 2014, p. 485).

Fabiano et al. (2003) stated that The Men's Project findings suggested that men's willingness to intervene is associated with their peers' thoughts and beliefs when being put in similar situations. Participants stated they were much more cognizant of consent and reported they were much more willing to report sexual violence. They also verbalized that sexual aggression was not acceptable. This study was essential in providing a framework for men's involvement in stopping sexual violence. The men learned to utilize their peers and support their decision to intervene. The important finding is that college men are more likely to intervene when they believe that their peers would support the intervention.

After the study, the participants in the Men's Project reported that they felt a close camaraderie with each other. They were more passionate about stopping sexual violence. They stated that they were more aware of sexual violence on campus and reportedly used fewer demeaning terms like "tits, bitch, hoe" and used more appropriate language like calling women 'girls.' One man was shocked because there were many times where he would have to stop and think about what he was going to say. Many of the men decided to be involved in formal sexual assault prevention programs on campus. The Men's Project changed the participants' everyday language by having them challenge their old

language to one that does not include derogatory terms. Barone et al. (2007) reported that through the Men's Project, men were empowered to stop sexual violence.

Bystander programs are important and significant to bringing about change. Brown et al. (2014) stated that the current sexual assault prevention programs are bystander programs. According to the Clery Center (2021), higher education institutions are required to have some sort of bystander programming in higher education institutions that participate in federal student aid programs. The National Sexual Violence Resource Center (2016) found that there is a growing consensus in support of bystander programs due to its effectiveness. The White House Office of the Press Secretary (2015) reported that the bystander model is the most promising and effective sexual assault prevention program for higher education institutions. Flood (2005) found that the bystander program was one of the most effective prevention models and also presented best practices to create a more effective bystander program. First, programs must be clear and concise and easy to understand by the entire community. Second, the program must relay the message that emphasizes that sexual violence is not tolerated.

Gidycz et al. (2011) presented the different levels that make up the bystander model. These levels include an individual, relationship, and a community/societal level. Individually, one must learn and know about warning signs and how to intervene. At the relationship level, individuals share the benefits of bystander engagement with friends, families, and colleagues. On a community/societal level, interventions include putting together policies and programs. This may include integrating positive media messages.

According to a study conducted by the Public Health England in 2014, there were positive effects of the bystander program at several higher education institutions. These results included participants having increased knowledge about sexual violence, increased empathy towards the victims, more confidence in intervening, and a stronger motivation to stop sexual violence. Casey and Ohler (2011) reported that through this program, there was a decrease in many areas. There were decreases in the likelihood of perpetrating sexual violence, incidences of community violence, rape myth acceptance, and decreased denial of violence as a problem.

Another example of the effectiveness of the bystander approach is the Bringing in the Bystander program done by the Green Dot foundation. Flood (2005) reported that the participants who completed workshops in the Bringing in the Bystander program were more likely to intervene in situations of sexual misconduct without backlash from others. The Green Dot Program (Green Dot Etc., 2012) asked people to visualize a United States map with green dots spread all over (each dot representing one action). “A green dot is any behavior, choice, word, or attitude that promotes safety for all our citizens and communicates utter intolerance for violence” (Green Dot Etc., 2012, p. 1). Examples of green dots were removing a woman from a potentially sexually violent situation or hanging up an anti-violent poster at their residence. A green dot is an “individual choice at any given moment to make our world safer” (Green Dot Etc., 2012, p. 1). The Green Dot Program involved men and women and trained individuals on ending sexual violence. A portion of this program was just for men, and they were trained to use green dots including asking women how sexual violence has affected them, speaking to family

and friends about sexual misconduct, visiting various websites that highlighted things that men could do to mitigate sexual violence, and Googling ways that men can end sexual violence. Other Green Dot activities included planning awareness events and having open conversations and understanding sexual assault is a serious crime. There were several positive outcomes from this sexual assault prevention campaign.

Coker et al. (2011) discovered that 46% of 2,504 college undergraduates heard a campus Green Dot speech and 14% received bystander training. Coker et al. (2011) mentioned that the participants of the Green Dot program were less likely to become victims or perpetrators of sexual misconduct. Flood (2005) also reported that students who went through the Green Dot training were one-third less likely to commit sexual harassment. DeKeseredy et al. (2017) stated that the participants had lower rape myth acceptance and the participants reported that they intervened more during sexual violent scenarios versus their non-trained peers.

Another notable case study when studying successful bystander programs was performed by the Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs (2013). The Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs (2013) completed a study reviewing the impact of multiple bystander intervention programs. This study found that these programs had positive results and resulted in increased likelihood of intervention, and a reduction in sexually violent acts, even if participants believed they were not likely to be caught. Abbey and McAuslan (2015) noted that it is important to initiate prevention efforts on men younger than 18.

Although the bystander model is the most widely used method of sexual assault prevention education there are limitations of this approach. First, sexual assaults can occur when there are no witnesses around. Secondly, the sexually violent incident may not be recognized because of the perception of the lack of danger. Moreover, many bystander intervention programs “rely upon and reinforce a type of masculinity that can make for problematic interventions” (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 15). Another limitation of this approach is getting the community to listen and having them be proactive. Instead of waiting for a tragic event to happen, it is important to bring awareness in community centers, hospitals, or crisis centers.

A comprehensive program will require attention to different knowledge areas and should also cater to different skill sets. This is so intervention can occur while the misconduct is occurring. According to Powell (2014), “Supportive interventions with victims will require very different skills from the more challenging interventions with potential perpetrators” (p. 3). Even with these limitations, bystander intervention is still quite effective, as it puts the responsibility to the community, including men’s involvement, rather than on the women as victims. After thorough investigation, literature suggested that men’s involvement in these bystander prevention programs heightens the impact and effectiveness of decreasing the number of sexual assaults on campus.

Theoretical Framework

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) are considered experts on the Male Peer Model. This model “has contributed to the study of all-male peer groups and the support these groups provide that may legitimate women abuse” (Franklin et al., 2012, p. 1457). The

Male Peer Model stresses that negative attitudes toward women and relationships are addressed within close peers and social networks. Support systems become problematic when social networks are comprised of peers who hold adverse beliefs about women. Franklin et al. (2012) found that these support systems may provide men with confidence and encouragement to treat women in abusive ways. The close peer relationships may encourage negative sexual behaviors and the objectification of women. The objectification of women is deeply rooted in this model. An element of the Male Peer Model is that peer interactions increase the possibility of the objectification of women. “Research suggests that fraternity members are more likely to objectify women than nonmembers” (Seabrook et al., 2018, p. 4). The Male Peer Model stresses that negative attitudes toward women are addressed within close peers and social networks. The close peer relationships that occur in fraternities may encourage negative sexual behaviors and the objectification of women.

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) explained the defining characteristic of the Male Peer Model as holding the characteristic of hypermasculinity and the sexual objectification of women in explaining sexual assault. The Male Peer Model may explain the prevalence of rape in all-male college environments, and how this environment may condone sexual assault. The theory suggests the prevalence of rape can be contributed by all-male peer groups that condone the sexual objectification of women. Due to college fraternities and the number of men living in one contained area, this may explain the behavior of men due to the frequent interactions with similar mindsets. “All-male living spaces may explain the behavior of men who belong to informal homosocial networks

such as similarly-minded friends who regularly gather...members draw on the social networks fundamental to the peer group in doing so may normalize woman abuse” (Franklin et al., 2012, p. 1460). The Male Peer Model has been supported by a study completed by DeKeseredy (1998) who found that “social ties with physically, sexually, and/or psychologically abusive peers were strongly related to abuse among men who experienced high levels of dating life-event stress” (DeKeseredy, 1998, p. 3). This finding supported the idea that sexual violence towards women is a behavior that is socially learned from interaction with others.

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) used this model to explain various social and individual factors that influence sexual assault. This theory asserted that membership in all-male group organizations plays a central role in understanding sexual assault on campus. This is due to the fact that men seek support from other men regarding their relationships. This theory stated that there are six factors that may cause or legitimize sexual violence within all-male groups, which are: alcohol consumption, all-male membership, hypermasculinity, group secrecy, sexual objectification of women, and absence of deterrence.

The first factor is alcohol consumption. Martin and Hummer (1989) found that alcohol abuse is more prominent in all-male networks like fraternities. Hey (1986) also reported that alcohol is associated with men’s conversations about women which may encourage some men to commit sexual violence. There may not be precise quantitative evidence of a causation between alcohol and sexual aggression, but Ward et al. (1991)

asserted alcohol is an important part of the student lifestyle and . . . “unwanted sexual experiences are a product of that lifestyle” (p. 65).

The second factor that may promote sexual violence is all-male group membership. Levinson (1989) found that sexual violence is promoted in cultures where all men reside together or spend most of their time together. The fraternity is seen as a family and additional studies (Bowker, 1983; Clawson, 2014; Schwartz, 1991) show that these men are more likely to sexually abuse women because they share familial bonds in all-male settings. This all-male lifestyle involves rituals like hazing. All-male groups are a strong source of peer-pressure. Matza (2018) found that men have anxiety when they do not adhere to manly behaviors and manly conversations. This anxiety and fear are a source of legitimization of sexual violence.

Hypermasculinity is the third factor that may promote sexual violence. Kimmel (1987) found that masculinity is socially constructed with complex interactions. The brothers learn from each other and there are stereotypes of fraternal men. Martin and Hummer (1989) listed stereotypes and masculine attributes like athletic skills, wealth, and sexual success with women. DeKeseredy et al. (2007) found that sexual objectification of women and predatory sexual behavior is promoted and encouraged by like-minded men. Fraternities may have rules and expectations that male members conform to the gender-appropriate norms.

Group secrecy is also a common way which fraternities foster sexual violence. Ellis (1987) defined group secrecy as the inability to reveal abuse which is happening inside and outside the brotherhood. Ehrhart and Sandler (1992) found that rituals and

social interactions can encourage men to lie to investigators to protect their friends from public stigmatization and punishment. The fraternal men may get away with sexual violence because they think their peers will not attempt to stop the rape. DeKeseredy (1990) reported that group secrecy tells violent men that their actions are not ethically or morally wrong.

Sexual objectification of women is another factor which may nurture sexual violence. DeKeseredy and Schwartz (1993) asserted that fraternity members are often taught to sexually objectify women through rituals and events. Brothers may use women to attract new members. Warshaw (1988) gave examples of sexual objectification through artifacts like tangible objects including inflatable dolls and nutcrackers shaped of nude women. Fraternal men possess friends who share the sexist ideology of sexual objectification of women. Sanday (2007) stated that many men join fraternities to have more access to women and these women are seen as objects. Many members abuse these women.

Absence of deterrence is the last tenet of the Male Peer Model. Fraternity brothers may not see that abuse is a problem or crime. This is a factor that permits abuse to occur. Men may think that abuse is acceptable, and they will not suffer any punishments. McMillen (1990) asserted that many male students will not lose that much if campus officials know about the sexual abuse, because on many campuses these officials will not seriously punish men who batter and sexually abuse women.

DeKeseredy and Schwartz's (1997) Male Peer Model explained prevalence of date rape by highlighting organized all-male peer groups in higher education settings that

may condone sexual exploitation and abuse of women. The tenets of alcohol consumption, all-male group membership, hypermasculinity, secrecy, sexual objectification, and absence of deterrence all legitimize abuse which is learned through relationships. This model found that all-male peer groups learn to objectify women through their regular social interactions, especially at all-male events.

Conclusion

According to the Male Peer Model (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997), men's peers have a strong effect on the ways in which individual men relate and respond to women. In fact, the model suggests that peer influences may lead to instances of sexual violence. After critical analysis of the literature, I believe it strongly implies that men are affected by their peers and that positive male influences may discourage inappropriate and harmful behaviors. In this review I gained an understanding of how these dynamics occur. As a result, I strived to understand how training efforts can lead to fewer such incidents, particularly within fraternal organizations at higher education institutions.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

The aim of this study was to gain an understanding of how fraternal organizations learn about sexual assault and misconduct. Additionally, I explored how fraternal organizations socialized their members in regard to their relationships with and respect for women. Lastly, I gathered information on the kinds of informal and formal training that fraternity members received surrounding the treatment of women and what the fraternity members took away from this training.

Qualitative Research Design

According to Yauch and Steudel (2003), the primary strength of the qualitative research approach to studying a culture is the ability to probe for underlying values, beliefs, and assumptions. This is essential in understanding what is driving the men's behavior. Hammarberg et al. (2016) also uncovered that qualitative methods could answer questions about experience, meaning, and perspectives. Consequently, qualitative methodology was the chosen methodology for this inquiry as I wanted to understand how fraternity men made sense of sexual misconduct. More specifically, the study was approached using the interpretive case study framework. I looked at the lived experience of members of a fraternity, with a focus on their attitudes about relationships with women. I looked at these experiences in the context of a system of social fraternities. This chapter discusses aspects of the research methodology including research design, theory, data collection and analysis, site selection, sampling strategy, ethics, credibility, and self as researcher.

Qualitative Research Design: Interpretive Case Study

Qualitative research methodology has five primary research designs. Creswell (2018) defined these five qualitative research designs as: narrative, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnographic, and case study research. In this study I used a case study approach. “A case study is a general term for the exploration of an individual, group or phenomenon” (Sturman, 1997, p. 61). Yin (2003) stated that a case study “allows the researcher to explore individuals or organizations, simple through complex interventions, relationships, communities, or programs” (p. 543). Yin (2003) also noted that a case study is used when the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions. The focus of this study was to understand how fraternity members learn about sexual misconduct and how they learn about the treatment of women. Case studies can vary in scale. In this study, I studied the culture that is shared by Greek letter fraternities at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). This is not to say that all fraternal organizations are alike; however, it is reasonable to say that individual chapters are shaped by their inclusion in a larger network of social fraternities.

Interpretive Case Study. “Qualitative case study methodology provides tools for researchers to study complex phenomena within their contexts” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544). The interpretive case study is the research paradigm also known as interpretive research, which is based on the assumption that “social reality is not singular or objective but is rather shaped by human experiences and social contexts, therefore best studied by.... reconciling the subjective interpretations of its various participants” (Peltz, n.d.,

para 3). In this study, I wanted to understand how fraternal members' experiences shaped their perception of women.

According to Harrison et al. (2017), interpretive research originated from areas of anthropology, sociology, psychology, linguistics, and semiotics. They stated that one main distinction of this type was the theoretical sampling strategy where respondents were based on whether they fit the phenomenon being studied. The subjects possessed certain characteristics that made them suited for my study. This study did not choose random sampling from a population, but the participants came from the stringent criteria of being in a fraternity. The Greek system was my bounded system which made it appropriate for case study.

Walsham (2002) mentioned that this methodology is focused on language, signs, and meanings from the perspective of the participants involved in the social phenomenon. I documented the language of these participants, especially their language about women. Walsham (2002) also mentioned that in interpretive case studies, language could involve images, metaphors, and sarcasm. This was going to provide context to my research as well as language used about women and language that the men used with each other. This methodology also "embeds the researcher within the social context that they are studying" (Pelz, n.d., para 4). I utilized this method because I interpreted the data on two levels. These two levels were central to an interpretive case study. Walsham (2002) mentions that the first level requires viewing or experiencing the phenomenon subjectively from the participants. The second level which Walsham (2002) mentioned was to understand the meaning of the participants' experiences by providing a thick

description of the phenomenon of interest that can communicate why participants acted the way they did.

There are several advantages of interpretive case studies. Walsham (2002) reported that the main advantage of the interpretive case study is being able to explore hidden reasons behind complex and multifaceted social processes. In this study, I gathered a holistic perspective of fraternities related to sexual misconduct and the fraternal men's attitudes toward women. To gather this perspective, I explored different nuances of their experiences and attitudes and dove deeply into the data in order to provide detailed descriptions, which was essential to an interpretive case study. An interpretive case study draws upon the tradition of phenomenological research and interpretive studies focus on "language, signs, and meanings from the perspective of the participants involved in social phenomenon" (Pelz, n.d., para 6). That is to say that this interpretive study focused on the social influence of constructing meaning through language and experiences within the social context of the fraternity.

Data Collection

For this qualitative study, semi-structured interviews were conducted to answer the research questions. In this study, I practiced purposeful sampling which Patton defined as "selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study" (Patton, 2015, p. 264). Patton defined information rich cases are those "from which one can learn a great deal about issues: of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry" (Patton, 2015, p. 264). Studying information rich cases yielded insights and in-depth understanding. The sample which was purposeful were men in social fraternities.

There was one interview for each participant with an understanding that it would last one hour. I worked with multiple universities. I received IRB approval from a total of three higher education institutions, one small private liberal arts college and two large research universities, all these being in the Midwest. Due to the sensitive nature of the topic, the only participants that I was able to successfully include in this study was one of the large public universities and the one private college. This study (20-F-18) was approved by Ohio University (please see Appendix B for approval letter). For the two public universities, to recruit participants, I worked with the Office of Greek Life. The Director of Greek Life gave me access to all Greek members' email addresses (which were NOT FERPA protected). I sent a mass email out marketing my study. I ensured that I thoroughly explained my study in this communication.

Additionally, I collected data from a private university. A faculty member of the fraternities agreed to share the recruitment email with the fraternity presidents at the small liberal arts university. These fraternity presidents disseminated this information to their members by email or word of mouth.

I paid each fraternity member \$40 in cash when they completed an interview. The shortest interview was 45 minutes and the longest interview was 80 minutes. My goal was to collect a sample of 12-15 participants but I ended up interviewing 28 men. These participants were selected with the following criteria: participants have had been in a fraternity for at least one semester and each participant was in a social fraternity versus a religious or service fraternity. All participants were identified by pseudonyms they chose and the name of their fraternal organization remained confidential.

Site Selection

Fraternity members were recruited from Midwestern higher education institutions. Previous studies (Boeringer, 1996; Franklin et al., 2012; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Nolan, 2018) have been comprised of primarily online questionnaires from multiple universities.

Semi-structured Interviews

The research was derived from semi-structured interviews. I completed all these interviews during the COVID-19 pandemic so virtual interviews ensured physical health was not compromised. Kvale and Brinkman (2009) explained that the purpose of semi-structured interviews is to gain a deep understanding of participants' experiences and perceptions surrounding a phenomenon of interest. There were advantages to semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews allowed me to probe deeper about how members learned about sexual misconduct. I collected many details as I asked the interviewees to elaborate on answers (versus a questionnaire is more limited to this elaboration). Semi-structured interviews allowed the fraternity members to have freedom to share their opinions and express their views. Kvale and Brinkman (2009) stated that the advantage of semi-structured interviews was that they could provide reliable and comparable qualitative data.

The data were composed of semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants virtually. Adams (2015) recommended semi-structured interviews to be a maximum of one hour to minimize fatigue for both the interviewer and interviewee. I ensured that the virtual interviews took place in an empty room without distractions.

According to Josselson (2013), “This space should be private, in some place where there is a door that you can close. Public places are not acceptable for maintaining some kind of secure boundary around the conversation” (p. 54). I also wore headphones so the conversations would stay private.

I wanted to gain a thorough understanding of my research topic of socialization among fraternity men and sexual assault prevention. In order to do so, I held 28 interviews. I gathered this information through in-depth interviews and pursued the members’ experiences with women, sex, higher education, and fraternities. Each of the participants had narratives to tell, all with different contexts, situations, and outcomes. These interviews were not meant to form any causation, correlation, or generalization of a population. I merely tried to understand the socialization of men in fraternities in the context of sexual assault and sought to understand different experiences. I gained an understanding of fraternity members’ experiences and did not conduct my research based on the fraternity members’ preconceived ideas about assault.

Interview Questions. The questions that I asked fraternity members were informed by the Male Peer Model (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1997). DeKeseredy and Schwartz’s (1997) model asserted that a determinant of violence against women may be male peer support. This theory informed the interview questions, and I was merely interested in understanding how relationships with men and the culture of fraternities shaped the fraternity members’ images of women and relationships with women. The questions pertained to how fraternity culture, including attitudes about women, shaped the fraternity members’ understandings of sexual assault and prevention. The Male Peer

Model drove questions involving dialogue between men involving women and informal interactions among fraternity members. Additionally, I investigated how participants perceived formal education programs and their efficacy.

Data Analysis

The interviews were recorded on two devices, a computer and a phone. This ensured accuracy of interview data and gave me the ability to confirm what each participant said. Each interview was transcribed, and I read the transcripts several times to gain an understanding of the whole interview. I practiced a manual coding process recommended by Saldana (2013). After each interview was transcribed, I utilized descriptive and pattern coding. Descriptive coding is defined as, “a word or short phrase – most often a noun – the basic topic of a passage of qualitative data” (Saldana, 2013, p. 88). This was conducted by what Saldana (2013) referred to as a “lumping.” Saldana (2013) explained that lumping involved assigning the code based on the meaning I derived from the text passage and then chunking the data together to fit more data into fewer and broader codes. “Lumping gets to the essence of categorizing a phenomenon” (Saldana, 2013, p. 20). When Saldana (2013) introduced lumping, he asserted that lumping of the data categorizes a phenomenon and is more of an expedient method of coding. In this process, I lumped the data and attributed codes to portions of transcription. An example of this is when I lumped data with intervention. I lumped the data surrounding intervention when it comes to first, how men intervene, second, how men preferred to be intervened, and third, how intervention would affect the relationships between the brothers. That is, I provided a short descriptive title of the code along with a

detailed description of the characteristics of the code. Saldana (2013) defined detailed descriptions as a one to three sentence description of the data's properties. Following the initial coding, I identified patterns among the codes. "The ultimate goal of the case study is to uncover patterns, determine meanings, construct conclusions, and build theory" (Patton & Applebaum, 2003, p. 67). When translating codes to categories, I discovered that there were several benefits of this study.

This research has potential to impact Greek organizations and higher education institutions, but in order to obtain the information, it was necessary to gather and provide thick and rich descriptions by thinking about the research questions and how they were worded to reduce vagueness in responses. That is why it was so important to get the context of what the interviewees were saying. The purpose was not to just collect facts but to uncover truth and gain understanding and not testing a hypothesis or trying to prove any correlation or causation effects. This study was guided by the theoretical framework, the Male Peer Model.

Limitations

One limitation of this study included the sampling method. This study was based on a sample of fraternity members at four-year higher education institutions in the Midwest. There was a lack of diversity in the fraternal organizations; however, holding interviews with multiple fraternity members, common themes were still discovered. This was a qualitative study; thus, the goal of the study was to gain an understanding from a purposeful sample.

Another limitation was that external factors were not being looked at, such as upbringing, and the environment outside the Greek housing system. There were numerous other risk factors that could be studied. In a study completed by Stathopoulos (2003), risk factors that he investigated were substance abuse, pornography consumption, negative gender-based attitudes, and mild sexual abuse experiences. The results found that these risk factors were significant predictors of perpetration of sexual violence.

An additional limitation that presented itself was time and resources. A significant amount of time was used in conducting and transcribing these interviews. I looked at previous research in similar studies. The majority of the literature has been quantitative – telling us about occurrences of sexual assault, but there is limited research that studies possible factors that contribute to sexual assault. Consequently, I needed in-depth interviews to capture a deeper understanding of why this was occurring on campus and the role if any fraternities play in it.

Who I am as a Researcher

I recognize that researcher subjectivity is part of any research study. The fraternity members' experiences highlight times where violence against women was accepted, rapes were witnessed or committed, and vulgar terms of women were used. I understood that these observations, stories, and experiences were unique incidents that occurred with the subjects and these lived experiences were discovered with the goal of research. This is to say that although I may have had personal, negative judgments about these realities, I entered the study with the belief that these authentic stories were important to tell and to examine.

I was familiar with interviewing methods and possessed diverse knowledge surrounding elements of sexual assault including psychological and physical aftermath on the victim, definitions of consent, and daily struggles of male and female college students and their concerns about their safety. This knowledge enhanced the communication during the interview process. Also, academic advisors and faculty assisted in overseeing this research design and ensured biases about certain sexes were prevented and/or eliminated.

This topic was sensitive in nature. Being a woman, conducting this research may have shaped how participants responded to me. The participants may have been evasive, or they may not have been entirely honest due to fear of my reaction to their responses or fear that the perception of their fraternity would be tarnished. I completed a pilot study, and this experience prepared me for this type of response. I ensured confidentiality and anonymity of the fraternity members' identity. Also, as an interviewer, I did everything to make the participants feel at ease and also attempted to ask questions in a way that men may feel more comfortable answering. For example, I referred to terms like bro-code and slut-shame as a way to make the men more comfortable answering certain questions. Additionally, I had prior related experiences, and this may have affected my approach as a researcher. Since I have been a survivor of similar crimes, this may have affected my positionality as a researcher. To counteract this, I relied on my committee to assist me in staying aware. By working collectively with faculty members, this helped me with any ideological struggles I may have had.

Trustworthiness and Credibility

Guba and Lincoln (1985) presented techniques that I could engage in to conduct a sound qualitative study. Using an interpretive and a constructivist approach, I followed recommendations made by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Russell et al. (2005), by using trustworthy approaches represented by my attention to the theoretical framework in the development of interview questions; purposeful sampling, consistent with the research goals; repeated and thorough readings of the transcripts; and rigorous coding processes, as represented in the table in Appendix C. An additional method of ensuring that data were credible and transferrable was that I communicated with other researchers and subject matter experts in this phenomenon. Feedback was provided to ensure all research was progressing appropriately.

