

**Preventing the Big Three: Exploring a Fraternity’s Chapter Advisory Board Training  
using Lundvall’s Knowledge Taxonomy to Prevent Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Alcohol  
Abuse**

**By**

**Douglas G. Montgomery**

An Applied Research Project  
Submitted to the Department of Political Science  
Texas State University  
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree of  
Masters of Public Administration  
Summer 2019

Faculty & Alumnus Approval:

---

Nandhini Rangarajan, Ph.D

---

Sherri Mora, Ph.D

---

Jeremy Garrett, MPA

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to evaluate a training program for volunteers who devote their time to their fraternity as alumni. The evaluation is through the lens of preventing sexual assault, hazing and alcohol abuse, or more succinctly put, the big three. First, using Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge, this study looks at scholarly research on how to prevent the big three and what a chapter advisor needs to know to help prevent the big three from occurring. Second, there is a discussion on the methodology used in this study and the strengths and weaknesses of using only document analysis and participant observation. Third, this study evaluates a training program for an anonymous fraternity with many chapters all over the United States at both public and private institutions of higher learning. Finally, this study explains the results of the evaluation and provides recommendations for improvement to the training program and future research opportunities. Most of the need-to-know material was present in the existing training program but some of it was not obvious to the passive participant. There was no mention of Title IX at all in the training. Overall, the training was fairly robust for a one-hour training program.

## **About the Author**

Douglas G. Montgomery (Doug) is currently an attorney practicing in the San Marcos, Texas area and has a solo practice. His main practice areas include criminal law, mental health law, municipal law, and guardianship/probate work. He currently serves on the board of directors (known as the Octagon) for Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity and is an alumnus of his chapter at Texas A&M University where he completed his undergraduate degree in Psychology. Doug graduated from Texas Tech University School of Law in 2012 before moving to San Marcos, Texas to open his law practice. This research project was completed to satisfy the requirements of a Master's degree in Public Administration at Texas State University. In what spare time he has, Doug manages some honey bee colonies and enjoys exploring the Texas hill country.

Contact Doug at [doug@montgomerylawfirm.net](mailto:doug@montgomerylawfirm.net) with questions or comments regarding this research.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would first like to thank the anonymous fraternity that provided me access to their fantastic online training program. Those involved know who you are and I appreciate the inter-fraternal courtesies extended by you to a member of a rival organization. We all have the same goals of keeping our members safe so that we can continue to instill in future generations the values and traditions we believe in without the destructive forces that have plagued the fraternity experience, especially lately.

Next, I want to thank Dr. Nandhini Rangarajan for encouraging me to finish this project on-time while I battle through numerous personal and professional matters. Thank you for your patience!

<b>Chapter I: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Recent headlines of fraternity incidents	
Figure 1.1 Fraternity member accused of sexual assault	
Figure 1.2 Photos of hazing victim, Timothy Piazza	2
Role of Fraternity Advisors	3
Existing Training	4
Purpose Statement	
Chapter Summaries	6
<b>Chapter II: Literature Review</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge</b>	
WH1a: Definitions of the Big Three	
WH1b: Federal laws that apply	9
WH1c: Fraternity Policy	10
<b>WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge</b>	<b>11</b>
WH2a: Instruction for Chapter Membership	
WH2b: Identifying and Reporting the Big Three	13
WH2c: Managing Allegations	
<b>WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge</b>	<b>15</b>
WH3a: Following the Policies	
WH3b: Self-Reporting Violations	16
<b>WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge</b>	<b>18</b>
WH4a: The Proper Authorities for Advisors	
WH4b: The Proper Authorities for Chapter Members	19
<b>Chapter III: Research Methodology</b>	<b>25</b>
Chapter Purpose	
Research Method	
Training Program to be Evaluated	
Document Analysis	26
Participant Observation	
Gauging the Level of Support	27
Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework	
Table 3.1 Operationalization Table	28
Chapter Summary	31
<b>Chapter IV: Results</b>	<b>32</b>
Chapter Purpose	
Lundvall’s Taxonomy of Knowledge Principles	
Know What	
Table 4.1 Working Hypothesis 1a Results (Definitions)	34
Table 4.2 Working Hypothesis 1b Results (Federal Laws)	35
Table 4.3 Working Hypothesis 1c Results (Risk Management Policy)	36
Table 4.4 Summary of WH1 (Know-What)	37
Know-How	
Table 4.5 Working Hypothesis 2a Results (Instruction for Chapter Membership)	39
Table 4.6 Working Hypothesis 2b Results (Identifying and Reporting the Big	41

Three)	
Table 4.7 Working Hypothesis 2c Results (Managing Allegations)	43
Table 4.8 Summary of WH2 (Know-How)	44
Know-Why	
Table 4.9 Working Hypothesis 3a Results (Following the policies)	46
Table 4.10 Working Hypothesis 3b Results (Self-Reporting Violations)	47
Table 4.11 Summary of WH3 (Know-Why)	48
Know-Who	
Table 4.12 Working Hypothesis 4a Results (The Proper Authorities for Advisors)	49
Table 4.13 Working Hypothesis 4b Results (The Proper Authorities for Chapter Members)	50
Table 4.14 Summary of WH4 (Know-Who)	51
<b>Chapter V: Conclusion</b>	<b>53</b>
Research Limitations	
Future Research Opportunities	
Know-What	54
Know-How	55
Know-Why	56
Know-Who	57
Table 5.1 Research Evidence and Recommendations	58
<b>References</b>	<b>61</b>

## **List of Tables and Figures**

Figure 1.1 Fraternity member accused of sexual assault, Jacob Anderson	1
Figure 1.2 Photo of hazing victim, Timothy Piazza	2
Table 2.1 Conceptual Framework	20
Table 2.2 Operationalization of Conceptual Framework	22
Table 3.1 Operationalization Table	28
Table 4.1 Working Hypothesis 1a Results (Definitions)	34
Table 4.2 Working Hypothesis 1b Results (Federal Laws)	35
Table 4.3 Working Hypothesis 1c Results (Risk Management Policy)	36
Table 4.4 Summary of WH1 (Know-What)	37
Table 4.5 Working Hypothesis 2a Results (Instruction for Chapter Membership)	39
Table 4.6 Working Hypothesis 2b Results (Identifying and Reporting the Big Three)	41
Table 4.7 Working Hypothesis 2c Results (Managing Allegations)	43
Table 4.8 Summary of WH2 (Know-How)	44
Table 4.9 Working Hypothesis 3a Results (Following the policies)	46
Table 4.10 Working Hypothesis 3b Results (Self-Reporting Violations)	47
Table 4.11 Summary of WH3 (Know-Why)	48
Table 4.12 Working Hypothesis 4a Results (The Proper Authorities for Advisors)	49
Table 4.13 Working Hypothesis 4b Results (The Proper Authorities for Chapter Members)	50
Table 4.14 Summary of WH4 (Know-Who)	51
Table 5.1 Research Evidence and Recommendations	58

## Chapter I: Introduction

In recent news, the world has placed a spotlight on the shortcomings of intercollegiate fraternities and their failures to protect their own members and members of the communities in which they operate.

This has led to lawsuits, ruined lives, and in extreme cases, death. In late fall 2018, news was released that a former



fraternity president at *Figure 1.1 Jacob Anderson leaving court after accepting a plea agreement to avoid prison time.*

Baylor University would not face jail time for charges of sexual assault. In that case, a young woman attended a fraternity party where she was allegedly drugged and raped by Jacob Anderson. It was also alleged that Anderson came from an affluent family and had a girlfriend at the time of the incident (Yan & Burnside, 2018).

On February 2, 2017, Timothy Piazza, a sophomore at Penn State University, was a new member (pledge) that was subjected to a hazing ritual called “The Gauntlet” where he was required to drink liquor, beer, and wine mostly on an empty stomach. Piazza was also on antidepressants which contributed to his inebriation. Piazza fell down a flight of stairs and was knocked unconscious. The fraternity members present for the ritual debated whether to seek medical attention for Piazza but ultimately decided not to. That is, until the next morning. By then, Piazza’s injuries were so severe that he later died in the hospital. It was estimated that Piazza’s blood alcohol content at one point was probably as high as 0.40 on the night of the incident. In



Piazza’s case, the combination of excessive alcohol consumption and a toxic fraternity culture proximately led to his death (Flanagan, 2017).

The stories above involve three major issues among collegiate culture and especially fraternities. Those issues are hazing, alcohol abuse, and sexual assault. This study refers to these issues as “the big three” generally. This study likely cannot take credit for coining this term.



Figure 1.2 Photos from the home of Timothy Piazza.

However, the term did not appear in any of the scholarly research. This study will refer to “the big three” throughout the study in an attempt to be less verbose. Focus on the big three consumes an enormous amount of time by university administration, fraternity executives, and national fraternal organizations and their board members. A great deal of emphasis has been placed on reducing, and, ultimately,

eliminating the big three from the collegiate and fraternal culture.

Unfortunately, stories like the ones above keep appearing in the media. This begs the question of are we doing enough to prevent incidents of the big three? On balance, fraternity men have better grades, give back to their alma maters, and disproportionately find themselves in the top levels of government and business when compared to the general collegiate male population

(Nelson & Engstrom, 2013; Flanagan, 2014). However, fraternities should be safe places for their members and the communities they operate in. Fraternities should better the lives of their members and teach young men the values that the organizations claim to hold. Fraternities should be better and set the example.

