The Consequences of Faculty Sexual Misconduct

Sarah R. Cohodes*
University of Michigan and NBER

Katherine B. Leu
University of Michigan

April 13, 2026

Abstract

Faculty sexual misconduct targeted at students is a widespread problem. The consequences of such incidents include direct harm to victims and may also entail a loss to science if students who encounter misconduct become discouraged from continuing their studies in their chosen field. We link publicly available information on degree completion by institution, academic field, and gender to a database of faculty sexual misconduct incidents verified in the media or court cases covering the years from 1983 to 2023. Then, we employ a stacked event study approach to document the extent to which publicly reported faculty sexual misconduct decreases in-field degree completion. Exposure to a field-specific faculty sexual misconduct public report decreases degree completion in that field by 4.7 percent four years after the incident. This decline is driven by reports occurring in 2015 and after, among which we observe a 7.9 percent decline in in-field degree completion. Students exit majors dominated by men, but this shift has little effect on predicted earnings because students shift away from both high- and low-earning majors.

*Cohodes: University of Michigan Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy and NBER (email: scohodes@umich.edu); Leu: University of Michigan Department of Sociology (email: kleu@umich.edu). We extend special thanks to Elizabeth Armstrong, Anna Neumann, and Aaron Pallas for feedback on this project. Basit Zafar, Louis-Pierre LePage, John Conzelmann, Samantha Eyler-Driscoll and seminar participants at Aarhus University, AEFP, BYU, and the University of Michigan provided helpful comments. Rochelle Ballantyne and Abigail Slovick provided excellent research assistance. Cohodes's contribution to the preparation of this manuscript was funded by a grant from the Research Council of Norway, Project Number 325245 and by a Fellowship at the Opportunity & Inclusive Growth Institute at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank. Leu was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education, through award number R305B200011 to the University of Michigan. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the Institute of Education Sciences, the US Department of Education, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, or the Federal Reserve System.

When a man gets #MeToo'd—which is to say, when a man experiences the consequences of his offenses against women—a predictable cry emerges from the predictable corners of the internet: What about his art? What about the jokes he'll never tell; what about the books he won't write; what about the films we'll never get to see?

These fans don't ask about the women who've been sidelined or silenced or who have abandoned their chosen fields. What about the jokes we'll never hear...? What about the documentaries we'll never see...? And what about the would-be comedians or actors or writers or journalists who were raped or assaulted as young women, and who were stopped before they got started, silenced before they could speak?

– Jennifer Weiner, *New York Times Book Review*, October 13, 2019[1]

1 Faculty Sexual Misconduct and Its Consequences

Faculty sexual misconduct targeted at students is a widespread problem. Several survey-based assessments of the incidence of sexual harassment in academia, including the fields of anthropology, social work, and archaeology, have found high levels of misconduct, primarily targeted at women and trainees (Clancy et al., 2014; Moylan and Wood, 2016; Meyers et al., 2018). Those working at training sites and field placements are especially vulnerable to misconduct. In a recent survey of 33 college campuses, 19 percent of students reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment, and faculty perpetrators accounted for 11 percent of these incidents (Cantor et al., 2019). The problem is particularly acute for women graduate students—among women graduate students in the sciences, rates of experiencing harassment by faculty range from 20 to 50 percent (National Academies of Sciences and Medicine, 2018). A broad, systematic review of evidence from across the globe finds that sexual misconduct in higher education is widespread, with women facing high rates of sexual harassment across time and locations (Bondestam and Lundqvist, 2020).

The consequences of such incidents include the mental anguish and, in some cases, physical harm, experienced by the victims. However, they also entail a loss to science if students who encounter misconduct become discouraged from continuing their studies in their chosen field. This effect can be both direct—when students subjected to harassment leave the field or institution—and indirect—when students leave or never enter a discipline to avoid the possibility of mistreatment, out of fear of reputational consequences,

[1]This quotation comes from Jennifer Weiner's review of Chanel Miller's memoir, *Know My Name*, about surviving sexual assault by a Stanford University student.

or because they are concerned that the faculty member's gender-based misconduct foreshadows a career trajectory filled with sexual harassment.

Measuring the direct effects of faculty sexual misconduct would require identifying victims and following them over time in a process similar to that in McLaughlin et al.'s (2017) survey-based investigation of workplace sexual harassment, which finds that experiencing workplace harassment increases financial instability and the likelihood of changing jobs. Using linked Finnish administrative data, Adams-Prassl et al. (2024) investigate a similar question but overcome the need for survey data by using criminal violence and comprehensive data typically available only for European countries. In the case of academic sexual harassment in the United States, an individual-level analysis poses several challenges. First, the appropriate data likely do not exist. Because many victimized students are anonymous in news reports, identifying the victims and matching them to individual-level data not only would raise serious privacy concerns but also would likely prove impossible. Anonymous surveys often ask about experiences of faculty sexual misconduct but do not include longitudinal information on college progress, major, occupation, or earnings. Second, identifying an appropriate comparison group is difficult. Finally, studying only the individuals who have directly experienced harassment may *underestimate* the impact of faculty gender-based misconduct by not showing the discouragement and spillover effects on others in the field.

To overcome these constraints, this paper broadens the definition of the consequences of faculty sexual misconduct by including not only direct harm to the victim but also discouragement of others in the field. To do so, we focus on public reports of faculty sexual misconduct. Becoming aware of faculty gender-based misconduct in one's academic field can lead students to change fields for several reasons: Students may be concerned that they will be harassed by the offending faculty member or others in the future. Students may have few means to protest the situation other than leaving the department. Students may also view a publicly known incident of faculty sexual misconduct as representative of an academic field and careers associated with that field and thus choose to leave to avoid such conduct. Students may also wish to avoid an academic department with a bad reputation. Research shows that exposure to gender-biased teachers earlier in the educational career—in primary school—has long-term impacts on students' likelihood of enrolling in advanced math and science courses in high school (Lavy and Sand, 2018). Alternatively, exposure to sexual harassment may cause some students to redouble their efforts in their field to defy expectations. This

paper measures the overall response to public reports of faculty gender-based misconduct on in-field degree completion.

