* (Armstrong, Hamilton, and Sweeney 2006)
  + Type: Descriptive
  + Main Study: Data is from a study of college life at large midwestern university involving nine months of observation of a women’s floor in a party dorm and in-depth interview with 42 residents, and 16 group interviews.
  + Main Finding: Show that sexual assault is a predictable outcome.
  + Secondary facts: Fraternities offer the most reliable and private source of alcohol for first-year students excluded from bars and parties because of age and social networks. Fraternities control every aspect of parties at their hosues: themes, music, transportation, admission, access to alcohol, and movement of guests. Fraternities police the door of their parties, allowing in desirable guests (first-year women) and turning away others (unaffliliated men). The promise of more or better alcohol was often used to lure women into private spaces of fraternities
  + Downfalls: only at one school. Descriptive evidence. Small sample. Only looked at “party dorm” people whose opinions and experiences vary greatly from other college kids.
* (Seabrook and Ward 2019)
  + Type: Descriptive/small random experiment
  + Main Study: Undergraduates were randomly assigned at one university. Pooled from undergraduate psychology. 408 total. Treatment is whether fraternity information is given or not given when telling a story of sexual assault. Finds that fraternity members are seen as less guilty and victims as more culpable when perpetrator was a fraternity member. Large part of sample (28%) from fraternity or sorority.
  + Downfalls: Small sample in which a large portion of the sample comes from a fraternity or sorority. This would make sense that fraternity and sorority members see their own as less culpable. While they control for Greek affiliation for women, they do not for men. Just one university.
* (Pike 2000)
  + Type: Descriptive
  + Main Study:
  + Data: Uses the 1997 MU Freshman Survey. Sample population is first-time college students living on campus or in Greek housing. No international students. 31% response rate, 827 students. No compensation.
* (Rooney and Smith 2019)
  + Type: Economic/Causal
  + Main Study: How do college scandals affect outcomes? Scandals look at include sexual assaults, murders, hazing, and cheating. Murders and sexual assault make up 70% of the sample treatments. New York Times citations serves as a proxy for size of national media coverage. Find no effects on competitiveness, no effects on donations.
  + Data: Constructed a large data set of top 100 US universities from 2001-2013. Find that scandals with significant media coverage substantially reduce applications (10%).
  + Downfalls: Only looks at top 100 universities. Can’t look at effects of “snowballing”. For instance, scandals tend to get bigger and more salient as time goes on. While they look at persistent effects (no effects after 2 years), they can’t find the effects of scandals getting larger and larger.
* (Williams, Powell, and Wechsler 2003)
  + Type: Economic/Causal
  + Main Study: Use the Harvard College Alcohol Study which samples 3 times in the 1990s. Use the full price of alcohol as an instrument for drinking. Finds that an extra drink on a typical drinking occasion is associated with a quarter of an hour less time spent studying per day. Students drink more as they get older up until the age of 21. They spend more hours studying as they age, and achieve a better GPA as they get older until they reach 21. Finds that alcohol reduces human capital stock as measured by GPA.
  + Insights: drinking may reduce time to study therefore affecting GPA. I don’t think this is a good paper.
* (Kremer and Levy 2008)
  + Type: Economic/Causal
  + Main Study: Uses the random assignment of roommates to estimate the effect of alcohol use among college students at a large state university. Finds effects on males. In particular, if a male was assigned a roommate that previously drank alcohol prior to college, then that male should expect to have a lower grade point average than those assigned to nondrinking roommates.
* (Liang and Huang 2008)
  + Type: Economic/Causal
  + Main Study: Uses zero tolerance laws to show that harsher punishment amounts to less drinking and driving. The control group here is older college students. Hence, comparing drinking and driving of young underage students to older college students. 26-27% reduction in probability of drinking and driving among those who reported drinking away from home.
    - Data: The College Alcohol Surveys by Harvard School of Public Health (1993, 1997, 1999). This has 119 schools and coverage of 40 states.
  + Other Results: Shows that most drinking occurs at a student’s residence, although not too different from drinking away from home.
  + Shortcomings: survey data.