### **Role of Fraternity Advisors**

One of the stalwarts of Greek Life is the Chapter Advisor, or Advisory Board in some cases. A Chapter Advisor is the adult in the room. They are strictly volunteers and alumni of the national organization and sometimes even the individual chapters which they advise. Advisors are adults with their own careers, families, and children but dedicate a certain amount of time each month to assist the undergraduate members of the chapters they advise. This includes attending meetings, one-on-one interactions with chapter leaders, and generally advising the chapter. Advisors like this exist in not just fraternities, but sororities as well. Universities also utilize the advisor model for most on campus student organizations through faculty/staff advisors. They are members of the university's faculty or staff that volunteer as mentors for various student organizations.

These advisors are usually the closest element to a chapter and have the most direct communication with members of the organization outside of the students themselves. Most advisors wield a great deal of influence over the leadership of the chapters and can influence the decision making process.

Unfortunately, there are few models available for ideal roles of chapter advisors. In fact, these advisors are almost always unpaid volunteers who loved their time as undergraduate members and want to give back. Their motivation is usually altruistic and genuine. Many newer

chapters have a limited pool of alumni available to act as chapter advisors. In fact, it may take years for a volunteer to emerge that has the time to attend chapter meetings and communicate with chapter leaders regularly. When a volunteer does emerge, they are usually so far removed from the fraternity life and collegiate mindset that they need a primer for what it means to be a college fraternity man today.

Simply put, these volunteers require training. They need to be trained on how to address fraternity culture that leads to the “big three”. They need to learn how to identify the warning signs and know the proper course of action to take if the chapter is fostering a toxic culture. Indeed, proper mentorship may not eliminate the big three from occurring but reducing them may ultimately save lives.

### **Existing Training**

There are few examples of chapter advisor training available. One organization I contacted has allowed me to access their online training for chapter advisors. In fact, they have unveiled a new training program and have already removed the old one. I will be one of the first to access this new training and utilize it for my project here. The organization is a large collegiate fraternity with chapters across the United States at both public and private institutions of higher learning. I have chosen to keep the name of this organization confidential in the event I find any flaws in their training – the concern is that any flaws found could be magnified in the event of a lawsuit following an incident of the big three.

### **Purpose Statement**

Incidents of sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse are far too common within the collegiate fraternity system. As a result, fraternal organizations are struggling to implement

policies that will eliminate or mitigate these problems. Many of these organizations rely on unpaid volunteers to serve as advisors for the undergraduate members. Use of these unpaid volunteers exposes a gap in knowledge in that they are rarely trained or the training that exists is insufficient to prepare these volunteers for the important task of reducing or eliminating sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse.

The purpose of this exploratory research project is threefold. First, it explores Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge in relation to identifying what volunteers need to know regarding the prevention of sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse. Second, utilizing a working hypothesis framework, this study assesses the new chapter advisory board training from a large collegiate fraternity while incorporating Lundvall's knowledge taxonomy. Third, this study uses the results of the assessment to make recommendations to improve the fraternity's chapter advisory board training.

Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge was first used to create a conceptual framework from various scholarly sources authored by Dr. Lundvall. Then the framework was used to explore the chapter advisory board training program for the fraternity. Data for this study were collected via analyses of documents related to the existing training program and structured interviews of current advisory board members that have completed the training.

For purposes of this project, any mention of "the big three" refer to sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing. Any mention of the terms "advisor," or "chapter advisor" refer to the chapter advisory board or abbreviated as "CAB". Any mention of the term "members" refers to undergraduate members of the fraternity.

## **Chapter Summaries**

Chapter II explores the scholarly literature as it relates to Dr. Lundvall's knowledge taxonomy and methods to help prevent the big three on college campuses. Chapter III discusses the new training program released by the anonymous large fraternity and compares the program to the best practices learned through the literature review. Chapter IV provides recommendations for improving the training program within the fraternity.

## **Chapter II: Literature Review**

This chapter presents a review of scholarly research on sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse in a collegiate setting as well as prevention of the three areas generally. Most of the works focus on one of the big three but not all three at once. The goal of this chapter is to pull together information from various scholarly works and use them to generate a series of working hypotheses that will be tested and whose results will be discussed later in Chapter IV. The working hypotheses generated follow the four types of knowledge identified by Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge. Each type of knowledge is described according to Dr. Lundvall's taxonomy and working hypotheses are formulated based on the type of knowledge being discussed.

### **WH1**

According to Lundvall, Know-What knowledge refers to knowledge about facts (Lundvall 2006, p. 3). Examples of facts are ingredients of a recipe or the number of people that live in a particular city. This kind of knowledge can be referred to as information. It can be identified and broken down in a way that can be turned into data, i.e. measured (Lundvall 2006, p. 3). Know-what knowledge can be obtained by reviewing primary sources of information, or, in the case of this project, reviewing laws and policies.

Based on the foregoing, the first working hypothesis was identified as the following:

### **WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge**

#### **Definitions of the Big Three (WH1a)**

With regard to chapter advisory board training, know-what refers to the facts that must be known for an effective advisor to have a framework in which to operate. Examples of these facts include how we define the Big Three, federal laws that apply, and the policies of the organization that are intended to govern behavior. It is crucial that advisors obtain knowledge of these facts

prior to engaging with chapter membership. Failure to do so may lead to misinformation communicated by the advisor to chapter membership that the members then interpret as sacrosanct. Once the misinformation is passed on, it can become ingrained in the culture of the chapter.

In order for an advisor to be effective, he must know how to define the individual components of the Big Three. Hazing definitions vary from state to state, but for purposes of this research, the definition of hazing is derived from an academic perspective as “any activity expected of someone joining or participating in a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of a person’s willingness to participate” (Allen & Madden, 2008, p. 14). This definition is sufficiently broad enough for the purpose of this project, but it is not necessary for chapter advisory board training to precisely mirror this definition. Many state law definitions could be more specific but will likely incorporate some form of the definition referenced above. It is not appropriate to simply use a legal definition for this project due to the technical aspects of a legal definition and the variety of different definitions from state to state. Regardless, the legal definition is important for the advisor to know, but the onus of researching it is on that advisor.

An advisor must know the definition of sexual assault. Generally, the term sexual assault describes all forms of unwanted sexual activity (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993, p. 3). This term includes, but is not limited to rape (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993, p.3). Other forced sexual activity and even sexual experiences not involving intercourse are all included in the definition (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993, p. 3). The key elements of a broad definition of sexual assault appear to be that there is contact of a sexual nature and that the contact is not wanted. Legal definitions may vary, but for purposes of this project, the definition will be all forms of unwanted sexual activity.

Finally, an advisor must know the definition of alcohol abuse. Binge drinking for men is defined as consuming five or more drinks at one time or in one sitting (Enos & Pittayathikhun,

1996, p. 2; Nelson & Engstrom, 2013, p. 396). The definition does not include an exact timeframe. Binge drinking may only be one form of alcohol abuse, but it is the most common form among the fraternity community and is a robust indicator of problem drinking (Nelson & Engstrom, 2013, p. 395-396). For purposes of this project, alcohol abuse will be broadly defined as consuming five or more drinks at one time or in one sitting.

Based on the foregoing definitions and explanations, this study expects to find the following:

**WH1a:** Chapter advisory board training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.

#### **Federal Laws that Apply (WH1b)**

One of the most important laws that affect universities that receive federal funding is known as “Title IX.” Title IX can be found in the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688) which state: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance...” There are exceptions to Title IX for Greek organizations which include the ability to exclude members based on sex. This exception has endured since the law’s passage. In fact, in recent news, Harvard University has chosen to prohibit single-sex Greek organizations on campus (Field, 2018). This move by Harvard prompted multiple Greek organizations, both male and female, to file a federal lawsuit against Harvard to enforce the exceptions in Title IX. Litigation is still pending.

The key word in the Title IX excerpt above is “discrimination.” At first glance, sexual assault does not appear to be a form of discrimination. However, case law has evolved overtime and the Supreme Court ultimately decided that peer-to-peer sexual harassment or assault



constitutes a form of sex discrimination and, therefore, placed a burden on universities to investigate claims of sexual assault (Silbaugh, 2015, p. 1054). This interpretation opened up universities to potential civil lawsuits if they ignored sexual assault or simply left it to local law enforcement.

The scope of a university's Title IX investigation can include a review of a Greek organization as well as other individuals who may have contributed to a culture of sexual harassment. Ultimately, not only is the student who perpetrated the crime subject to criminal prosecution, the student may also face sanctions from the university. In a system where criminal liability must be found beyond a reasonable doubt, a university may have a much less stringent standard. Hypothetically, a student accused of sexual assault may avoid criminal prosecution but probably not university sanctions. The same goes for the Greek organization and potentially any bystanders that did not prevent the assault.

Based on the information discussed above, this study expects to find the following:

**WH1b:** Advisory board training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.

### **Fraternity Policy (WH1c)**

Each Greek organization has its own risk management policy or some form of policies that police behavior of individual members. These policies allow the national organizations to sanction their own members in the event of an incident. Usually, these policies are more stringent than state or federal laws in place. They are designed to cultivate a culture that will prevent incidents from rising to the level of a violation of state or federal law. Unfortunately, these policies have been in place for many years at the organizational and institutional levels and have done little to actually stop the behaviors they aim to prevent. This is because many of the policies are unclear (Salinas, Boettcher, & Plagman-Galvin, 2018, p. 37).

An advisor must be able to clarify risk management policies promulgated by the organization or else history has shown that the policies themselves do nothing to prevent the big three. Before an advisor can clarify and explain the policies to the chapter membership he or she must first know the policies and why they exist.