The impact of changing majors can be substantial. Changing academic fields potentially increases time to degree and thus the costs of higher education and can decrease the likelihood of degree completion (Yue and Fu, 2017; Liu et al., 2021). Shifting majors may also change career outcomes, which could exacerbate gender differences in earnings. While gender segregation within majors has decreased over time, gender differences in chosen academic field continue to contribute to occupational segregation and earnings differentials (Shauman, 2016; Sloane et al., 2019; Zheng and Weeden, 2023). Faculty sexual misconduct may contribute to academic field-based gender segregation if, for example, a report of a faculty gender-based misconduct incident in history shifted men toward economics majors (a field dominated by men) and women toward education (a field dominated by women). Thus, an academic field change, especially one that aligns with gendered norms, can exacerbate wage differentials between men and women. Students who change majors generally move to more gender-segregated fields (Astorne-Figari and Speer, 2019), and women's anticipation of workplace discrimination, including sexual harassment, influences their major choice (Lepage et al., 2025).

To our knowledge, no academic research has measured the response to reports of faculty sexual misconduct for in-field degree completion. To do so, we use a stacked event study approach that exploits variation in the timing and location of misconduct reports to understand to what extent reported faculty sexual misconduct affects in-field degree completion and whether the response differs by time and gender. Specifically, we analyze in-field degree completion using two linked data sets: publicly available information on degree completion by institution, academic field, and gender and a database of faculty sexual misconduct incidents verified in the media or court cases. The event study approach accounts for trends in degree completion by institution, academic field, and over time. Constructing a comparison group for each report of an incident and stacking the resultant datasets prevents bias from heterogeneity in exposure response over time. Additionally, by linking majors and institutions to information on field-specific earnings, we estimate how shifts in major could affect earnings.

We find that exposure to reports of faculty sexual misconduct does little to change institution-level outcomes such as application or enrollment, consistent with the findings from Rooney and Smith (2019).

However, this lack of an institution-level response disguises a *within*-institution response. Students exit the focal major with a decline of 4.7 percent of field-specific degrees in that institution, which is statistically significant at the 10 percent level. The impact of reported misconduct exposure is more apparent when the sample is split between early reports (1983–2014) and recent reports (those occurring in 2015–2023), where 2015 approximately corresponds to the rise of the #MeToo movement (in 2017). Students in the latter subsample are 7.9 percent less likely to have completed a degree in the focal major.

In the recent time period with the large shift away from the focal major, degree completion in majors dominated by men declines post-exposure by 3.9 percentage points, driven by larger changes among men. However, the shift in major has little impact on predicted earnings, as measured by major-specific lifetime earnings (Webber, 2018) or major×institution-specific 5-year postgraduation earnings from the College Scorecard. This is because students shift out of both high-paying (STEM) and low-paying (arts) academic fields. The shift out of high-earning fields is consistent with students being willing to accept a compensating differential for lower pay in the form of anticipated safety. The shift out of arts implies that students are also willing to give up creative pursuits for anticipated safety.

This paper contributes to our understanding of how sexual misconduct affects higher education. Most related research focuses on either institution-related outcomes or the impact on faculty perpetrators. Campus "scandals" that include this type of misconduct and other incidents appear to have a short-lived impact on institutional outcomes: Rooney and Smith (2019) show that at the top 100 institutions, highly publicized scandals, including sexual assaults, murders, cheating, and hazing, reduce the number of applications to that institution for two years, after which the impact disappears. Further, the authors find that these scandals have no impact on enrollment, yield, academic credentials of the incoming class, or donations. In their examination of the response to Title IX cases (most of which investigate student-to-student gender-based misconduct), which became more prominent between 2011 and 2017 because of a policy change at the US Department of Education, Lindo et al. (2019) find that application and enrollment *increase* after a scandal, an unexpected pattern that they attribute to the idea that "any press is good press." However, both of these papers focus on the *institutional* level, where we cannot observe one main margin along which individual students potentially react to reports of faculty gender-based misconduct: namely, by shifting out of academic fields with publicly known perpetrators and into other fields. Other related work uses the same academic

misconduct data to understand the impacts on the faculty perpetrators and downstream effects on science, finding that senior scholars are less likely to suffer employment consequences than more junior faculty (Jogani and Ruiz Sanchez, 2023; Shin and Park, 0) and that perpetrators' work is less cited after the incident (Widmann et al., 2025). In this paper, we refocus the investigation of "scandal" responses by examining field-specific consequences for *students*, a shift that allows more thorough consideration of the potential for reported misconduct to negatively affect students in the long run.

More broadly, this paper also contributes to our understanding of sexual misconduct in society as a whole. Most of the relevant evidence comes from the workplace, and recent attention to the problem of sexual misconduct in the #MeToo era has both drawn attention to the problem and tendered potential solutions. Exposure to hostile work environments decreases women's wages in Europe (Zacchia and Zuazu, 2023). At the extreme end, workplace harassment can become violence between coworkers. Adams-Prassl et al. (2024) use Finnish data to find that such incidents have negative employment and earnings consequences for both victim and perpetrator, though victims are likelier to be unemployed, especially when the incident involves violence by a man against a woman. Even before harassment occurs, it can deter gender-minority individuals from entering workplaces dominated by the opposite gender (Folke and Rickne, 2022) or, in some settings, entering the workforce at all (Chakraborty and Lohawala, 2021). Beyond the impacts on individuals, firms with high levels of sexual harassment have lower stock value (Cici et al., 2021); this effect spills over to industry peers but can be mitigated if the affected firms respond to the misconduct (Abeysekera and Fernando, 2024). Overall, this evidence shows that sexual harassment is widespread in the workplace, pervading almost all aspects of work life. It worsens labor market outcomes for affected individuals and lowers the value of firms. As considered here in terms of the deterrent effect in academic field, it has the potential to contribute to occupational gender segregation.

However, there is hope that greater awareness and reporting can address these harms. Policy responses can increase reporting (Cheng and Hsiaw, 2022). Following the #MeToo movement, sex crime reporting increased in locations where the movement was particularly salient (Chen and Long, 2024). In turn, reducing the threat of sexual harassment increases productivity. Female mutual fund managers were more productive after the Harvey Weinstein scandal reduced the threat of sexual harassment (Cici et al., 2021). Our work here highlights the urgency of addressing and condemning this type of misconduct.