Discussion

It is important to remember that the purpose of this study was to understand and not to generalize. The human experience is transferable but not generalizable. I cannot say all fraternity members have a culture of objectification of females, but I can transfer these experiences in order to assist in creating robust training programs to reduce sexual violence on campus with other all male-peer groups. I sought to understand lived experiences and by doing this, respect was always present. I tried to remove any gender biases or stereotypes. I respected the participants and showed emphatic neutrality and trust, especially in the sensitive topic of sexual assault. By conducting this research, my hope was to be able to help make evidence-based contributions to higher education institutions to disperse to other scholars and professionals.

Conclusion

This study served as a way to understand how men's socialization processes in the fraternal all-male setting may foster or explain sexual behaviors. The results of this study can be used to improve training to prevent sexual assault. Additionally, university administration may benefit from these findings, as they may create insight on how to decrease sexual assault at higher education institutions. To do this, a vigorous research plan was completed, and research was completed in a structured manner to ensure the richness of information was genuine and applicable.

Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, I describe the findings of this interpretive case study. Using virtual semi-structured interviews, I investigated the following research questions:

1. How do fraternity members' relationships with male peers shape their perceptions and treatment of women?
2. What kinds of informal and formal training do fraternity members receive surrounding treatment of women? What do the fraternity men take away from these experiences?

This chapter includes two sections. First, I provide a brief profile of each of the 28 participants in this study. I have organized these participants by the type of institution they attended, private and public university students. These profiles contextualize the information provided in the second section of the chapter, a cross-case analysis of the interview data.

Participant Profiles

In this section I introduce each of the 28 participants, including their race, institution type, fraternity affiliation, and amount of time in the fraternity. I have assigned pseudonyms to the fraternities and participants chose their own personal pseudonyms. I also noted if participants were in NCAA athletics, as this is an additional type of all-male social group. Before I present the demographics of the participants, I found details of the different college profiles that may help explain some trends.

Private University Profile

The private, church related, liberal arts university was in a suburban setting. There

was a population of around 2,500 students. The suburb where the university was located had a population of around 40,000 residents. The university had twelve fraternities and sororities and 27 percent of the student population was involved in Greek life. There was an average of 15-20 sexual misconduct cases reported each year. The male to female ratio was 2:3. The race demographics were 77% White, 7% Black, 5% Multiethnic, 5% Hispanic, 3% Asian, 2% Unknown, 1% International.

Public University Profile

The flagship, research, public university was in a large urban area. There was a population of around 65,000 students. The suburb where the university was located had a population of around 900,000 residents. The university had 47 fraternities and sororities and ten percent of the student population was involved in Greek life. There was an average of 750-775 sexual misconduct cases a year. The male to female ratio was 1:1. The race demographics were 66% White, 9% International, 8% Asian, 6% Black, 5% Hispanic, 4% Multiethnic, and 2% Unknown.

Table 1*Private University Participant Profiles*

| Name | Ethnicity | Year | Major | Fraternity | Time in Fraternity |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| ^a Connor | White | Junior | Business & Sports Administration | Rho | 3 Years |
| Nick Dares | White | Junior | Environmental Science | Rho | 2 Years |
| ^a BD | White | Sophomore | Criminal Justice | Rho | 1 ½ Years |
| Matthew | White | Senior | Communications | Rho | 3 ½ Years |
| ^a Quincy | White | Sophomore | Exercise Science | Alpha | 1 ½ Years |
| Steven | White | Senior | Systems Engineering | Rho | 3 Years |
| Ginther | | | | | |
| Jason | White | Senior | Music Education | Omega | 4 Years |

^aNCAA Athlete

Table 2*Public University Participant Profiles*

| Name | Ethnicity | Year | Major | Fraternity | Time in Fraternity |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Eugene Jackson | White | Sophomore | Finance | Beta | 2 Years |
| Jack | White | Sophomore | Logistics | Beta | 1 Year |
| John | White | Sophomore | Finance | Beta | 1 Year |
| Eddy | White | Senior | Neuroscience | Beta | 2 ½ Years |
| Alec Smith | White | Senior | Forestry | Gamma | 3 Years |
| | | Fifth Year Senior | Electrical and Computer Engineering | Delta | 4 Years |
| Timothy | White | Alumnus (19') | Agriculture | Epsilon | 2 Years |
| John Smith | White | Fifth Year Senior | Food Science | Epsilon | 4 Years |
| Clark Kent | White | Sophomore | Finance | Zeta | 1 Year |
| Sam | White | Junior | Consumer Science | Zeta | 1 ½ Years |
| Will Bennett | White | Junior | Business | Theta | 2 ½ Years |
| Blake Boone | White | Sophomore | Mechanical Engineering | Theta | 1 Year |
| Aaron Baker | White | Junior | Logistics | Sigma | 3 Years |
| | White | Fifth Year Senior | Landscape Architecture | Sigma | 3 Years |
| Jay | White | Junior | Exercise Science | Kappa | 1 Year |
| Jeff | Asian-American | Junior | Nutrition | Kappa | 2 ½ Years |
| Bradley Phillips | White | Senior | Civil Engineering | Lambda | 2 ½ Years |
| Jamie | Asian-American | Senior | Computer Science Engineering | Mu | 6 Months |
| Derek Brooks | White | Alumnus (18') | Political Science | Gamma | 3 Years |

Table 2 (Continued)

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-----------|------------------------------|-------|-----------|
| Benny Mills | White | Senior | Computer Science Engineering | Psi | 2 ½ Years |
| Eli Nolan | White | Sophomore | Biology | Delta | 1 Year |

^aNCAA Athlete

Cross Case Analysis

The cross-case analysis resulted in five themes. The themes included Fraternity Foundations, Women and Fraternities, Behaviors, Interventions, and Training. Each of the themes are broken down into subthemes. In conducting the analysis, I worked with all data from the interviews, including gaining an understanding of participants' motives and rationales for joining fraternities. These findings provided an important backdrop to understanding the context of fraternity men's values that are related to their behaviors and attitudes toward women, as well as their connection with each other, which shaped their behaviors.

Fraternity Foundations

Participants discussed two primary purposes for joining fraternities. The first was brotherhood, which was by far the most important reason. The second was professional and social networking.

Brotherhood. Under this theme, I discuss definitions of brotherhood, ways in which the relationships manifest in fraternity life, and why these relationships hold importance for the participants. The single most important aspect of fraternity life cited by the participants was their relationships with each other. They frequently used the term

brotherhood. John provided a rich definition of brotherhood: “being able to go to anybody at any time of the day with any concern or need...someone there to either help...or listen or talk to me...be there for me.... and that is what I need.” John’s definition speaks to the essential nature of brotherhood—a deep reliance on and connection to brothers. It was consistent with that of other participants. Common elements in the definition of brotherhood included support and empathy towards each other. Brotherhood was the utmost importance to all of the participants. Timothy defined brotherhood similarly to John, but also pointed out the mentoring aspect of the relationships which was common among most men. Timothy said, “brotherhood is having the best interest of other brothers at heart. It means having good morals and trying to relate to the brothers.” The quotes from both John and Timothy illustrate the centrality of relationships in fraternity life. It was clear through the interviews that the number one reason participants joined a fraternity was to form friendships. This section addresses the importance of friendships and how the men’s goals were realized through affiliation with their fraternity.

Participants’ responses consistently emphasized that fraternity affiliation is primarily about friendships. It was a motivating factor for joining fraternities. After joining, these relationships were realized through rituals, completing service projects together, and supporting practices including formal mentoring relationships. In the interviews, the terms friendship and brotherhood are interchangeable. Participants often cited the important role their fraternity affiliation played as a source of personal

support. Men talked about how fraternal friendships were important because of the encouragement and support the brothers provided.

John pointed out that he had a positive experience with being on a sports team in high school, which he compared to fraternity friendships. “I got a very good experience with brotherhood (through the high school sports team) and it was something I realized I wanted to continue for the rest of my life.” John mentioned why he sought out this kind of community when he started college because it was meaningful.

Blake Boone described the importance of having this support system which was based on strong brotherhood.

If I am ever going through any tough times or if you are going through anything, there is always a bunch of guys that I can talk to and feel comfortable sharing that kind of information with. I can have more of a deeper conversation with them than some of my friends from high school that I have known for years. I do not even tell them some of the stuff that I tell these guys.

Blake seemed to have valued the fraternal relationships, as the most valuable peer relationships to him thus far in life. Blake went on to talk about the importance of his relationships with his fraternal brothers and placed it within the context of a fraternity ritual. Fraternities, like their sorority counterparts, are replete with rituals. The ritual Blake highlighted focused on building relationships.

I am not sure every fraternity does this, but we have this thing at the end of chapter meeting. We go around the room and if anybody has anything they would like to share about their personal life or something that they are going

through, that is just an opportunity for them to stand up and speak on that.

Everyone just listens and lets them talk. Afterwards, if someone wants to reach out to that person and have a further conversation and make sure they are doing okay they can.

The fraternity created conditions which people can reach out and ask for support and encouragement.

Nick Dares put it simply when it came to his favorite part of being in a fraternity, it was creating and maintaining relationships for the rest of his life. “I have a few people in the fraternity that are my best friends and they will probably be my best friends for life.” Almost all of the men agreed that friendships were the best part of being in a fraternity. Nick Dares appreciated that the relationships he created would be with him throughout the rest of his personal and professional life. Many of the participants were determined that the friendships formed would last for the rest of their lives.

Participants did mention other reasons for joining fraternities—specifically, their role in providing leadership and philanthropic opportunities to members. Leadership and philanthropy are generally touted as major purposes for fraternities, but surprisingly, they were hardly ever mentioned in the study. Only one person stated that one of the reasons they joined the fraternity was to engage in philanthropic opportunities. Jeff explained, “...the aspect of being able to do organized service with a group of people and not just go to a food pantry by yourself...that shows a lot of selflessness.” Although Jeff did mention that completing service was the primary motivator to join the Greek organization,

friendships were still an element because of his desire to do service with a group of people versus doing it alone.

In addition to philanthropy and leadership, the opportunity for personal growth was also mentioned, although sparingly, as a reason for joining a fraternity. Seven of the 28 participants stated that they joined the fraternity for personal growth. Will stated, “I wanted to be around a group of people that were going to push me to achieve the most that I could academically and to encourage me to be involved on campus, to improve myself personally and professionally.” Blake explained,

The support system is very nice, and it is set up so I can use it to become a better version of myself and I have taken advantage of that. I feel like the person that I was before joining was very different from the person that I am now. I’m very happy with who I am now.

Blake’s experience showed that Greek life had a positive impact on him. Greek life gave him an opportunity for self-improvement and upon self-reflection he was happy with the changes he saw in himself.

Alec, Connor, Matthew, and Eddy stated that the fraternal friendships fostered new ideas and gave them the ability to meet people from all different backgrounds. Some fraternities had opportunities for the brothers to attend regional or national conventions and conferences. Many times, these trips required traveling various distances and enabled the brothers to meet people in different chapters from all over the nation. Eddy highlighted how fraternities allowed him to connect with people from all over the world.

I have been super thankful for the opportunity to have met people that live all over the US and they (current and previous brothers) give me places to stay. I can go travel now and it is way cheaper and I can experience more things with people that I really do like.

Eddy's friendships that he created not only financially helped him when traveling, but these relationships allowed him to be exposed to diverse groups of people.

Matthew shared thoughts which were similar to Alec's on the benefit of fraternities. He agreed that fraternities have opened his mind to different perspectives. This was because of his attendance at multiple national chapter conventions. Through these conventions he met brothers from around the world. He stated, "I think that is really what I got the most out of being in a fraternity. Just meeting different people from different backgrounds...with perspectives that are different than my own." When speaking to me, he mentioned perspectives, this included political preferences, and different views that people from small towns share versus people from urban settings.

Even among the participants who cited the value of fraternities in fostering commitments to philanthropy and other forms of personal growth, friendships were still a major reason why they joined. All participants spoke about friendships as a driving reason for membership. The friendships had emotional value to the participants. Some participants also saw relationships cultivated through their fraternities as opportunities to meet people who might be helpful to their professional and social connections.

Networking was the second most popular reason why men joined fraternities.

The Value of Professional and Social Networking. The majority of participants saw fraternity participation to be a valuable place to network. There were two forms of networking, professional/career networking and the other which was more prominent was social networking. Participants used the words networking and connections interchangeably. The participants stated different benefits of networking and building connections. With professional networking, some brothers stated that one benefit was to meet new people to advance their professional and academic endeavors. The brothers hoped that their fraternity would help find them a good job or would help them get into a good graduate school. Sam explained how he appreciated how much his fraternity allowed him to network which may help in the future. He stated, “I think for networking, it is really good once you graduate, then you can contact all the other people in your fraternity, and they can hook you up with jobs and other things like that.” There were additional definitions of networking and forming connections.

Fraternity brothers liked to network for social purposes. This included planning and attending multiple events throughout the year. At these events, fraternities paired with several different sororities for occasions like parties, tailgates, formals, and service events. With all these socials, many participants stated they met hundreds of women. Women were not only more accessible in a fraternity, but participants stated that it was an expectation to have frequent interactions with them. The university and Greek life staff stated that it was mandatory to hold a certain number of events which they had to pair with sororities. Eugene admitted that in fraternities, the accessibility to women and the quantity of women are much higher. He reported that his fraternity had events with

six different sororities with at least 50 girls each. Some interviewees enjoyed being paired with women, not only for planning events, but for dating purposes.

Another aspect of networking was the ability to meet women regarding dating and relationships. When talking to the fraternity brothers at the private university, participants stated that 50%-60% of the fraternity brothers were in serious relationships. At the public research university, participants responded that 10%-20% of all fraternity brothers were in serious relationships. The private university was much smaller, which may have contributed to the large percentage difference. However, an element that was common among the participants was that they fully enjoyed connecting with women. Quincy illustrated that point by stating, "It is just the connections that you get to make with other women. I mean, between mixers and socials and other activities you get to do, it gives you the opportunity to interact with a lot of girls." Quincy liked the relationships and the interactions with women. The men liked how being in a fraternity allowed the men to make connections with various women and sororities in the Greek community.

In addition to mixers and socials, fraternities were always paired up with sororities each term to complete certain tasks and activities. With so many events, it is inevitable that fraternal men will often interact with women. All the participants admitted having frequent conversations about women and with women, especially about the sorority members that the brothers had to plan events with.

Women and Fraternities

One incentive of being in a fraternity is the connections you can make with women. This topic covers the topics of dynamics and reasons for connecting with women and the role of top-tier sororities.

Connecting with Women. As expected, all the participants stated that they had regular conversations about women within their fraternal communities. I wanted to find out what the context of these conversations were about, specifically conversations that surrounded treatment and relationships with women. During the interview, I asked participants what their most recent conversations were about. Bradley Phillips mentioned that the last conversation had to do with party planning but admitted that the conversations were not always positive and he said, “there were a lot of conversations about the girls that were attending (the event). Sometimes the conversations went a little south. I guess it was obviously not something you want them to hear.” I did appreciate Bradley Phillip’s honesty as he acknowledged that degrading conversations can form from situations as simple as planning socials. The topics of the conversations ranged from men’s opinions about women that they planned events with, to encouraging other brothers to approach and talk to women they had never met before. It is not surprising that some participants stated that some of these conversations could be negative in nature.

Aside from party planning, the participants mentioned that there were frequent conversations and comments centering general advice and encouragement about their relationships with women. The most common advice that was shared among the men was

about how to approach women. Blake shared a story about the most recent scenario he encountered when talking about women.

We were all sitting in the TV room at our fraternity house. One guy was going through Tinder, and he matched with this girl and then he passed the phone around and then all the guys looked at it and gave their comments. We were hyping him up to send the first message as the first message is always the hardest one to send. We are...giving advice on what the first message should be and just joking around, like who is good and who is bad. A lot of times, it is just passing the phone around, everyone comments, and then everyone asks for advice.

Talking about women on Tinder was a popular practice among fraternal brothers. There were three different participants from three different fraternities who stated that their most recent conversation about women was about a girl on the Tinder application.

Eugene shared,

...one of my brothers showed us a Tinder match that he liked a lot. He was around when we were all sitting around the table and we were helping him respond to the texts, making sure he does not say something stupid and blow his chance. Honestly, that happens fairly often among us.

The Tinder application, a social media platform, was one of the most common ways to talk to and talk about women with male peers.

The advice that the brothers gave to other brothers could be directive about how to handle relationships. Sometimes, the advice could be used to gain sexual conquests.

Often, men encouraged and rewarded each other for sexual conquests. Fraternities expected brothers to encourage each other in all aspects. This encouragement benefitted the men by helping them gain the confidence to interact with women. Nick Dares explained that being in a fraternity gave him more confidence. “My brothers always hype me up...if I see a cute girl at a bar, they say “you got it bro, go talk to her” and, I think that’s probably one of the biggest benefits...the confidence boost this fraternity brought me.” Nick valued the support and affirmation the brotherhood provided him.

Men in fraternities also encouraged their brothers when relationships were not going the way they wanted. Jack went through a breakup during his first few months of being in a fraternity. He explained the roles his brothers played when he was struggling. They reaffirmed that the relationship ended for a reason. “It’s more saying things to help me feel better about the whole situation. They would say you don’t need her and you’ll feel better when you talk to new people.” The brothers were supportive by encouraging Jack to build new connections and validated him when his relationship ended.

Aside from encouraging brothers before and after conquests and relationships, men encouraged their brothers to pair with women in high tier sororities. High tiered sororities were a common topic of conversation and being paired with them for events was considered a major goal in fraternities.

Fraternity Men Seek Top Tier Sororities. All the participants at the public and private university stated that men in fraternities uniformly pursued women in top tier sororities. The brothers introduced the tier system and explained that fraternities fall

under a top, middle, or bottom tier. The tier system was composed of reputations from one sorority or fraternity. These reputations were widely known among all members of the fraternity and sorority system. Krueger and Brekhus (2013) explained that characteristics of men and women in top tier fraternal organizations could vary from the types of attractiveness, clothes they wear, their socio-economic status, the money members put into their appearance, and the amount of time and money spent towards the actual sorority or fraternity house. The top tier fraternities/sororities shared characteristics like wearing expensive brands, paying high membership fees, and coming from wealthy families. These qualities made members part of the small and elite. Even though these tiers were not based on facts, the participants did mention that they had a strong desire to network with the top tier sororities. All the fraternity members admitted that there were sororities who were known to have more attractive women which was obviously the most desired. This was the same for fraternities. It is commonly understood among the fraternal men that if you were in a lower tier fraternity, you were going to attempt to pair up with a higher tier sorority. Will Bennett explained the idea of popularity and status of fraternities and sororities. He said it was a regular topic and “It unfortunately gets brought up quite a bit. I think to try to make comments on the supposed social status of someone or of an organization would also qualify as degrading within our community.” Will Bennett was referring to the fact that that woman who are in lower tier sororities who may not be as attractive, were targets for degrading comments.

Bradley Phillips agreed that the tier system was commonly discussed and sometimes not in the most positive way. He said, “girls are very much a goal in

the fraternity, and you want to be well known by the very high up and very social popular sororities. It's almost like a game.” This game is being played out by fraternities competing for the attention for higher-tier sororities. The participants stated that they tried to pair up with the high-tier sororities by hosting the best parties.

There were also conversations about the sororities that were not as highly desired who were paired with fraternities during social events. The older brothers explained to the younger brothers that certain women were not the best to be engaged with. Eddy talked about how his brother gave him guidance about some of the women that the fraternity interacted with. He explained that an older brother took him under his wing and told him that several of the girls that came to their events were not the types of girls that you would want to be in serious relationships. Eddy was grateful for having made friends with women they shared events with but he said “I typically do not like to interact in a more sexual way with one of those girls, because they are not exactly the type of women who I would like to be associated with.” He explained that it is good to be friends with these women and he wanted to ensure their safety but would not want to pursue a romantic relationship. Eddy’s comments point out that, at least in part, the determination about who to date comes from the values articulated by fraternity brothers.

The participants reported that there were many degrading conversations which made fun of girls in lower tier sororities because they were seen as ‘less desirable’ to be paired with due to their attractiveness level. Sam told a story about how a woman was discriminated against because she was not in a high tier sorority.

There was this girl that would always come to our events, and she was one of our

better friends. But she was in a lower tier sorority, so we did not pick her to be our fraternity's sweetheart. We picked some girl that we did not really know that was in a higher tier to try to form relationships with them. When the guys would talk about the girls in some of the lower tiers, they would be pretty insulting. They would call them whales if they were a little bit larger and you know things like that. Insults were a big part of it. That was never to their face though. It was always in texts and in private meetings and stuff.

Sam seemed to be excusing egregious behavior, when he said it was “not to their face.”

In addition to having conversations about trying to pair with certain sororities, several other types of degrading conversations happened. However, the term degrading may be open to interpretation, so I asked all the participants what they considered to be degrading conversations and behaviors. This information was important, as it may assist in identifying possible training topics for sexual assault prevention. A central idea of this research was the kind of behaviors men display with each other and with other women. Understanding these behaviors may aid in selecting training topics for fraternal brothers.

Behaviors

At heart, the issues of inappropriate misconduct are about the language and behavior cultivated within the fraternity culture. This section discusses the behaviors of fraternal men pertaining to their relationships with women. It includes relevant physical and verbal interactions with other brothers and with women. The analysis uncovered four subthemes. These were degrading discourse, defining boundaries of bad behavior, dynamics influencing behavior, and strategies for improving behavior.

Degrading Discourse. Participants admitted that conversations about women that occurred within their fraternity communities were often insulting. John talked about this study and stated that if participants said they did not talk about women frequently, then they were being dishonest. He explained that everyone in his chapter has had conversations about sexual encounters. John admitted that his brothers frequently objectified women through conversations. He does feel many scenarios do not have a clear right or wrong and he would never be comfortable with mistreating women. He said “I start thinking about it, every day you hear guys say X, Y, Z about some girl. I had to reflect a little bit because I do feel like a lot of guys engage in that talk like all the time.” It is important to know the definitions and conditions of what is considered degrading because in order to know how to prevent sexual misconduct it is important to know how fraternal men define sexual misconduct. I asked the participants what they found to be degrading. I found three popular themes. Fraternal men defined degrading conversations as sexually explicit details, gender stereotypes against women, and the last theme was that the definition of degrading were dependent on other variables.

In this discussion, there is general awareness that the men explained that sexually explicit details were considered degrading. That meant discussing what men have done or what they would have liked to do physically and sexually to a woman. Sharing these details was considered degrading to almost all the participants. Bradley gave an example of sexually explicit details his brothers shared. “I want to blank that girl and then continue on to specifics of what they want to do...It is a lot of what they want, and they are just very open about what their intentions are.” It seemed that anything that

happened sexually between a man and a woman should happen in private. The men felt that should stay between the man and woman versus being shared with peers. I was surprised by the fact that sharing sexual behaviors among friends was considered degrading. My personal reflection to this was that being a woman, I was expecting men to mention body comments as a common way to degrade women, but sexually explicit details were surprising because many times, women talk about sexually explicit details to their friends.

Timothy talked about a conversation he saw in a group text. He read from his phone and quoted what his brothers were saying. His brother texted, "I'm going to blank so-and-so and she's just going to suck me off good tonight." Blake gave his definition of what sexually explicit details meant. "If you are talking about what you did to a woman while you were having sex with them, that kind of stuff is a little more explicit. I don't think I would be comfortable with someone talking about that in a group setting." Interestingly, Blake said he did not "think [he] would be comfortable." It is notable that he did not assert strongly that he had concerns about this behavior.

Another brother, Sam stated that in a group text there was a conversation that started with sexually explicit details and then went into something more degrading. He explained that this behavior and culture was a catalyst of him leaving the fraternity. Sam explained what he heard his brother say about a girl who was in a relationship. He quoted what he heard and saw in his brothers' text.

She will for sure, either me or you. Time kills all deals though so let's go after her in August. The brothers said, "let's both run a train." One kid made a joke, he

said, “trickle down banging.” And another kid legitimately answered dominance. Sam decided to leave the fraternity after the situation and explained, “I just could not handle the culture anymore. I did not feel like it was part of who I was.” Sam’s example and his subsequent choice to leave the fraternity indicates that this behavior was not an isolated incident executed by one brother, but elicited comments from others in the fraternity. There was apparently no counter or push back to this behavior.

Bradley shared a similar situation, including another illustration that this was part of a culture of degrading thought and behavior. He mentioned examples of sexually explicit details. He considered what he heard was graphic. “I want to fuck that girl and then continue on to specifics of what they want to do.” After hearing several stories about fraternity brothers, they thought sexually explicit details were degrading. The next theme I found was that gender stereotypes could be disrespectful and demeaning. Men mentioned that they thought gender stereotypes were very degrading.

The second most common response to what the men considered degrading were gender stereotypes and microaggressions. Several of the brothers stated that these kind of comments and jokes were extremely common. Matthew shared a recent story of his definition of degrading regarding gender stereotypes. A female friend was hanging out at the house with some of the fraternity brothers. A fraternity brother walked by and said in passing that “a woman's place in the kitchen.” Matthew considered it to be a microaggression. Matthew observed that gender-role comments was considered a form of misconduct.