Based on the information discussed above, this study expects to find the following:

**WH1c:** Advisory board training provides training on the fraternity's risk management policy.

## **WH2**

Know-how knowledge refers to skills and the ability to do things on a practical level (Lundvall & Johnson, 1994, p. 28). In the learning economy as described by Lundvall & Johnson (1994), know-how knowledge is somewhat difficult to transfer than it is to convey facts and figures to another. This describes the problem mentioned earlier regarding risk management policy ineffectiveness at curbing the big three. Indeed, it would appear there is much know-how knowledge that must be conveyed in a competent advisor training program in order for it to work. Unfortunately, this may be the most difficult type of knowledge to convey through a training program without some form of practical application in order for trainees to gain experience.

Based on the foregoing, the second working hypothesis was identified as the following:

**WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge**

**Instruction for Chapter Membership (WH2a)**

As stated earlier, chapter members need more than just a set of rules in order to prevent the big three. When addressing specifically sexual assault, there must be an effort to combat rape culture. Rape culture is where there is an environment that tolerates sexual assault and date rape. It becomes normalized and routinely excused (Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2018, p. 3504). Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford (2018) found that fraternity men were more likely to perpetuate

rape culture when compared to sorority women and certainly more likely than the general student population (p. 3518). Most of the assaults that occur happen in Greek housing. Men control the resources in the fraternity houses and set the rules for who can attend and who is served alcohol. This sets up a dynamic where the balance of power is unequal and can support a rape-prone culture (p. 3519).

Some recommendations to solve this problem include educating fraternity men about these facts rather than warning women. Merely warning women shifts the burden to the victims and does not hold the men accountable. Additionally, bystander intervention training must be a priority for both men and women if culture is going to change (p. 3524).

In addressing alcohol abuse, a holistic approach is necessary by using self-development and self-awareness tools rather than focusing entirely on the policies and laws (Enos & Pittayathikhun, 1996, p. 3). Enos and Pittayathikhun recommends six principal strategies to help prevent alcohol abuse: 1) information dissemination; 2) providing alternatives to drinking and drug use; 3) problem identification and referral; 4) education; 5) community-based activities; and 6) efforts to change the environment. Of those six, education and environmental change are alleged to be the most practical in effective prevention programming (Enos & Pittayathikhun, 1996, p. 3).

In addressing hazing, whistle-blowing appears to be one of the best tools to prevent hazing. The key is to moderate when the whistle should be blown so that others in the organization understand that their actions may result in whistle-blowing. Every whistle-blower engages in a cost-benefit analysis when deciding whether to report (Richardson, Wang, & Hall, 2012, p. 175). The benefits must outweigh the costs in order to trigger a positive response. Education regarding the definition of hazing and examples of what constitute hazing will be most effective in setting the standard for whistle-blowing.

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH2a:** Advisory board training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership to prevent the big three.

### **Identifying and Reporting the Big Three (WH2b)**

Bystander training is probably the most effective way to teach fraternity men how to identify and encourage reporting the big three. Often, the first line of defense is for a peer to identify a potential problem and then step-in to prevent or mitigate the incident (Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2018). Any competent advisor training program must explain bystander intervention and teach the advisors how to encourage chapter membership to adopt a bystander intervention mentality.

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH2b:** Advisory board training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.

### **Managing Allegations (WH2c)**

Chapter advisors are not police. However, they can serve an important role in managing the response when an allegation of the big three occur. Advisors are usually the first people outside of the chapter membership to get news of an alleged violation. They then have to decide whether to pass the information along to the national organization, the university, or even law enforcement. Every advisor has a duty to take accusations seriously and must follow up on those accusations by interviewing involved parties.

For sexual assault allegations, speed is essential when it comes to collecting any medical evidence (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993, p. 42). If the victim has not already sought medical treatment, then the advisor should recommend that she do so immediately. This not only serves the purpose

of preserving evidence in the event of criminal prosecution, it could also exonerate an innocent party if the victims memory was affected by drugs or alcohol. A chapter advisor that responds well will be more likely to see that the victim receives justice and protect his organization at the same time (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993).

In instances of alcohol abuse, medical attention may be required just as quickly as in sexual assault cases. However, it is unlikely that the chapter advisor will know anything about an intoxicated person needing medical attention until it is either too late, or some other incident occurs as a result of intoxication, such as hazing, property damage, or various criminal charges. In terms of hazing, the advisor has tools at his disposal that likely include sanctions from the national organization or academic consequences through the university. According to Bohmer and Parrot (1993), the chapter advisor should have a plan in place for when incidents occur so that he can manage allegations of the big three.

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH2c:** Advisory board training provides training on how to manage allegations of the big three.

### **WH3**

“Know-why knowledge refers to scientific knowledge of principles and laws of motion in nature, in the human mind and in society” (Lundvall & Johnson, 1994, p. 27). In other words, know-why knowledge can be obtained through accumulating data but it is rooted in practical experience (Lundvall, 2006, p. 6). For purposes of advisory board training, know-why knowledge aims to describe why students should not act in a way that would create instances of the big three. This type of knowledge should compliment the others described in this study.

Based on the foregoing, the third working hypothesis was identified as the following:

**WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge**

### **Following the Policies (WH3a)**

Students must know why they should follow the laws and policies. This may seem like a no-brainer, but research has shown that simply relying on the laws and policies do not have the desired effect of preventing the big three. At this stage in life, students need to know why they should not do something rather than simply be told not to. For many students, college is the first time they are away from home for an extended period of time. Without parental authority figures around to set boundaries, this can be a recipe for disaster for some college aged students.

The challenge here is to combat the group norms that allow the big three to perpetuate (Perkins, 2002). Norms can be so powerful that they interfere with individual choice. People have a strong tendency to conform to the normative (Perkins, 2002). This is particularly strong when a member of a group has something to gain such as group acceptance. Arguably, acceptance is the goal for fraternity men from the beginning. The desire to belong to a smaller group in the context of a larger university setting may result in the individual acting in a way that he may otherwise not have.

In fact, when studying individual opinions compared to what the individuals thought their peers would think, Perkins (2002) cited to a study that found students individually felt drinking to excess was acceptable only in limited circumstances, yet those same students thought their peers believed this was acceptable (Perkins, 2002). There is a gap between how students would prefer to act as individuals versus what the students believe is acceptable as a group.

Students need to be aware of the disconnect between the individual attitudes and the group attitudes of college students. When made aware of this, students may be more likely to comply with the policies in place because this awareness should reduce overall peer pressure. Explaining

why a policy exists and debunking perceived norms appears to be critical in educating students about a policy rather than simply stating the policy.

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH3a:** Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.

### **Self-Reporting Violations (WH3b)**

Self-reporting is much like whistle-blowing but with an additional dynamic. Generally, the difference is that the group agrees to self-report rather than rely on a single whistle-blower. Usually, the incident has already occurred and the organization has a meeting to decide what to do. With all of the incidents involving Greek organizations in the news one must be concerned about those incidents that do not make the news. Much like crime, the number of criminals being caught is far less than the number of crimes being committed. Likely, the same is true regarding the big three. In order to assess the full scope of the problem and offer assistance, students must be encouraged to self-report violations.

Students need to have incentive to self-report their violations. There must be safe-harbor provisions in student conduct codes, organization disciplinary policies, and state laws. Without these provisions, the motivation to self-report disappears. Advisors should encourage students to self-report violations because discovering violations early on may allow the national organization or university to step in and offer counseling/advising to change the culture early on before the organization, or one of its members, commits a reprehensible act.

When studying whistle-blowing behavior, there are five stages to take into account according to Richardson, Wang, & Hall (2012). The first stage is usually the triggering event. The second stage is when the whistle-blower identifies a problem with the event and begins a decision-

making process about what to do next. This is accompanied by a cost-benefit analysis. Then the whistle-blower takes action in the third stage followed by the organizational reaction in the fourth stage. Finally, the fifth stage is where the whistle-blower assesses the organizations response (Richardson, Wang, & Hall, 2012, p. 175).

The second stage during cost-benefit analysis is where most fraternity men fail to blow the whistle. As stated before, fraternities are close knit groups that fill a need for belonging that a student possesses. Because this need is so strong in many young college students, the idea of betraying the trust of the group is frightful for most. Depending on the severity of the activity, the whistle-blower may face retaliation from the organization's members. This is why it is important for the group to have a culture in place that encourages self-reporting as a group. We cannot rely on whistle-blowers alone. The organization needs to conduct its own cost-benefit analysis and identify the value in self-reporting its violations to the university or national organization.

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH3b:** Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three.

#### **WH4**

“Know-who refers to specific and selective social relations” (Lundvall & Johnson, 1994, p. 28). It is not about knowing who an advisor should know, rather, it “involves the formation of special social relationships...” (Lundvall, 2006, p. 3). “Know-who involves information about who knows what and who knows what to do, but it also involves the social ability to co-operate and communicate with different kinds of people and experts” (Lundvall & Johnson, 2001, p. 13). In regards to chapter advisory board training, this type of knowledge refers to who the experts are that can assist the advisor, and ultimately the chapter.



Based on the foregoing, the fourth working hypothesis was identified as the following:

**WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge**

**The Proper Authorities for Advisors (WH4a)**

Chapter advisors need to know who the stakeholders are at the university and national organization and the proper channels to report violations. Knowing the stakeholders is not just for the purposes of reporting violations, it serves the purpose of engaging the advisor with the support network already in place around the chapter. When problems occur, it is much easier if the advisor already knows who the stakeholders are and can contact them immediately. This is particularly important for newer advisors who may be unfamiliar with the evolution of Greek life and higher education since their time in college. The advisor must be “plugged-in” to the vision of the university and national organization in their coordinated efforts to change Greek culture for the better.

