Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity

In this section, I analyze three types of heterogeneous effects. First, I examine which type of triggering event of a moratorium causes the most significant decreases of offenses and find that fraternity-related deaths exhibit the strongest results for alcohol offenses. Second, I estimate the optimal length of a moratorium. While there is no clear answer to this, the estimates show that moratoriums should last at least a month to give effects. Last, I show that moratoriums are most effective when overseen by the university rather than the fraternity members themselves.

Triggering Event

As described in Section BLANK, there are several reasons why a moratorium is triggered: a fraternity-related death, a prominent sexual assault, or a behavior violation. There is little reason to expect that each of these cause similar effects. As an illustration, a death may be more salient than a behavior violation,[1] resulting in a stronger belief among fraternity members that their behaviors need to be modified. Moreover, both deaths and sexual assaults are less subjective results of risky behavior—a moratorium may seem more justified than an instance of hazing.

Figure **??** demonstrates that when a moratorium occurs due to a fraternity-related death or sexual assault, the effects of the moratorium are most prominent. Alcohol offenses decline significantly when a fraternity-related death is the triggering event. However, this may be due to a shock mechanism in which students across campus are changing their behavior in response to the death rather than the moratorium. For instance, students may be mourning the death of a student and partying behavior is reduced in response. This effect would contaminate the effect of a moratorium, as it would be unclear whether the moratorium is changing behavior or the death itself. To mitigate this issue, I include an additional 15 universities that experienced a fraternity-related death in the sample period, but *did not* undergo a moratorium.[2]. With the inclusion of these universities, alcohol offenses maintain strong and significant decreases signaling that the moratorium itself is changing behavior rather than the occurrence of a death.

Additionally, Figure **??** also shows significant decreases in sexual assaults when a triggering event involves either a sexual assault or behavior violation. However, the shortcomings of the estimations underlying these results must be carefully considered. Specifically, sexual assaults are a significantly under-reported offenses—estimates show that nearly BLANK PERCENT of sexual assaults go unreported (CITE). Because of this, sexual assaults relatively rare in police reports, thus resulting in small amounts of observations needed for identification. In addition, these estimates are based on a small subset of university (18 universities for Trigger: Behavior and 10 for Trigger: Sexual Assault). Taken together, the results indicate evidence of decreases in sexual assaults, although more evidence is needed to substantiate this claim.

Length

Each moratorium varies in its length. As shown in Table **??**, the average length of a moratorium is 63 academic calendar days, with a minimum of 6 days and a maximum of 541 days. This is a large discrepancy,

[1] Recall that a behavior violation includes hazing, offensive behavior, rule violations, and other disorderly conduct.

[2] These universities were found using Hank Nuwer's repository of hazing-related deaths in the US: https://www.hanknuwer.com/hazing-deaths/.

and to inform best practices, it is important to know which length is optimal. Short-lived moratoriums may not be effective since there is little time for behavior to change, although longer moratoriums' benefits may diminish if imposed too lengthy.

In an ideal data set, a model that shows the effects of a moratorium along each day/week of enforcement would be estimated. More specifically, the model would show an optimal number of days/weeks that produces the strongest effects. Unfortunately, it is challenging to model such regression since every moratorium has a different length; only the lengthy moratoriums will identify the later days/weeks' effect since short moratoriums will have ended. While imperfect, Figure **??**, **??**, and **??** examine such models by examining the each week of a moratorium across the sample. The figures show evidence that the largest effects for alcohol are observed in the 5th and 6th weeks of a moratorium, although it should be noted that this estimate is identified by only 27/38 universities.

In light of these previous shortcomings, I bin each moratorium into three percentiles based on length (33rd, 66th, 100th). The three percentiles correspond to 0-32, 33-57, 58-541 academic calendar days under moratorium respectively. Table **??** shows that when moratoriums are under 33 days (Panel A), there is little effect on any of the offenses. On the other hand, Panel B exhibits the strongest effects among the three quantiles. In particular, alcohol offenses decrease significantly by an approximately 32% from the mean. Notably, the magnitude of both alcohol offenses and sexual assaults are the largest among the three panels although sexual assaults are not significant. Panel C shows weaker evidence of significant decreases in alcohol offenses from the moratoriums that last between 58 and 541 days with alcohol offenses decreasing 28% from the mean. Overall, this evidence shows that moratoriums need to be implemented for at least a month's worth of academic calendar days to have effects across campus while there is evidence of diminishing returns if imposed for too long. On the contrary, short moratoriums have no effect on student behavior.

University vs. IFC

Recall that there are two sources of enactment/oversight for campus-wide moratoriums—the university itself and the university-specific IFC. In the sample, 28 of the 45 (62%) moratoriums are enacted by a university. While a university-enacted moratorium is overseen by the university, an IFC university is only overseen by the fraternity members themselves. More specifically, an IFC-enacted moratorium is purely an agreement among fraternity members to restrict behavior. Hence, there is reason to suspect differences between these two sources of jurisdiction since IFC moratoriums may lack the oversight and punitive measures that university moratoriums have. Without this additional incentive to oblige, fraternities could "look away" from the guidelines set forth by the IFC.

In Table **??** alcohol offenses are shown to significantly decline when a university imposes the moratorium as shown in Panel A. Notably, each coefficient estimate in Panel A is negative, unlike the estimates shown in Panel B . While the estimates in Panel B fail to be statistically significant, it is noted that the magnitudes of the estimates for alcohol and sexual assault offenses are similar. Despite this, the results show that universities are the best source of oversight for moratoriums rather than the fraternity members themselves.