Jason agreed that gender stereotypes were degrading. He explained the type of

stereotypes he hears. “You're a girl, you're at a party all alone. You're helpless and need someone to be with you or you're a girl and you're not strong enough.” Jason's comments showed the perceived inferiority of women versus men in the Greek culture.

Benny Mills had similar thoughts. He mentioned that words can be degrading but how they are said can also be demeaning.

I would say condescension, so assuming that someone does not know what they are doing and assuming that you have to show them how to do something. I think this is very degrading because it implies stupidity or a lack of experience where you have no idea. Also, sexist jokes like women cannot do X, Y, or Z or that's a woman's thing, or this is a man's thing, stuff like that.

There were frequent expressions that suggested that brothers considered women as an inferior sex but it was interesting to learn that there was a strong emphasis on tone and way statements are made. However, the most surprising and most common theme was that men found the definition of degrading dependent on external factors. The most popular external factors were the verbal and nonverbal cues women showed and whether the girl was present. Many of the men had their own parameters on what they considered to be degrading.

Defining Boundaries of Bad Behavior. The most common answer that I received when I asked the brothers about what they considered to be degrading was that it was dependent on the women's reactions. More than half of the participants stated that this was the main factor in deciding whether something was inappropriate or not. Quincy explained that the definition of degrading could be confusing. He shared that many times

it can be confusing because everyone has different comfort levels. Quincy stated, “Some people are perfectly okay with people grabbing their butt where other places, some people totally are not. I think that is where it gets difficult, it's not just one set standard of a boundary.” Quincy’s confusion stemmed from the vastness and number of behaviors that could be considered inappropriate.

Jeff said that definition of degrading behaviors is wide and varied. He stated that the girls’ physical cues define what is degrading. He explained that women could find a gesture like hugging as uncomfortable, therefore degrading. Jeff said, “just touching them in any way could make them uncomfortable. I think it is reading their body language, but unfortunately in a lot of the environments we are all intoxicated.” Jeff admitted that alcohol can make it more difficult to decide whether something is degrading.

The second most common indicator of degrading behavior was if the girl was present during the time of the act. Many of the men thought that if the girl was there then it was degrading and if not, the behavior was not concerning. Connor stated, “If your brothers are making comments in their own time...they are not necessarily in the wrong. But if it is in front of that person or in a group with other females, I think you are definitely in the wrong.” Connor’s comments were reflective of other participants who ignored the toxic consequences of cultivating a culture of disrespectful communication.

Eugene agreed that to consider if something was degrading was dependent on whether the female spoken about was present. It also depended on the relationship the brother had with the woman. When asked to define degrading comments he stated, “...it depends on body language and context. If it was a close girlfriend, the guy would call

them something in a joking manner which would be okay.” There were some participants who stated that the definition of degrading is based off the reaction of the other men. In other words, the rules of what is degrading are defined by the group that is objectifying the victim.

Eddy shared that there were always men around and he went on to say that the other men's reactions were obvious. Eddy also minimized objectifying language, pointing out that sexual language is commonly used for comedic effect. He stated, “It's not to be taken seriously. If I saw a group of brothers talking bad to a woman, I would not be worried about it because in my experience...it's completely innocuous.” Eddy perceived that if the inappropriate comments were meant for entertainment, then it is not considered degrading.

Will Bennett explained his litmus test of whether something was inappropriate. He echoed Eddy's view that comedic intent made it less problematic. He added the alcohol use and victim reaction were also factors in considering whether it was problematic.

I would first ask myself, was this meant to be humorous? Is that clear to the woman that my fraternity brother was talking to? I say that can often occur. I would see the woman's reaction to whatever she's just heard and then I would act depending on how she responds. The next thing I would do is probably try to identify levels of sobriety of both parties, because that is obviously going into factor into what is degrading.

Will acknowledged that alcohol could blur the line of what is appropriate and what is

not. Will also explained that the brothers had an unwritten rule about what was considered degrading. He shared that all his fraternity members had “a rule of thumb” when making comments on someone’s appearance. He said, “If they can fix it in ten seconds, tell them about it. If they cannot, do not bring it up. If the remark falls on the ‘don’t bring it up’ side, that is often going to fall on the side of degrading.” After his comments about comedic effect and alcohol, this last point suggests a lack of clarity about what constitutes degrading behavior.

Something that was surprising was when I asked the participants the definition of degrading, only three of the brothers’ initial response was something physical in nature. For example, comments about girls’ bodies, degrading names for women, and anything surrounding physical appearance were mentioned by only a handful. Some participants said their upbringing determined if they committed degrading behaviors. Quincy stated, “It just goes back to how people were raised. You were raised to talk about women like that, then you probably still do, but if the parents gave them good morals and values, they probably are more respectful. “Quincy’s feelings were in his opinion, that the way men treat women, that socialization process was learned much earlier than interactions within the fraternity.

There were some men who attributed the problems of degrading behaviors to the larger culture on university campuses. Men had more access to women in college and it was not solely a fraternity that increased access to women. There was more freedom at college because the students were away from home and away from their parents or guardians. This may have been an explanation of the behaviors. Aaron stated, “I had put

increased degrading behaviors back on college culture instead of fraternal culture. I have had conversations like, 'I'd love to get with her' with people before I got into a fraternity." He commented that the hookup culture is more because of the college setting and not just fraternities, specifically he said it depended on who you spent time with on a regular basis. Aaron explained, "I don't surround myself with people who are going to degrade women, so I feel like my conversations have roughly stayed the same...because I have always surrounded myself with people who share the similar opinions...respect towards everyone." Aaron acknowledged that peer groups can strongly influence negative behaviors.

Another determinant of how men treat women was their relationship status. The majority of the participants were single and only a handful were in relationships. The participants who attended the public university stated that less than half of the men in their fraternity were in relationships. The participants who were in relationships were in that relationship for at least one year. They stated that being in relationships taught them what was acceptable behavior. There was one participant who was in a relationship for most of his college career. John stated that since he was in a serious relationship, he never engaged in the hookup culture and degrading behaviors attached with the culture.

John from the public university agreed that the majority of fraternity men were not in relationships. He commented on how rare it was for men to be in committed relationships while they were in a fraternity. "I only knew a handful of guys who were in real committed relationships. I think most guys join a fraternity because they enjoy partying...you invite a girl out, and there is a preconceived notion *of we're going to hook*

up tonight". Then he explained he did not actively participate in that mentality since he was in a relationship.

Another aspect of defining bad behaviors was a term known as slut-shaming. This term was universally known among fraternal men. It meant that men criticized and/or condemned women for engaging in frequent sexual behavior, most likely with many men. Almost all the men did not consider slut shaming as degrading. This was surprising as when one slut-shamed, it involved using vulgar terms for women. Aaron did not consider slut shaming as degrading, but more of a way to look out for your fraternity brothers. He said,

I would say if it's factual, you're just telling people that it's true. I have been hurt like that before. She slept with three other guys while we were together. I would define that as slutty. If it is something I know to be untrue, I would have to intervene (when men are slut-shaming). If it were a known lie and it's going to hurt the girl, I have to put a stop to it. ...my first part of the answer is kind of douchie, but I have learned that I need to look out for myself more before I look out for people who hurt me.

Aaron's situation seemed like an anomaly because other men did not mention honesty was a determinant if something was inappropriate. Like many of the comments I elicited from the participants, Aaron's comments focused on excusing some behaviors while at the same time naming them as problematic, or at least acknowledging that they might be considered problematic. While excusing many degrading behaviors, Aaron, like other participants, did want to assert that some behaviors are indeed inappropriate. It struck me

as the interviewer that they were both supportive of the culture of disrespect, but also wanted to assure me that some moral boundaries existed. The next section examines the shaping influences that lead to the views expressed in the preceding section.

Dynamics Influencing Behavior. This study uncovered two things that influence the men's behaviors, negative or positive. These are the influences their peers have and the role that surrounding environment plays.

Peer Influence. It was noted at the beginning of the cross-case analysis section that brotherhood had the most important influence for fraternity membership. This section focuses on the ways in which these important relationships shaped attitudes and behaviors surrounding sexual conduct.

Older brothers had a significant level of influence on younger brothers, some positive and some negative. The negative behaviors were more pronounced. The biggest issue was the influence of older brothers regarding the treatment of women. More than half of the participants pointed out that older brothers treated women worse than younger brothers. The participants gave a variety of reasons for this. The first reason is that the younger men had less experience with women, and they wanted to impress them. On the other hand, according to Alec Smith, the older brothers often were more familiar with some of the older women, and that comfort, based on familiarity, often was loose and lewd. Not fully understanding the context and comfort of these relationships could lead younger members of the fraternity to follow their role models in contexts that were less appropriate, given the nature of the lack of a relationship foundation.

Derek had a different view, and explained how inexperience contributed to how

the younger men treated women. He stated that older members have poorer relationships with women and explained the difference between the two classes. “The eager freshmen who just came in who never talked to many women in their life, compared to the seventh year who just treat women horribly...they're 24 years old talking to 18-year-old girls at parties.” There is a variation in perceptions about how men mature through the years.

Will agreed and stated,

...when you are young, maybe you do not know anyone. You might try to be more outgoing to try to meet more people and may be trying to impress someone. Maybe you are a little more willing to be embarrassed because you do not know those people so I would say there can be a difference between younger and older brothers and their treatment of women.

Will acknowledged that years of experience influenced the treatment of women. Some of the men explained that when older members left, the fraternity environment changed. The older men set a negative example of how women should be treated and when the older men graduated, there was a strong cultural shift. John explained, “When I first started, there was a lot of jargon, gross jokes, and objectifying women. As we lost a few of the older members, that culture was lost, which I was happy about.” John explained that now, the fraternity instills in the brothers to be gentlemen as part of the new member education. Jamie who represented a different fraternity also explained how he saw a positive change when the older brothers graduated and left the fraternity. He stated, “With older members, there was a lot more drama and more degrading and disgusting behaviors that were associated with our fraternity. ...seeing two years’

worth of new pledges coming in, I can tell that they're more responsible." This suggests the possibility of a shift in general attitudes about women.

There were only a few men who thought that older members treated women better than younger brothers. Timothy stated,

Most of the older brothers are probably a little bit more respectful. They do have a good set of values...and they are not as likely to do something. Whereas a new member, they might not have that set of values instilled in them yet. They might be at a certain point in their life, and it is like, alright, we need to help them become better fathers and brothers and husbands, things like that.

Based on Timothy's comments, there seems to be a realization among men that there is a need for mentoring to help younger brothers improve in regards to relationships. There was a contradictory aspect to this study. Even though there was a consensus that older brothers treated women worse than younger brothers; the older members did mentor the younger brothers on how to treat women, many times more respectfully, according to the participants.

All participants recognized the influence, whether positive or negative, of the older brothers. Influence occurred both formally and informally. Many times, it was before events. Eli gave a description of what these conversations looked like and what the older brothers taught him. "The first rule that they told us was to respect women and if you are not going to respect women then you're not going to be a part of this fraternity. I was really amazed because it was like the first thing that they said to us." This comment illustrated that men also have negative preconceived notions about fraternities

surrounding women which obviously was not a deciding factor when joining the organization.

Some brothers gave more specific instructions on how to treat women. The older men wanted the younger brothers to treat women politely and to show a certain amount of chivalry. Aaron described the conversations. He stated, "...the older brothers are like, this is what you wear, this is how you treat your date, pay for your date, you make sure your date gets home safely, stuff like that." Aaron stated that the older brothers helped him develop in regards to treating women with respect. He explained, "the older brothers said don't be weird around girls, talk to them, laugh at their jokes. They (the older brothers) did change me more than I thought, just doing that. I would say it's not as much change as it is development." Aaron's growth in regards to treatment of women was not realized until it was brought up in the interview. Understanding that having his brothers set expectations before events was educational.

The younger brothers also learned that sex was not a central part of being in a fraternity. This was demonstrated during an event that John's fraternity hosted. John explained,

At formal, the younger brother asked his older brother, "do we have the expectation of having sex with a date?" and I was like, "absolutely not" and I felt bad that the older brother who graduated put that thought in their mind. That is not the expectation. You bring the date to have fun too. We have a nice dinner and just with chivalry, treat them real kindly, but then also like just sharing with them that we can sleep in different bedrooms and just keeping those boundaries

set up.

This was an example of how older brothers influenced younger brothers' perceptions about sex and dating. Matthew admitted how much of an impact his older brothers had on him when it came to respecting women. He explained how much he appreciated what the older brothers taught him and how important those relationships were when he was a younger fraternity brother. Matthew stated that when he was new, he looked up to the juniors and seniors because they treated women correctly. "I listened to how they spoke and how they held themselves.... I just followed the older brothers' lead. Those are my mentors and those are my guides." Matthew's statement showed his appreciation of the guidance his older brothers offered.

Older brothers could play a role in standing up against sexual misconduct. The younger brothers admitted that the older brothers deserved respect and attention. The influence of the older brothers could be negative as well. Sometimes, the older brothers could be seen as intimidating. They could be seen as so intimidating that the younger brothers would hesitate in intervening if misconduct was occurring. Jamie explained, "I would pull them aside and let them know where our fraternity is heading. I think if they're older, especially if they're older than me, I probably wouldn't engage and just let it go." This fear of older brothers can truly affect the occurrences of sexual assault.

Blake had similar thoughts and he explained how he would be more hesitant to intervene if the perpetrator was older. "I probably would not step in myself just because there are different dynamics. If he is an older brother and has been in the fraternity longer, he has more reputation, like all that kind of stuff." There was one participant,

John, who shared the perspective that older brothers do not influence younger brothers. John explained that his interactions with older members was minimal. “A lot of my interactions with older members was locker room talk, or like them talking about girls they have had sex with...older members don’t really interact with the younger members as much.” However, this was an outlier as most participants acknowledged the influence of older brothers in fraternities.

Benny admitted that the relationship dynamic is based on who was in the pledge class. He explained that he did not have much of a relationship with his older brothers. “Your pledge class is your number one close friend group. ...myself and other members of my pledge class felt resentment towards the older guys. Those relationships were not as strong as the members in your pledge class.” Surprisingly, the close niche was not based on age. It was the time frame when multiple brothers joined the fraternity that made a significant impact on the relationships between the brothers.

Blake shared a similar view with John on how his relationships with older brothers were different from the relationships he made with his pledge class. He stated, I think most of my experience is shaped around the guys that I've gotten to know pretty well that I live with and that I knew during my pledging semester. We never really had those conversations about women or talked about women with older brothers.

Blake explained that the communication with older brothers was minimal.

As a fraternity member, the older and younger brother relationships could be leveraged when it comes to treating women. The majority of men stated that since being

in a fraternity, they learned how to treat women better. One of the reasons why fraternal men developed into respectful men towards women was the environment.

Influence of the Surrounding Environment. Participants discussed ways in which fraternities improved their treatment of women. One of the factors was the environment. Men noted that sexual misconduct existed in fraternities, attributing this to there being more events at fraternities than other campus venues. The participants suggested that the awareness of potential problems helped them put strategies in place to reduce the risks of inappropriate behaviors. Participants noted that the increased exposure and social interactions with women helped them understand and respect women more. The last factor is that men support and respect women more because they wanted to uphold the fraternity's name and image.

Some participants noted that the college environment, in general, poses safety risks for women. For instance, Will suggested that the world outside of fraternities presented risks.

For me, coming to a completely different city and completely different environment, you are not always aware of some of the risks and dangers that women might face. I think that coming to a college campus, you can start to become more aware of those risks and just realize that this could possibly happen here, whether it's sexual assault or rape. You could go to a large party, and you might not know everyone, so I think that you realize it's just a little more of a possibility.

Will realized that the party culture and geographic setting can contribute to the presence

of sexual violence not just an all-male peer group.

John held a similar view, noting that the college campus, in general, presented risks. He explained, “I think just being in this kind of age in college where everyone's drinking and doing a lot of drugs, things like that happen a lot more often than you think. I feel I am definitely more cognizant.” By this response, John confirmed that external factors can play a role. This awareness stemmed from the knowledge that alcohol and drugs can have significant impact on men’s behavior.

Jason also emphasized the risks outside of fraternities and even made the case that his fraternity community helped to protect women from the outside risks.

What helped (with the treatment of women) was coming here. It is a bigger city vibe than what I am used to, and women really do not feel safe walking alone. For example, I became an active member in my fraternity, my brothers really emphasized that, “Hey, women don't feel comfortable doing this. We need to make sure that these girls feel as comfortable as possible. They should feel safe, and they deserve to feel safe.” Once they said that to me, I started to try to notice things that made people uncomfortable or if I could ever pick up on that vibe and try to make people more comfortable.

Jason’s experiences and relationships he had with brothers made him realize that potential risks for misconduct can happen outside the fraternity house and he felt obligated to make sure women felt safe even if they were not at fraternity events. Aaron supported the view that fraternities could be a safe haven. Unlike Jason, however, he noted that respect was an important behavior at events because the chapter did not want

to lose opportunities for future events. Whatever the motivation, Aaron argued that the risk did encourage fraternities to take steps to maximize safety, “. . .stuff about how to talk to women, that's talked about right before our first party. And then if there are problems and stuff with the new members, that's discussed at a regular member meeting every week.” Jason’s motivation for safety was different than Aaron, as he wanted to be able to continue the culture of having different events at the fraternity house.

Most of the participants realized that sexual violence was encouraged by the fraternity environment, but they also highlighted other external factors—such as college culture and society, at large. It is obvious that many interactions take place between men and women during events at locations that may be conducive to sexual violence. I now discuss how these social interactions and various experiences with women may motivate men to treat women better.

Additional Strategies for Improving Behaviors. After analyzing men’s behaviors with each other and with other women, I present three strategies that may minimize sexual misconduct. These are having beneficial interactions with women, taking advantage of the fraternity’s name and status, and leveraging relationships with other brothers.

Beneficial Interactions with Women. Many participants stated that they learned how to treat women through lived experience. In particular, they described interactions that led to humanizing and personalizing the problems associated with sexual violence. There is an increase in opportunities to interact with women at parties, but the participants had regular interactions with them outside of formal social events. Many of

the participants explained the benefit of having women around them every day. Jackson explained how those everyday interactions helped him respect women more and improved relationships as a whole. “You start to view them more as friends because you are surrounded by them very often. You view them more on a personal level and actually understand them.” He further explained he gained several friends just from being in the house and talking to women. He added “...just seeing them and understanding them and getting to know them on a deeper level improved my relationship with them.” The frequency of interactions with women seemed to make a large impact.

John noted that being connected with and hearing stories from female friends “who were sexually assaulted or who have felt uncomfortable affected the way I treat women.” Similarly, Jack recalled when a friend close to him was sexually assaulted. He told the story, “She talked to me about it. The situation with my friend brought a whole different perspective and helped me realize that this kind of behavior is not tolerated and that I can actually do something about it.” This strong form of self-empowerment stems from the fact that internal emotions caused by acquaintance going through something traumatic can yield a desire for change.

Participants noted that having some formal events outside of parties helped to create opportunities to get to know women better, setting the foundation for strong relationships and learning. Joining philanthropic events were cited by participants. There were executive boards with every event that consisted of many sorority sister leaders. Connor stated, “I am involved with execs so between sorority executives and fraternity executives, you do get to meet more people and I have gained a lot of respect for women

in their leadership.” Connor’s admiration of women leaders was a powerful motivator to treat women with respect.

One member, Timothy, even mentioned that his exposure to women outside the fraternal system helped him respect women more. He told the story of their female head of the household and their female chef and how he and his brothers tried to respect them in a variety of ways.

We would respect her and made sure that if there were meals that needed to be made, that she had everything she needed. Having a woman in a fraternity house, you have to really change your behavior, be respectful and set a positive example. It seemed to Timothy that having a woman and connection within the fraternity house set the men up to be more successful in regards to the treatment of women.

Another female figure that influenced how men treat women were the fraternity advisors. Interestingly, there are several females that lead and monitor fraternal organizations. One motivation to respect women that the participants mentioned was the presence of a woman Greek advisor. The men wanted to practice their best behavior. John explained the reason why having female advisors adjusted how he treated women. “Our female advisor is just a testament to...treat women well just because when they come to meetings, we're making sure that we have manners...pushing their chairs in and stuff like that.” John explained that a person in authority of Greek life, especially being a woman, made a difference in men’s behavior.

Timothy shared a similar story on how his fraternity’s advisor played a role in how the fraternity men treated women; however, the difference in this story is that the

respect they practiced may only be temporary. In regards to the female advisor he said, “We can’t say certain things around her. You have to not say anything with any degradation to it. If she isn’t around, it might be more elusive.” He admitted that the fraternity brothers should behave the same way whether the advisor was there or not.

The last motivation to respect women is upholding the fraternity's name. The importance of keeping a positive fraternity image was extremely important to all the participants, so much that they were able to grow regarding the treatment of women.

Upholding the Fraternity Name. There were 28 participants representing 14 fraternities. All but one participant stated that the fraternity and brotherhood were extremely important to them. Sam believed that his motivation to leave his fraternity was the culture and how the brotherhood was negative in regards to his treatment of women. Sam’s counterparts disagreed though. All of his other colleagues stated that keeping the fraternity image was a motivation to respect women more. Jay stated, “My older brothers mostly taught me about respect and having a good relationship with sororities on campus and the general student body. Specifically, we did have a conversation about the importance of respecting women and how that affects our image.” Just like their close relationships with their brothers, the fraternity image was of the utmost importance to them.

Sometimes having a negative image leads to fraternities shutting down. Many fraternity members expressed fear of this happening to their chapter. Connor illustrated this point, “...some decisions are so drastic; we can be affected for many years when people get kicked off campus or bad things happen. I think there is just a reputation that

you want your fraternity or your sorority to have.” Some of the participants also added that the reputation of the fraternity was started and maintained by brothers before them. Disrespecting women would make the hard work of keeping that image obsolete. Eddy explained,

There is a culture among our fraternity. You have to be extremely careful because it is a topic that people are talking about a lot. You can get shut down for an accusation that is not even true, which is a big fear. So, I guess awareness of how you are interacting with women and making sure that you know all these interactions are positive and keeping up the public image, which is not the right word because it should just be the way it is, but having a fraternity uphold those values, it is so you can maintain everything that you are doing here.

Aaron shared the same sentiment. “The older guys had relationships with women and all the sororities wanted to do events with us. That would be what the older brothers really instilled in us, to keep our good name and our reputation.” He recognized the older brothers have worked hard to build and maintain a positive image of the fraternity.

Baker clearly shared his concern for creating and maintaining a strong and positive fraternity reputation. He stated that he was fearful for the brothers in his fraternity. “I feel fearful for the sake of my fraternity, because stuff like that can really hurt us, get us removed from campus, or can destroy the reputation which obviously you do not want.” Another participant, Jamie, was extremely passionate about his fraternity image. He stated, “Sexual misbehavior is something that annoys me because of a bad apple in the bunch. The image of the fraternity is important and the overwhelming

consensus of the entire fraternity is we want to have a positive image on campus.” It was no anomaly that the motivator for men to respect women was based on the desire for a positive perception, versus practicing good behavior as a principle. Sam admitted that the view of respecting women was to mainly uphold the fraternity image. Sam stated, “It’s like, we don’t want to get in trouble versus we want to be a moral organization. It’s about not getting in trouble with the university. Being respectful to women was more just like covering their own asses.” Sam acknowledged that respecting women may not be for the right reasons. He admitted that this could be considered selfish.

The other aspect of keeping the reputation of the fraternity positive is maintaining the reputations of individual members. There was a fear and realization that possible situations surrounding sexual misconduct could affect the participants’ future. Sometimes, the brother’s own reputation took precedence over the image of the fraternity. Aaron honestly admitted that he had a strong personal motivation. “Everything comes back to me. What’s going to be best for me in the long run? My reputation is huge and I’m putting it at stake. That seems selfish, but I couldn’t care less what some of these guys do.” This was somewhat surprising because a common theme was that men value their friendships and by stating his fear of self-image and reputation was somewhat contradictory to putting value on friendships.

Aaron reinforced this point by sharing a story of misconduct he witnessed in his fraternity.

While I was in the fraternity, I did recognize this situation at a bar where we were celebrating something. This girl was definitely uncomfortable with what this guy

was doing and they kicked him out and the girl was fine, but that is probably what I would do. I would kind of pass it off to someone with authority and power because at a bar, I would start escalating a situation. I would end up getting into a fight. I would end up with charges as well. So, looking out for myself while looking out for others.

Aaron did realize that even though he knew what the right and moral action to take was, fear of his reaction to sexual misconduct may cause violence and further negative behaviors.

Quincy was extremely cognizant of his behavior around women because that behavior may affect his future. He shared, “You have to be careful of what you do especially if you are drinking...not putting yourself in bad spots where you could do something that could mess up the rest of your life.” Quincy’s response was telling as it shows that some men in fraternities consider their future when partaking in behaviors involving sexual misconduct.