Many institutions of higher learning where Greek life is active also have full-time employees dedicated to monitoring and assisting Greek life activities. Getting staff, faculty, and other campus partners, onboard with preventing the big three is important in developing systems and structures that support campus-wide cultural change (Rios, 2014). Greek life staff often attend special seminars do a great deal of training in the prevention of the big three. It is their job to know what to do when a crisis emerges involving the big three.

Fraternities are national organizations with headquarters and staff many miles away from the individual chapters. These national headquarters’ need to be notified about allegations of the big three. However, they are often less poised to impact risky behaviors than their campus partners (Rios, 2014). The advisor himself can often be a strong source of guidance during a crisis involving the big three because alumni garner greater respect from the undergraduates than some

third party who has not been in their shoes. The three segments working together help triangulate the process and can better identify violations when they occur and stop little problems from growing into bigger ones (Rios, 2014, p. 50).

Therefore, this study expects to find the following:

**WH4a:** Advisory board training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to.

**The Proper Authorities for Chapter Members (WH4b)**

Probably more important than advisors knowing whom to report allegations to is the chapter members knowing who to report allegations to. Many students may not realize who is available to support them. It is the duty of the chapter advisor to know who is available for chapter membership and then to relay that information to the membership in a meaningful way. Members need to know who should receive notice of allegations based on the severity and type of violation. In some cases, that may include law enforcement. But in other cases, depending on the severity and type of violation, it may be the chapter advisor alone.

A good chapter advisor is going to develop a solid relationship with the undergraduates he is advising. The Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors “have stressed the need for fraternity advisors to attain cultural competence in order to provide formal advising of fraternity members from different backgrounds” (Rios, 2014, p. 21). This is relevant because if a good advisor has taken the time to obtain this level of competence, then he is likely to be the first one to receive a phone call from a student regarding violations. A good advisor should especially focus on building this relationship with new members during their probationary periods (Rios, 2014). This is the critical time where hazing and forced alcohol consumption is most likely to occur and most likely to be revealed to those outside of the chapter.

As stated in the previous working hypothesis, there is also the university’s Greek life office and the fraternities national organization to reach out to. In the event that the chapter advisor is not very effective, then the on-campus Greek advisors may be the first to get notice of violations. However, there is a fear among chapter members that by notifying the university officials they will face administrative punishment from the university that may affect their status as students.

Ultimately, the chapter advisor should cultivate trust between himself and the chapter so that he is notified before a violation can even occur.

Based on the foregoing, this study expects to find the following:

**WH4b:** Advisory board training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.

**Table 2.1 Conceptual Framework**

<b>Title:</b> Preventing the Big Three: Exploring a Fraternity’s Chapter Advisory Board Training using Lundvall’s Knowledge Taxonomy to Prevent Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Alcohol Abuse	
<b>Purpose:</b> The purpose of this exploratory research project is threefold. First, it explores Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall’s taxonomy of knowledge in relation to identifying what volunteers need to know regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing. Second, utilizing a working hypothesis framework, this study assesses a large intercollegiate fraternity’s chapter advisory board training while incorporating Lundvall’s knowledge taxonomy. Third, this study uses the results of the assessment to make recommendations to improve the fraternity’s chapter advisory board training.	
<b>Working hypothesis</b>	<b>Supporting literature</b>
<b>WH1:</b> The current chapter advisory board training adequately provides “know-what” training regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing (the big three).	
<b>WH1a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.	Allen & Madden (2008), Allen & Madden (2012), Anderson & Danis (2007), Bohmer & Parrot (1993), Choate (2003), Enos & Pittayathkhun (1996), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Nelson & Engstrom (2013), Rios (2014).
<b>WH1b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.	20 U.S.C. §§ 1681–1688, Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Rios (2014), Silbaugh (2015).

<b>WH1c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the fraternity’s risk management policy.	Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Salinas, Boettcher, & Plagman-Galvin (2018).
<b>Working Hypothesis</b>	<b>Supporting Literature</b>
<b>WH2:</b> The current chapter advisory board training adequately provides “know-how” training regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing (the big three).	
<b>WH2a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership to prevent the big three.	Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney (2006), Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford (2018), Choate (2003), Enos & Pittayathikhun (1996), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Rios (2014), Rosenberg & Mosca (2016), Richardson, Wang, & Hall (2012).
<b>WH2b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.	Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney (2006), Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford (2018), Choate (2003), Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt (2012), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Richardson, Wang, & Hall (2012).
<b>WH2c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to investigate allegations of the big three.	20 U.S.C. §§ 1681–1688, Bohmer & Parrot (1993), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001).
<b>Working Hypothesis</b>	<b>Supporting Literature</b>
<b>WH3:</b> The current chapter advisory board training adequately provides “know-why” training regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing (the big three).	
<b>WH3a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on perceived college norms and why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.	Dick, Ziering, & Matthiessen (2016), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Perkins (2002), Tribbensee (2004)
<b>WH3b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three.	Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt (2012), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Richardson, Wang, & Hall (2012)
<b>Working Hypothesis</b>	<b>Supporting Literature</b>
<b>WH4:</b> The current chapter advisory board training adequately provides “know-who” training regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing (the big three).	
<b>WH4a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to.	Bohmer & Parrot (1993), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Paterson (2013), Rios (2014), Schwartz & DeKeserdy (1997)
<b>WH4b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.	Bohmer & Parrot (1993), Lundvall & Johnson (1994), Lundvall & Johnson (2001), Paterson (2013), Rios (2014), Schwartz & DeKeserdy (1997).

**Table 2.2 Operationalization of Conceptual Framework**

<p><b>Title:</b> Preventing the Big Three: Exploring a Fraternity’s Chapter Advisory Board Training using Lundvall’s Knowledge Taxonomy to Prevent Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Alcohol Abuse</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The purpose of this exploratory research project is threefold. First, it explores Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall’s taxonomy of knowledge in relation to identifying what volunteers need to know regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing. Second, utilizing a working hypothesis framework, this study assesses a large intercollegiate fraternity’s chapter advisory board training while incorporating Lundvall’s knowledge taxonomy. Third, this study uses the results of the assessment to make recommendations to improve the fraternity’s chapter advisory board training.</p>		
<b>WH1: Know-what</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<b>WH1a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Does the training provide definitions of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p> <p>How does the training define sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p>
<b>WH1b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Does the training provide training on federal laws regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p> <p>How does the training inform you about the laws regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p>
<b>WH1c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the fraternity’s risk management policy.	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on the fraternity’s risk management policies?</p> <p>How does the training address the fraternity’s risk management policies?</p>
<b>WH2: Know-how</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<b>WH2a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s	Does the training provide information on how the advisor can instruct chapter

instruct chapter membership on policies regarding the big three.	chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	members on the policies regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address the manner in which you instruct chapter members on the policies regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH2b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Does the training provide information on how members can identify and report sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address ways members can identify and report sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH2c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to investigate allegations of the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Does the training provide methods on how to investigate allegations of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address ways to investigate allegations of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH3: Know-why</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<b>WH3a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Does the training provide information on why members should follow policies?  How does the training address why members should follow policies?
<b>WH3b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's	Does the training provide information on why

	chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	members should self-report allegations of the big three?  How does the training address self-reporting of allegations by chapter members?
<b>WH4: Know-who</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<b>WH4a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who to report allegations of the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Does the training provide information on who to report allegations of the big three to?  How does the training address who should be notified when there are allegations of the big three?
<b>WH4b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Does the training provide information on who the members should report allegations of the big three to?  How does the training address who members should report allegations of the big three to?

## **Chapter III: Research Methodology**

### **Chapter Purpose**

This chapter describes the research methodology utilized to review the four types of knowledge acquired through the advisor training program. This includes background information on how I obtained access to the training program. Further, this chapter discusses the operationalization of the conceptual framework and the types of data collection methods used. Finally, there is a short discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen research method followed by a brief summary.

### **Research Method**

This study uses a case study methodology. A case study approach is appropriate because analyzing a particular training program is very specific. “The limitation of attention to a particular instance of something is the essential characteristic of the case study” (Babbie 2004, 293). Babbie (2004) defines a case study as “the in-depth examination of a single instance of some social phenomenon...”

Applying that definition and characteristics to the advisor training program examined in this body of work, one can see that a case study is the most appropriate methodology. This is because the training program is designed to prepare advisors for the rigors of volunteerism in the modern fraternity world. Not only is the fraternal community an example of something unique to be studied, but this sub-group of volunteer advisors is even more specific. Therefore, a case study approach was deemed appropriate.

### **Training Program to be Evaluated**

This case study evaluates an advisor training program intended to inform unpaid volunteers about how to manage fraternity men. The volunteers that will complete the training encompass an



age range that includes recent graduates and older. The author of this study is not a member of the fraternity. This particular fraternity is a large fraternity with chapters at many universities all over the country. The decision not to reveal the name of the fraternity is due to potential liability concerns in the event a flaw is detected in the current training program. With Greek life under a microscope, the organization must maintain its anonymity.

### **Document Analysis**

“Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic material” (Bowen 2009, p. 27). According to Bowen (2009), there are many types of documents that can be subject to document analysis. The scope is very broad.

Training manuals are considered a type of document. Since documents can be electronic and still be subject to document analysis, therefore, it would stand to reason that an online training program could be assessed via document analysis.

### **Participant Observation**

Participant observation is another research method that can be used to collect data. “Validity is stronger with the use of additional strategies used with observation, such as interviewing, document analysis, or surveys, questionnaires, or other more quantitative methods” (Kawulich 2005, p. 4). Used in conjunction with document analysis, participant observation can be used to build theory and generate or test hypotheses (Kawulich 2005).