Finally, we add to the literature on major choice in college.[2] Choice of major is consequential (Lovenheim and Smith, 2023), with regression discontinuity evidence from Chile and Norway, where students choose their major at college application, showing differences in earnings (Hastings et al., 2013; Kirkeboen et al., 2016). In the US, when spots in economics and business majors are allocated by grade cutoffs, there are also substantial earnings differences by field (Bleemer and Mehta, 2022; Andrews et al., 2024). Survey and experimental research finds that college major choice is shaped by expected earnings and self-perception of ability but that a large share is due to "tastes," such as enjoyment of coursework in college or expectations around job conditions (Arcidiacono, 2004; Zafar, 2011; Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, 2014; Wiswall and Zafar, 2015). These tastes can be shaped by college experiences such as coursework (Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, 2014; Fricke et al., 2018; Patterson et al., 2023), grades (Arcidiacono et al., 2012; Astorne-Figari and Speer, 2019; Kugler et al., 2021; Li and Xia, 2024), role models (Carrell et al., 2010; Abeysekera and Fernando, 2024; Patnaik et al., 2024), peer composition (Lyle, 2007; Ersoy and Speer, 2025; Anelli et al., 2023), price (Patnaik, 2021), and timing of major declaration (Li, 2025). Relevant qualitative research finds that the culture within academic departments shapes students' persistence in these majors (Seymour and Hewitt, 1997; Blair-Loy and Cech, 2022). Consistent with this research, our paper contributes to the literature on major choice by showing how experiences with sexual harassment within a department, whether direct or indirect, influence students' major choices. There is also evidence that women in male-dominated computer science and engineering majors disproportionately regret their major choices (VanHeuvelen et al., 2026). Closely related to the ideas in this paper is Lepage et al. (2025), which shows that women's anticipation of gender-based hostility influences their major choices.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the data, and Section 3 explains the stacked event study design. Results are reported in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

[2]Two recent overviews on this topic are Patnaik et al. (2021) and Conzelmann et al. (2025).

2 Data

2.1 Institutions

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (US Department of Education) collects information from postsecondary institutions in the United States on degrees granted, admissions, enrollment, and institutional characteristics. We use the Urban Institute's Education Data Portal to access the IPEDS data (Urban Institute, Urban Institute). IPEDS reports degrees awarded by institution, degree, gender, and academic field for 1983/84–2023/24. In addition, there are IPEDS data on number of applications, number of admitted students, and enrollment. Academic fields (majors) are coded by a Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code, which changes over time in the IPEDS data. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) provides CIP crosswalk files, which we use to categorize majors into 47 groups. For example, a student can major in a specific field such as "European history" (CIP code: 54.0103). These majors are assigned to their "CIP family" (in this case, history, 54). We group majors together in this way as different institutions have different norms about how they categorize a degree completion. Some use the detailed CIP code, some the broader code, and some change over time. Since the broader code encompasses all cases, we use it here. There are 40 out of 47 major-categories associated with our source of incidents that meet our sample criteria, discussed below.

2.2 Incidents

Any accounting of faculty sexual harassment and other offenses will underestimate the true incidence of misconduct. For every case that is publicly known, there are likely others settled quietly with no media attention and many more that are never reported. A formal catalog of such incidents will therefore represent only the "tip of the iceberg" (Cantalupo and Kidder, 2018a) of gender-based misconduct. Further, our comparison group here will not comprise only sites with no incidents but will (most likely) also include sites with nonpublic and unreported incidents. However, the use of publicly known incidents is appropriate because students must be aware of the misconduct to respond by switching fields of study or institutions.[3]

[3]Degree completions in comparison departments without a public report may still be influenced by faculty sexual misconduct if non-public information made known via whisper networks influenced degree completion in these fields. However, since our estimand captures the response to public reports of misconduct, the potential of whisper networks to influence comparison units is

The Academic Sexual Misconduct Database (ASMD) (Libarkin, 2025) catalogs publicly confirmed incidents of faculty sexual misconduct and has been used in legal research (Cantalupo and Kidder, 2018a) and studies of the impact of faculty sexual misconduct on perpetrators (Jogani and Ruiz Sanchez, 2023; Widmann et al., 2025). Initially developed as an anecdotal repository of academic sexual misconduct, since 2016, the ASMD has evolved into a systematic catalog of publicly known, verified incidents generated via weekly web searches. Cases are identified by means of a standardized internet search protocol.[4] To be included, the incidents must be documented in news articles or legal materials and must involve college or university faculty, administrators, researchers, or others in a supervisory position engaging in "sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual misconduct, stalking, violations of dating policies, violations of campus pornography policies, and similar violations." Cases that involve accusations but not evidence are excluded. Qualifying evidence includes an institution's having found the perpetrator guilty of one of the above acts or fired him or her for such an act, the perpetrator's having admitted to the misconduct or resigned or died before the completion of an investigation, a legal settlement between an institution or perpetrator and an accuser, or a court finding or other documentation (such as electronic communication) showing that misconduct took place.

Research assistants for this project further verified and augmented the ASMD data. Specifically, they conducted Google and LexisNexis searches following the same criteria as ASMD, verifying and correcting the information in ASMD and collecting additional information: date of the article/court case; date of the incident, if known; gender of perpetrator and victim(s); student status of victim(s) (undergraduate or graduate); and amount of news coverage. This verification proved important both to double-check the data and to obtain the year the first article about the incident was published. This is necessary as students must be aware of an incident to respond to it; thus, we use the year of the first article on the incident as the event year. To harmonize the ASMD information with the academic year, we assign articles from prior to July in a calendar year to the original calendar year and articles from July and after to the subsequent year.[5]

wrapped up in the definition of the comparison: we are comparing departments with a public report to those with no public report, regardless of whether misconduct occurred in non-reporting comparison departments. We consider the role of whisper networks in the *treated* departments in Section 4.3.

[4]Details of the protocol are documented at `https://academic-sexual-misconduct-database.org/node/744`.

[5]Since the Urban Institute version of IPEDS assigns the observation year according to the year of the fall term, the article will match the year of the fall term before the first opportunity to graduate the subsequent spring.

As of August 22, 2024, the ASMD included 1,254 academic sexual misconduct incidents from the 1970s to the present. We restrict the sample to faculty-perpetrator cases with student victims at four-year public or nonprofit institutions that can be matched to undergraduate fields of study in IPEDS. This results in a sample of 443 reported incidents (see Table 1 for details). Specifically, to include an ASMD incident in this analysis, we include only cases that involve a faculty member as the perpetrator since these can be associated with an academic field, which reduces the sample to 843. Restricting to cases that happened in 1983 and after (college degree information is available for years from 1983/84) and 2023 and prior (the most recent year of college degree completion data is 2023/24) further reduces the sample to 816. We can successfully match to an academic field in 766 cases. Eliminating duplicates by year, institution, and academic field yields 733 incidents. Limiting to four-year institutions that are public or nonprofit schools (excluding for-profits) reduces the sample to 671 cases, and limiting these cases to those with student victims (as opposed to faculty or staff) results in 555 incidents. Of these, 443 match to undergraduate academic fields (excluding, for example, medicine and law when offered only at the graduate level). These 443 cases and 256 institutions are the source of the faculty misconduct reported incidents considered in this paper.