Jeff shared that he tries to be very aware about things he says to or things he says about women because of how his reputation might be affected. He is more careful with his conversations because of how easy words can get back to the girl. “People can say things and rumors are brought up. It could get tied back to who you’re talking about. I try not say anything disrespectful, like “this girl last night was crazy” you know, which happens often.” This shows the closeness of not only the fraternity, but the Greek culture as a whole and how easily the knowledge of misconduct can spread.

Nearly all participants made the case that being a fraternity member helped them

with their views and treatment of women. Only one participant shared his thoughts on how the fraternity did not help him. Derek admitted that being in a fraternity worsened his opinions and treatment of women. Derek shared,

Being in a fraternity did not help me with my views of women. I think it definitely led down the path of your brothers talking shit about women, so you are going to too. I thought it probably made it more difficult to date and more difficult to be a respectful person. I think being in a fraternity gives you an aura that you can treat women poorly, you can just hit back with whatever because that is what your friends are doing, and you can be openly hostile at a party. Like, “it's my party” like I can just be openly hostile or rude and kick them out or whatever.

Derek's view was an anomaly as the rest of the participants stated that the fraternity had helped them learn about proper treatment of women. There are actions that brothers take to prevent sexual misconduct. After learning this, I wanted to understand what the brothers would do if misconduct was happening. In the next section, I discuss intervention methods that brothers prefer using if they do have to act against sexual misconduct.

Leverage Relationships with Other Brothers. This study showed that the majority of men joined fraternities to form friendships. These friendships were meaningful and many of the men took what other brothers said about the treatment of women very seriously. The friendships were used as a way to mitigate situations and a way to intervene during questionable situations. Many of the men shared examples of how these friendships helped them in regards to respecting women. The brothers taught

them about women and the proper behaviors to practice. Aaron explained the role his brothers played in regards to respecting women. The older brothers gave him advice. “This is how you treat your date. Pay for her and make sure she gets home safely. They tell you how to how to intervene. I guess looking back, they did change me more than I thought. Just doing that.” The fact that Aaron did not realize how much his brothers have changed him illustrates how learning about the treatment women does not have to be a formal and planned out education process.

Jeff explained that older brothers frequently give younger brothers advice about women and what they should and should not do. “We encourage our brothers not to take them home but to get to know them. That's our only goal at these social events then maybe another day, meet up with them.” Many times, the newer brothers learned from older brothers, not just through words, but practiced respect with women through their actions. Many of the men observed several dealings with women and translated what they observed to what etiquette with women should look like every day. Jeff elaborated, “Based off of brothers’ actions and how they talk to women, I learned that talking to women is not all about trying to pursue them or anything like that.” He stated that his brothers taught him that it is possible to talk to women as friends and not sexualize them. He explained that he learned that his female colleagues do not have to be people to just have sex with.

Benny shared that it was a combination of his fraternity and what his brothers instilled in him which improved his treatment of women.

One of their (the older brothers) basic principles was to respect women, guests,

and others at events. That has always been kind of instilled. That's always been talked about (by older brothers), to make sure that guests don't have to worry about someone leaving their drink unattended because someone might slip something in it or people inappropriately dancing on them. We have had female friends of brothers say that they were uncomfortable because someone was doing whatever. After that, they were strictly punished (by older brothers) because we all want women to feel very safe and welcome at our events. So, for that reason, I would definitely say that my respect and attitude towards women definitely improved. My relationships with them definitely did improve because of that.

In this example, members of fraternity leadership are reactive when negative behaviors happen. It does cause me to question if there are ways to be more proactive when training men how to increase safety at Greek events. The fraternity members described how many times they were held accountable to respect women with the assistance of other brothers, whether it was through a formal mentorship or informal interactions with the brothers. To be held accountable involves not only support but also being able to intervene when treatment of women goes awry. These challenging situations require intervention with other brothers.

Interventions

The following section investigates intervention. Intervening when a fellow fraternity member displays inappropriate conduct with a woman or women can be difficult. In the next section I discuss these intervention dynamics, which include how men like to be intervened if and when a situation happens, reasons why men do not

intervene, the aftermath of the confrontation between brothers, and the effects of receiving feedback when intervention occurs.

Intervention Dynamics. Participants indicated that intervening during brothers' inappropriate interactions with women can be challenging. In this section, I examine dynamics around the decisions to intervene. This section deals with the following: 1) how men like to intervene during times of misconduct; 2) reasons why men do not intervene; 3) how participants would react if one of their brothers notified them that they committed sexual misconduct; 4) if and how friendships are affected if intervention happened between the brothers.

Preferred Intervention Strategies. During the interview, I asked the fraternity brothers if hypothetically there was an inappropriate situation that happened, how and if they would intervene. There were several responses. A little more than half of the participants stated that they would get another brother to either intervene or assist in intervention. Participants preferred finding a brother close to them. The participants made it clear that they would want to ask for assistance when intervening in times of misconduct. The brothers said they would do this for a few reasons. The first reason was that the men stated that they lacked physical strength. Jason explained,

I would want to go get help because I am not very physically strong. When it comes to physical interaction, I am not the best for it. So, I probably would try to go get someone or be like, hey so-and-so is on this girl. We need to get him off of her right now and I probably would go get a couple of fraternity brothers and get the situation resolved.

The realization that strength in numbers can prevent sexual violence may be beneficial, especially when trying to prevent dangerous situations at events. Another reason why men liked brothers to assist is because the person intervening can have more confidence. Jeff said, “If I was with a group of brothers and saw another group of brothers talking bad about a woman, since I have other brothers, I would feel less nervous to go up and make a move.” Some men would get an additional brother who had a leadership role in the fraternity. Quincy said, “I would let the president of the fraternity know if he's around. If not, I would let the vice president know.”

It is notable that Quincy does put a level of trust in chapter leadership.

The second most popular style of intervention that the brothers preferred was removing the perpetrator from the situation. The participants highlighted that this was done by distracting the brother. Benny explained what he would do, “I might go up to him and be like, hey, I need to talk to you really quick just to try to get some separation. Then I can distract him long enough...I could maybe get him to leave.” There was only one brother in the entire sample that stated he would prefer removing the woman. When removing the woman, he also highlighted that he would want her to feel comfortable. John went into more detail on how he would remove the woman from the situation. “I would get her home but realize that I’m a guy. I may not deserve her trust at all. I could bring her in a comfortable environment so she could flee the situation and feel at peace.” He admitted it was difficult to imagine a situation but if he did run into something similar, he would remove her from the situation and talk to her about it.

Eddy explained a nonconventional way that his brothers took when intervention

was needed; however, this method was used only when the perpetrator was not a brother. Eddy explained, “There's an emergency word that you yell and everyone in the whole fraternity stops what they're doing and like ‘turns it on.’ Like, this is what is going on, you know, like, in the end, everyone has the focus.” This shows that there are ways to communicate and it was important to Eddy’s fraternity to have a way to prevent and/or be aware of situations.

When discussing how men intervened, I found that most participants felt more comfortable intervening when their brothers were committing the act versus a total stranger. Aaron admitted, “I would intervene pretty quickly if it was somebody I knew, but other than that, if I was in a situation where I didn't know anyone...I probably would have just let it go.” Eddy said, “I would make less assumptions about the situation whereas if I heard a stranger say something, I wouldn't intervene.” In conclusion, men felt more comfortable intervening with someone they know, this was due to the men’s knowledge of the context of the situation. Because they knew the brother well, the men were aware of the perpetrator’s normal behavior.

The fact that the participants knew the person, not necessarily closely like a brother, having some kind of personal relationship made the brother more comfortable stepping in. Eugene said,

I would be more comfortable stepping in, even if I am not super close with the person. I know who their friends are. Before being in a fraternity, if I am at a house party or something where I do not know half the people there and I see a guy being degrading to a girl and I have never met the guy, I honestly might be a

little less likely to step in. I might make a remark to someone. I would assess the situation and would be like, should we do something about this?

Eugene's challenge to making a decision was based on his relationship status with his brothers and whether they had a close-knit relationship. Benny agreed that he was more comfortable confronting people he knew. He also stated that the person whose behavior he would be intervening would likely reflect on it more and take the situation more seriously. "Confronting someone you do know and being honest shows that you have a good friendship. . .where you can tell the truth." Eugene's comment shows that he values honesty and this honesty may produce a more respectful environment and can also be greatly appreciated by the brothers.

In contrast to Benny and Eugene, two participants stated that they felt more comfortable intervening when the perpetrator was someone they did not know. Baker explained,

I think I would be quicker to hesitate on somebody I know more. I would have to think a little more like, what are they doing? Like, I know this guy pretty well. I do not think this is something he would do. I would step in if it were somebody I do not know as well and I think I would step in quicker for the most part.

Baker acknowledged that it would be more challenging to intervene with a peer. It is noteworthy that sexual assault prevention and decisions to intervene is dependent on the kinds of relationships that brothers have with each other. Their relationship status could be a deciding factor on whether sexual misconduct occurs. Jeff also explained his reasoning of why he felt more comfortable intervening with someone he did not know as

well. He started by explaining, similarly to Baker, that he would not expect people he knew well to “make bad decisions” or to “do anything physical.” However, with someone he did not know well, he said, “I’m going to step in.” This level of comfort around strangers is interesting because it means that men may not believe that their close friends and peers are capable of sexually violent behaviors.

Many times, there were occurrences when the perpetrator was outside the observer’s fraternity. In situations like this, men mentioned that they would get someone in the other fraternity that they knew well to talk to the perpetrator. There were sometimes when the men said they would not intervene at all. The men gave various reasons why. Some reasons the participants gave was as follows: the men do not like confrontation, they do not know the context of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, they do not want to feel outnumbered by men who do not think misconduct is happening, the observer does not want to be seen as less of a man, and fear of being kicked out of the fraternity.

As noted earlier in this chapter, brotherhood runs deep. Even when participants said they would find it easier to confront brothers than strangers, they held these fraternal relationships in high esteem. For many of the brothers, these relationships are sacrosanct, and they are wary of violating the brotherhood. This is evident throughout the next section on why men do not intervene.

Reasons Men Do Not Intervene. One of the primary reasons men do not intervene is because there is a fear of confrontation. Some of the brothers explained that they do not like facing conflict. Benny admitted, “I am very non-confrontational, so I do

not like arguing and intervening is literally confronting someone or kind of interrupting that. I think definitely one of the biggest fears is the discomfort and argumentativeness and confrontational part.” The slight chance that relationships can be affected truly alter people’s decision to stand up to sexual misconduct.

Another reason why fraternity men may not intervene during sexual violence is fear that they will be seen as less of a man. Brad elaborated further, “you don’t want to be looked at as the guy who’s the wimp. I don’t know if you’ve heard that wording before, but yeah, you don’t want to be seen as the super nice guy.” Being a member in an all-male organization, participants stated there was a challenge of upholding not only the fraternity’s name but preserving a man’s reputation. The participants explained how reputation and perception were extremely important, especially around older fraternity members. Jamie explained his reservations by intervening in situations involving older brothers. “If anyone at the fraternity was speaking about women in a degrading manner, I would pull them aside. I think if they were older, especially if they’re older than me, I probably would just let it go.” Blake admitted that he would feel more comfortable intervening with someone who was close versus if it were an older brother he did not know as well. “If it was one of my closer brothers, I’d step in and talk to him about it. If it were an older brother or someone I didn’t know well, I’d talk to my other brothers about it. I wouldn’t intervene.” The fact that brothers may be accepting of negative behaviors because of tenure of certain men leaves potential for education targeted to older brothers.

An additional reason that the participants gave as to why they may not intervene

is the fear of being outnumbered or singled out in their decision. Benny detailed, “If I don’t intervene, it is due to the fear of being singled out, even though the chances are minuscule that you’re the only one. No one wants to be that one person to isolate themselves.” The realization that the desire to maintain the status-quo is a hinderance to mitigate misconduct can be helpful in creating prevention programs between brothers.

The number one reason why men do not intervene is the fear of losing their friendship with other brothers. The majority of the participants stated that they valued their friendships, so much so that they would be hesitant to intervene in sexually violent situations. Blake said,

My friendships do come in a little bit when intervening because having those friendships is not something that you really want to lose. If I were in a scenario and I lost all my friends, because those friendships are valuable to me, I probably would not step in. What my action does and how that affects the relationships does come into mind.

Blake’s acknowledgement of placing value on friendships before intervention was an honest response and I as a researcher was very grateful for his truthful answer. Baker shared the same sentiments and admitted he would not intervene because of his fear of losing his friendships. “I wouldn’t be courageous enough because of losing a friendship with that brother. If I had to step in and tell him he was doing something wrong, then I’d be worried about the possibility of losing that friendship.” Brad agreed and said he would be thinking about the consequences of his friendships. “It would come back to hurt me in a sense and if I stepped in, how people would view me? Would they trust me and how

would they act around me?” Brad’s fear of upsetting the brotherly dynamics and status-quo prevented him from intervening. Sam, who left the fraternity because he did not agree with the culture, highlighted the importance of friendships in influencing responses to problematic behaviors. He confessed:

My relationships weighed pretty heavily in the decision of having to call somebody out for anything. Friendships definitely play a big part of it especially with the guys I was more friends with, I would not want to call them out. That would leave me with like very few friends in the fraternity.

Sam was clear that he was not excusing his failure to intervene when he said, “I wish I would have said something, even the little things because I think they all perpetuate the culture of the fraternity.” Sam did have regret for not intervening more.

As you see, the majority of the reasons the men gave as to why they do not intervene is fear of losing friendships. All the reasons why men do not intervene has to do with the element of fear. Fear of confrontation, being seen as less of a man, being outnumbered, and the fear of losing friendships are the central reasons why men do not intervene.

One reason that the men gave as to why they did not intervene that was not related to fear was the absence of context during the situation. The context that was unclear was the relationship between the perpetrator and the woman. The couple may have been in a relationship where the woman did not define their partner’s behavior as misconduct. Jackson detailed more about his lack of knowledge of the relationship between the parties and how that was a reason why he did not intervene. Jackson elaborated on the added

challenge of intervening because you do not know the person. “It’s harder because you don’t know who they are, what the situation is, whether it’s a girlfriend or boyfriend. You don’t want to be a part of someone else’s business. Unless someone’s going above and beyond you don’t do anything.” This vagueness or ambiguity makes the decision to intervene very challenging and may cause the brother to hesitate in doing something about the situation.

One of the participants told a story that explained why he was more hesitant intervening during situations regarding sexual violence. This was a unique scenario and he told a story of what his friend ran into. “It could just be staged. My friend stood up for a girl who he thought was being abused and it was a skit. It was an act, they were holding a gun saying, give us your phone and wallet.” The “staged” situation was most certainly an anomaly. However, the fact that it was brought up in this context hints at the rationalization that occurs among men when they fear confrontation. Sam’s acknowledgement of his struggles and, ultimately, his decision to leave the fraternity highlights the tension at least some men face in addressing concerns, especially when it might put their connection to the brotherhood in jeopardy.

The Aftermath of Confrontation. The three areas I wanted to investigate were: if the fraternal men considered relationships with other brothers before intervening, if they did actually have to intervene, and how that would affect the relationships dynamic.

Chapter codes indicate that a role of a fraternity brother is to make him aware if his values around women were misaligned. Most participants stated that if they had to give feedback or if they had to alert a brother that he was committing sexual misconduct,

there would be resentment and this intervention would affect the friendship. Jack explained, “I know with some of my brothers, intervention would deteriorate our relationship. It would be a lot of embarrassment towards them. They would probably feel resentment towards me.” A few of the men shared that if they gave feedback to their brothers, it would strengthen their relationship. John admitted that the feedback “strengthens your relationships overall, just knowing that you have that accountability.” Some of the men simply stated that the manner in which the brother gave the feedback would determine how it affected the fraternal relationship. John explained, “Confrontation is never fun. If the outcome makes everyone better in the end, I feel like that is a win.” He details that it is about how you confront the other brother. “If you call them out in front of people in a demeaning way or if you don’t have a good relationship with them, that’ll ruin that relationship because it looks like you’re pointing out their problems rather than helping them.” With this answer, John confirmed that the way something is presented is just as important as the message. something is presented is just as important as the message.

Blake shared his opinion and he explained the relational dynamics of intervention. “If I went into the situation punching the guy, that’d have a negative effect on my relationship with him; if it’s handled calmly and I was just trying to get the girl away, it wouldn’t negatively affect the relationship.” Blake even shared a specific example.

There was this one guy who had to step in because a guy had his arm around the girl, and she was uncomfortable with it. I do not think he even dislikes the person.

So, if it is done correctly and you are not going in with ulterior motives, I do not think it has a negative effect on your relationship and in some scenarios, it might even boost your relationships and how people view you.

Again, maintaining the relationship is a high priority for the participants and Blake used strategies for balancing that value with ensuring safety for the person who is at risk.

After discussing how giving feedback to their brothers may affect the relationship, I investigated reactions to being confronted. Some of the men admitted that they have been in situations where they did something they regretted. In these situations, the participants relayed preferred ways of getting feedback.

Receiving Feedback During Intervention. After discussing what the men's reaction would be if they were given feedback and how the friendship would be affected, I asked how men would prefer to be intervened. The responses were common among all the men, that feedback should be given calmly, on a one-on-one basis, face to face, and feedback should be given immediately by a close brother. Men explained that speaking in a calm manner may deescalate the situation. If empathy is shown and men are spoken to in a calm manner, reactions may not be as negative. John stated that he wants someone approaching him "from a loving mindset. So not as a joke or like just roast me, but coming from a calm, caring tone." John explained how he would like to be approached in a questionable situation and how empathy goes a long way.

Sitting down, trying to empathize or being honest and laying out how an interaction occurred and other people's perception of it is a healthy exercise, just trying to make a person understand when they're wrong or if they're making other

people feel uncomfortable.

The ability to share one's view on the situation and asking brothers to reflect on a situation is an activity that is appreciated by fraternity members. Related to empathy, tone is very important when giving feedback. Many participants stated the importance of having a calm demeanor when intervening. The participants said that men may be defensive when they are told that they are not acting in a way that aligns with the fraternity values. Jason stated,

I'd appreciate if someone came up to me and was level-headed about it. Not like, "I can't believe you did this!" Just be like, "Hey, I just want to let you know you did or said that and it made her uncomfortable. What's going on?" I would hope it'd be an approach like that.

Jason explained that the civility of the conversation allowed the relationship between the two brothers to grow. Men shared that they hoped they could help a brother develop into a better man. Eugene explained how he preferred to be approached if he did something deemed inappropriate by his brother.

Being civil, not shouting and saying, hey man, let's talk. I don't think anyone would be, no, get out of here! Keep a civil tone and have a conversation instead of just yelling at me. It'd be appreciated and constructive.

Eugene's views on feedback versus confrontation can be utilized when teaching brothers how to intervene.

Another intervention factor that men mentioned was that confrontation should be given on an individual basis instead of in front of or with a group. This was not a surprise

considering that one of the reasons why fraternity men did not intervene was because of fear. Baker explained the benefit of a private conversation and how the number of people present would determine how he would respond if he was the one who was receiving the feedback. "I'd want him to tap me on the shoulder and ask if he could speak to me in a different room, one-on-one...in a non-public manner, because with everyone's eyes on you feel very pressured and hot in a situation." He explained what a difference it makes and how helpful pulling someone aside can allow for more reflection.

The men stated that feedback should not only be given on a one-to-one basis, but it should also be face to face. Men found face to face intervention the preferred approach, versus speaking on the phone or texting. Baker explained how face to face interactions made the fraternal relationships stronger. He stated, "there's other ways of intervention, you could send a text, but texts aren't always well received as having it in your face. Have this person telling you to your face shows the best way that he actually cares about him." Jack shared Baker's sentiments and explained how face to face interactions made the relationship better. Jack explained that the preferred method of the face to face interaction would help get his attention and would help him realize the seriousness of the problem. He said "...face to face interaction would lead me towards apologizing or leaving. Additionally, if it was someone that I really respect, I would know he was really looking out for me." The level of closeness to brothers appears to be a determinant on how the perpetrator may act, either calmly or combatively.

The final commonality I discovered was that men responded better if they were approached by a brother with whom they had a close and trusting relationship. Some of

the larger fraternities have over one hundred brothers and it is challenging to be close to all of them. As I discussed before, the fraternity members tend to resonate with their pledge class versus other brothers. Men explained that feedback coming from a closer brother is taken more seriously. They also explained that if it was a closer brother giving feedback then the accused would be much less likely to be defensive. Jack explained that he would take his friend's feedback to heart. "I would be more disappointed in myself than I would have been if it would have been someone that I did not have as good of a relationship with giving me feedback." Jack reinforced that with closer brothers giving feedback, the perpetrator would probably feel regret or remorse.

John elaborated further on how the closer you are, the more open you are to change and improvement. He explained that if it was a closer friend, he would be more committed to helping that brother than if it were a non-brother. John said,

If it were someone that I knew really well, I would want to be next to them and have those uncomfortable conversations until you could have that fixed. Feedback strengthens your relationships and allows you to take accountability. If it was someone I didn't know as well, I would definitely hesitate to bring as much energy and time to make that correction happen.

The effort of helping brothers seems to increase with closer friends.

Some brothers indicated they would be open to feedback. There were only a couple of brothers who admitted that they would be angry when given feedback or when a brother made them aware that they were engaging in questionable behaviors. Derek admitted that he would act negatively if someone were to give him feedback. "I'd

probably be like, what are you talking about?! I would not be happy. But obviously, no one would be happy about being confronted on something like that. I would probably just yell at him.” Derek acknowledged that it would be hard to admit to himself that he was capable of doing something inappropriate.

Taken together, the findings to this point highlight the feelings, reactions, and meaning making approaches of the participants in relationship to matters of sexual misconduct. The friendship bonds shape the ways in which participants interact with their peers and with women. They also bear on the ways in which participants experience training.

Training

Title IX requires every higher education institution to include sexual assault prevention training in students’ college experience. This section is comprised of two parts. The first part is an overview of what formal training the men received. This includes what topics were discussed as part of those trainings. The participants also shared their thoughts and feelings about the formal training they received. In addition, I elicited comments about what aspects of training the men thought were helpful and not helpful. The second part discusses any informal training they received. Participants talked about the importance of their relationships and how informal education occurs through peer relationships and casual conversations. This information of discussing the brotherhood, men’s interactions with women, and peer influence can be used to create training practices. This training can be formal or informal. Now I will discuss what formal training the brothers received and their thoughts on their training as well as any

informal training the brothers received which was done through conversation or observation.

Formal Training. Those participants who experienced formal training primarily occurred while they were first year students. After asking what kinds of training they received surrounding sexual misconduct, no two answers were alike. That is to say, experiences with training appeared to vary greatly. Some men stated that they did not receive training at all. Some of the participants stated that they received training by the Title IX Office while others said the Office of Greek Life facilitated training. The training modes varied. Some trainings were panels, led by a moderator and some participated in training through a computer-based model, and some described training via video. To get a more accurate overview of what training looked like to them, I asked the men about any specific details they remembered. I wanted to gather just initial thoughts they had about any training that they already received. Quincy described his experience, noting that the sexual misconduct training is part of a battery of educational modules. He indicated that the 30-minute, online sessions seemed long. The training was to be done on their fraternity website and consisted of five modules; three were sexual misconduct and the other two were over hazing and alcohol and drugs.

Timothy had a different experience from Quincy. He explained his required training was in person versus a computer-based model. This training took place in a sorority house. There was a facilitator who trained the brothers by giving scenarios and also taught brothers how to represent themselves as fraternity members and as men. Timothy stated that the training was memorable because "...it was at a sorority house and

there were girls; also, someone would come and talk about their life and what mistakes they made and how they changed, like their lifestyle.” Being in the presence of women for the training helped to humanize the information.

In some fraternities, chapter leadership had a formal training planned. Jeff, a leader in his fraternity, explained a training model that his fraternity had in place.

We have something called FRACK that we teach our new members. It stands for follow instructions, respect authority, courage to calm and follow your convictions, and keep the secrets. So always be a gentleman. We go through one letter of FRACK each week. We also have them do reflections.

The regular meetings and ongoing reflections ensure that participants deeply consider different dimensions of the behaviors and consequences of disrespectful and otherwise harmful behaviors toward women. According to Jeff, questions include:

What is a time where you were told instructions, but you decided not to follow it? And what were your reasons for doing so? Something like that. Like think about a moment and reflect on these types of things. Like what is a time when you might have not had the best character in front of a girl or something like that. Things spark from there, like, “Oh, I realized that this is what I did in the past and it was not okay. I want to not make those mistakes again.

Jeff’s example shows that formal training does not always have to be prescriptive, but it can be catered by adding reflection, which can be extremely effective. Steven detailed similar content, although not a multi-week format, like the one described by Jeff. He shared that chapter leadership facilitated training and improved his awareness of sexual

violence. He explained that their fraternity's education process was led by an executive member (president, vice president, peer educator). "We talked about what's appropriate and what isn't and how it relates to a toxic masculine society." He reflected that he has improved his treatment of women since joining his fraternity because he is more conscious of what things could be considered degrading.

