Studies most related to mine:

* (Even and Smith 2020)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic Study
    - Uses differed recruitment as the variation to get a causal effect of Greek life on grades.
    - Grades reduce by 0.1-0.3 standard deviations attributed to Greeks
    - Greek effects are largest during the semester of pledging
    - No salary effects.
    - This is an economics study in JHR
    - Uses RD and panel methods with the minimum required GPA as the cutoff and the differed recruitment as the change.
  + Author’s position:
    - Selection into Greek organizations is definitely a problem
    - Following a chapter suspension, grades of former members rebound closer to their expected levels suggesting that suspensions may also improve academics.
    - Current dues can average near $500 per semester.
  + How does it relate?
    - Finds variation in differed recruitment. Finds a causal effect of Greek membership on GPA. Effects stronger for males.
    - Looks specifically at effects on Greek membership
  + Data used:
    - Only looks at one large university
  + Shortcomings
    - One university
    - Good academic performance data
* (P. W. Routon and Walker 2014)
  + Type: Economic – Probably the main paper in this field
  + Main Study: Uses propensity score matching to estimate the effects of Greek membership
  + Main Results:
    - Find that membership increases the likelihood of graduation on time and graduate school aspirations.
    - Finds that membership makes 14 percentage points.
    - Small negative impact on grades.
  + Data: Uses a longitudinal survey of college students from over 400 institutions.
    - Higher Education Research Institute surveys (1994-1999)
  + Fraternity members are about 14 percentage points more likely to report they drink beer “frequently” while sorority members is about 9 percent points.
  + Other Results
    - Fraternity members spend about 1.9 hours per week more than non-Greeks partying.
    - Included analysis from over 450 American colleges and universities
    - Fraternities are predominantly white, spend approximately 2 hours more per week partying, spend approximately 2 hours more per week socialization with friends, drink more, and parent’s income is higher and level of schooling is higher.
  + Downfalls:
    - Since only matches on observables, Greek membership is still not random. Lots of unobservables go into a Greek membership. Sexual desire, desire to network, desire to be loved, etc.
    - Only looks at economic and academic consequences of fraternity membership at a small North-eastern college. Very limited external validity.
    - Alumni who graduated in the 1970s make up 31% of the sample.
    - A lot of the survey required alumni to recall status’ of college attributes. For instance, self reported SAT score, self reported attractiveness level, self reported drinking habits, self-reported drinking intensity,
* Insights: drinking may reduce time to study therefore affecting GPA. I don’t think
* (Lindo et. al)
  + College partying –
  + Main results- football games more partying more sexual assault
* (“Greek Myth or Fact? The Role of Greek Houses in Alcohol and Drug Violations on American Campuses” n.d.) Manu Raghav
  + Economic/Associative, not really causal
  + Main Study: investigates the degree to which fraternities affect drug and liquor law violations across universities in the US. Finds that a larger percentage of students in fraternities is associated with an increase in the number of drug law arrests. Finds that a larger percentage of sororities is associated with an increase in the number of liquor law violations.
  + Problems with this study:
    - Uses the US News Reports which does not consider only IFC fraternities: considers multicultural and professional fraternities too which is a much different population.
    - Uses the Campus Safety and security data which is aggregated to the yearly level.
    - Cannot directly attribute the violations to fraternities/sororities.

Bigger restrictions makes less alcohol:

* (Hansen 2015)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic
    - More punitive laws on alcohol reduce peoples willingness to do it.
  + How does this relate?
    - Just further evidence on the effects of alcohol and restricting it.
* (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.