2.3 Descriptive Statistics

2.3.1 Institutions

Certain institutions are likelier to have incidents reported in the ASMD. This can be seen in Table 2, which reports mean institutional characteristics from the 2010 IPEDS for all institutions (Column 1) and institutions without (Column 2) and with ASMD incidents (Column 3). The institutions with incidents present in the ASMD are likelier to be the most selective institutions, those that offer graduate programs, those in urban areas, those that are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and those that offer residential housing. Institutions without ASMD incidents are likelier to be private or religiously affiliated. Higher tuition is associated with having no reported incidents, and high enrollment is associated with having reported incidents. Overall, it appears that factors that increase the likelihood of faculty–student interaction (graduate programs, residential housing, enrollment) also increase the likelihood of reported incidents. This is consistent with the idea that the prevalence of incidents seems to reflect the prevalence of degree completions, as underscored by Appendix Figure A.1, which shows that the states with

the most (fewest) degree completions tend to have the most (fewest) incidents. As can be seen in Columns 4 and 5, institutions in our comparison groups are similar to the ever-report institutions in Column (3), though there are some differences. We describe the methods by which comparison institutions are selected in Section 3 below.

Appendix Table A.1, which uses institution characteristics to predict the likelihood of an institution having any reported incident (Column 1) and the year the incident was first documented (Column 2), shows that many of these institutional characteristics are predictive of an institution having an ASMD incident but few are predictive of the timing of the incident. These characteristics could be correlated with the likelihood of having an incident, the likelihood of its being reported, and the likelihood of substantiated allegations being reported in the press. Despite these associations with the likelihood of an incident being present in the ASMD, only two of these characteristics (selectivity and enrollment) are associated with incident timing.

2.3.2 Incidents

Appendix Table A.2 provides background information on the ASMD incidents. The vast majority were committed by male perpetrators (97 percent), with only 3 percent of incidents committed by female perpetrators. The overwhelming majority of victims were women (89 percent), though some of the incidents involved male victims (6 percent) and both male and female victims (4 percent). Documentation of the incidents (news reporting and/or court documents) mentioned multiple victims in 56 percent of the articles, with 44 percent of the incidents reporting a single victim. This could underestimate the likelihood that a single perpetrator had multiple victims if the perpetrators in reported incidents with a single victim had other victims whose experiences did not become public. The overwhelming prevalence of cases with a male perpetrator and female victim is consistent with workplace sexual harassment claims, with 78 percent of recent Equal Employment Opportunity Commission sexual harassment claims filed by women (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2022).

Appendix Figure A.3 further describes reported incidents' intensity, the extent to which they were covered in the news, and formal consequences for perpetrators. Among departments with reported incidents, 83 percent had a single incident reported, while 17 percent had repeated reports, including both clusters of reports within the same year and multiple reported incidents in the same department over time. 41 percent

of reports received substantial media attention, with more than 5 news articles covering the misconduct. Perpetrators experienced a variety of consequences as a result of their actions. These consequences ranged in severity from warnings to court judgments, with a small minority of perpetrators (1 percent) dying by suicide in the most extreme cases. By far the most common consequence, affecting perpetrators in 58 percent of reported incidents, was that the perpetrator(s) left their institution. The prevalence of this outcome may contribute to the phenomenon known as "passing the harasser" (Cantalupo and Kidder, 2018b).

Incident reporting has greatly increased over time, as shown in Figure 1. Panel A shows the prevalence of incidents over time for all incidents in the ASMD (light shading) and those specific to faculty (dark shading). Panels B and C reflect incidents in the analysis sample, which excludes some incidents as described above. For the period from the 1980s to about 2010, the ASMD includes approximately 5 to 10 incidents per year that meet the study criteria (Panel A). For the years after 2010, there are about 25 incidents a year, followed by an even sharper rise. The rise in the late 2010s likely reflects the #MeToo movement, which rose to great prominence after revelations of Harvey Weinstein's misconduct in October 2017. The drop-off in recent years reflects the fact the ASMD includes only "verified" incidents, so that recent cases yet to be resolved are not yet part of the data. It may also represent a return to a norm after the 2017 shock. We later split the sample between incidents from 2014 and prior and incidents from 2015 and later to capture the pre-/post-#MeToo periods. Panels B and C show that the incidents matched to the analysis samples broadly reflect the prevalence over time for the ASMD as a whole.

The reported incidents are concentrated among some majors, which may be driven by the size of the major, the likelihood of misconduct by major, and the likelihood of reporting by major. Panel D of Figure 1 shows the prevalence of reports by academic field in the analysis sample. Majors such as biology, English, and psychology are likely to have many reported incidents because of their large size. Majors such as music, theater, and anthropology have relatively high numbers of reported incidents despite being small academic fields in most institutions. This may be due to the nature of instruction in each of these fields, with opportunities for one-on-one interaction and/or interactions outside of the classroom for performances or fieldwork. Appendix Figure A.4 also shows that many of the majors with high reported incidence of sexual misconduct in this sample have relatively high shares of female students, for example music, English, and psychology, which may suggest that the gender distribution of students and faculty may play a role.

3 Empirical Framework

We use variation in *when* and *where* a report occurred to identify changes in in-field degree completion induced by knowledge of a faculty gender-based misconduct incident using an event study framework. A well-known example of faculty sexual misconduct illustrates the value of this approach. In 2014, news reports exposed the widespread mistreatment of women students in the University of Colorado philosophy department.[6] The event study approach used in this analysis compares the rate of degree completion in philosophy at UC-Boulder in the years prior to the public report (2013 and earlier) to the rate of degree completion in philosophy during and immediately after the incident. Comparing degree completion within the same field and institution across time accounts for the specific culture of the academic field and institution, while other controls account for temporal trends in degree completion in the field of philosophy. Comparing the UC-Boulder philosophy department to philosophy departments at other institutions that did not experience public reports of faculty gender-based misconduct in the philosophy field provides additional identifying variation. These institutions are limited to institutions with ASMD reports in other fields to account for selection into the ASMD. Again, additional controls account for institution-specific trends, such as the size of the philosophy department. The estimation strategy described below makes this type of comparison for every academic field$\times$year that has been the site of a publicly reported faculty sexual misconduct, averaging the changes in degree completion across each case.

The key assumption in this example, and with each case used in this analysis, is that public knowledge timing is as good as random. This seems plausible given the evidence from Appendix Table A.1 of little relationship between event timing and institution characteristics. The fact that the institutions with reported incidents are not random need not bias the estimate. Instead, other institutions need only serve as a plausible counterfactual of changes in academic fields over time; in other words, the pretreatment trends in outcomes in the treatment and comparison groups must be parallel.