Training varied both in respect to modalities and content. A common topic was that of consent. It was the most frequently cited content that participants recalled from their training. Quincy explained that he went to training where the sole topic was consent. He explained his thoughts about what he learned about consent and how it has to be reciprocal. He also added that he remembered the fact that alcohol makes it more challenging to gauge what the women want. "...problems lie when people say yes in an altered state of mind... if there's doubt and it's not a sober yes then wait. If tomorrow in the morning it's okay, do it." He highlighted that the memorable part of training was that sexual encounters should be a sober interaction and most importantly, consent must be present.

Benny also commented on how drunk consent is not a valid consent. He mentioned that the topic of consent remains memorable today. He stated "...it's tougher because then you have to know how to read those signs more if they are inebriated and then if they are, you have to discount the consent." He said that stuck with him the most in training. Other topics that the men learned about included reporting processes, signs of intoxication, differences in terms like harassment and assault, and signs of abuse. These were not talked about as frequently. In addition to recording their descriptions of training,

I explored their judgments about various training content and modes.

Participants had mixed reviews about their training experiences. Half of the men found sexual assault prevention valuable, and the other half did not. Jeff explained that he thought the training was valuable because it made him more aware

...like hugging could be uncomfortable to someone. I work in healthcare, a lot of people that are autistic or have anxiety don't like to be touched. Especially people with autism, touching them will aggravate them a lot in many scenarios.

Jeff found that what he learned in sexual assault prevention training was transferrable to current and future endeavors.

There were others who, like Blake who found training not to be worthwhile, but at least walked away with some sort of awareness. John observed,

I feel like people leading training did not change how they thought, but it did bring up the conversation, which I thought was cool. But as in terms of value, I do not know if it changed any of the preconceived notions that people went in with.

The training that these fraternity members received did not have any memorable aspects but John did appreciate that the training increased the awareness of sexual assault as a problem. After discussing their views on training, the participants were more than happy to discuss ideas on what would make training better.

Improving Training. In order to improve training, it was important to gather the men's reactions to the value of what they learned about sexual misconduct. After telling me their reactions, we discussed recommendations they may have to improve training.

Recommendations include involving women during training; having the training

in person, interactive, conveniently located. The training should also encourage open communication, be facilitated by a male, and possess intrinsic value. The most common response to the question of what we can do to improve sexual assault prevention training was to involve women.

Training can come in many different forms and can be led by men or women. The participants stated that if women were more involved in the training process, that it would make the learning outcomes more memorable and valuable. Women could be involved in training in a variety of ways as suggested by participants. Bradley explained, “Having a woman in the room, obviously, makes people talk respectfully.” Bradley stated that just being present during training, women can make an impact. Although presence alone was identified as being potentially helpful, participants more often cited the importance of hearing from the women. Bradley noted, “I think having a woman giving actual information would help. It would be good to have both perspectives.” Baker echoed this point and shared his feelings that it would be valuable to have women come in to talk about their personal experiences.

If you get a volunteer to say how they’ve been raped, the room would get quiet really quick. People would take a lot away from that. ...this has happened to of our peers...and it’s not something people just talk about.

Baker did realize that there was a challenge in getting people to volunteer to talk about such a serious issue but he felt that actually knowing or hearing something traumatic may impact the other men.

Several participants mentioned partnering with sororities for training. Sam said,

“Having sororities as a part of the conversation would be helpful. I think to see where they are coming from would be good for a lot of the guys.” John specifically cited a session with sororities in which people had breakout conversations. He said that the personal, small group conversations were useful and effective because “...if it were just a couple guys who came in with a non-caring perspective, they could just mess around. If they’re with women...that changes the mood and makes them a lot more receptive to the information.” John’s acknowledgement that the presence of women may change behaviors and attitudes of training is extremely valuable. Involving women automatically changes the environment which more learning can occur.

Many of the men brought up the idea that survivor stories would help make training more effective. There was consensus that it is difficult to understand and keep in mind the impact that sexual violence has on women. He says that bringing in survivors from the sorority would help the brothers admit that sexual assault is a problem in the Greek community and, perhaps, be mindful of the consequences during a potentially dangerous situation.

Even though sexual assault is regrettably not uncommon, there are still many men who said they do not know anyone that has been personally affected. John reported that he and his friends do not have any acquaintances that have been personally affected by sexual assault. “To have a testimony of a person who’s affected by it speaks volumes and can be extremely powerful” but he also acknowledges how it could be challenging for the women to be vulnerable about experiences involving sexual misconduct. Of course, it is very likely that many of these men do know someone who has been affected by assault,

but are not aware.

Some men acknowledged they personally knew someone who had been affected by sexual misconduct. Jack explained how he was personally affected when his close friend was assaulted. He explained that he was extremely overcome with emotion.

I got upset and frustrated and started pacing around my room, and talked to my mom and dad about it to get it off my chest. I never had a situation like that before...I guess experiencing it makes it different.

The emotional toll that Jack went through was a personal experience that helped him realize that sexual violence is a problem, it does exist, and sexual violence can affect many people around him.

Steven agreed that survivor stories could be very powerful and valuable to training efforts. He explained, "It might be helpful if you gave an example of what happened to this person just because I feel like that's more engaging. People would actually be like, wow, this is actually horrible!" Will shared the same sentiment. He explained how he would like to hear survivor stories. "When I have seen or read firsthand accounts of sexual misconduct, sexual assault, whatever the severity level is, they are always incredibly harrowing to me because I think that they are often incredibly detailed." These explicit details tend to cause more disturbing feelings and may be used as a motivator to fight sexual violence.

Only one participant stated that having familiar women involved in training would not be beneficial. Jackson admitted,

Once you coincide with women, especially Greek life, a lot of people in Greek

life know each other so I feel like they would be a lot less willing to speak out about past actions and past things that they have seen. A lot of those people may be involved with each other. I would say keeping it separate to either all guys or all girls, that is a smart decision.

This was an anomaly however, as Jackson realized how close the Greek communities are and how coed training may impact the dynamics of the community.

The second most popular suggestion to improve training was to have it in person. The brothers talked about the value of face to face training and how it was much more memorable than their virtual sessions. Will explained the types of benefits of in person sexual prevention programming. "If conducted in person, I think it's always going to be more effective, especially given the sensitive personal issues that you would be trying to address here." He stated that he dislikes when recorded videos get sent out via email by The Office of Greek Life staff and found the videos to be extremely ineffective.

Steven admitted that he finds in person training somewhat inconvenient, but still more effective than the virtual options.

I mean, as much as it would suck to go in person and actually have to pay attention, some people would say that it would be way more valuable because you are kind of forced to pay attention. It's not like you could turn on the TV and just kind of tune out for a while.

Steven acknowledged the inconvenience that in person training can have but still shared that he finds in person to be more effective.

Sam echoed Steven's view that in person training encourages one to pay attention

to the topic of sexual violence.

Most people don't get a lot out of online training because they can click and not pay attention. In real life situations, I don't know that anything they learned online would come out so it's definitely not the best method.

Sam also mentioned that part of it was because of the unrealistic scenarios. Blake commented on how computer-based training was not valuable. He communicated negative experiences of this technology-based training.

It was some online thing and all I had to do was go through some questions and click the agree, disagree, and neutral options. There were various scenarios as what you view as right and wrong. And then like, the question, would you step in? What would you do in that kind of scenario? But it was not a free response, and it was not even a discussion. It was just something that I did on my own. Thinking back to it, I was sitting in the library on my computer, just like clicking the different boxes. There was not any further discussion on it. It was just filling it out and getting it done so that I did not have to do it later.

Blake's response indicates that forced-response quizzes were particularly unlikely to produce engagement on the part of the trainee.

Many of the participants stated that whether the training is in person or virtual, the key for training to be effective is for it to be interactive. Derek shared his frustration and reflected on how his training lacked any type of interaction and led to boredom. He stated that many of his brothers sent jokes through text messages during training.

I don't think anyone paid attention or changed behaviors because of it. I think it was just like boilerplate, like you have a responsibility to yourself to treat women with respect (which of course I do not like that training approach)."

He detailed that it was boring because it was done via PowerPoint and had advice like "do not drug women at parties." He stated that he finds it obvious when a girl cannot give consent and it "was presented in a way that no one actually cared."

Jason understood that interactive training for sexual misconduct could be uncomfortable. He mentioned "...people playing the role, it could be uncomfortable, but I'm sure there's a way that we could make it interactive so it's more educational and more hands-on for people." Jason stated even with the level of discomfort, with increased interaction in training he could get something out of training.

Jeff was passionate and came up with ideas to be utilized in training which could be more interactive. "...having little groups, you make a little scenario, like, 'hey, you guys, like talk bad about this girl' and then present. You're not talking about an actual girl and then use YouTube to break up the conversation." The use role-playing and the integration of media could add variety to training.

There were two participants that shared that they do not think videos would be useful for sexual assault prevention training. Quincy explains the videos and why they are ineffective.

The word cringy describes videos...it seems fake. We're telling you this can happen, but it feels like you're just making it up. We know it happens in the university setting and I think we're smart enough to figure that out.

Derek agreed with Quincy about how videos were not an ideal part of training. He also talked about role playing and spoke about how that is also an ineffective way to train.

“Videos don't work. Skits are patronizing and stupid. I've done a lot of them, and none had any impact. You can have it be interactive other than using media and role playing.

You can have open table discussions.” Benny talked about what open discussions looked like to him and an example of how they can benefit the fraternity men. Benny said,

...having more open dialogue of where people can ask questions and talk about what they think sexual assault is. I think that kind of shows that there are a lot of people who do not think X, Y or Z is sexual assault, but it actually is in certain situations. Talking about that leads to a good baseline because people think sexual assault is when you're in an alley and someone comes up to you and does stuff, but it's more than that. So, I think starting with that baseline and having more of an open discussion platform would be a lot more beneficial.

Benny's thoughts centered around activities that could elicit diverse responses to what sexual assault consists of, which he found may be helpful. Blake agreed and compared the value of in person training versus computer-based training without any type of interaction. Blake thought training should be more open discussion. He shared that reading scenarios on screen was not valuable.

If you had in person training where you talk versus clicking a box, it is more valuable, especially since with the other training I can go through and I know which boxes they want me to click, and I do not even have to read it. Open discussion or having something where you actually have to talk is more valuable

and more memorable than just a form to fill out.

He also added that many of the questions in computer-based training, you can go back and fix because for the incorrect answers, the real answers were provided.

Participants shared that they enjoyed being in group settings during training. Eugene would like to see his peers in training and explained how helpful it would be. He highlighted that just seeing everyone learning the same thing may discourage negative behaviors. "...being in a room going through training with 60 other men might deter them from abusing women. Just knowing that everyone knows that it's not okay by seeing everyone watching the same video and speakers as you." Eugene detailed how being in groups, even larger groups, can bolster training just by attending.

Jackson preferred the smaller groups. He said, "I feel like those intimate, smaller conversations, the informal ones, are more productive. My training was more of a larger setting so, I feel like training wasn't as productive as it could have been." Jamie stated that just going to training with a group is extremely powerful. He explained further, "I think a big thing would be going alone versus going with people. I think it makes the experience more shared if you're going with people." Quincy explained how the group setting would help training be more effective. He said,

If we did the training as a group and we actually got to discuss things like scenarios, that would definitely be more beneficial. If you do train in a group and you have smaller breakout groups and you have to talk about it, then I think that's where there could be growth.

Quincy thought the ability to talk and listen to others on a more intimate level may help

lead to a positive change in men.

Whether there are larger or smaller groups, the men had a consensus that friendly banter and even humor would make the training effective and memorable. Clark told a story about a humorous discussion that he had at his sexual assault prevention training.

The instructor had all of us in the class write on a sticky note, what makes a good sexual experience for us, so we all wrote different things. We posted them anonymously and he read them off. He discussed the differences in each person and how each person prefers to have different things in their sexual experiences.

The facilitator made a point of saying that everyone has different preferences, but you need to be respectful of those preferences and everyone needs to be respectful of other people's boundaries. I think the big tie in there was, it's okay to be a little weird or whatever (which everyone found funny) but as long as you respect other people and respect what they view as a sexual experience, then you'll be okay.

The creativity and humor made this training more memorable and Clark detailed how he remembered all the content from that training by just engaging in an activity that allows other to laugh.

The topic of sexual assault is very serious and can be extremely tragic. Humor can also be a way to prevent mental overload on negative topics. Eugene explained how one activity helped him. "Condom demonstrations where students put condoms on bananas, stuff like that helps. I think jokes in the right places are always helpful." Eugene verbalized that integrating humor through the training keeps the crowd engaged and

keeps a lighter tone on a very morbid subject.

The fraternity brothers mentioned that during training, there were many scenarios that were given to them, and they had to choose what to do in these scenarios. Many of the men reported that these situations were extremely unrealistic and would not happen in real life. Bradley detailed “Training videos talk about stuff that would never happen in real life because everyone would obviously be on that guy immediately. Making it realistic would make it easier to recognize what it actually looks like.” Men would like to have featured situations that actually can happen.

Something that surprised me was the importance of the gender of the facilitator. All but one participant stated that training would be more enticing if it were led by a man, more specifically a fraternity brother. Some participants stated that the men in training would be more receptive if it were taught by another man involved in Greek life. Older brothers were very respected and held a strong presence, especially those brothers who had executive level positions. Jack shared his opinion that he thought people would not attend training if it was led by a third-party individual giving a lecture. “I feel like if it was a very respected and well-liked brother who was elected to a position, it would get a lot more attention and a lot more attendance.” Jack vehemently thought that someone in the Greek community may appear to be taken more seriously with sexual assault prevention.

Eddy explained how he went to a sexual assault prevention training session which was led by a woman. He described the experience, “It seems like a lot of the guys didn't really want to be there but that could've been a product of how it was presented. In truth,

it'd probably be better if it was from a brother-to-brother interpersonal relationship."

Several of the participants stated that having a male facilitator, which did not necessarily have to be from a fraternity, made the sensitive topic more relatable. Aaron explained,

Training should be taught by someone who is not a professor because I got the majority of my beliefs, my training per se, from fraternity members and stuff. So, someone who's not 40 years old and lecturing you about their kids, that doesn't really hit home with a whole bunch of guys. The trainer should be more informal.

Aaron stated that this could be done easily, "for example, just by having simple casual conversations or group discussions would be more meaningful, especially if it came from a guy." It was surprising how the gender of the facilitator could change the impact of sexual assault prevention training.

Many times, universities have the fraternity's Greek advisor facilitate sexual assault prevention training. The Greek advisor has responsibilities to the fraternity. They guide, advise, and support the chapter as well as ensuring that policies and procedures are met during the academic year. One of these policies is to make sure that the brothers receive proper training. I asked the participants whether the advisor played a role in their sexual assault prevention training experience and the majority of men stated that their advisor would just record whether they completed the mandatory training or not. The men were extremely aware of their advisor's role and the brothers reiterated that the advisors are supposed to play a large role in the organization, but they are passive in their duties, especially with training. Blake mentioned

There was a course I had to take online. Afterwards, there was a box that the

advisor had to check to make sure everyone went through this course. It wasn't anything extreme. I don't notice anything going on with them.

The men admitted that the fraternity had more of a role in training than their advisor. Jackson stated, "The advisors haven't played a role. Training has mostly been the fraternity itself versus the Greek life administrative staff. They've not reached out to us about anything. I would say the fraternity as a whole has done way more." This was surprising to me as one of the advisor's main responsibilities was to ensure proper training of the brothers.

Jack also shared that the Greek life staff has had minimal interaction with the men regarding training. He also attributed the training he received to his fraternity. He said that Greek advisors had no involvement with sexual assault prevention efforts. "They've never reached out with any sort of support in trying to create positive relationships with sorority girls. A lot that I've learned has come from executive members of the fraternity and hasn't come from Greek life staff." Jack does realize that education happens, but mostly through peers.

Some men had not even met with their advisor. Eugene admitted, "I can't say that I've ever had any interaction whatsoever with Greek life staff or advisors, regardless of whether it's about sexual assault or paying dues. I can't say that I've had any interaction whatsoever with them." Sam shared a story about how his advisor had an opportunity to educate the men, but the men stated that she was too passive.

It was only after the fact that she talked to us. It was definitely not preventative. It was more after something would happen and then there would be consequences,

but not really a conversation about it. There were guidelines we were supposed to follow as far as like, we were supposed to have guest speakers and attend different things or do like online modules where we would talk about relationships with women. But if you didn't do that, it wasn't like a big deal or anything. It's just kind of like a point system. Like if you did training, you got some points or you had better standing with the university or something. But there weren't really any consequences to not doing it.

It seems to me that the sexual assault prevention training with Greek life consisted of a checks and balance system and the only thing recorded was attendance.

Jeff was one of the very few participants that said that the Greek advisors did play a role in sexual assault prevention training. "Many advisors send out webinars and stuff like that. They talked about positive components of having relationships or having connections with women in other sororities. It doesn't have to be only sexual relationships. It can be service-related connections." However, the majority of the men did not find the Office of Greek Life staff helpful.

The Value of Informal Education. Some of the brothers spoke to the value of informal relationships and messages they received from their brothers. However, it is notable that these modes of education focused on self-image and protection of reputation. For example, Aaron explained the role his older brother had on him when teaching him how to treat women. "The older guys and the people in charge had strong brotherhood and great relations with women and all the sororities...the older brothers really instilled in us to keep our good name and our reputation." Jay reiterated the point about respecting

women as a means for protecting one's own image. "My fraternity did have a conversation about the importance of respecting women and how those relationships and the types of women you are in relationships with affects our image." He mentioned that he received most of his education about respecting women by older brothers and having relationships with sororities which in turn can affect the perception of the fraternity.

Big brothers do play a role, but conversations are not happening on a regular basis. Many times, they do not happen at all. Blake explained, "I think back to my pledging experience with the older brothers. We never had those conversations on how to treat women...and there hasn't really been any big group discussions with older brothers about that type of stuff." Blake reiterated that he was closer to his pledge class and conversations with them were much more frequent. In addition to appealing to the individual members' self-image and reputation, they also appealed to the image of the entire fraternity. Jason gave this example.

At the very beginning the president, the social chair, and the new member educator sat down with us and they said, "Hey, this is who we are. We are the gentlemen of campus. We are here to make everyone feel welcome and safe. We walk people back home and make sure they get into bed safely. We make sure they have drinking water. Like we make sure everybody has a good time." So really, leadership has upheld that message the whole time.

Jason reiterated that executive members of the fraternity had high expectations with the treatment of women, especially at socials and parties.

There were times when formal topics like consent were discussed in an informal

manner. Quincy described what his chapter leadership taught him in passing.

Our chapter leadership would say you are going to talk to girls, you are going to do things with girls, it's part of being in college. But consent, consent, consent. If you are going to take her home, consent. Make sure that it is something she wants to do, but also make sure it is in a sober manner. A drunk yes is not a yes.

Consent came up as a topic even outside of formal training. This shows that significant and important messages that are typically taught in formal training is often emphasized through informal conversations with older brothers.

Many of the men had a certain philosophy that it was peer education that was the most valuable experience versus some type of formal curriculum. Jack explained, "I learned through experience of other guys and how the other guys handled those situations. I guess that is technically training." Jeff also contributed and supported the fact that learning by experience was the most valuable type of training.

As you go through years in a fraternity, you learn more about social interaction through practice, I personally believe social relationships, like women's stuff, isn't something you can teach someone, it's something you really need to practice.

Jeff really cherished the fraternal experience, as it helped his treatment of women and allowed him to learn things on a first-hand basis.

In summary, training was found to be variable at the public and private universities. Inconsistencies were across the board in types of training they received, the people who were qualified to facilitate training, the topics of training, and the frequency of training. Even though many of the participants were in the same fraternities, no two

answers were the same. Although many of the men found training to be ineffective, they did find consent to be the most memorable and valuable topic. There were mixed views about training, a common theme was how important these friendships were to the brothers and how these relationships were the real sources of education. These friendships can be leveraged regarding sexual assault prevention education and the friendships tend to be more valuable as a vehicle for training versus any type of formal training.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to understand the behaviors and perspectives surrounding treatment of women and sexual assault prevention from fraternity members. Participants described both formal and informal educational experiences that shaped their attitudes and behaviors toward women. In respect to formal training, participants described that they had better experiences with interactive training than with online educational experiences. This fits into the overall theme of the value and importance of relationships both within and outside of fraternities to participants. Along with interactive training sessions, participants described informal interactions with brothers—especially older brothers—as valuable in their socialization around these issues. These experiences were mixed, with some informal interactions. The older brothers sometimes help shape positive behaviors, but they can sometimes support negative behaviors. It is notable that even some of the better, informal educational experiences were based on the idea of preserving one's or the chapter's reputation, and less on respecting the value of women as a principle. When gathering the attitudes and behaviors of the fraternal men, as well as

their feelings about training, I discovered four themes which I will discuss in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this qualitative study, I explored fraternal men and investigated the following research questions:

1. How do fraternity members' relationships with male peers shape their perceptions and treatment of women?
2. What kinds of informal and formal training do fraternity members receive surrounding the treatment of women? What do they take away from these experiences?

To respond to these questions, I interviewed 28 fraternal men from two campuses, one, a large public university and the other, a small private institution. In these interviews, I explored participants' general experiences as fraternal members. In addition, I asked the participants to respond to hypothetical scenarios involving interactions with women and with other fraternity members. I also asked them to reflect on formal sexual assault prevention training as well as informal interactions that shaped their understanding of women and sexual violence.

Summary of Findings

The main findings included the following: First, there is substantial power and influence of brotherhood and in brothers' relationships on participants' reported attitudes and behaviors. Second, formal training is most effective when it capitalizes on the value of relationships among brothers and women in sororities. Third, formal training is important in ensuring that brothers have an understanding of consent. Lastly, protection of self-image and the chapter was a significant influence on discourse and behavior

surrounding the treatment of women. Many of these findings also coincided with aspects of the Male Peer Model. In the following I provide a summary of each of these findings.

Brotherhood

The primary reason the participants joined fraternities was to create friendships. These friendships not only allowed them to form social bonds, but exposed them to different experiences, which include philanthropic events and various socials. Also, personal growth and professional networking were other motivations for joining a fraternity.

The fraternity provides education on topics such as the history of the fraternity, leadership practices, and treatment of women. The bonds of brotherhood serve as a subtext for the attitudes and approaches these men take in respect to their relationships with and attitudes toward women.

Relational Training

There were several types of mandatory and optional trainings offered to the fraternity members. Many of these modes of training were mentioned in the literature including the social norms and the bystander training models. However, the participants stated that the most powerful educational experiences occurred through socials, formals, or through casual conversations with brothers. In particular, advice and information on how to treat women from respected brothers were highly regarded by the participants. Even though there was much knowledge that was transferred, many brothers also went through formal training. The formal trainings which involved interaction among brothers were considered of value.

The Meaning of Consent

The brothers went through various training models, whether it was through a lecture or computer-based training. At these trainings, many topics were covered. Topics included alcohol consumption and how to treat women before, during, and after dates. However, the most memorable topic for the men was the meaning and importance of consent. Some specific things about consent that the men remembered was the fact that drunk consent is not consent. The other memorable fact about consent was that is a two-way process, and consent must be explicit –that is, through verbal agreement.

Chapter Protection

Chapter self-preservation appeared to be as important to participants as the actual treatment of women. Participants consistently highlighted the consequences of non-participation in sexual assault prevention training. Consequences can include severe sanctions such as shutting down the chapter. Participants also highlighted the importance of maintaining a high reputation among their counterparts in the fraternity community.

Male Peer Model

In this study, the findings of how male peer relationships may shape how men treat women aligned with the Male Peer Model. The salience of peer relationships permeated every aspect of this study. Below, I discuss how each tenet of the Male Peer Model manifested in this study.

Alcohol Consumption

Inappropriate behaviors may occur during events and parties, particularly gatherings where there is a high level of alcohol consumption. The Male Peer Model

attributes alcohol abuse as a catalyst for sexual violence. In addition, the men in this study discussed that they hold numerous events with hundreds of women and that was a reason why some men joined the fraternity. Benny admitted that alcohol settles the women's and men's anxiety and stated, "...if there's a lot of alcohol, people may break those physical boundaries a lot more."

While some participants raised the influence of alcohol at various times in the interviews, alcohol use was not a focus of the study. That is to say, my focus in this research was to uncover what interventions could be designed and implemented to mitigate the real issues. Although this research did not focus on confronting alcohol use, the brothers did recognize the role alcohol played when it came to decision making, especially with women. Benny Mills explained "If we have any events in a club or bar where there's a lot of things being said and there's a lot of alcohol, people may break those physical boundaries a lot more." This awareness does mean the men are more conscious of how alcohol can affect decision making in terms of sexual activity.

Many of the men did mention the role that alcohol played in obtaining consent to sexual activities. The men explained their understanding that when a girl consents under the use of drugs and/or alcohol, then it should not be taken into consideration. The participants said they learned about the role of alcohol through their brothers and through training. Quincy stated what he learned from his chapter, "Consent, consent, consent. If you're going to take her home - consent, make sure that it's something she wants to do, make sure it is in a soberly manner. A drunk yes is not a yes." The message that consent when drunk is not a conscious decision to engage in sexual activity would be easy to

relay, and may be taken more seriously if coming from a brother.