Unfortunately, due to the sensitivity of the issues affecting fraternities, I was unable to contact and interview advisors that have completed the training program. However, participant observation combined with document analysis should yield satisfactory results.

## **Gauging the Level of Support**

In both methods of data collection the level of support was evaluated using three levels: weak, limited, or strong. Both the weak and strong levels are virtually absolute. However, the limited level is on a spectrum. In some cases, the term limited was used when evidence of a document existed but it was not all that apparent. Whenever one sub-hypothesis yielded a strong result but another sub-hypothesis yielded a weak result, the average result for the overall working hypothesis was deemed to be limited. In Chapter IV, the level of support is identified for each sub-hypothesis and explained in greater detail.

## **Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework**

The working hypotheses and sub-hypotheses were operationalized through the use of document analysis and participant observation. Table 3.1 outlines the operationalization of the conceptual framework. Table 3.1 is identical to Table 2.2 from Chapter II except this time the table includes the information source for each sub-hypothesis. The conceptual framework has four main working hypotheses. The first two working hypotheses have three sub-hypotheses and the last two each have two corresponding sub-hypotheses. In the operationalization table, there are four columns. The first column provides the working hypothesis being tested. The second column lists the methods used to test the working hypotheses. The third column indicates the particular source material with enough specificity for the researcher and fraternity to identify the part of the training under review. Finally, the fourth column lists the evidence sought by the researcher in support of each working hypothesis and sub-hypothesis.

**Table 3.1 Operationalization Table:**

<p><b>Title:</b> Preventing the Big Three: Exploring a Fraternity’s Chapter Advisory Board Training using Lundvall’s Knowledge Taxonomy to Prevent Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Alcohol Abuse</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The purpose of this exploratory research project is threefold. First, it explores Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall’s taxonomy of knowledge in relation to identifying what volunteers need to know regarding the prevention of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing. Second, utilizing a working hypothesis framework, this study assesses a large intercollegiate fraternity’s chapter advisory board training while incorporating Lundvall’s knowledge taxonomy. Third, this study uses the results of the assessment to make recommendations to improve the fraternity’s chapter advisory board training.</p>			
<b>WH1: Know-what</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<p><b>WH1a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Fraternity risk management policy</p> <p>Keeping Members Safe module</p>	<p>Does the training provide definitions of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p> <p>How does the training define sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p>
<p><b>WH1b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>All five modules of CAB Training</p>	<p>Does the training provide training on federal laws regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p> <p>How does the training inform you about the laws regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?</p>
<p><b>WH1c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on the fraternity’s risk management policy.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of</p>	<p>Fraternity risk management policy</p> <p>All five modules of CAB training</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on the fraternity’s risk management policies?</p> <p>How does the training address the fraternity’s risk management policies?</p>

	chapter advisory board training.		
<b>WH2: Know-how</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>
<b>WH2a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership on policies regarding the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	All five modules of CAB training	Does the training provide information on how the advisor can instruct chapter members on the policies regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address the manner in which you instruct chapter members on the policies regarding sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH2b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	All five modules of CAB training	Does the training provide information on how members can identify and report sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address ways members can identify and report sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH2c:</b> Advisory board training provides training on how to investigate allegations of the big three.	Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board online training  Participant Observation: Researcher's completion of chapter advisory board training.	Your responsibilities for our members module  How to work with campus partners module	Does the training provide methods on how to investigate allegations of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?  How does the training address ways to investigate allegations of sexual assault, alcohol abuse, and hazing?
<b>WH3: Know-why</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Evidence</b>

<p><b>WH3a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Your responsibilities for our members module</p> <p>Keeping our members safe module</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on why members should follow policies?</p> <p>How does the training address why members should follow policies?</p>
<p><b>WH3b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>Keeping our members safe module</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on why members should self-report allegations of the big three?</p> <p>How does the training address self-reporting of allegations by chapter members?</p>
<p><b>WH4: Know-who</b></p>	<p><b>Method</b></p>	<p><b>Source</b></p>	<p><b>Question/Evidence</b></p>
<p><b>WH4a:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who to report allegations of the big three to.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s completion of chapter advisory board training.</p>	<p>How to work with campus partners module</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on who to report allegations of the big three to?</p> <p>How does the training address who should be notified when there are allegations of the big three?</p>
<p><b>WH4b:</b> Advisory board training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.</p>	<p>Document analysis: Anonymous fraternity’s chapter advisory board online training</p> <p>Participant Observation: Researcher’s</p>	<p>Keeping our members safe module</p>	<p>Does the training provide information on who the members should report allegations of the big three to?</p> <p>How does the training address who members</p>

	completion of chapter advisory board training.		should report allegations of the big three to?
--	--	--	--

### **Chapter Summary**

This chapter discussed the particular research methodology used and how it incorporates document analysis and participant observation to operationalize the conceptual framework with enough confidence to yield satisfactory results. The following chapter presents the results of this study.

## **Chapter IV: Results**

### **Chapter Purpose**

This chapter presents the results of the research. A summary of the documents analyzed is used to evaluate the three levels of how well the fraternity's training delivers the type of knowledge under Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge. The three levels for evaluation are strong, limited, or weak. The results are organized by working hypotheses.

### **Lundvall's Taxonomy of Knowledge Principles**

This applied research project uses Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall's principles of knowledge taxonomy and literature on the topics of sexual assault, hazing, and alcohol abuse to create a set of working hypotheses. Second, this study tests an anonymous fraternity's chapter advisory board (CAB) training against the working hypotheses. Third, it uses the results of the assessment to make recommendations for improvement to the anonymous fraternity. Four main working hypotheses and multiple corresponding sub-hypotheses were developed from the conceptual framework to reach these results.

**WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge**

**WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge**

**WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge**

**WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge**

### **Know-what**

**WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge**

### **Definitions (WH1a)**

Knowing how to define the big three is important before holding a conversation about how to prevent the behavior. We must know precisely what the behavior is that we are trying to reduce or eliminate.

## **Document analysis**

The CAB training clearly defines hazing in the risk management policy. There is a limited definition of alcohol abuse where most of the discussion involving alcohol pertains to statistics of harm due to alcohol abuse. This particular fraternity has taken many steps to remove alcohol from its organization through alcohol free housing and banning use of alcohol above 15% ABV (eliminating hard liquor). Finally, sexual assault is not as clearly defined as hazing, but there is a clear definition of consent and the training really emphasizes consent as key. Table 4.1 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH1a.

## **Participant observation**

The CAB training clearly defines hazing but does not clearly define sexual assault or alcohol abuse. However, the training does a lot to allow the participant to infer what sexual assault and alcohol abuse are. There is a strong emphasis on consent as key in preventing sexual assault and there are strict rules on the consumption of alcohol. As a participant, the message gets across regarding what the big three are even if the documents do not clearly define the big three. Table 4.1 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH1a.

## **Level of Support**

Based on the document analysis and participant observation, WH1a had limited support in regards to sexual assault and alcohol abuse, but had strong support in regards to hazing. The only reason sexual assault and alcohol abuse are categorized as limited is because there is not a strict definition of these two outlined in the training. However, the training does do a good job of conveying what these two are through examples and statistics.



**Table 4.1**

<b>WH1a: CAB training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b>  <b>1) Fraternity risk management policy</b>  <b>2) Keeping members safe training module</b>	<b>Does the training provide definitions of the big three?</b>	<b>Risk policy provides a clear definition of hazing but not alcohol abuse or sexual assault.</b>  <b>Keeping members safe training module addresses consent as key in regards to sexual assault. Alcohol abuse is referred to via statistics of harm.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training define the big three?</b>	<b>As a participant, one can infer from the training that alcohol abuse is anything that violates the risk management policy. While there is no hard definition of sexual assault, the definition can be inferred from the emphasis on consent as a key element.</b>

**WH1b (Federal laws)**

An effective chapter advisor must be familiar with Title IX of the Education Amendments that prevent discrimination based on sex. Title IX pertains to sexual assault from the big three. Hazing and alcohol abuse are generally controlled by state laws and are not analyzed here due to the breadth of possible laws.

**Document analysis**

Title IX was not discussed in the CAB training program. Table 4.2 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH1b.

## **Participant observation**

Title IX was not discussed in the CAB training program. Table 4.2 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH1b.

## **Level of Support**

Unfortunately, there is weak support for education on Title IX. However, the issues that Title IX aims to prevent are addressed in the overall training. Since the law is not specifically referenced, then the level of support here is deemed as weak.

**Table 4.2**

<b>WH1b: CAB training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis: CAB training and associated references.</b>	<b>Does the training provide training on federal laws regarding the big three?</b>	<b>None found.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training inform the participant about the federal laws regarding the big three?</b>	<b>No information provided.</b>

## **WH1c (Risk Management Policy)**

Every CAB member must be familiar with the organizations risk management policy. This is the foundation for any fraternal organization and it is usually endorsed by the insurance carrier of the organization. It is intended to be relatively short, to the point, and easy to read so that it can be distributed to the members of the organization. All fraternal organizations have one.

## **Document analysis**

The risk management policy of this fraternity is easily accessible in the first module of the CAB training. Throughout the training and especially in the final module regarding the safety of the members the risk policy is elaborated on. The policy itself does not specifically address sexual

assault but it does reference sexual harassment. Alcohol use and hazing are discussed at length in the policy. Table 4.3 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH1c.