We use several matching strategies to ensure comparison institutions are similar to treated institutions (see Section 4.3 for alternative comparison groups). In our preferred specification for the institution$\times$majors analysis, we define the comparison group as institution$\times$majors with a high propensity to have a reported

[6] See https://www.dailycamera.com/2014/01/31/cu-boulder-reports-pervasive-sexual-harassment-within-philosophy-department/.

incident. We estimate this propensity in the institution×major sample via a logit model with predictors for institution characteristics, size of major, growth of the major, and major fixed effects. We select as comparison departments the non-treated departments above the 95th percentile of predicted probabilities. For the institution-level sample, we use as comparisons the institutions selected in a similar propensity score process to the above, but with a logit model estimated at the institution level rather than the institution×major level and excluding the major-specific predictor variables. As can be seen in Table 2, they are not a perfect match to the institutions in the ASMD but are much more similar than the overall group of institutions that never appear in the ASMD. These are our preferred comparisons because they compare treated departments/institutions to matched never-treated units, and the comparison units are selected at the unit of analysis.

Recent work has highlighted how analytic approaches that use variation in treatment timing may be biased by differences in the response to treatment over time (Borusyak et al., 2024; Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2020; De Chaisemartin and d'Haultfoeuille, 2020; Goodman-Bacon, 2021; Roth et al., 2023; Sun and Abraham, 2021). Given the long panel employed here, this is a serious concern in our context, as it seems reasonable that responses to reports of faculty sexual misconduct may differ over time as social norms evolve. To avoid this source of bias, we trim the data for each reported incident to 8 years before and 8 years after the report, including the report year (i.e., years 0 through 7). More importantly, we estimate the event study and related summary estimates of the effect of reports of misconduct via a stacked dataset approach (Deshpande and Li, 2019; Cengiz et al., 2019; Wing et al., 2024).

Specifically, for each reported incident, we generate a dataset made up of the institution×major of the focal reported incident, the not-yet-treated institution×academic field in the same major, and the never-treated institutions×major in the focal major from the high-propensity comparison group, all covering only the relevant (trimmed) years.[7] This allows us to restrict the comparisons between the treated institution×academic fields to "clean" comparisons within the same academic field that will not introduce bias due to heterogeneity in the treatment response.[8] In addition to reducing potential bias due to treatment heterogeneity, this approach has the benefit of clearly specifying the comparisons for each reported incident.

[7]It is possible to create stacks for each year×major level, but this makes it difficult to consider heterogeneity by incident or institution characteristics.

[8]There are a number of other approaches to restricting event study analyses to only clean comparisons; however, the stacked approach is intuitive and easily adapted to the three dimensions here (institutions, majors, years).

These reported incident-specific datasets are then stacked, with estimation conducted on the resulting combined stack with fixed effects, including dataset fixed effects so that all comparisons occur within dataset. Reports at the same institution×major are included only if they are at least 16 years apart. The stacked approach does not identify a specific treatment effect parameter; thus, we weight the estimates by share of the treated cases in each incident×dataset as suggested by Wing et al. (2024).[9]

Formally, for institution $c \times$ academic field a in year t and dataset d, we estimate the effect of a publicly reported faculty sexual misconduct incident in field×year×dataset t^*_{acd} on degree completion with a nonparametric event study specification of the following form:

$$Y_{acdt} = \delta_{acd} + \lambda_{adt} + \sum_{\substack{\tau=-8 \\ \tau \neq -1}}^{7} \beta_\tau \mathbb{1}(t - t^*_{acd} = \tau) + \epsilon_{acdt} \tag{1}$$

where the outcome, Y_{acdt}, is the log number of degrees completed by women, men, or all students in a given year (or another relevant outcome). The year relative to the reported incident is indicated by τ, and each $\mathbb{1}(t - t^*_{acd} = \tau)$ is an indicator variable equal to one for each of the years surrounding the calendar year of the public report of the incident. These indicator variables exist only for academic fields in institutions that experienced a report of a misconduct incident. The data are trimmed so that each reported incident contributes 8 years of data prior to the incident and 8 years after. The excluded category is the year before the event, $\tau = -1$, and untreated units are included in this category, too. The β_{-8} to β_{-2} coefficients trace nonparametric pretrends and can be used to consider whether the identification strategy is valid. Treatment effects that occur in response to exposure and vary over time are indicated by β_0 to β_7. Standard errors are clustered at the institution×academic field level to reflect the unit of analysis exposed to the report and account for duplication across datasets (Wing et al., 2024).

Calendar year×dataset fixed effects, λ_{adt},[10] control for changes over time (e.g., the growing popularity of computer science) within each dataset. Institution×dataset fixed effects, δ_{acd}, control for time-invariant institution×field characteristics, such as the size of an academic field at a given college, or the

[9] In our setting with one stack per reported incident, this approach essentially weights the estimates so that each incident contributes equally, except cases with an unbalanced panel.

[10] Since each dataset in the stack is restricted to the focal major, we do not need to include academic field fixed effects. However, we leave the academic field, a in the notation to retain focus on the fact that these are major-specific impacts. This is also the case for the institution×dataset fixed effects discussed next.

institution×field-specific likelihood that a sexual misconduct case becomes public, within dataset. The fixed effects are all estimated within dataset because of the different composition of each dataset. This set of controls ensures that if there are institution-, field-, or institution×field-specific behavioral norms that affect degree completion (by gender), such as discouraging women from particular fields, any response to a specific report will be assessed on top of such preexisting responses.[11] Therefore, the estimates generated here may delineate the lower bound on the impact of the public report of faculty gender-based misconduct on student academic field choice and degree completion.

The identifying variation comes from the interaction between within-college academic field and time. Thus, each β_τ is identified via two comparisons of the outcome variable: 1) a comparison to the year before the report of a faculty sexual misconduct incident within a specific college×academic field, controlling for changes over time with λ_{adt}, and 2) a comparison to institutions with and without reported incidents within the same academic field and calendar year, controlling for time-invariant college characteristics with δ_{acd}.

To summarize the event study and increase statistical precision, we also estimate a parametric model in the form of a comparative interrupted time series (CITS):

$$Y_{acdt} = \omega_{acd} + \phi_{adt} + \beta^{postXtrend}\mathbb{1}(t >= t^*_{acd})(t - t^*_{acd}) + \beta^{trend}(t - t^*_{acd}) + \eta_{acdt}. \tag{2}$$

The change in outcomes after t^*_{acd} is indicated via $\beta^{postXtrend}$, which allows the event impact to accumulate over time, and is nonzero only in the post-event period $\tau >= t^*_{acd}$. We could include the post-event period indicator, with the associated coefficient, β^{post}. However, the event studies for degree completion appear to evolve linearly over time without a jump after the event and when such a term is included it is typically not statistically significant.