All-Male Membership

I chose to study communities that were all male, so this tenet of the model was found to be important in this research. This aspect of the model is particularly powerful considering that in the majority of cases, the fraternity brothers lived together. In fraternal life, there are meetings, rituals, and events that are attended by just men where misconduct or degrading language often occur. During my interviews, there were many stories and scenarios about being in an all-male environment and how that may foster sexual violence like the use of gender stereotypes or objectification of women. There were incidences when all-male bonding impacted the individuals. This study showed us that it is not just an all-male environment or formal membership that shapes behavior, but it is the friendships, bonds, or the needs for those bonds that may perpetuate sexual misconduct. There is an obvious reluctance to put the fraternal relationships at risk by challenging and confronting situations where misconduct occurs.

Although there were many negative stories during the interviews about the peer influence that may foster sexual violence, it is notable that there is a strong propensity to define the boundaries of good behavior in the terms established by the fraternities themselves. Eugene stated that he learned about those boundaries in the fraternity. He said that fraternity leadership instilled in him that he has to verbally ask before touching a woman. Jack told me what he said to his brothers about crossing boundaries and what it may look like. "If she visibly looked uncomfortable. If it's like sensual touching while she doesn't want it at all." These friendships also taught brothers what to do if boundaries

are crossed. Aaron described what his brothers told him about intervention before holding a party. “Try to remove the brother from the situation, get away from a girl or you could intervene...or remove the brother from the situation and say, “Hey, come get a drink with me”...just get away from the situation.” These friendships are strong and the brothers learn how to behave from their friends. Matthew explained that he took away a lot from his brothers. “I listened to how they (the brothers) spoke and how they held themselves and I kind of followed foot in that.” These college aged men put much value in peer relationships. Robert Kegan (1982) pointed out that adults are often so immersed in their “Socialized Mind” that they are less able to be true to their personal values. That is, they are often defined by their social relationships. This reality seemed to be present in this study.

There are aspects of this study that align with Robert Kegan’s (1982) Moral Development Theory. The theory explains the high value that young adults put in peer relationships. Kegan’s Theory of Development (1982) presented five stages of development. He discovered the stages of transformation to an adult, subject-object shift, socialized mind, self-authoring mind, and self-transforming mind. The third stage of Kegan’s Theory of Development (1982), the Socialized Mind, takes place as young adults. In this phase, it is the forces outside the individual that powerfully shape the sense of self and understanding of the world. Inhabitants of the Socialized Mind take into account of how other people, like peers, view them when making decisions or forming opinions. Several of the fraternal members stated how friendships acted as an external factor when it came to decision making, especially when it came to intervention.

Matthew explained,

My friendships would influence my decision to intervene...the perception that somebody is going to judge you...does weigh in. I think it's that perception that somebody is going to judge me. Somebody's going to talk about me. So, I think it weighs a lot. At the end of the day, I'm still going to try to do the right thing, but that thought is always going to be there like, "Oh, what are they going to say about me? When are they going to talk about me?" I think that weighs heavily.

Matthew clearly expressed his hesitance due to fear of losing friendships. Bradley Phillips also explained that he was concerned about how intervening can cause the unpleasant feeling of being seen as less of a man. "...someone that's higher in the fraternity, popularity or power wise, and they're doing something, it's hard to go up and say something...you don't want to be seen as a wimp or the super nice guy." This fear of what his fellow peers may think of him parallels the stage of the Socialized Mind in a young adult's moral development.

Sanday (2007) expressed another dimension of all-male membership and argued that "men in fraternities use violence against women as a way to declare their masculinity in the face of homosocial bonding rituals" (Sanday, 2007, p. 191). Although it is interesting that Sanday's finding points out that the all-male membership factor of being in a fraternity brings about negative behaviors, there were some favorable outcomes. This includes the support that the men give each other when relationships with women do not work out. While the participants of my study did not explicitly mention relying on each other when they were had difficulties with women, they did repeatedly refer to the

“brothers” as valuable sources of support. This could be a tool for future sexual assault prevention trainers.

Hypermasculinity

While peer influence was clearly referenced by most, if not all participants, this study captured examples of hypermasculinity. There is much literature (Corprew et al., 2014; Gutierrez, 2018; Taylor, 2015; Zernechel, 2017) that reinforces that hypermasculinity may influence sexual violence. The study Murnen and Kohlman (2007) completed involved a sample of an all-male athletic team. They found that membership in all-male groups is associated with greater endorsement of sexual violence. Conversely, Nikolov (2021) reported that there are all-male groups that seek to challenge toxic masculinity. The difference between Murnen and Kohlman’s (2007) study and my study is that the researchers found that a male sample of athletes engaged in behaviors explained by competition and physical aggression, which aligns with the factor of hypermasculinity as a catalyst for sexual violence. This study was different as there were no elements of competition and physical aggression with other men recounted in my study. In this particular study, my interviews did not elicit discussions in which participants described explicit pressure towards masculinity; however, there was implicit sexual objectification of women. In this setting, participants referenced substantial peer pressure and expectations of conformity instead of competition.

Sexual Objectification of Women

The sexual objectification of women occurs during events and through hazing practices. The men are taught to objectify women through older brothers and through

their friendships. Participants discussed certain objectification scenarios including using beautiful women to attract new members. There is also much objectification that occurs during conversation. In many cases, these men do not view these behaviors as being negative, as they seem to be accepted within the fraternity communities. Frequently, gender and sexual stereotypes are mentioned to women and about women. This form of objectification happens frequently. Davis (2018) found that the most frequent use of objectification was through text messages with each other that talked about rating the women's attractiveness level. This aligned with my study as the most popular form of objectification that occurred was viewing social media profiles and commenting on their bodies or appearance. Russian (2017) also reported that at the University of Massachusetts, there are parties where brothers consistently comment on attractiveness of the females in line at the door to come to the party and those who are considered more attractive go to the front of the line. Although there were times when men mentioned that they sought higher tier sororities to be at their parties, they did let all women in however, the attractive ones were ones that had more benefits like being voted sweetheart.

It was surprising to see the different forms of sexual objectification and how the definition of degrading was subjective in terms of the participants. There were numerous elements that had to be considered when deciding if something was sexually degrading or objectifying. If it was not false information, if the woman was absent, if the actions were frequent, if it was used for comedic effect, and the types of cues the woman gave off were all indicators of whether the action was deemed inappropriate. Aaron stated that if the comment was a fact, then it was not considered hurtful. "I would say if it's factual

then you're just telling people it's true. If it's a known lie then it's going to hurt the girl in the long run or in the short run.” Aaron stated that the term ‘slut’ was only derogatory if the girl was hooking up with multiple men within the same time period.

In many situations, the men said that they did not think the action or words were inappropriate because it was not in front of the woman. Connor stated, “...it depends on the setting, whether it’s degrading. If it's in their own time...I wouldn't necessarily tell them they’re wrong, if it's in front of that person or in a group with other women, I think you're definitely in the wrong.” Connor found that this test of if the woman cannot hear it or take any offense to it, then it is perfectly acceptable, was normal.

The other litmus test of whether a behavior was degrading was the frequency which it happened. “If it was just incessant, I would probably think, what the hell? Like, why am I even talking to you guys? You guys are idiots and maybe then I would say something like, let's talk about something else...,” said Eddy. It is important to note though that men’s idea of the term ‘frequent’ can be ambiguous, so this test leaves a lot of room for interpretation.

Comedy was another indicator of whether the behavior was degrading. Eugene explained, “If it’s funny, that kind of verifies it...offensive versus if someone makes a joke...and no one laughs that's definitely less okay.” Eugene believed that if comments were funny and were not said intentionally to hurt the person, then it is not degrading.

Lastly, the men made it clear that behaviors can be ambiguous when deciding if something was inappropriate. Some of the participants admitted that they used the reactions and cues of women to decide if something was sexual misconduct. Jack

explained, “If she visibly looked uncomfortable or...if he's grabbing her close to him while she's trying to get away. Those are different things that I think are crossing boundaries.” Jack went on to explain that the woman’s facial expression and body language are extremely important when trying to decide if something is unwarranted. While Jack described what crossing physical boundaries looked like, verbal misconduct was not mentioned as frequently.

In defining boundaries of bad behavior, it is important to look at the participants conceptions of what bad behavior is. The results illustrate that it was common for participants to confess some confusion about how to define bad behavior. There was ambivalence whether the brothers understood it to be bad behavior or whether the behavior should be excused.

Absence of Deterrence

Another tenet of the Male Peer Model is that an absence of deterrence contributes to sexual violence. DeKeseredy and Schwartz (1993) pointed out that a fear of informal or formal sanctions within a community can act as a deterrent. While the peer group on one hand reinforced sexual violence, there were examples of behaviors that deterred inappropriate conduct. In addition, the threat of consequences such as sanctions and harm to reputation also acted as deterrents. An example of a behavior that deterred sexual misconduct was brothers not wanting to intervene because of fear of confrontation. The other primary reasons were that they were scared of being seen as less of a man, fear of being outnumbered, not knowing the context of the situation, and a very common explanation was the fear of losing friendships with the brothers. There is not much

literature that describes the friendships between all-male groups and how fear of losing those friends can influence the decision for other men to intervene. The literature that I discovered that was most common involving fear between the perpetrator and the victim who were in a close relationship did not surround male peer-to-peer relationships, but abandonment issues between partners in incidences of domestic violence (Bornstein, 2006; Kelly & Johnson, 1995; Riggs et al., 2009).

The one deterrent that is mostly seen in the literature is the challenge of bystander interventions (Coker & Clear, 2015, McMahon & Banyard, 2011). There is one study that concentrated on the difficulty of bystander intervention and being part of all-male groups. Corboz et al. (2015) study concluded that the challenges of bystander intervention involved difficulties like lack of confidence, inner secrecy, and the dynamic of younger brothers fearing older brothers. The relationship dynamics in my study were similar to those found in Corboz et al. (2015) study; however, elements like fear of physical strength and harm of a tarnished name of the all-male organization was not found. When men verbalized things that they considered before intervening, they explained all their fears. The first fear is that the male could not physically intervene. Jason elaborated why he would not intervene by himself, "...I'm not physically strong. When it comes to physical interaction, I'm not the best for it...I would probably go get a couple of fraternity brothers and get the situation resolved." Another finding that was not found in the Corboz et al. (2015) study was the role of reputation of all-male peer organizations. The men found they were more concerned about the reputation of the fraternity than doing what is morally right. Quincy detailed, "...it's more about the image of the

fraternity” versus ethical responsibility to intervene. Similarly, Jay shared that during new member education, he learned about “respect and having a good relationship with sororities on campus...specifically we had a conversation about the importance of respecting women and how that affects our image.” The finding that the image and reputation of the fraternity meant more than doing what is right in regards to treatment of women was surprising. Knowing this can contribute to the field of higher education, especially advancing respectable treatment of women as a positive impact to the reputation for the fraternity.

Group Secrecy

Group secrecy was found as a large factor of lack of intervention in the Corboz et al. (2015) study but was rarely mentioned by the participants in this study. There was almost no mention of group secrecy when it came to reporting however, there were times where sexual misconduct was promoted and at times behaviors were kept secret because the behavior was considered a tradition. Jake shared a story.

This particular fraternity had been known to mark cups at parties that women drank from. Brothers in that fraternity would view them as targets and offer them more drinks. Also, they would mark girls’ cups who were commonly known to be easier to prey on.

He stated that this was secret for obvious reasons. I suspect situations like this may happen frequently, however, because admitting these types of incidences may call for mandatory reporting, these stories were not often shared during the interviews. There was no mention of specific incidents happening and being secretive when it came to reporting.

There is a strong loyalty to the fraternity when it comes to reputation and not necessarily to their brothers. Something that was shared that had high secrecy and which was not necessarily related to sexual misconduct was the frequent use of recreational drugs. Franklin, Bouffard, and Pratt (2012) uncovered the same finding that there was a high use of recreational drugs which may contribute to sexual violence. The secrecy did not necessarily have to do with reporting sexual misconduct. It was surprising that brothers hardly mentioned their loyalty to each other which is often interrelated with secrecy.

Implications for Practice

Among the important findings of this study was that sexual assault prevention training is most effective when leveraging relational bonds that exist between fraternal peers. These relationships can be capitalized on by engaging respected members of the Greek community to deliver training. In addition, implementing programs that coach upper class students in mentoring strategies can promote more respectful behaviors and improve attitudes toward women. Training should always leverage this powerful influence of peers. This can include having the older and more respected brothers leading training versus an outside consultant or university faculty or staff.

Facilitation

When asked about facilitator, mode, and time of training, no two answers were the same. Identities of facilitators varied substantially among the fraternities. Some men even stated they were not required to complete any sexual assault prevention training. However, there were some consistencies on preferences of training. Next, I will discuss

the implications of each of the elements of training.

Face to Face Training

The interviews garnered that face to face training has more influence than online training modalities. This is for two primary reasons: first, it is harder to be distracted and second, there is room for interaction and discussion. Much of the training was computer-based. The participants did not like engaging in this type of training. They described it as boring and mentioned the fact that it contained unrealistic scenarios. Face to face training can offer benefits that computer-based models cannot offer. Group discussion being one of them. Consent is one thing that seemed to be ambiguous among all the participants and more clarity would be present if there was back and forth conversation about consensual cues. Also, men found that a brother from the Greek community that they respect should facilitate training because they would be taken more seriously.

Face to face training would also allow for less distractions. Many men found that if there was face to face training, they would take it more seriously. Some men stated that face to face training may lead to a consensus that sexual violence does exist and is not acceptable. Jackson explained that face to face training can be more exciting if the men can go together and even walk together to training because the idea of brotherhood seems to motivate the men.

Men would also like to see more humor in training. Many of the participants agree that this is a serious issue and the element of comedy can make the curriculum easier to digest and more effective. The men who did enjoy training involved activities that had humorous aspects and the fraternity brothers all paid attention, and this increased

engagement. The second most popular theme I found was men would like to see women involved in training.

Engaging Women in Training

There are several ways to engage women. First, almost all the men said survivor stories increase the impact. They all acknowledged that it would be difficult to find guest speakers but they said it would be extremely powerful. Some of the men stated that they do not know anyone who has been personally affected by sexual assault, so they believe that meeting a survivor would be extremely effective. Another way to involve women is to have them attend the same training session as the men. Some participants even recommended holding the session in a sorority house, in order to highlight the importance of power equity.

Men noted that they receive important information pertinent to legal and policy ramifications of sexual misconduct through training. Providing an early training on the meaning and context of consent is important. Basic policy expectations particularly focused on the meaning of and context for granting consent were cited as important by participants in this study. Therefore, ensuring that members receive clear communication concerning legal and institutional policy expectations is essential and complements the more dynamic relational aspects of training. Detecting the presence of harm to women is the first step in preventing future harm and to be proactive in this, fraternity members need to be educated successfully with regard to how alcohol affects decision making abilities.

A key finding of this study that relates to training is the presence of a relationship

dynamic in which men do not want to confront fraternity brothers in incidents of sexual misconduct. This is especially the case of younger men confronting their older brothers. These confrontations are laden with potential social risks. Facilitated discussions and presentations that focus on these very real dynamics are important. The question for planners is, “How can the deep social bonds translate into effective training mechanisms?”

Finally, the interviews made it clear that members pay attention to the reputation of a fraternity. This can be valuable as high levels of respect towards women may boost reputation levels and affect tier ratings. There could be other ways to correlate a better reputation and more positive perceptions of fraternities with the proper treatment of women. This can be used as a motivator to increase and maintain respect for women.

Implications for Research

Due to the current reporting requirements there are to exploring self-reported actual responses and incidences of sexual misconduct and because of the sensitivity of this topic and the reluctance to answer questions related to sexual assault, further studies are likely to use the study of hypothetical scenarios.

This study captured data from two institutions, a large public university and a small liberal arts college. This study has the potential to be expanded to other institutions. Institutions may have unique cultures and different approaches to educating men on sexual misconduct. It would be especially useful to examine institutions and fraternity chapters that are intentional about leveraging brotherly relationships to provide unique models of sexual assault prevention training.

One reality of studying a sensitive subject like sexual misconduct is that the identity of the researcher can shape the interview responses. Further research conducted by men would provide useful additions to this study. Due to the highly sensitive nature of the research, the presence of a female researcher is likely to elicit different responses than if a male interviewer were to talk to the brothers. Social science quasi-experiments need to be cleverly designed and that control for social desirability could elicit values underlying men's actual beliefs and behaviors.

This study also indicated that the reputation of the fraternity is of great importance. It would be important to question reputation, and if and what role that plays in other fraternities at other universities. Because this research only concentrated on two schools it would be notable to understand if these nuances, including the tier system, happen at other types of schools.

The feedback that the participants provided was that survivor stories may make sexual assault prevention training more effective. It would be worth exploring what is happening across the country to include survivor stories and whether they are using this as a tool to educate men about treatment of women in their training. Research can be completed to understand how these survivor stories may have an effect on incidents of sexual violence. By expanding this research to other schools, we can examine what is being done in training to prevent sexual violence and validate the effectiveness with other higher education institutions.

It is important to understand fraternity orientation models across the country to see what people do in regard to bystander training in regard to confronting older brothers.

Additionally, these studies represent all-white fraternities. Other research, for instance, researching attitudes in the National Pan-Hellenic Council and researching non-white fraternities, religious fraternities, social organizations, or other all-male peer groups can add to the understanding of this important issue in different contexts.

Personal Reflection

Due to the delicate nature of the topic of sexual violence against women, this study took significant time to complete. The IRB process took several rounds over a long period of time, particularly due to the reporting requirements of Title IX. Once the IRB was approved, getting participants was extremely challenging. This part of the process did not surprise me; however, the extremely high level of circumspection among potential participants was surprising. During the interviews, I learned that they were uncomfortable by just the non-verbal cues they were displaying. I could see them sweating, or their answers seemed guarded or rehearsed. I learned how to be a better researcher by having to solve this issue. To increase comfort among participants and in hopes to elicit honest answers, I had to be creative with the questioning technique I used. By sharing the same ‘bro code’ language, the participants were more at ease. For example, instead of asking if the fraternity men have witnessed a brother saying something demeaning to a woman, I asked if they have seen brothers “slut-shaming” a woman. I was at a loss for words on how something simple like altering the language can elicit more honest answers. I not only learned how to cater my interview to each participant, I learned how to remain a subjective interviewer.

Being a woman, I can understand the participants’ hesitations to answer some

questions. At the beginning of the study, I questioned whether I could be subjective. There is so much negative publicity with fraternities, it could make it challenging to begin the interview process with an open mind. What helped me through this process was researching fraternities and reviewing all the positive contributions they make to universities and colleges around the world. Also, before starting the interview with the men, I shared my passion for studying Greek life as it can play an essential part of male student development. After sharing my enthusiasm and reluctance to talk to me, they were open and honest to sharing stories. One thing I did expect from the interviews was that the stories may emotionally and mentally affect me.

I expected to and was concerned about hearing about graphic stories about men objectifying or disrespecting women. I did not consider any stories to be overly threatening or disgusting. When hearing the stories that the men told, I maintained control of my facial expressions. I did find one man's story of marking cups to target vulnerable females the most difficult story of this study. When stories came up about specific scenarios similar to this, I saw a pattern that all the fraternities placed blame on other chapters versus their own. One thing I was also expecting was more victim-blaming. I was surprised that I did not hear any accusations towards women when they talked about cases of sexual violence. Although, none of the men admitted that they themselves committed any sexual assaults (which was not surprising), the number of and realism of stories they shared made for extremely useful data. After collecting this data, my thoughts about fraternities, and whether the existence of fraternities is needed, was uncertain.

Before going into this study, my thoughts about fraternities were primarily negative. I thought the main benefits for joining Greek organizations were only for meeting women and partying. After this study I did realize that fraternities offer positive benefits contributing to student development, especially in regards to treatment of women. The information that I am extremely grateful for have collected and the easiest information to gather was information on sexual assault prevention training. I am grateful that the brothers did take something away from training, not necessarily about specific topics, but more ideas for continuous improvement.

There is discussion whether the fraternities are worth keeping around and whether the benefits outweigh the negatives. I feel like no matter what, there will be all-male peer-based groups in higher education. Whether in the form of athletic teams, fraternities, or friends sharing houses, all-male communities will always exist in some way or another. The living arrangements can be changed from all-male to coed but that does not necessarily prevent or reduce sexual misconduct or sexual violence.

One thing I wish my study possessed was a more diverse sample. It would have been interesting to see how men's heritage, religion, social-economic status, and upbringing affects the treatment of women. Even with the homogenous population, I am extremely grateful for the honesty of the participants and their willingness to elaborate on rituals and practices their fraternities have. There is no one size fits all answer on how to mitigate sexual violence on higher education campuses but there is much room for additional investigation and I hope that my research is carried on by future students and higher education practitioners.

Conclusion

Claims are frequently made that fraternity membership is primarily about leadership development and public service. This study did not support these common claims. The findings in this study indicate that relationships are at the foundation of membership motivation and the behavioral dynamics within fraternity chapters. DeKeseredy's (1997) Male Peer Model presents the idea that sexual violence towards women is a behavior that is socially learned with other men. The male peer relationships are powerful forms of behavioral influences. This has been illustrated in this study, demonstrating the importance of relationships between the other brothers. Many of the men explained how education, both formal and informal, about treatment of women manifested in their chapters. In particular, older brothers educated their younger brothers on a variety of topics, for example, at the beginning of their younger brothers' fraternal experience about how to treat women at events was a memorable topic.

A point of discussion is how training can be effective when it capitalizes on the value of relationships among men in fraternities and women in sororities. The literature did not mention how friendships and male peer relationships are leveraged in training, but the literature does state that other men strongly affect other men's attitudes and behaviors toward women (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1991; Koss & Gaines, 1997; Swartout, 2013). The interviews showed that the older brothers especially have a strong influence on younger brothers. Baker mentioned that older brothers often will be taken seriously in both formal and informal educational settings. Baker also stated that the trainer should always be someone respected and should be selected by other brothers because there are

always going to be brothers who hold respect a lot more than others. Chin et al. (2012) stated that when men are not fully involved in training, awareness of sexual assault is limited. Even though training may not be robust, this study illustrated that training through brotherhood can be one of the most powerful methods of education about sexual assault.

References

- Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college student's perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72(5), 747-756. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.1991.9936229>
- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(1), 147-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00669.x>
- Abbey, A. (1991). Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? *Journal of American College Health*, 39(4), 165-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.1991.9936229>
- Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (4th ed., 492-492). essay, Jossey-Bass.
- American Association of University Professors. (2016, September 23). *Joint statement on rights and freedoms of students*. <https://www.aaup.org/report/joint-statement-rights-and-freedoms-students>
- American Association of University Professors. (2017, July 31). *Campus sexual assault: Suggested policies and procedures*. <https://www.aaup.org/report/campus-sexual-assault-suggested-policies-and-procedures>
- American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Apa Dictionary of Psychology*. American Psychological Association. <https://dictionary.apa.org/rape>
- Andrade, A. (2014). Interpretive research aiming at theory building: Adopting and

adapting the case study design. *The Qualitative Report*.

<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2009.1392>

Annan, T. (2009). Campus sexual assault prevention: supporting male student allies in an effort to sustain engagement. *The Vermont Connection*, 30, 8-14.

Association's Committee on Women in the Academic Profession. (2017, July 31).

Campus sexual assault: Suggested policies and procedures.

<https://www.aaup.org/report/campus-sexual-assault-suggested-policies-and-procedures>

Babbie, E. R. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Earl Babbie (9th ed.). Wadsworth.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2003). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1), 61-79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.10078>

Barboza, A.R., Iverson, S., Williamsen, K., Houlemaarde, M., & Monahan-Kreishman, M. (2018). Beyond compliance addressing sexual violence in higher education [Monograph]. *College Student Educators International*, 8-22.

Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0045>

Barrick, K., Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Moore, Plummer, D. (2012). Factors associated with incidents of sexual assault among undergraduate women at historically Black colleges and universities. *Victims and Sexual Offenders*, 7(2), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2012.657287>

- Basile, K. C., & Saltzman, L. E. (2002). Sexual violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended Data Elements. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/e721362007-001>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/2>
- Benson, H. (2017, February 21). BENSON: Please ignore the fraternity and sorority tier system. <https://www.elonnewsnetwork.com/article/2017/02/please-ignore-the-tier-system>
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.): *Preventing intimate partner violence: Developmentally appropriate interventions across the life span*. American Psychological Press.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2003). *The social norms approach: theory, research and annotated bibliography*. Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, www.edc.org/hec/socialnorms/.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians*. essay, Jossey-Bass.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. *Preventing Violence in Relationships: Interventions across the Life Span*, 163–196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10455-007>

- Best Schools. (2021, August 30). *Joining a fraternity or sorority: The pros and cons of Greek Life*. TheBestSchools.org. <https://thebestschools.org/magazine/joining-a-fraternity-or-sorority-real-pros-and-cons-of-greek-life/>
- Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 13*(1), 68–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987107081254>
- Boeringer, S. B., Shehan, C. L., & Akers, R. L. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. *Family Relations, 40*(1), 58. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585659>
- Bornstein, R. F. (2006). The complex relationship between dependency and domestic violence: Converging psychological factors and social forces. *American Psychologist, 61*(6), 595–606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.61.6.595>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qrj0902027>
- Bowker, L. H. (1983). *Beating wife beating*. Lexington Books.
- Brecklin, L. R., & Forde, D. R. (2001). A meta-analysis of rape education programs. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 303–321. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.16.3.303>
- Briere, J., & Jordan, C. E. (2004). Violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(11), 1252–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504269682>
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage.