**Participant observation**

One of the first links for the participant to click on is the risk management policy. The policy is provided as a reference point but the training does not emphasize the hard rules listed in the policy. However, the training does elaborate on the topics that the risk policy addresses and goes beyond what the risk policy includes. Table 4.3 lists the findings of this participant observation analysis as they pertain to WH1c.

**Level of Support**

Based on the fact that the policy itself is quickly available early on in the training and that the behavior the policy aims to prevent is addressed later on in the training, the level of support for WH1c is strong.

**Table 4.3**

<b>WH1c: CAB training provides training on the fraternity’s risk management policy.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b> 1) Fraternity risk management policy 2) CAB training	<b>Does the training provide information on the fraternity’s risk management policies?</b>	<b>The policy itself is available through a link early on in the training.</b>  <b>CAB training does elaborate on hazing and alcohol use. The policy does not address sexual assault, but only sexual harassment.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address the fraternity’s risk management policies?</b>	<b>The participant can review the entire policy very easily early on in the training. The subsequent training reflects the policy and goes beyond the policy.</b>

**Table 4.4**

WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge				
Sub-hypotheses	Element of the Big Three	Documents analyzed	Participant observation	Overall support
WH1a: CAB training provides training on the definitions of the big three.	Sexual assault	Limited	Strong	Limited
	Hazing	Strong	Strong	
	Alcohol abuse	Limited	Strong	
WH1b: CAB training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.	Sexual assault	Weak	Weak	Weak
	Hazing	Weak	Weak	
	Alcohol abuse	Weak	Weak	
WH1c: CAB training provides training on the fraternity's risk management policy.	N/A here	Strong	Strong	Strong
WH1: Overall support		Limited	Limited	Limited

**Know-how****WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge****Instruction for Chapter Membership (WH2a)**

An important facet to training chapter advisory board members is to show them “how to” instruct the general membership on the organizations policies regarding the big three. This goes beyond simply reiterating what those policies are.

**Document analysis**

Rather than focusing on the big three specifically, the CAB training is focused on teaching CAB members how to approach the undergraduate members so that the CAB is effective in areas that include the big three but also other areas that need advisement. In regards to the big three,

CAB training recommends that a CAB member attend the first new member meeting each semester and educate the new members on the risk management policy and zero tolerance policy for hazing. This CAB member also should be responsible for tracking online education for new members. Table 4.5 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH2a.

### **Participant Observation**

The CAB training focuses on the STOP model to help CAB members engage in constructive dialogue with undergraduate members. The letters in STOP stand for Safety, Talk, Oppose, and Plan. The training goes into detail about how to use that model to engage the membership on the big three. This model is presented in the keeping members safe module.

Additionally, there is an entire module on how to relate to today's college students that goes into great detail about "Generation Z" and how they are different, but also similar, to older generations. While this module does not specifically address the big three, it seems to be an essential part of learning to communicate with college students so that the big three can be part of the conversation. Table 4.5 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH2a.

### **Level of Support**

Strictly looking at the texts of the documents, there is little in the way of how to instruct chapter membership on the policies of the big three. However, using participant observation, there is ample information on how to instruct chapter membership generally. Essentially, the support for WH2a is weak in terms of document analysis, but strong in terms of participant observation. The participant is able to utilize the methods learned on how to instruct chapter members generally and then inject the big three into that equation. Basically, the approach is for CAB members to

learn how to relate to and instruct chapter members first, and then use that knowledge to instruct them on the big three.

**Table 4.5**

<b>WH2a: CAB training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership on policies regarding the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis: CAB training and associated references.</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on how the advisor can instruct the chapter members on the policies regarding the big three?</b>	<b>Regarding the big three specifically, none were found.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address the manner in which you instruct chapter members on the policies regarding the big three?</b>	<b>Training is very informative for the participant on how to relate to and communicate with college students. This leads to the participant being able to instruct chapter members on the big three as well as other areas of importance.</b>

**Identifying and Reporting the Big Three (WH2b)**

An important part of reducing or eliminating the big three is for chapter members to know how to report incidents that occur. Ideally, so that the issues can be addressed before something bad happens.

**Document analysis**

Through supervision of the new member education program, the CAB member in charge of that task has the ability to ensure that new members brainstorm examples of the big three and how to solve the problems that arise. However, this task is somewhat removed from the advisor because it relies on the chapter member in charge of education to actually follow through with the

new member education program. In fact, this information was buried within a linked page to a linked page from the CAB training. It could be easily missed but it does exist.

The keeping members safe module addresses how to ask questions to spark a conversation regarding alcohol abuse and sexual assault. This module also recommends sober monitors at parties that can observe and intervene before a dangerous situation occurs. Table 4.6 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH2b.

### **Participant Observation**

If the participant is motivated enough, all of the resources the CAB member needs are available through the training via links to outside resources. While there appears to be ample support for teaching members how to identify the big three, there is little support in how the members should report the big three. There is ample support for who the CAB member should be in contact with between himself, the university, and national organization, but little support for telling the undergraduate members who to report to. It appears the assumption is that the CAB will have a close relationship with the students and the students will report to the CAB who can then report to other authorities. Table 4.5 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH2b.

### **Level of Support**

Based on document analysis and participant observation, WH2b had limited support. There was strong support for how to instruct members to identify the big three, but weak support on how to report the big three.

**Table 4.6**

<b>WH2b: CAB training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis: CAB training and associated references.</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on how members can identify and report the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for how members can identify the big three but weak support on how to report incidents.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address ways members can identify and report the big three?</b>	<b>The CAB shares responsibility with the students to ensure they know how to identify the big three.  If the overall training works, then the CAB will receive any reports of the big three.</b>

**Managing Allegations (WH2c)**

An effective CAB member must be able to manage allegations of the big three so that the cause is identified and corrected before the problem gets worse. This is most important when the allegations have to do with alcohol abuse or hazing. Sometimes, a member may need help with alcohol dependency or a related mental health issue that could be corrected before it gets worse. With hazing, issues may start out small or seem innocuous at first, but can quickly turn into deadly situations.

Sexual assault requires a different approach. With Sexual assault, the CAB member likely has a duty to report the issue to law enforcement. If reported quickly, law enforcement may be able to determine whether the member should be charged or whether the member should be exonerated. Unlike alcohol abuse and hazing, there is not a sliding scale for sexual assault that allows the CAB member to intervene and provide guidance once an assault has occurred, it must be reported to law enforcement.



### **Document analysis**

The CAB training has a module dedicated to the CAB members responsibility to members of the fraternity. There are scenarios and hypotheticals that outline how an advisor should respond to reports of the big three. These scenarios outline the resources available to the advisor. One is fashioned as a quiz and the other is series of pages to read about an actual incident and how the advisor responded. Table 4.7 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH2c.

### **Participant observation**

Part of the CAB training is a module on working with university partners. This module encourages the participant to reach out to the various key players and stakeholders in the university system so that when problems arise, the advisor will know who to communicate with. With this training, the advisor can effectively work a problem that arises or easily reach out to someone with more knowledge on how to do so. Table 4.7 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH2c.

### **Level of Support**

Support for WH2c is strong in both document analysis and participant observation.

**Table 4.7**

<b>WH2c: CAB training provides training on how to manage allegations of the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b>  <b>CAB training modules:</b>  1) <b>Your responsibilities for our members</b> 2) <b>How to work with campus partners</b>	<b>Does the training provide methods on how to manage allegations of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for how to manage a scenario that includes one of the big three through a hypothetical and real life scenario.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address ways to manage allegations of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for how to manage allegations by communicating with campus partners regularly so that when incidents occur the advisor can seek help if necessary.</b>

**Table 4.8**

WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge			
Sub-hypotheses	Documents analyzed	Participant observation	Overall support
WH2a: CAB training provides training on how to instruct chapter members on policies regarding the big three.	Weak	Strong	Limited
WH2b: CAB training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.	Limited	Limited	Limited
WH2c: CAB training provides training on how to investigate allegations of the big three.	Strong	Strong	Strong
WH2: Overall support	Limited	Limited	Limited

**Know-why****WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge****Following the Policies (WH3a)**

CAB training should provide training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three. It should never be enough to simply state the rules to the members. Most do not understand why certain rules are in place or feel that breaking a minor rule is a license to break the major ones. The goal should be to get the members to *think* about their actions.

## **Document Analysis**

In the keeping members safe module there is a discussion about the fraternity's values versus a "score card" culture around sexuality. The aim of this discussion is to distinguish fraternity men from a toxic culture that preys on women. Using the fraternity's value system as a way to prevent sexual assault is an effective tool. There are two videos and a scenario that address all of the big three in the keeping members safe module. The videos use a quote from a notable alumnus to encourage the members to be true to their values instead of going down the wrong path.

Shaping the culture of a chapter is emphasized in the first module which addresses the advisors role in the building the fraternity. Table 4.9 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH3a.

## **Participant Observation**

There is ample evidence in the CAB training for why members should follow policies regarding the big three. Some of that evidence includes hypotheticals and real world scenarios that have had tragic consequences. An effective advisor will be able to digest the information and relay it to the membership. There are also references to other tools that advisors can use to help coach the membership. Some of those tools include other online training just for the members. Table 4.9 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH3a.

## **Level of Support**

Support for WH3a is strong in both document analysis and participant observation.

**Table 4.9**

<b>WH3a: CAB training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b> <b>CAB training modules:</b>  1) <b>Your responsibilities for our members</b> 2) <b>Keeping members safe</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on why members should follow policies regarding the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for why members should follow policies through examples and real life scenarios.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address why members should follow policies regarding the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for why the policies should be followed by members through examples and real life scenarios.</b>

**Self-Reporting Violations (WH3b)**

Self-reporting violations is sometimes the only way the CAB or national fraternity will ever find out about violations of the big three. Members should be encouraged to self-report not just the big violations but the small ones too.