Any changes relative to comparison units are accounted for via β^{trend}, which measures any trend in in-field degree completion prior to the public report of the incident. This also serves as a falsification test, as $\beta^{trend} \neq 0$ would indicate the presence of nonparallel trends. This parametric specification uses the same stacking, matching, fixed effects, standard error clustering, weighting and identifying variation as discussed above for the stacked event study approach. We summarize the CITS model by reporting the coefficient for

[11] It is not possible to control for institution-specific time trends within each stack since these would be collinear with the existing fixed effects.

the total effect four years after the report ($\beta^{postXtrend} \times 4$). A simpler difference-in-differences approach is also possible, but the CITS trend fits the data better given the observable changes in treatment effects over time in the event study.

For all our models, identification rests on the same two assumptions. The first is that the timing of faculty gender-based misconduct public reports are not correlated with academic field×institution trends in degree completion, for example, a downward trend in field-specific degree completion before the event. This assumption would be violated if students responded to incidents before they are made public via news coverage—perhaps if the students had inside information from whisper networks. This first assumption is testable. Figure 2 and Table 3 both show a lack of pretrends. To further address this concern, in Section 4.3, we estimate the impact of faculty sexual misconduct with the timing of the incident marked as the year of the incident, rather than the year of publication of the incident.

The second assumption is that there are no coincident shocks to the college and field that affect degree completions. This assumption is not testable. However, the reports span a long time period and many institutions, making it unlikely that another phenomenon occurred at the same time and location across many years and sites. In addition, the inclusion of year×dataset fixed effects within field accounts for any general trends in degree completion in an academic field over time, while the institution×dataset fixed effects account for time-invariant differences in major size by institution. A related concern is the existence of faculty sexual misconduct incidents in the comparison group – a particularly salient potential coincident shock. Given that reported incidents are likely the "tip of the iceberg," it is possible that comparison departments also have faculty sexual misconduct in a similar time frame, potentially biasing these estimates. However, our estimand of interest is the *public report* of a faculty sexual misconduct incident vs. no public report. We argue this is the appropriate comparison because it is the policy-relevant outcome: students other than the victim(s), institutions, and policymakers can only react to an incident if it is publicly reported.

Similar models estimated at the institution level (rather than the institution×academic field level) yield estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on degree completion at the institution to determine whether the response to a report of misconduct takes the form of transfers within an institution or dropouts/transfers to another institution. The institution-level estimates include calendar year×dataset fixed effects and institution×dataset fixed effects. These account for, respectively, changes over time in

college completion within dataset, time-invariant institution-specific characteristics such as average size and assortment of majors offered within dataset, and trends in degree completion at the specific college. This is the approach used by Lindo et al. (2019) and is similar to the one in Rooney and Smith (2019), though we have a longer panel, address treatment heterogeneity via stacking, and use a different source and definition of incidents. A few of the outcomes measured at the institution level appear to have a downward drop close in time to the reported incident, for these cases we add a post-treatment shift indicator, $\tau >= t^*_{acd}$, with coefficient, β^{post}, to the specification.[12]

4 Results

4.1 Institution-Level Outcomes

We begin our presentation of the empirical results by showing that the presence of a report of a faculty sexual misconduct incident has little impact on institution-level outcomes, consistent with the prior evidence from Rooney and Smith (2019) and Lindo et al. (2019). As shown in Appendix Figure B.1 and Appendix Table A.3, in the years following the first incident at an institution, there is overall little impact on student applications or enrollment among either women or men.[13] Regarding other institutional outcomes (revenue, expenditures, and staff), given that there are only small shifts in student population, it is not surprising that there is no change in these outcomes. These event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on institutional characteristics show little scope for change at the institutional level.

Our focus here is on degree completion rather than enrollment. The right side of Table 3 shows estimates of the impact on BA attainment measured at the *institution* level (see Appendix Figures B.4–B.6 for the event study figures). There are no changes in institution-level degree completion. That is, exposure to a report of faculty sexual misconduct does not change the likelihood that students graduate from college.

[12] We follow Lafortune et al. (2018) to use different CITS models for different outcomes depending on the appearance of the trend in the event study.

[13] Appendix B has nonparametric event study estimates for all outcomes.

4.2 Institution×Academic Field

The potential for *within*-institution shifts underpins the motivation for this paper; we consider it next by turning to the focal outcome—degree completion (natural log) *in the focal field*—in Figure 2. This figure shows percent change in degree completion for all students (Panel A, green), women (Panel B, pink), and men (Panel C, blue); the other event study figures follow the same form. The left column of the exhibit displays results for the full time period, the center column for early incidents, and the right column for recent incidents. All of the graphs display the nonparametric estimates from Equation 1, as indicated by the solid dots, with the bars denoting 95-percent confidence intervals. The parametric CITS estimate from Equation 2 is displayed via a dashed line with associated shaded 95-percent confidence interval, with the coefficients from this estimate available in Table 3.

Before discussing the results, we note two important patterns. First, none of the estimates show meaningful pretrends as estimated via the parametric model. For in-field degree completion in the nonparametric model, a few point estimates just prior to the public report are positive and statistically significant. However, inspection of Figure 2 shows that this is driven by the early period where we find little response to incidents. Additionally, since these trends go in the *opposite* direction of the estimated impacts, they do not imply that response to the incident is the continuation of an existing trend. Second, the nonparametric coefficients are generally in line with the parametric estimates, revealing a similar pattern of results.

In contrast to the institution-level findings, the response to a report of an incident in a specific academic field, is a decline in degree completion for all students, women, and men *in that field*. This can be seen in the left-most column of Figure 2, where both the parametric and nonparametric estimates of degree completion trace out an increasing decline over time. In all cases, the response grows over time. The growth in response over time is unsurprising since it is difficult for upperclassmen to change major with little time left until degree completion. However, the yearly point estimates in the nonparametric model are rarely statistically significant.

To summarize the impact and gain precision, Table 3 presents results from a parametric model, for different time periods in different panels. Across the whole time period, for in-field degrees, there is a downward trend in in-field degree completion (labeled "Post event×years elapsed) of -1.2 percent per year (Panel A, Column 6). Table 3 also reports the total impact on in-field degree completion four years after

the incident, as calculated from the parametric estimates. This estimate shows a 4.7-percent decline in degree completions in the incident perpetrator's academic field for all students four years after the incident (statistically significant at the 10 percent level).