Alcohol causes bad things to happen like heath/moratality/crime:

* (Francesconi and James 2019)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic
    - Alcohol causes all sorts of problems: binge drinking increase the probability of road accidents by 18%, injury-related accident and emergency attendances by 6% and arrests by 71%.
    - Uses two-stage least squares
  + Author’s Position:
    - Alcohol causes ad things to happen. Not much else to really note in this article that is related to my work.
  + How does it relate?
    - Not very related – only on the effects of binge drinking and health effects/stupid behaviors
  + Data:
    - Health survey in England
  + Shortcomings:
* (Carpenter and Dobkin 2009)
  + Main Point:
    - Alcohol has mortality effects. Drinking is bad.
    - 9% increase in the mortality rate at age 21.
      * This is from alcohol overdose, drunk driving, and suicides.
  + How does it relate?
    - Effects of alcohol and why it’s bad/why we care about alcohol.
* (Carpenter and Dobkin 2017)
  + Main Point:
    - Alcohol increases emergency room visits:
      * These are due to people getting injuries from others, alcohol overdoses, and accidental injuries
  + Author’s Position:
    - Restricting alcohol is good. We should do it more.
  + How does it relate?
    - Restricting alcohol has many benefits.
    - Alcohol is bad. This is why we care about alcohol.
* (Carpenter and Dobkin 2015)
  + Main Point:
    - Alcohol causes increases in propensity to commit crimes:
      * Mostly in the form of assaults/nuisance crimes/alcohol offenses.
      * Modest increase in arrests from property crimes – so maybe not the best placebo
      * Modest increase in arrests for sale or usage of illegal drugs
  + How does this relate?
    - Could be evidence that property crime shouldn’t decrease (e.g. no noticeable difference between robberies and burglaries)

Alcohol effects academic performance:

* (Carrell, Hoekstra, and West 2011)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic
    - Drinking impairs college performance in terms of grade point average – highest performing students are the most affected.
* (Ha and Smith 2019)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic
    - Alcohol affects college performance – it affects those who didn’t have access to underage drinking the most (e.g. not fraternity members).

Peer effects of alcohol

* (Fletcher 2012)
  + Main Point:
    - Economic
    - Peers influence alcoholic behavior. Nothing new here
  + How does this relate?
    - Most just an effect of why we might expect fraternity parties being banned to decrease alcohol offenses.

Effects of Drugs:

* (Marie and Zölitz 2017)
  + Main Point:
    - Finds that legal cannabis access affects student performance.
      * Grade improvements are driven by younger students and effects are stronger for women and low performers.
        + Performance improvements stronger in courses that require mathematic/numerical skills
      * Driven by improved understanding using course evaluations
  + Author’s Position:
    - Limiting cannabis buying/access improves grades.
  + How does it relate?
    - Mostly a tertiary relation as a reason why we care about drug offenses.
  + Data:
  + Shortcomings:
    - Study was in the Netherlands so not sure if it applies to the US

Fraternity literature

Fraternity membership on grades/graduation:

* (Mara, Davis, and Schmidt 2018)
  + Type: Economic
    - This study has a nice lit review to steal
  + Main Study: Causal effect of fraternity membership on college grades and future income levels by exploiting time variation in college’s social and residential environment. Use presence of theme houses and non-Greek social houses and the presence of female students on campus to instrument for Greek membership.
  + Data:
    - Alumni survey administered in fall 2009. Restricts survey to men who are currently employed full time. 1600 observations over 40 years.
  + Main Results:
    - Fraternities lower grade point average by approximately .25 points on the traditional 4-point scale
    - Raises future income by approximately 36%
  + Downfalls:

Fraternities and sexual assault

* (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.

Fraternity parties and drinking:

* (Glindemann et al. 2007)
  + Type: Control trial
  + Main Study: Took 702 university students attending one of 12 fraternity parties. The parties were held by six fraternities each hosting two parties. BAC levels were assessed using breathalyzers. Flyers for a raffle to win $100 if below the BAC were given out.
    - Treatment: if BAC is below .05 then you get a raffle chance for $100
      * Control: If you decide to take a BAC test, you get a change.
  + Main Results:
    - Those in the treatment group had mean BAC levels significantly lower than at the baseline parties (~20%) difference. And percentage of partygoers with a BAC below 0.08 was significantly higher at the intervention parties by 10%.
  + Shortcomings: researchers were in the party physically, thus changing the surroundings.
    - Researchers physically tested them at the party, asked questions at the party – thus we’re getting a super selective sample here