**Document analysis**

Practically the only thing in the training that encourages self-reporting of incidents is the good Samaritan policy. This policy is available towards the end of the keeping members safe module. The policy is in place to provide a level of immunity from the national fraternity in the event an incident is self-reported by a member before law enforcement or other authorities are required to intervene. Table 4.10 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH3b.

## Participant observation

Not much in the training is geared towards encouraging members to self-report violations except a link to health and safety resources that includes the good Samaritan policy. Table 4.10 lists the findings of this participant observation analysis as they pertain to WH3b.

## Level of support

Due to the existence of a good Samaritan policy and its limited inclusion in the training, the support is more than weak but certainly not strong. Both document analysis and participant observation show limited support for WH3b.

**Table 4.10**

<b>WH3b: CAB training provides training on why chapter members should self-report violations of the big three.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b> <b>CAB training modules:</b> <b>1) Keeping members safe</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on why members should self-report violations regarding the big three?</b>	<b>Limited support for this question via the good Samaritan policy referenced towards the end of the keeping members safe module.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address self-reporting violations of the big three?</b>	<b>Limited support for this question due to the existence of a good Samaritan policy but not emphasized.</b>

**Table 4.11**

WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge			
Sub-hypotheses	Documents analyzed	Participant observation	Overall support
WH3a: CAB training provides training on why members should follow policies regarding the big three.	Strong	Strong	Strong
WH3b: CAB training provides training on why chapter members should self-report violations of the big three.	Limited	Limited	Limited
WH3: Overall support	Limited	Limited	Limited

**Know-who**

**WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge**

**The Proper Authorities for Advisors (WH4a)**

Fraternity advisors need to know who they can call when something goes wrong. This is an important facet to preventing problems before they occur. The more “plugged-in” the advisor is to the network of stakeholders that affect a chapter, the more effective he will be at building systems and structures around the chapter to prevent incidents.

**Document analysis**

The module on how to work with campus partners recommends that CAB members should have a working relationship with Greek advisors on campus. The document lists examples of all

of the individuals and offices that an advisor should be familiar with. Table 4.12 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH4a.

### **Participant Observation**

Most of the information for this working hypothesis is found in the module on how to work with campus partners. These are the people that are closest to the chapter and can be the eyes and ears of the CAB. Table 4.12 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH4a.

### **Level of Support**

There is strong support for WH4a in both document analysis and participant observation.

**Table 4.12**

<b>WH4a: CAB training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b>  <b>CAB training modules:</b>  <b>1) How to work with campus partners</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on who to report allegations of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for this question with a list of possible interested parties.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address who should be notified if/when there is an allegation of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for this question with a list of possible interested parties.</b>

### **The Proper Authorities for Chapter Members (WH4b)**

Advisors need to know who the undergraduate members should be in contact with on a regular basis both to help when an incident occurs and to prevent incidents from occurring altogether. In many cases, these are the same individuals or institutions that advisors need to know.



## Document analysis

The module on keeping members safe includes a link to an event planning form that is required by the undergraduate members to complete before hosting an event. Part of the event planning form is a link to the crisis management plan put out by the national organization. The crisis management plan provides contact information for various people to contact in the event of a violation. Table 4.13 lists the findings of this document analysis as they pertain to WH4b.

## Participant observation

The crisis management plan is buried within the module and not obvious. The plan is intended for undergraduate members to use so that would explain why it is not a priority for the advisor completing the training. However, the advisor should know the plan exists so that he can adequately prepare the chapter members in the event of a crisis. Table 4.13 lists the findings of this participant observation as they pertain to WH4b.

## Level of Support

Due to the existence of the crisis management plan the level of support under document analysis is strong. However, as a participant, it is difficult to find the plan without diving deep into some of the external links. Support under participant observation is limited for WH4b.

**Table 4.13**

<b>WH4b: CAB training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Document Analysis:</b>  <b>CAB training modules:</b>  1) <b>Keeping members safe</b>	<b>Does the training provide information on who to report allegations of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for this question with a list of possible interested parties.</b>
<b>Participant observation</b>	<b>How does the training address who should be notified if/when there is an allegation of the big three?</b>	<b>Strong support for this question with a list of possible interested parties.</b>

**Table 4.14**

WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge			
Sub-hypotheses	Documents analyzed	Participant observation	Overall support
WH4a: CAB training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to.	Strong	Strong	Strong
WH4b: CAB training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three.	Strong	Limited	Limited
WH2: Overall support	Strong	Limited	Limited

**Summary**

Chapter IV outlines all of the results of the research performed under this project. Based on the documents analyzed there are many things this fraternity can be proud of in its CAB training modules. In some cases, as a participant, the level of support is higher because the participant is able to piece together the relevant parts of the training and tie that into his own knowledge of the fraternity experience. Indeed, this training program was created by fraternity men for fraternity men.

The purpose of this research was exploratory in nature to determine whether the CAB training for this particular fraternity utilizes Lundvall's knowledge taxonomy to best create a

training program for unpaid volunteers. Chapter V goes into more detail regarding the results of this study, research limitations, and recommendations for improvement of the CAB training.

## **Chapter V: Conclusion**

This chapter summarizes the results of this research project and provides recommendations for improvement. First, there is a short discussion on the research limitations found during this project and opportunities for future research. Next, the results are summarized by working hypothesis and sub-hypothesis. Finally, the chapter concludes with an overall impression of the training program and recommendations for improvement.

### **Research Limitations**

One of the biggest limitations to this research project was the unavailability of potential survey participants. Being that this particular training program was proprietary for the fraternity, the researcher would need to obtain a list of all participants and contact them with surveys. This was discussed but since the researcher was not an alumnus of this organization the likelihood of survey compliance was quite low. The best way to obtain survey data would be for the organization to request a survey immediately following the training and make it a requirement before certification is complete. Such a survey exists but for a very different purpose than the one that is the subject of this project.

### **Future Research Opportunities**

Future research on this topic should include an expansion on the know-who portion of the analysis. There could be another working hypothesis regarding the students as the subject of the know-who element. In other words, the advisor needs to “know who” the students are in today’s society and how they think about the big three. Knowing your audience is crucial for a teacher to be effective and I think expanding on this potential topic or building off of this study in that way could be very interesting.

## **Know-What (WH1)**

The elements of know-what, as identified in the CAB training, are summarized below.

### **CAB training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three (WH1a).**

The CAB training does an excellent job at defining hazing as it is clearly defined in the organizations risk management policy. The definitions of sexual assault and alcohol abuse are less clear but easily contextualized by the participant. While sexual assault is not defined, the term consent is. *Recommendation:* Overall, the organization should endeavor to more accurately define alcohol abuse beyond it's policies which ban or limit the use of alcohol. The definition of consent is likely sufficient as a definition for sexual assault.

### **CAB training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three (WH1b).**

This was an area of weakness for the CAB training of this organization. The major federal law is Title IX. While many students have no idea what it means, it is important for advisors to know why Title IX is important and how it ties into the university system, particularly at institutions which receive public funds. Additionally, there was no mention of laws regarding hazing or alcohol abuse outside of the risk management policy. Albeit, alcohol and hazing are usually criminalized at the state, not federal level. *Recommendation:* Include a brief summary of Title IX and explain its importance.

### **CAB training provides training on the fraternity's risk management policy (WH1c).**

This was an area of great strength. The organization's risk management policy was one of the first documents for the participant to review. Throughout the CAB training, the risk

management policy was referenced indirectly but was clearly the foundation for most of the topics presented. *Recommendations*: no changes need to be made.

### **Know-How (WH2)**

#### **CAB training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership on policies regarding the big three (WH2a).**

The CAB training does not work well as a “how-to” manual for training chapter members, but it does provide ample information for the participant to know what should be relayed to the undergraduate members. Due to this dichotomy, the findings were weak in terms of document analysis but fairly strong from the standpoint of a participant. *Recommendation*: Include a more direct approach in terms of “nuts and bolts” on how advisors can instruct undergraduate members on the policies related to the big three. In other words, teach the teacher how to teach.

#### **CAB training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three (WH2b).**

The ability for an undergraduate student to identify one of the big three before it becomes a serious problem is very important. The documents provide some information on how to spark conversations on issue related to the big three as well as hypotheticals. Also, there are additional resources provided to the advisor through the training module and are available offline. However, some of these resources are buried deeply. *Recommendation*: bring to the surface some of the buried tools for advisors to use when discussing the big three with the undergraduate members. This is a relatively minor fix but may require some reformatting of the modules or a separate module altogether.

**CAB training provides training on how to manage allegations of the big three (WH2c).**

The focus here was on hazing and alcohol abuse. The theory is that any allegations of sexual assault should result in law enforcement action immediately whereas a *minor* hazing or alcohol incident could be dealt with internally. Overall, this was a strong area for the CAB training. There were many hypothetical scenarios and summaries of actual incidents for the participant to see how things should be handled. *Recommendation*: no changes required.

**Know-Why (WH3)**

**CAB training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three (WH3a).**

This was another strong area for the CAB training. There were plenty of scenarios to teach the participant why policies should be followed regarding the big three. *Recommendation*: no changes required.

**CAB training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three (WH3b).**

The organization has a Good Samaritan policy to protect members from organizational sanctions in the event the parameters of the policy are met. However, it was buried within a module. Beyond the Good Samaritan policy, there was not much to explain why an undergraduate member should self-report a violation, only that they should not commit a violation to begin with. *Recommendation*: bring the Good Samaritan policy to the surface and expand on the rationale behind self-reporting and early help as a tool to prevent the big three.