The impacts on in-field degree completion are driven by recent reports. This can be seen by comparing the center column and the right column of Figure 2 and Panels B and C of Table 3, which split the sample into "Early Incidents" (those from 1983 to 2014) and "Recent Incidents" (those from 2015 to 2023). These roughly reflect the pre- and post-#MeToo periods.[14] The center column of the figure and Panel B of the table show the results for the early reports, with no change in degree completion reflected in either the coefficients of the estimates or the cumulative impact 4 years after the incident. In the right column of the figure and Panel C of the table, the response to reported misconduct becomes apparent for the recent incidents. At the institution level, there remains little response. However, in terms of in-field degree completion in this subsample, 4 years after the incident, there is a 7.7-percent decline in women's BA completions (Column 4), a 7.1-percent decline in men's (Column 5), and an overall decline of 7.9 percent (Column 6). The estimates for the full sample and women are statistically significant at the 5 percent level, the men's estimate at the 10 percent level. In all cases, there are negative estimates on the "Post event$\times$years elapsed" term of about -2 percent.[15]

The present data cannot definitively speak to why there has been a greater response in recent years. The #MeToo era may have shaped public consciousness and behavior around sexual harassment in multiple ways. For example, it may have led to greater recognition of the harms of sexual harassment, leading to more severe consequences for perpetrators. It could also have led to greater news coverage of the topic. We consider both of these possibilities here. First, in Appendix Table A.4, we split the sample by the seriousness of the incident's consequences for the perpetrator. Report outcomes are considered serious if the perpetrator is no longer employed (whether through retirement, resignation, firing, or nonrenewal of contract), if there is

[14] Many trace the beginning of #MeToo to the 2017 Harvey Weinstein scandal; however, the term was coined in 2006 by Tarana Burke. This subsample split also reflects the periods before and after the 2016 US presidential election and allows us to observe a full post-treatment period for incidents occurring in the earlier time frame.

[15] A potential explanation for this is the fact that the outcome data is right-censored for recent incidents, which have shorter post-event windows than early incidents. However, the weighting scheme explicitly weights each stack by the number of treated units; stacks for recent incidents therefore receive less weight in the overall estimates. Additionally, as we discuss in Section 4.3, results with a shorter time window—5 years before and after the event—are very similar. Results with the shorter time window and a balanced panel are of the same direction and magnitude, but are no longer statistically significant, likely due to the small number of incidents in the balanced sample.

a criminal or civil court judgment, or if the perpetrator has died by suicide. Report outcomes are classed as not serious if they involve a suspension, revocation of an honor, demotion, warning, or a required training or are not categorized. Over two-thirds of the reports have outcomes we categorize as serious; this is a result of the ASMD including only incidents with verified evidence or a court case, which skews the incidents toward those with severer consequences. The outcomes of recent reports are only slightly likelier to be categorized as serious (70 percent) than those of reports occurring in the earlier period (66 percent). Students do respond more to reports with more severe consequences, but this is apparent only for incidents in the recent period (Column 9 of Appendix Table A.4), and this difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.351$). This implies that consequences may make a difference in this time period but do not drive the difference between the early and more recent reported incidents. It is also the case that more serious consequences are a result of more serious violations, and thus students may be responding to the severity of the reported incident itself, rather than the consequences.

Next, we examine the possibility that greater news coverage explains the greater reaction to recent reported incidents in Appendix Table A.5, which divides the sample between high- and low-coverage reports. We define high news coverage as 5 or more news articles on the incident. If the response in recent years is greater because of greater news coverage, we should see a news coverage effect in both sample periods. It is the case that 27 percent of the early reports have high news coverage whereas 56 percent of the recent reports do. However, among both early and recent reports, there is greater response from *lower* news coverage, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10 percent level among recent incidents ($p = 0.067$). Thus, it appears that while the number of reports with high news coverage did increase in recent years, since students react more in low news cases, this cannot explain the greater response in recent years. This may be a result of our research design. High news reports may decrease selection of the focal major around the country, resulting in little difference between the department with the reported incident and comparison departments. More news coverage could also counteract declines in department majoring if the principle of "any press is good press" is operating in these cases Lindo et al. (2019).

Another possibility is that students respond more strongly to reports with multiple victims. However, in both cases, multiple victims make up about 57 percent of the sample. Of course, all reports could have additional victims not mentioned in the news coverage. Additionally, there are few differences in response

by number of victims mentioned in the news coverage in each time period, as shown in Appendix Table A.6.

The share of majors in STEM fields has increased over time, and differential response by field might explain the recent response to reports. However, students are no more likely to shift out of STEM degrees than non-STEM degrees, in both time periods (Appendix Table A.7).

We investigate some other dimensions of heterogeneity by institution or department characteristics. Students in the subsample of more recent incidents respond more sharply at more selective institutions (Appendix Table A.8)—those listed as "more selective" in the 2010 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. However, the data here cannot offer much precision as this difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.550$).

Finally, students' responses to reported incidents may vary by department size. Larger effects in smaller departments may reflect more information-sharing among students about problematic faculty members. It could also reflect a mechanical reduction in the number of faculty in the department as a result of a firing or resignation in the wake of an incident, which would reduce the department's capacity to offer classes and support students. Appendix Table A.9 shows how effects vary by department size. As a proxy for department size, we use the average number of graduates across all years for each institution-major, and define "large" departments as those whose average number of graduates is above the 75th percentile across all departments (around 40 students). While a larger response is seen among smaller departments overall, this effect is concentrated during the early period. Among more recent incidents, the reverse is true: there are somewhat larger effects for large departments, though this difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.515$). This suggests that the response to more recent incidents is not driven by faculty capacity constraints.

To summarize, for over 30 years prior to the #MeToo movement, there was little response to reports of faculty sexual misconduct in terms of either degree completion or in-field degree completion. However, since the #MeToo era, the impacts are clear: a persistent decline in in-field degree completion. This decline does not seem to be driven by differential response to reported consequence severity, higher levels of news coverage, or the presence of multiple victims. The somewhat larger response in large departments and lack of significant difference by department size in the recent time period suggests that the change is not due to a mechanical lack of capacity to serve students due to losing a faculty member. We cannot rule out other explanations, but the response is consistent with a culture change during the #MeToo movement.

4.3 Robustness

As discussed in Section 3, the event study framework could be undermined if students responded to misconduct prior to its becoming publicly known via a news article or court document. This is typically called an anticipation effect in the difference-in-differences literature. In this case, anticipation would correspond not to students anticipating an incident occurring but to their becoming aware of it through whisper networks and rumors prior to its becoming public. For approximately 87 percent of the incidents, we are able to discern the timing of the misconduct via the documentation available. In only 8 percent of the cases did the incident occur in the same year it was made publicly known, with 21 percent of the incidents occurring in the year prior and 26 percent occurring either two or three years prior to the public reporting.