- Brome, M., Saul, J., Lang, K., Lee-Pethel, R., Rainford, N., & Wheaton, J. (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: beginning the dialogue*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Brown, A. L., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2014). College students as helpful bystanders against sexual violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(3), 350–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314526855>
- Burn, S. M. (2008). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60(11-12), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Burt, M. R., & Albin, R. S. (1981). Rape myths, rape definitions, and probability of conviction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 11(3), 212–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1981.tb00739.x>
- Campo, S., Lederman, L. C., & Stewart, L. P. (2007). Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated health communication campaign. *Journal of Health Communication*, 12(4), 417–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730701325822>
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., & Chibnall, S. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct* (116–121). Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2), 231–280. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.231>
- Carone, A. (2014, October 21). Fraternity culture linked to college sexual assault

problem. <https://www.kpbs.org/news/2014/oct/21/fraternities-and-campus-sexual-assault-problem/>

Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). *Toward a multi-level, ecological approach to the primary prevention of sexual assault: Prevention in peer and community contexts.*

Trauma, violence & abuse. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19383629/>

Casey, E., & Smith, T. (2010). “How can I not?”: Men’s Pathways to involvement in anti-violence against women work. *Violence Against Women*, 16(8), 953–973.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210376749>

Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2011). Being a positive bystander. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(1), 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511416479>

Castellano, J. (2015, June 19). *Campus sexual assault can cost universities millions.*

Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jillcastellano/2015/06/18/campus-sexual-assault-can-cost-universities-millions/#58cf3bd71a31>

Centers for Disease Control. (2015). *The public health approach to violence prevention.*

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/publichealthissue/publichealthapproach.html>

Centers for Disease Control. (2021, February 5). *Preventing sexual violence | violence prevention injury center.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/fastfact.html>

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: methods for the 21st Century.* Sage.

Chin, H. B., Sipe, T. A., Elder, R., Mercer, S. L., Chattopadhyay, S. K., Jacob, V.,

- Wethington, H. R., Kirby, D., Elliston, D. B., Griffith, M., Chuke, S. O., Briss, S. C., Ericksen, I., Galbraith, J. S., Herbst, J. H., Johnson, R. L., Kraft, J. M., Noar, S. M., Romero, L. M., & Santelli, J. (2012). The effectiveness of group-based comprehensive risk-reduction and abstinence education interventions to prevent or reduce the risk of adolescent pregnancy, human immunodeficiency virus, and sexually transmitted infections. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(3), 272–294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.11.006>
- Clark, M. (2014, September 29). *In combating campus sexual assault, a new focus on fraternities*. <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/combating-campus-sexual-assault-new-focus-fraternities>
- Clawson, M. A. (2014). *Constructing brotherhood: Class, gender, and fraternalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Clery Center. (2021). Clery Center. <https://clerycenter.org/policy/the-clery-act/>
- Cleveland, H. H., Koss, M. P., & Lyons, J. (1999). Rape tactics from the survivors perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(5), 532-547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626099014005005>
- Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of green dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410264>
- Corboz, J., Flood, M., & Dyson, S. (2015). Challenges of bystander intervention in male-

dominated professional sport. *Violence Against Women*, 22(3), 324–343.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215602343>

Corprew, C. S., & Mitchell, A. D. (2014). Keeping it frat: Exploring the interaction among fraternity membership, disinhibition, and hypermasculinity on sexually aggressive attitudes in college-aged males. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(6), 548–562. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2014.0062>

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Daley, P. (2011). *The fraternity leader: the Complete Guide Improving Your Chapter*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Davis, S. E. (2018). Objectification, sexualization, and misrepresentation: social media and the college experience. *Social Media + Society*, 4(3), 87–96.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118786727>

Davis, K. C., Parrott, D. J., George, W. H., Tharp, A. T., Hall, G. C., & Stappenbeck, C. A. (2014). Studying sexual aggression: a review of the evolution and validity of laboratory paradigms. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(4), 462–476.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037662>

DeCou, C. R., Cole, T. T., Lynch, S. M., Wong, M. M., & Matthews, K. C. (2017). Assault-related shame mediates the association between negative social reactions to disclosure of sexual assault and psychological distress. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 9(2), 166–172.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000186>

- DeGue S. (2016). Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 50(3), 295–302.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.034>
- DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(4), 346–362.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004>
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (1990). Male peer support and woman abuse: the current state of knowledge. *Sociological Focus*, 23(2), 129–139.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1992.10570559>
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2016). Thinking sociologically about image-based sexual abuse. *Sexualization, Media, & Society*, 2(4), 1-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2374623816684692>
- DeKeseredy, W., Hall-Sanchez, A., Nolan, J., & Schwartz, M. (2017). A campus LGBTQ community's sexual violence and stalking experiences: the contribution of pro-abuse peer support. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 1(2), 169–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1332/239868017x15099845241783>
- DeKeseredy, W., Donnermeyer, J. F., Schwartz, M. D., Tunnell, K. D., & Hall, M. (2007). Thinking critically about rural gender relations: toward a rural masculinity crisis/male peer support model of separation/divorce sexual assault. *Critical Criminology*, 15(4), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-007-9038-0>
- Dixon, S. (2015, October 02). *Costs of campus sexual assault*. Keep Her Safe.

<http://www.keepersafe.org/the-costs-of-campus-sexual-assault/>

Duplaga, M. (2019). Perception of the effectiveness of health-related campaigns among the adult population: An analysis of determinants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(5), 791.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16050791>

Dyson, S. (2015). Challenges of bystander intervention in male-dominated professional sport. *Violence Against Women*, 22(3), 324–343.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215602343>

Edwards, K. E., Shea, H. D., & Barboza Barela, A.-R. (2018). Comprehensive sexual violence prevention education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2018(161), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20252>

Ellis, D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1996). *The wrong stuff: an introduction to the sociological study of deviance*. Allyn & Bacon Canada.

Ehrhart, J. K., & Sandler, B. R. (1992). *Campus gang rape: party games?* Center for Women Policy Studies.

Erdely, S. R. (2014, November 19). *A rape on campus: A brutal assault and struggle for Justice at UVA*. Rolling Stone.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20141119200349/http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/features/a-rape-on-campus-20141119>

Ethridge, D. (2004). *Research methodology in applied economics: organizing, planning and conducting economic research*. Blackwell.

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003).

- Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health*, 52(3), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480309595732>
- Feldman, K. A., & Astin, A. W. (1994). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65(5), 615. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2943781>
- Fenton, R. A., Mott, H. L., McCartan, K., & Rumney, P. N. (2015, July). *Centre for Legal Research - University of the West of England*. Centre for Legal Research. <https://www2.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/BUS/law/Law%20docs/dvlitreviewproof0.6.forCLR.pdf>
- Fisher, B.S., Peterson, S., Cantor, D. (2016). Victims' use of resources, evaluation of resources and reasons for not using resources. Rockville, MD: Westat. p. 21
- Flack, W. F., Daubman, K. A., Caron, M. L., Asadorian, J. A., D'Aureli, N. R., Gigliotti, S. N., Hall, A. T., Kiser, S., & Stine, E. R. (2007). Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(2), 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506295354>
- Flick, U., Kardoff, E. von, & Steinke, I. (2004). *A companion to qualitative research*. Sage.
- Flood, M. (2005). Men's collective struggles for gender justice: the case of antiviolence activism. *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*, 458–466. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233833.n27>
- Foubert, J. D., Garner, D. N., & Thaxter, P. J. (2006). An exploration of fraternity

culture: implications for programs to address alcohol-related sexual assault.

College Student Journal, 40(2), 361–373.

Foubert, J. D., Godin, E. E., & Tatum, J. L. (2009). In their own words: sophomore college men describe attitude and behavior changes resulting from a rape prevention program 2 years after their participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(12), 2237–2257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354881>

Fox, W., & Bayat, M. S. (2007). *A guide to managing research*. Juta.

Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual assault on the college campus. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(11), 1457–1480.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812456527>

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: an evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 720–742.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211409727>

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction*, (3rd Ed.). Pearson.

Green Dot Etcetera. (2018, November 06). Green Dot etc.
<https://cultureofrespect.org/program/green-dot-etc/>

Gutierrez, F. C. (2018). Violence and hypermasculinity in university fraternity initiations: situating the reproduction of masculinity in the Philippines. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 27(3), 243–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1060826518815147>

Hammarberg, K., Kirkman, M., & de Lacey, S. (2016). Qualitative research methods:

when to use them and how to judge them. *Human Reproduction*, 31(3), 498–501.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dev334>

Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J (2017). Case study research:

foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*

/ *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 18(1). [https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-](https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-18.1.2655)

18.1.2655

Hartocollis, A. (2019, February 12). *Women sue yale over a fraternity culture they say*

enables harassment. The New York Times.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/12/us/yale-fraternities.html>

Heisecke, K. (2014). (rep.). Raising awareness of violence against women: article 13 of

the Istanbul convention (11). Istanbul, Europe: Council of Europe.

Hembree, E. (2008). Prolonged exposure therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder

following sexual assault. PsycEXTRA Dataset.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/e649352010-001>

Hey, V. (1986). *Patriarchy and pub culture*. Tavistock.

Holmes, C. (2018). *Managing a fraternity family tree: big-little reveals and beyond*.

OmegaFi Blog. <https://blog.omegafi.com/managing-a-fraternity-family-tree>

Howe, J., Molitor, T., & Versaci, M. B. (1970, January 1). *A hierarchy of identity: the*

effects of tier system stereotypes on members of the Greek system. IDEALS @

Illinois. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/32099>

Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of

social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1580–1589. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(14\)61683-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(14)61683-4)

Jordan, C. E., Combs, J. L., & Smith, G. T. (2014). An exploration of sexual victimization and academic performance among college women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(3), 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014520637>

Josselson, R. (2013). *Interviewing for qualitative inquiry: a relational approach*. Guilford Press.

Judge, B., Miller, K., University, P., King, B., Fernandez, S., Connors, G., Wagner, S. J., Cotter, K., Blackwell, L., Klug, K.-L., & Varin, A. (2020, August 5). *Let's talk about the Greek tier system*. The Odyssey Online. <https://www.theodysseyonline.com/lets-talk-about-the-tier-system>

Kanin, E. J. (1967). Reference groups and sex conduct norm violations. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 8(4), 495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1967.tb01085.x>

Keeves, J. (1997). *Educational research, methodology and measurement: an international handbook* (2nd ed.). Pergamon.

Kegan, R. (2001). *The evolving self: problem and process in human development*. Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: the mental demands of modern life*. Harvard University Press.

Kelly, D. R. (2008). Leadership development through the fraternity experience and the

- relationship to career success after graduation. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity Advisors*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46(3), 476–499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00215.x>
- Kessler, G. (2021, December 7). *Analysis- one in five women in college sexually assaulted: an update on this statistic*. The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2014/12/17/one-in-five-women-in-college-sexually-assaulted-an-update/?noredirect=on>
- Kimmel, M. S. (2018). *Guyland: the perilous world where boys become men*. Harper-Perennial.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1987). *Changing men: new directions in research on men and masculinity*. Sage.
- Kingkade, T. (2016, February 8). *This is why every college is talking about bystander intervention*. HuffPost. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/colleges-bystander-intervention_n_56abc134e4b0010e80ea021d
- Kirkpatrick, C., & Kanin, E. (1957). Male sex aggression on a university campus. *American Sociological Review*, 22(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2088765>
- Koelsch, L. E., Brown, A. L., & Boisen, L. (2012). Bystander perceptions: implications for university sexual assault prevention programs. *Violence and Victims*, 27(4), 563–579. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.4.563>
- Koskei, B., & Simiyu, C. (2015). Role of interviews, observation, pitfalls and ethical

- issues in qualitative research methods. *Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research*, 2(3).
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55(2), 162–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.55.2.162>
- Koss, M., & Gaines, J. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8(1), 94–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626093008001007>
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) study: performance period: January 2005 through December 2007. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e423412008-001>
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). The differential risk factors of physically forced and alcohol- or other drug-enabled sexual assault among university women. *Violence and Victims*, 24(3), 302–321. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.24.3.302>
- Krueger, K., & Brekhus, W. (2013). *Organizational identity of sorority women: the interplay of belonging, appearance, representation and institutional meaning* (dissertation).
- Kvale, D. (1996). *InterViews*. London: Sage.
- Levinson, D. (1989). *Family violence in cross-cultural perspective*. Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

- Linder, C., Grimes, N., Williams, B. M., Lacy, M. C., & Parker, B. (2020). What do we know about campus sexual violence? A content analysis of 10 years of research. *The Review of Higher Education*, 43(4), 1017–1040.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2020.0029>
- Martin, P. Y., & Hummer, R. A. (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. *Gender & Society*, 3(4), 457–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124389003004004>
- Martin, P. Y. (2015). The rape prone culture of academic contexts. *Gender & Society*, 30(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243215612708>
- Matza, D. (2018). *Delinquency and drift*. Routledge.
- McMahon, S., Wood, L., Cusano, J., Macri, L. M. (2018). Campus sexual assault: future directions for research. *Sexual Abuse*, 31(3), 270–295.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217750864>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2011). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- McMillen, L. (1990). An anthropologist's disturbing picture of gang rape on campus. *The Chronical of Higher Education*, 37(3), 30.
- Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., Thompson, M., Wilson, P. A., Khan, S., Benson, S., Bah, K., Kaufman, K. A., Reardon, L., & Hirsch, J. S. (2017). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: prevalence and factors associated with risk. *Plos One*, 12(11).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186471>

- Mental Health America. (2017, March 30). *Sexual assault and mental health*. Mental Health America. <https://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/conditions/sexual-assault-and-mental-health>
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C., Anderson, H. A., Stetkevich, N., Brown, E. W., Moideen, F., & Silverman, J. G. (2012). “Coaching boys into men”: A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*(5), 431–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.01.018>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.
- Mouilso, E. R., Fischer, S., & Calhoun, K. S. (2012). A prospective study of sexual assault and alcohol use among first-year college women. *Violence and Victims, 27*(1), 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.1.78>
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(2), 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.2.186>
- Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? The meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11/12), 359–375. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1020488928736>
- Murnen, S. K., & Kohlman, M. H. (2007). Athletic participation, fraternity membership,

and sexual aggression among college Men: a meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 145-157. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9225-1

National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2016). *Statistics about sexual violence*.

National Sexual Violence Resource Center. <https://www.nsvrc.org/>

Nikolov, N. (2021, June 11). *Boys do cry: the support groups freeing men from toxic masculinity*. Mashable. <https://mashable.com/article/men-support-groups-masculinity-mental-health>

O'Connell, M. E., Boat, T. F., & Warner, K. E. (2009). Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: progress and possibilities. National Academies Press.

Office of the Press Secretary. (2014, January 14). *Memorandum -- establishing a White House task force to protect students from sexual assault*. National Archives and Records Administration. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/22/memorandum-establishing-White-house-task-force-protect-students-sexual-a>

Office of University Compliance and Integrity. (2019). *Definitions | Ohio State Title IX | misconduct policy*. Sexual Misconduct Response and Prevention. <https://titleix.osu.edu/navigation/policy/definitions.html>

Okunade, A. A. (1993). Logistic regression and probability of business school alumni donations: Micro-data evidence. *Education Economics*, 1(3), 243–258.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/096452993000000030>

Okunade, A. A., Wunnava, P. V., & Walsh, R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 53(1), 73–84.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1994.tb02674.x>

Orchowski, L. M., Untied, A. S., & Gidycz, C. A. (2013). Factors associated with college women's labeling of sexual victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 28(6), 940–958.

<https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-12-00049>

Otani, A., & Diamond, J. S. (2015, July 4). *Every time a fraternity or sorority got in trouble this year*. Bloomberg.com. <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2015-frat-sorority-offenses>

Parker, P., & NP catalyst. (2012, March 24). *Greek Life*. NPcatalyst.

<http://www.npcatalyst.com/greek-life/>

Parker, P. (2011, November 15). *Giving by fraternity and sorority alumni*. NPcatalyst.

<http://www.npcatalyst.com/2011/11/giving-by-fraternity-and-sorority-alumni/>

Parsons, J., & Taylor, L. (2011). Improving student engagement. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1), 33.

Patton, E., & Appelbaum, S. H. (2003). The case for case studies in management research. *Management Research News*, 26(5), 60–71.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170310783484>

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.

Patton M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Peacock, D., & Barker, G. (2014). Working with men and boys to prevent gender-based

violence. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(5), 578–599.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x14558240>

Peltz, B. (n.d.). Interpretive research. In *Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. essay, Lumen.

Perkins, H. W. (2003). *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians*. Jossey-Bass.

Porta, C. M., Elmquist, S., Martin, L., Sampson, K., Stack, K., Hill, A., Lee, A., &

Driessen, M. C. (2021). “It could bring down Greek life as a whole”: Greek life members’ perspectives on party culture, safety, responsibilities and consequences. *Journal of American College Health*, 1–11.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2021.1942004>

Powell, A. (2014, May 20). *Bystander approaches*. Australian Institute of Family Studies. <https://aifs.gov.au/publications/bystander-approaches>

Puddy, R. W., & Wilkins, N. (2011). *Understanding evidence part 1: best available research evidence*. Understanding Evidence.

https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/understanding_evidence-a.pdf

Rada, R. T. (1975). Alcoholism and forcible rape. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 132(4), 444–446. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.132.4.444>

Rolling Stone. (2018, June 25). *Rape at UVA: readers say Jackie wasn't alone*. Rolling Stone. <https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/rape-at-uva-readers-say-jackie-wasnt-alone-184240/>

- Riggs, D. S., Caulfield, M. B., & Fair, K. (2009). Risk of intimate partner violence: factors associated with perpetration and victimization. *Behavioral Emergencies: An Evidence-Based Resource for Evaluating and Managing Risk of Suicide, Violence, and Victimization.*, 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11865-009>
- Ropp, C. T. (2014). *The relationship between student academic engagement and alumni giving at a public, state flagship university* (dissertation).
- Russian, J. (2017). *The objectification of women in Greek life*. Massachusetts Daily Collegian. <https://dailycollegian.com/2017/10/the-objectification-of-women-in-greek-life/>
- Saldana Johnny. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Sanday, P. R. (2007). *Fraternity gang rape: sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus*. New York University Press.
- Schwartz, M. D. (1991). Humanist sociology and date rape on the college campus. *Humanity & Society*, 15(3), 304–316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016059769101500306>
- Scully D. (2016). *Understanding sexual violence: A study of convicted rapists*. Routledge.
- Seabrook, R. C., Ward, L. M., & Giaccardi, S. (2018). Why is fraternity membership associated with sexual assault? Exploring the roles of conformity to masculine norms, pressure to uphold masculinity, and objectification of women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000076>
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data* (2nd ed.). Sage.

- Stathopoulos, M. (2013). Engaging men in sexual assault prevention. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e643762013-001>
- Stewart, A. L. (2014). The Men's Project: A sexual assault prevention program targeting college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(4), 481–485. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033947>
- Sinozich, S., & Langton, L. (2014). *Rape and sexual assault victimization among college-age females*. Special Report. Retrieved January 6, 2022, from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsavcaf9513.pdf>
- Swartout, K. M. (2013). The company they keep: how peer networks influence male sexual aggression. *Psychology of Violence*, 3(2), 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029997>
- Tabachnik, J. (2009). *Engaging bystanders in sexual violence prevention*. National Sexual Violence Resource Center.
- Taylor, C. (2015). *Bros like me: adherence to male role norms in fraternity men*. OhioLINK. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=miami1447937198
- Thornberg, R., & Charmaz, K. (2006). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n11>
- Tracy, K., & Wallace, S. (2016). Benefits of peer support groups in the treatment of addiction. *Substance Abuse and Rehabilitation, Volume 7*, 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.2147/sar.s81535>
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). *Sexual harassment*. U.S. Equal

- Employment Opportunity Commission. <https://www.eeoc.gov/sexual-harassment>
- US Legal. (n.d.). *Find a legal form in minutes*. Sexual Misconduct Law and Legal Definition | USLegal, Inc. <https://definitions.uslegal.com/s/sexual-misconduct>
- Valenti, J. (2014, September 24). *Frat brothers rape 300% more. One in 5 women is sexually assaulted on campus. Should we ban frats?* The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/24/rape-sexual-assault-ban-frats>
- Vogt, T. V. (2015). *Exploring negative sexual experiences, attitudes, and behaviors by auditory status*. Rochester Institute of Technology.
- Walsham, G. (2002). Interpretive case studies is research: nature and method. *Qualitative Research in Information Systems*, 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209687.n6>
- Wantland, R. A. (2008). Our brotherhood and your sister: building anti-rape community in the fraternity. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 36(1-2), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852350802022316>
- Ward, S. K., Chapman, K., Cohn, E., White, S., & Williams, K. (1991). Acquaintance rape and the college social scene. *Family Relations*, 40(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585660>
- Warshaw, R., & Koss, M. (1988). *I never called it rape*. Harper & Row.
- Weiss, K. G. (2013). *Party school: crime, campus, and community*. University Press of New England.
- White House Office of Press Secretary. (2015, October 6). *Fact sheet: bystander: "stop*

the bleed" broad private sector support for effort to save lives and build resilience. National Archives and Records Administration.

<https://obamaWhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/10/06/fact-sheet-bystander-stop-bleed-broad-private-sector-support-effort-save>

- Wunnava, P. V., & Okunade, A. A. (2013). Do business executives give more to their alma mater? Longitudinal evidence from a large university. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 72(3), 761–778. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12019>
- Yauch, C. A., & Steudel, H. J. (2003). Complementary use of qualitative and quantitative cultural assessment methods. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(4), 465–481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428103257362>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: design and methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: design and methods* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Yin, R.K., (1984). *Case study research: design and methods*. (1st ed.) Sage.
- Zhang, A., Musu-Gillette, L., and Oudekerk, B.A. (2016). Indicators of school crime and Safety: 2015. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Zernechel, A., & Perry, A. L. (2017). The final battle: constructs of hegemonic masculinity and hypermasculinity in fraternity membership. *College Student Affairs Leadership*, 4(1).

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. Tell me about your decision to enter a fraternity.
2. What do you think are some of the best parts of being in a fraternity?
3. What are some challenges in being a member of a fraternity?
4. Think about the last few times you talked about women with your fraternity brothers? What did these conversations look like? Can you give me examples?
5. In what ways do you think you have changed in respect to your relationships toward women since you have joined a fraternity?
6. Have you changed the way you interact with women since being in a fraternity?
7. Have your conversations about women differed from before you were in a fraternity?
8. Upon observation, do you think most fraternity brothers are in relationships or single?

What would you do in the following scenarios:

Scenario 1: Imagine you witnessed a situation where a fraternity brother was speaking to a woman in a way that you believed to be degrading. How would you act in this situation?

- a.) What do you think you might be feeling in this situation?
- b.) What kind of behaviors do you think might be degrading?
- c.) Can you tell me how you would act in this situation before being in a fraternity versus now?

d.) Keeping in mind that it is important not to share details, have you encountered any situations like the one in this hypothetical scenario?

Scenario 2: Imagine you witnessed a situation in which a woman was clearly uncomfortable because of a fraternity brother crossing physical boundaries. How would you act in this situation?

- a.) What do you think you might be feeling in this situation?
- b.) In your opinion, what does crossing physical boundaries look like to you?
- c.) Can you tell me how you would act in this situation before being in a fraternity versus now?
- d.) Keeping in mind that it is important not to share details, have you encountered any situations like the one in this hypothetical scenario?

Scenario 3: Imagine your fraternity brother confronted you because he disliked something you said or did to a woman. How would you respond?

- a.) What do you think you might be feeling in this situation?
- b.) What might be an approach your fraternity brother could take to lead to a better response from you?
- c.) Can you tell me how you would act in this situation before being in a fraternity versus now?
- d.) Keeping in mind that it is important not to share details, have you actually encountered any situations like the one in this hypothetical scenario?

Scenario 4: Imagine you and a brother are talking and you observe three of your fraternity brothers making sexual comments (like slut shaming) about a woman. How would you respond?

- a.) What do you think you might be feeling in this situation?
- b.) What do you feel are sexually inappropriate comments (you do not need to censor your language in this situation)?
- c.) Can you tell me how you would act in this situation before being in a fraternity versus now?
- d.) Keeping in mind that it is important not to share details, have you encountered any situations like the one in this hypothetical scenario?

Scenario 5: Imagine you and a group of your fraternity brothers are talking and you observe three of your fraternity brothers making sexual comments (like slut shaming) about a woman. How would you respond?

- a.) What do you think you might be feeling in this situation?
- b.) What do you feel are sexually inappropriate comments (you do not need to censor your language in this situation)?
- c.) Can you tell me how you would act in this situation before being in a fraternity versus now?
- d.) Keeping in mind that it is important not to share details, have you encountered any situations like the one in this hypothetical scenario?