#### **Know-Who (WH4)**

**CAB training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to (WH4a).**

This was another area that found strong support within the CAB training. The training emphasized the importance of advisors working with campus partners and listed numerous positions and offices that are found on almost all campuses across the country. The training encourages the advisor to cultivate relationships with these individuals and offices to help prevent incidents from occurring and keep small issues from becoming bigger ones. *Recommendation:* no changes required.

**CAB training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to (WH4b).**

This area was another example of a hidden document buried within a link to the training. The crisis management plan referenced the findings of this working hypothesis was very difficult to find. The plan outlines who the undergraduate members should communicate with in the event of a violation. There is also the overall assumption that the undergraduates will communicate with the CAB. *Recommendation:* emphasize the crisis management plan by bringing it to the surface of one of the modules.



**Table 5.1 Research Evidence and Recommendations**

<b>WH1: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-What Knowledge</b>				
	Document Analysis	Participant Observation	Overall Support	Recommendations
<b>WH1a: CAB training provides training on the broad definitions of the big three.</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	Overall, the organization should endeavor to more accurately define alcohol abuse beyond its policies which ban or limit the use of alcohol. The definition of consent is likely sufficient as a definition for sexual assault.
<b>WH1b: CAB training provides training on federal laws regarding the big three.</b>	Weak	Weak	Weak	Include a brief summary of Title IX and explain its importance.
<b>WH1c: CAB training provides training on the fraternity’s risk management policy.</b>	Strong	Strong	Strong	None.
<b>WH1: Overall Support</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	
<b>WH2: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-How Knowledge</b>				
	Document Analysis	Participant Observation	Overall Support	Recommendations
<b>WH2a: CAB training provides training on how to instruct chapter membership on policies to prevent the big three.</b>	Weak	Strong	Limited	Include a more direct approach in terms of “nuts and bolts” on how advisors can instruct undergraduate members on the policies related to the big three. In other words, teach the teacher how to teach.
<b>WH2b: CAB training provides training on how to ensure members identify and report the big three.</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	Bring to the surface some of the buried tools for advisors to use when discussing the big three with the undergraduate members. This is a relatively minor fix but may require some reformatting of the modules or a separate module altogether.
<b>WH2c: CAB training provides training on how to</b>	Strong	Strong	Strong	None.

manage allegations of the big three.				
<b>WH2: Overall Support</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	
<b>WH3: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Why Knowledge</b>				
	Document Analysis	Participant Observation	Overall Support	Recommendations
<b>WH3a: CAB training provides training on why chapter members should follow policies regarding the big three.</b>	Strong	Strong	Strong	None.
<b>WH3b: CAB training provides training on why chapter members should self-report allegations of the big three.</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	Bring the Good Samaritan policy to the surface and expand on the rationale behind self-reporting and early help as a tool to prevent the big three.
<b>WH3: Overall Support</b>	Limited	Limited	Limited	
<b>WH4: Advisory Board Training Incorporates Know-Who Knowledge</b>				
	Document Analysis	Participant Observation	Overall Support	Recommendations
<b>WH4a: CAB training provides training on who advisors should report allegations of the big three to.</b>	Strong	Strong	Strong	None.
<b>WH4b: CAB training provides training on who the undergraduate members should report allegations of the big three to.</b>	Strong	Limited	Limited	Emphasize the crisis management plan by bringing it to the surface of one of the modules.
<b>WH4: Overall Support</b>	Strong	Limited	Limited	

The reoccurring issues seem to be fleshing out some of the important information that was buried within a link or sometimes a link within a link to content outside of the training. Most participants will not spend much time exploring all of the links and sub-links so some very important information may be missed by the casual participant. There definitely needs to be a discussion on the inclusion of Title IX into one of the training modules. The law is too important not to include as it provides a rationale for why many public universities do the things they do when it comes to sexual assault allegations.

Overall, the research evidence suggests that the CAB training for this organization is fairly robust. There are some areas for improvement but that is to be expected. Given that this is such a unique type of training coupled with a lack of available examples, I think this organization should be very proud of what they have generated through the dedication of volunteers and staff members from within the organization. To those interested parties reading this: Good job!

## References

- Allan, E.J., & Madden, M. (2008). *Hazing in view: College Students at Risk. Initial findings from the national study of student hazing*. Paper presented March 11th, 2008. College of Education and Human Development, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
- Allan, E.J. & Madden, M. (2012). The nature and extent of college student hazing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medical Health, 24(1)*, 83-90.
- Anderson, K. M. & Danis, F. S. (2007). Collegiate Sororities and Dating Violence: An Exploratory Study of Informal and Formal Helping Strategies. *Violence Against Women, 13(1)*, 87-100.
- Armstrong, E., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual Assault on Campus: A Multilevel, Integrative Approach to Party Rape. *Social Problems, 53(4)*, 483-499.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bohmer, C. & Parrot, A. (1993). *Sexual Assault on Campus: The Problem and the Solution*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2)*, 27-40.
- Canan, S. N., Jozkowski, K. N., & Crawford, B. L. (2018). Sexual Assault Supportive Attitudes: Rape Myth Acceptance and Token Resistance in Greek and Non-Greek College Students From Two University Samples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33(22)*, 3502-3530.
- Choate, L. H. (2003). Sexual Assault Prevention Programs for College Men: An Exploratory Evaluation of the Men Against Violence Model. *Journal of College Counseling, 6(2)*, 166-176.
- DeBard, R. & Sacks, C. (2010). Fraternity/Sorority Membership: Good News About First-Year Impact. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 5(1)*, 12-23.
- Dick, K., Ziering, A., & Matthiessen, C. (2016). *The Hunting Ground: The Inside Story of Sexual Assault on American College Campuses*. New York, NY: Hot Books.
- Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1688 (2012).
- Enos, T. & Pittayathikhun, T. (1996). Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention: A Bulletin for Fraternity and Sorority Advisors. *Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Education Development Center, 96(5)*.

- Flanagan, C. (2017). Death at a Penn State Fraternity. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/11/a-death-at-penn-state/540657/>
- Flanagan, C. (2014). The Dark Power of Fraternities. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/03/the-dark-power-of-fraternities/357580/>
- Foubert, J. D., Brosi, M. W. & Bannon, R. S. (2011). Pornography Viewing among Fraternity Men: Effects on Bystander Intervention, Rape Myth Acceptance and Behavioral Intent to Commit Sexual Assault. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 18, 212-231.
- Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual Assault on the College Campus: Fraternity Affiliation, Male Peer Support, and Low Self-Control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(11), 1457-1480.
- Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Art. 43.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual Assault and Harassment: A Campus Community Case Study. *Signs* 8(2), 296-319.
- Lundvall, B.-Å and Johnson, B. (1994). The Learning Economy. *Journal of Industry Studies*, 1(2), 23-42.
- Lundvall, B.-Å and Johnson, B. (2001). Why all this fuss about codified and tacit knowledge? *Journal of Industry Studies*, 12(4), 1-20.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (2006). Knowledge Management in the Learning Economy. *DRUID Working Papers 06-06*.
- Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., Asel, A. M., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). New Evidence on the Effects of Fraternity and Sorority Affiliation During the First Year of College. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(5), 543-559.
- Nelson, S. and Engstrom, C. M. (2013). Fraternity Influences on Binge Drinking and Grade Point Averages. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 50(4), 393-415.
- Paterson, B. (2013). Collaboration Between Fraternal Organizations and Colleges and Universities in Addressing Student Conduct Issues. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 8(1), 48-69.
- Perkins, H. W. (2002). Social Norms and the Prevention of Alcohol Misuse in Collegiate Contexts. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 164-172.
- Richardson, B. K., Wang, Z., & Hall, C. A. (2012). Blowing the Whistle Against Greek Hazing: The Theory of Reasoned Action as a Framework for Reporting Intentions. *Communication Studies*, 63(2), 172-193.

- Rios, J. N. (2014). A case study in promising practices in anti-hazing education training for fraternity advisors. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*.
- Rosenberg, S. & Mosca, J. (2016). Risk Management In College Fraternities: Guidance From Two Faculty Advisors. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 9(1)*, 7-14.
- Ruiz, V. (2010). A Knowledge Taxonomy for Army Intelligence Training: An Assessment of the Military Intelligence Basic Officer Leaders Course Using Lundvall's Knowledge Taxonomy. *Applied Research Project*.
- Salinas, C., Boettcher, M., & Plagman-Galvin, J. (2018). A Document Analysis of Anti-Hazing Policy. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 13(1)*. 32-50.
- Silbaugh, K. (2015). Reactive to Proactive: Title IX's Unrealized Capacity to Prevent Campus Sexual Assault. *Boston University Law Review, 95(3)*, 1049-1076.
- Singleton, R. A. (2007). Collegiate Alcohol Consumption and Academic Performance. *Journal on Studies of Alcohol and Drugs*
- Schwartz, M. D. & DeKeserdy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual Assault on the College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support*. Thousand Oaks, California, United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Swift, J. T. (2010). Exploring Capital Metro's Sexual Harassment Training using Dr. Bengt-Ake Lundvall's taxonomy of knowledge principles. *Applied Research Project*.
- Tribbensee, N. E. (2004). Faculty Adviser, Beware: You May Be Liable. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Legal Issues, 50(42)*, B11.
- Yan, H. & Burnside, T. (2018). Ex-Baylor frat president indicted on 4 counts of sex assault won't go to prison. CNN. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/12/11/us/baylor-ex-frat-president-rape-allegation/index.html>