1. Share with me what it was like to answer these questions.
2. Knowing how to respond in a situation and responding that way are two different things. Can you describe an experience where you felt this dissonance?
3. What do you think would be more comfortable or uncomfortable to you, saying something when a brother says something degrading to a woman or say something when a brother does something to a woman?
4. How do you think confronting your brothers would affect your relationship?
5. How important is that to you?
6. I gather you probably have different relationships with different brothers, how might you respond differently with someone close to you versus someone you do not know as well?
7. When you were a new member coming in, what did you learn from older members about relationships with women?
8. What role did advisors or Greek life staff in encouraging positive relationships between brothers and women?
9. Tell me about any training you have had related to issues of sexual misconduct or treatment of women.
10. What do you remember from your sexual assault prevention training?
11. Was the training valuable?
12. Is there anything else that you have thought of or would like to share before we end the interview?

Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Letter

Project Number 20-F-18

Project Status APPROVED

Committee: Social/Behavioral IRB

Compliance Contact: Rochelle Reamy (reamy@ohio.edu)

Primary Investigator: Fumiko Brinkmeier

Project Title: Socialization Among Fraternity Men and Sexual Assault Prevention

Level of Review: FULL

The Social/Behavioral IRB reviewed and approved the above referenced research.

IRB Approved: 05/28/2020 08:52:04 AM

Expiration: 05/13/2021

Waivers: A waiver of signature on the consent document is granted.

If applicable, informed consent (and HIPAA research authorization) must be obtained from subjects or their legally authorized representatives and documented prior to research involvement. In addition, FERPA, PPRA, and other authorizations / agreements must be obtained, if needed. The IRB-approved consent form and process must be used. Any changes in the research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, enrollment

numbers, etc.) or informed consent process must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects).

The approval will no longer be in effect on the date listed above as the IRB expiration date. A Periodic Review application must be approved within this interval to avoid expiration of the IRB approval and cessation of all research activities. All records relating to the research (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for at least three (3) years after the research has ended.

It is the responsibility of all investigators and research staff to promptly report to the Office of Research Compliance / IRB any serious, unexpected and related adverse and potential unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This approval is issued under the Ohio University OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00000095. Please feel free to contact the Office of Research Compliance staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

The approval will no longer be in effect when the Primary Investigator is no longer under the auspices of Ohio University, e.g., graduation or departure from Ohio University.

Appendix C: Coding Sheet

Table 3

Fraternity and Men's Codes and Themes

| Why do men join fraternities? | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Connections | 8 | BB, DA, DM, GE, QQ, SB, SJ, TT |
| Family - Legacy | 7 | CC, DA, MD, MJ, RW, SB, SJ |
| Brotherhood | 5 | BB, BC, JJ, MJ, QQ |
| Social | 5 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, CC, RW |
| Philanthropy | 4 | AS/BP, BB, MS, SJ |
| Growth | 3 | SB, SJ, RW |
| House | 2 | MD, PJ |
| Career Builder | 2 | JB, JQ |
| Need to Fit In | 1 | WJ |
| Leadership | 1 | BC |
| Guys with same major | 1 | TT |
| Favorite thing about being in a fraternity | | |
| Encouragement/Support System | 7 | AS/AS, BC, JE, JJ, JN, MJ, WJ |
| Social Aspects | 7 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BE, DA, GE, JQ, TJ |
| Learn about diverse ideas | 4 | AS/AS, CC, DM, GE |
| Meeting Women | 1 | QQ |
| Least favorite thing about being in a fraternity? | | |
| Stigma | 9 | AS/AS, BE, DA, JE, JJ, QQ, RW, SB, SJ |
| Responsible for entire frat/upholding the reputation | 4 | BB, JQ, MD, RW |
| Competition | 1 | AS/BP |
| Communication | 1 | JB |
| Peer pressure | 1 | BCB |
| Getting new members | 1 | TT |

Table 3 (Continued)**Relationship Status**

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Majority single | 6 | AS/BP, BE, JJ, SB, TB, TJ |
| 30% in relationships | 3 | BC, MJ, MS |
| 50% in relationships | 2 | MD, PJ |
| 10% in relationships | 2 | AS/AS |
| Older members in relationships | 1 | AS/BP |

How did these questions make you feel?

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Uncomfortable/nervous | 8 | BCB, DA, JJ, MD, MJ, SJ, TT, WJ |
| Forces you to think | 7 | BB, DM, JQ, MD, MJ, PJ, TT |
| Necessary/Good to talk about/Important | 6 | BE, DA, MJ, PJ, TB, WJ |
| Challenging | 4 | JB, JQ, QQ, SG |
| Would like to use this as a form of training | 3 | BE, DM, SB |
| Powerful | 2 | DM, JB |
| Easy | 1 | BC |
| Motivated to treat women better | 1 | BE |
| Relieved to be admitting behavior | 1 | JN |
| Enlightening | 1 | BCB |

Conversation about women

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Have changed/more frequent | 5 | AS/AS, CC, DM, JE, QQ |
| Have not changed | 1 | JE |

What are some recent conversations you have had about women?

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| Advice/Encouragement | 5 | JB, JE, MJ, SB, TT |
| Group text/We chat talking negatively general | 5 | DA, GE, MD, MJ, MS |
| Warning/Slut shaming | 4 | JN, MD, SG, WJ |
| Nothing bad | 4 | BCB, BE, DM, WJ |
| Social event/Tier goals | 4 | AS/BP, MS, RW, SJ |
| Lighthearted about guy just dating a girl | 3 | BC, GE, JJ |
| Sitting around tinder judging | 3 | AS/AS, JE, SB |
| Party Planning | 2 | DM, JE |
| I want to "f" this girl | 1 | SJ |
| Someone wanted to hook up with an ugly girl | 1 | BB |

Majority conversations about looks

1 CC

Table 3 (Continued)

What do you consider are degrading behaviors?

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| | 10 | BB, BC, BE, DM, JE, MJ, PJ, RW, SJ, TT |
| Depends on body language of girl and girl's reaction | 9 | AS/BP, JBJ, JE, PJ, QQ, SG, TB, TT, WJ |
| What do they want to do to a girl? | 7 | CC, DM, JJ, MD, MS, QQ, SG |
| Wide Range | 5 | BC, BE, JJ, TB, TJ |
| Treating Women Like Prizes | 4 | BB, GE, QQ, SG |
| Depends on if girl is there | 4 | AS/AS, DM, JN, WJ |
| Gender Stereotypes/Gender Roles | 3 | PJ, SG, SJ |
| Anything looks based/comments about body | 3 | AS/BP, TB, TT |
| Talking down to a person/being condescending | 3 | JQ, SB, SJ |
| Any form of touching without consent | 3 | BC, BE, TT |
| Name calling | 1 | TB, BC |
| Dancing Inappropriately | 1 | GE |
| Depends on frequency | 1 | QQ |
| Depends on severity of words/actions | 1 | TJ |
| Anything with angry tones | 1 | MJ |
| Catcalling | 1 | BE |
| Touching Waist | 1 | JBJ |
| Depends on if he knows girl | 1 | DA |
| Anything that means girls are lesser | 1 | TT |
| Porn | 1 | JE |
| Saying bad things is okay as long as it's not all the time | 1 | DA |
| Slut shaming is not bad if it is true | 1 | |

Has your treatment of women changed since being in a fraternity?

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| No | 7 | BCB, DA, JN, MD, MS, SB, SG |
| No because I am or have been in relationships | 7 | BCB, DA, JN, JQ, MD, PJ, TJ |
| No because the way I was raised | 5 | BC, CC, DM, QQ, TJ |
| No because has sisters | 4 | BB, PJ, TJ, TT |
| No because I've always had a lot of friends who are women | 2 | BB, JE |

Table 3 (Continued)**How has fraternity helped you when it comes to intervention?**

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Knows a lot more about women because more women and diverse friends | 11 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, BCB, BE, DM, GE, JJ, MJ, TB, TJ |
| Before fraternity would not step in | 11 | AS/AS, BB, DM, JBJ, JJ, MD, MJ, PJ, QQ, RW, SB |
| Improved confidence | 10 | BB, BC, JBJ, MD, PJ, RW, SG, SJ, TB, TT |
| Before fraternity wouldn't step in but now, they realize these things do happen | 7 | AS/AS, JBJ, JE, MJ, MS, RW, TJ |
| Learned by hosting parties | 7 | CC, DM, MJ, QQ, SG, TB, WJ |
| More respectful because accountability/fraternity values | 4 | BB, BCB, SJ, TT |
| Learned through brothers and practice | 4 | BB, JJ, MJ, TT |
| More willing to intervene because doesn't want the fraternity to get in trouble | 4 | QQ, GE, BE, AS/BP |
| Learned through women in leadership/executive positions | 4 | CC, QQ, TT |
| Learned by having a woman in the house (house mother) | 1 | TT |
| Maturity/Age | 3 | AS/BP, PJ, SG |
| More willing to intervene because strength in numbers now | 2 | GE, JE |
| Would step in because they're in a senior position and they know that the men would listen now | 1 | BB |

Treatment of Women - Older vs. younger brothers

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Older brothers treat women worse | 8 | AS/AS, GE, JN, JQ, MD, MS, PJ, RW |
| Younger treat better because men feel more comfortable because they've been friends with the women longer | 2 | AS/AS, GE |
| Older brothers treat women better | 2 | BB, TT |
| Older brothers have no impact | 1 | TJ |

Table 3 (Continued)**What prevents you from intervening sexual violence?**

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| | 6 | BC, BE, MS, SB, TB, TT |
| Fear of losing friendships | 1 | BE |
| Scared peers would be mad | 5 | AS/BP, MD, MS, SG, TB |
| Doesn't like confrontation | 3 | BC, JJ, TB |
| Doesn't know the context | 3 | AS/BP, DM, JN |
| Doesn't want to be seen as the wimp | 2 | BB, SJ |
| Because the two are in a relationship | 2 | BB, JN |
| Fear of getting ganged up on | 2 | SB, JQ |
| Scared of older brothers | 2 | |
| Would only say something to younger brothers not older brothers | | JQ |
| Feels like not his place | 1 | AS/AS |
| Only feels comfortable intervening in a big group | 1 | PJ |
| Scared of intervening in a large group | 1 | SG |
| Want people to like him | 1 | TB |
| Wouldn't say anything because it might lead to reporting (especially with other frat houses, out of spite) | 1 | SG |
| Doesn't want to kill the vibe of the party | 1 | SB |
| Embarrassed | 1 | DM |
| Not comfortable because they don't know the person | 1 | JE |
| Depends on if I'm drunk | 1 | JN |
| Wouldn't say anything in any situation | 2 | GE, MD |
| Wouldn't because it is just for comedic effect | 1 | GE |

Why do fraternity men have a reputation for degrading women more?

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | 8 | AS/AS, BC, CC, JJ, JQ, MD, RW, TJ |
| It depends on who you hang out with | 2 | AS/AS, MD |
| Because you are surrounded by men all the time | 2 | AS/BP, WJ |
| The tier system and trying to get higher tier girls to go out with them | 1 | WJ |
| Using girls as a marketing tool | 1 | DM |
| Not necessarily the frat but more media | | |

Table 3 (Continued)**How would you feel if you witnessed your brothers degrading women?**

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Embarrassed because tarnished frat image | 5 | AS/AS, BB, BC, DA, MS |
| Angry because tarnished frat image | 4 | BE, JJ, JN, SJ |
| Disappointed because tarnished frat image | 3 | BE, JE, QQ |
| Uncomfortable | 3 | DM, SB, WJ |
| Awkward | 3 | BB, JN, WJ |
| Disgusted because tarnished frat image | 3 | JN, MJ, PJ |
| Confused | 2 | BJJ, TB |
| Frustrated | 2 | JJ, WJ |
| Shocked | 2 | MS, PJ |
| Depends on closeness of brother | 1 | CC |
| Annoyed | 1 | PJ |
| Nervous because friends are there | 1 | QQ |

What would you do if you saw a fraternity brother abusing a woman physically or verbally?

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Would get another brother | 12 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, BCB, BE, JE, MJ, MS, PJ, QQ, SB, SJ |
| Would rely on a sober monitor | | MJ |
| If he is in the frat but doesn't know well, he'd get another brother that does know the perpetrator better | 11 | AS/AS, JE, PJ, SB |
| Would only intervene when they know the brother that is committing the violence | | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, BE, JN, JQ, PJ, SB, SG, TB, TT |
| Would not say something if they are outside the fraternity (but in another fraternity) | 3 | AS/AS, BE, SG |
| Would only say something if the fraternity brother was close (would only say something if it was a fraternity brother) | 5 | BE, JN, SB, TB, TT |
| Would not intervene with someone they didn't know because of the fear of the fraternity shutting down | 2 | AS/BP, BB |
| Separate the brother from the situation | 5 | BCB, DM, JQ, PJ, TT |
| Wouldn't say anything | 5 | DA, GE, BJJ, MD, TJ |
| Pull to the side | 3 | BE, JJ, MJ |
| Would intervene just to protect the reputation of that frat | 4 | BCB, JJ, MS, QQ |

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| | 4 | |
| When giving feedback this is the number one thing, they would highlight | | BC, JJ, MS, QQ |
| How one intervenes depends on the relationship with the brother | 3 | BB, MD, MS |
| Would check on the girl first | 3 | BCB, PJ, TT |
| Would involve fraternity leadership (exec board) and/or sober monitor | 2 | TT, MS |
| Distract brother | 2 | MD, MJ |
| Beat the guy up (actually happened) | 1 | MD |
| Use the emergency word in the house | 1 | GE |
| Only time would intervene by himself is at a bar | 1 | DA |
| Would bring a girls' friend because knows that many women don't trust men | 1 | PJ |
| Would have him apologize to the girl | 1 | BE |
| What are some factors that you consider on how you intervene? | | |
| It depends on the relationship with my brother | 6 | BB, GE, JE, JN, MD, MS |
| Would only intervene if they knew the girl | 5 | BB, MD, SG, TB, TT |
| Would only feel comfortable intervening with a stranger | 4 | BB, BC, JBJ, SJ |
| Would not say something if the girl was not there | 4 | BB, JE, MD, QQ |
| It depends on the relationship with brother if deciding go intervene in the first place | 3 | GE, JE, JN |
| Would intervene because would not want a guilty conscious | 2 | BC, WJ |
| Would not say anything in any situation | 2 | GE, MD |
| It depends on the kind of conversation | 1 | SB |
| Would give brother benefit of the doubt | 1 | JQ |
| Would not because don't want to kill the vibe | 1 | SB |
| Would say something later | 3 | AS/BP, DM, QQ, TT |
| Would say something in the moment | 1 | MS |
| How frequent it happens | 1 | GE |
| How would you feel if a brother came to you because of something YOU did or YOU said to a woman? | | |
| Embarrassed | 7 | BC, DA, JJ, MS, QQ, SB, TJ |

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Open to feedback | 7 | BB, BE, JBJ, JJ, JQ, SB, TJ |
| Grateful | 5 | JN, MJ, PJ, QQ, SG |
| Angry | 5 | BC, CC, JJ, MD, SB |
| Angry then know best interest at heart | 3 | BC, JJ, SB |
| Confused | 3 | AS/BP, MS, TB |
| Remorseful/Ashamed | 3 | QQ, SB, TJ |
| Ashamed because did not uphold frat values | 1 | QQ |
| Feel bad for the girl | 2 | PJ, SJ |
| Defensive | 2 | BC, PJ |
| Curious | 2 | GE, TT |
| Very apologetic | 1 | SJ |
| Bad because it makes ME look like a bad person - | 1 | |
| Before fraternity would be defensive but now not | | TT |
| Denial | 1 | TB |
| Understanding | 1 | BE |
| Surprised | 1 | SJ |

What if you were with a group of brothers and you see another group of brothers degrading women, what would you do?

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| Would use the advantage of power of numbers | 5 | BB, BC, BE, MS, SG |
| Would verify with other brothers if they also think the behaviors are degrading | 5 | BC, MS |
| Distract the group of men | 3 | BE, SG, TB |
| Get out of the situation or room (because of fear of getting ganged up on) | 3 | AS/BP, JQ, PJ |
| Talk to leadership (exec) | 2 | BC, TT |
| Would stay silent | 2 | GE, SB |
| Would join in | 2 | JN, SJ |
| Would intervene only to protect professional future | 1 | DA |
| Depends on what is said | 1 | JE |
| Would only intervene if you're the only person who thinks that it's wrong | 1 | CC |

How do you prefer to be approached when YOU are treating a woman in a degrading manner?

| | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Private conversation | 8 | AS/BP, BC, BE, CC, JQ, MD, PJ, SJ, |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| Intervention should be less than three people | 1 | CC |
| Calm and not angry | 5 | AS/BP, CC, DM, JE, WJ |
| Casual conversation | 5 | BCB, DM, JBJ, TB, WJ |
| Reasoning | 5 | AS/AS, JJ, QQ, SB, TB |
| Empathy | 4 | AS/AS, BCB, PJ, TJ |
| Given by someone close | 2 | MJ, WJ |
| Given the next day, especially if alcohol is involved | 2 | MD, WJ |
| Told right after (not the next day) | 1 | BC |
| Honest | 1 | AS/BP |
| Would like to be intervened during a formal meeting | 1 | GE |
| Want to be removed from the situation but not verbally or physically intervened | 1 | DA |
| Face to face | 1 | BB |
| | 12 | JJ, MD, MS, QQ, SB, SG, TB, TT, WJ |
| Does consider friendship before intervention | | |
| Does NOT consider friendship before intervention | 5 | BB, JE, MJ, TJ |
| | 9 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BC, DM, JE, JQ, MD, MJ, TB |
| Intervention WOULD affect the friendship negatively | | |
| Intervention WOULD NOT affect friendship negatively | 6 | BB, BE, DA, GE, SJ |
| Depends on the closeness of brothers | 3 | BB, CC, GE |
| Depends on the feedback approach | 1 | SB |

What environments and times do you see degrading behaviors happen more?

| | | |
|--|-----|-------------------|
| Bars | 4 | AS/AS, DA, GE, JJ |
| Smaller gatherings | 3 | BCB, MD, RW |
| Smaller groups because you are more vulnerable, and you feel comfortable treating women in a bad way | Inc | RW |
| Just guys in a separate part of the house | Inc | BCB |
| Open house parties | 2 | DM, SJ |
| Tail gates | 2 | BB, TJ |
| Date parties | 2 | DA, GE |

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Formals | 1 | PJ |
| Common areas with just guys without girls | 1 | JQ |
| Initiation week is the worst | 1 | PJ |
| Beginning of the semester | 1 | MD |
| Fraternity members generally abuse women they know already (sorority sisters) | 4 | JB, JQ, MD, MJ |
| Fraternity members generally abuse women they do not know (open parties) | 1 | AS/AS |
| Greek life staff did NOT play a role in preventing sexual misconduct in the fraternity | 13 | BC, CC, JB, JJ, MJ, MS, SB, TJ, TT, WJ |
| Greek life staff DID play a role in preventing sexual misconduct in the fraternity | 4 | BE, JQ, PJ, SJ |
| Advisor's only role was to 'deter' bad behavior (verbally reminds frat) | 2 | PJ, TT |
| Advisor just instilled the idea that rape would tarnish the fraternity reputation | 1 | DA |
| Advisor did NOTHING with an accusation | 1 | JN |
| Training did NOT help with understanding sexual misconduct | 10 | AS/AS, DN, GE, JE, JQ, MD, MJ, PJ, SB, TJ |
| Training DOES help with understanding sexual misconduct | 8 | AS/BP, BC, BE, CC, JB, QQ, SJ, TB |
| Only INFORMAL training helped | 8 | BC, BCB, BE, DA, JJ, MJ, SG, SJ |
| Learned through older brother | 5 | BC, BCB, DA, JJ, MJ |
| Learned through meetings before parties | 1 | DA |
| Learned through practice | 3 | AS, BC, MJ |
| What made the training ineffective? | | |
| Unrealistic situations because they are overly obvious | 9 | AS/AS, AS/BP, DA, GE, JE, JN, MS, QQ, SJ |
| Online training is just not helpful | 1 | SG |
| What formal types of training have you had? | | |
| No previous formal training | 4 | BC, CC, JJ, MJ |
| Training is not required | 1 | CC |

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| Through military | 1 | DM |
| Through high school | 1 | JE |
| Completed fraternity and university-wide training | 1 | BCB |
| Title IX because now an employee | 1 | WJ |
| Through university and not Greek life | 1 | JE |
| Just through Greek life and not through university | 1 | TT |
| What do you remember from your formal training? | | |
| | 5 | BB, DM, MJ, QQ, TB |
| Consent | | |
| Drunk consent | 1 | TB |
| Title IX | 3 | |
| Conflict management | 4 | CC, DN, JBJ, JN |
| One-on-one confrontation is better | 1 | DN |
| Signs of being drunk | 2 | SG, SJ |
| Signs of being abused | 3 | BCB, CC, WJ |
| Scenarios are memorable | 2 | JQ, SG |
| Difference between harassment and assault | 1 | DM |
| General sexual misconduct | 1 | QQ |
| Toxic Masculinity | 1 | SG |
| Resources | 1 | PJ |
| It happens mostly to people you know | 1 | TB |
| Verbal abuse does need intervention | 1 | SG |
| Polls | 1 | TT |
| What do you think would make training more valuable? | | |
| | 13 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, BC, JBJ, JE, MD, MS, PJ, QQ, RW, TB, TJ |
| Women should be present or involved | | |
| | 8 | AS/AS, BB, BC, JE, PJ, RW, TB, TJ |
| Survivor stories | | |
| What is crossing boundaries (women's perspective) | 2 | AS/AS, RW |
| | 8 | AS/AS, DM, JQ, MS, QQ, RW, SB, SG |
| In person | | |
| | 8 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BC, BE, GE, JE, SB, TB |
| Open Conversation | | |
| Friendly banter | 1 | AS/AS |

Table 3 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Smaller groups | 7 | AS/AS, BC, JE, JJ, JQ, QQ, SJ |
| Have a guy lead training | 6 | AS/AS, AS/BP, BB, DA, GE, MJ |
| Have a fraternity brother lead training | 3 | AS/AS, GE, MJ |
| Interactive | 5 | AS/AS, BB, BCB, SJ, WJ |
| Use real life situations | 5 | AS/BP, DA, DM, SJ, WJ |
| Shorter bursts (training sessions are too long) | 2 | AS/AS, JJ |
| No videos or skits | 2 | JQ, MD |
| Bring statistics and poll | 2 | TB, TT |
| Make sure the class understands that no question is a stupid question | 2 | AS/BP, BC |
| Have older guys validate the importance | 1 | AS/AS |
| Need a more convenient location | 1 | JJ |
| Training should only be with a pledge class (no juniors or seniors) | 1 | TJ |
| Should be completed before college or joining frat | 1 | CC |
| Should highlight intrinsic value | 1 | JB |
| Don't want women in training | 1 | JJ |

What are some topics you would like to see in training?

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------|
| Intervention methods and how to talk to brothers (combine with below) | 4 | AS/AS, ME, GE, MD |
| How to talk to brothers if they are doing something questionable | 2 | BE, MD |
| Crossing boundaries because that is confusing | 4 | AS/AS, JQ, QQ TJ |
| Consent | 3 | DN, JQ, RW |
| Definition of assault | 3 | DN, JE, TB |
| Toxic masculinity | 1 | MS |
| LGBTQ+ Issues | 1 | MS |
| Signs if abuse is happening between a couple | 1 | BC |
| Female on male rape | 1 | BB |
| Safe sex and contraception | 1 | AS/BP |

What are some other ways you learn about sexual violence?

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------|
| Other schools in the news | 2 | AS/AS, DA |
| Reports around campus | 1 | DA |

Table 3 (Continued)**MISCELLANEOUS**

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| | 12 | AS/AS, BB, DA, JBJ, JJ, JN, JQ, MD, PJ, QQ, SJ, TJ |
| Admits that degrading behaviors happen all the time | | |
| Admits that guys frequently cross sexual boundaries and do not care | 7 | AS/AS, BB, JBJ, JN, JQ, PJ, TJ |
| Does regret not saying something at some point when a woman was being disrespected | 9 | AS/BP, BB, BC, JE, JJ, MD, MS, PJ, SJ |
| 90% of the time men don't say anything even though they know that a behavior is wrong | 1 | BB |
| Admitted that he had to have a conversation for disrespecting women | 1 | DA |
| Knows a brother or a man getting kicked out of a fraternity because of certain behaviors | 9 | AS/BP, DM, GE, JBJ, JE, MD, PJ, RW, SG |
| Left their fraternity because did NOT like how they treated women | 3 | AS/BP, MD, MS |
| Admits that they would not intervene in any situation | 2 | GE, MD |
| Some of the best mentors are the sober monitors | 1 | TT |
| Admits rules are set with women at the beginning but they are never followed | 1 | MD |
| Would shut down all fraternities because the culture is so bad | 1 | MD |
| Does have sympathy for guys who cross physical boundaries when they're drunk because they don't know what is appropriate | 1 | CC |
| Fraternities combat sexual violence and challenges women stereotypes | 2 | BB, DM |



OHIO
UNIVERSITY

Thesis and Dissertation Services