To determine whether anticipation effects occur in our context, we substitute the incident year rather than the article year for the event year in our event study. We report the estimates of Equation 2 for degree completions in Appendix Table A.14. For in-field degree completion, there is no response to exposure redefined on the basis of the incident year rather than the year of public report. The lack of impacts imply that students respond to the incident becoming known publicly, *not* the timing of the misconduct itself.[16]

In addition to assessing anticipation effects, we test the robustness of our findings to a series of modeling choices, summarized in Table 4. This table reports the estimates of the impact of exposure to a report of faculty sexual misconduct four years after the report, as calculated from the CITS estimates, with the full models reported in Appendix Tables A.15 through A.20. The first line of Table 4 repeats the main specification for comparison purposes. Since our main conclusions are drawn from the recent period analysis, we focus on the comparison to the 7.9 percent decline found in that time period. The next line, labeled "Exclude Same-State," reports estimates from the same specification, but omits institutions in the same state as the focal institution. This would account for if news reports of an incident at Harvard spilled over to nearby Tufts, reducing enrollment in the focal major at both institutions. In practice, there are only a few same-state institutions for most events and the estimates are substantially similar to the main specification, though slightly smaller.

The next three specifications present alternative comparison groups. In the line labeled "Alternative

[16]It is important to note that the muted response to incident timing should not be construed as a reason not to address misconduct publicly, because a covered up response might increase the direct harm to victims even if it reduces spillovers.

Comparison," we use an alternative group, namely departments in *institutions* that are in the top 5 percent of propensity scores when the likelihood of an institution ever having a report is estimated as a function of institution characteristics and growth of the institution. In this case, the estimates generally follow the pattern of the main specification but are slightly larger (-8.2 percent vs. -7.9 percent). The next alternative comparison is labeled "Ever Treated Institutions" and includes all institutions that have an ASMD report but in other departments than the focal department. This approach still supplies "never-treated" comparisons, as the incident departments are compared to untreated departments in the treated institutions. To compare to similar institution types since there is no matching in this strategy, we limit comparisons to a coarse match on public/private, religious/secular, large/not large, urban/nonurban and selectivity status. The magnitudes of the estimates are smaller (-5.6 percent), though still in the same direction and statistically significant at the 10 percent level.

In the next line of Table 4, we use the original specification but add in faculty and staff victims, rather than limiting to student victims. Here, the pattern of results follows the main specification, but the magnitudes are slightly smaller (-7.5 vs. -7.9), though still statistically significant. This implies that students respond more to reports that involve other students, which is not surprising as misconduct involving faculty and other faculty or staff may be viewed as workplace misconduct and separate from the student experience.

Finally, in the last two lines of Table 4, we address a different concern: that the greater response in the recent period is an artifact of the shorter post-event observation window. The line labeled "Shorter Window" presents estimates using 5 years before and after the incident instead of the 8 used in the main analysis. Here, the results are similar to the main specification and, if anything, slightly larger in the recent period, further allaying concerns about right-censoring. In the last line of the Table, labeled "Balanced Panel," we show estimates in that same shorter time window, limited to incidents that have five complete pre-event and post-event years of data. Here the estimates are again very similar to the main specification, though they are no longer statistically significant. This is not surprising given the lower number of incidents in the recent period with no right-censoring.

4.4 Implications of the Shift in In-Field Degree Completion

Switching majors or changing interests because of exposure to reports of faculty abuse of power may be disruptive and frustrating at the individual level and may increase the time it takes a student to earn a degree. Students who are directly affected may be subject to great personal harm. However, many students switch majors and take more than four years to graduate. While encountering faculty sexual misconduct is disturbing, students may find another major that is just as rewarding even if they are deterred from their original choice. If, for example, students leave the field of business but enter economics, while their individual trajectories might be temporarily disturbed, the long-run impact on graduation and career opportunities may be small. However, if exposure to reports of faculty sexual misconduct prompts a switch to a major with fewer career opportunities or greater gender segregation, it has the potential to impact students' longer-run career trajectories. Shauman (2016) and Sloane et al. (2019) show that major choice contributes to differences in income and drives gender differences in wages.

We test this in Panel A of Table 5, which shows the institution-level impacts on degree completions in majors dominated by women and those dominated by men for the incidents occurring in recent time periods.[17] As described in Section 3, following the appearance of a post-report shift, as can be seen in Appendix Figure B.9, we add an indicator for post-report to these outcomes. We define majors dominated by women as those at the 25th percentile or lower in terms of share of degrees granted to men in a year (approximately 30 percent or fewer men in a field×year) and majors dominated by men as those at the 75th percentile or higher in terms of share of degrees granted to men in a year (about 57 percent or more men in a field×year) for the full sample of four-year institutions in IPEDS.[18] Note that this outcome is defined as a share of majors not the natural log of number of majors, so coefficients are interpreted as changes in percentage points.

Exposure to a reported misconduct incident decreases degree completions in majors dominated by men, with the shift concentrated in the recent time period. The cumulative decline 4 years after the event is 4.0 percentage points for reported incidents in the recent time period, with a small, not statistically significant reduction of 1.9 percentage points for women and a decline of 6.5 percentage points for men. All groups

[17] Appendix Tables A.10–A.11 show all time periods.

[18] The ASMD incidents occur in majors throughout the range of the share of degrees granted to men, with the incidents occurring somewhat less frequently in the majors heavily dominated by men, as shown in Appendix Figure A.2.

experience an immediate post-report shift, as represented by the negative coefficient on the "Post" indicator of 2 percentage points for women and 3 percentage points for men. This shows a fast response which changes little for women but grows for men. There is no change in graduation in female-dominated majors.

The larger shift for men is surprising, given that women are the typical victims of faculty sexual misconduct. However, this is consistent with women's responses being more muted than men's due to women students having anticipated a hostile environment in the male-dominated majors (Lepage et al., 2025) or already knowing about one through "whisper networks" (Johnson, 2023), and are thus less surprised by public revelations of sexual harassment incidents. A hostile environment to women has been well documented in economics (Wu, 2020; Dupas et al., 2021; Hengel, 2022; Eberhardt et al., 2023), for example. Perhaps a report drives women out of that specific field, but doesn't shift their overall determination to major in a male-dominated field. Further, consistent with gendered patterns of attrition from STEM fields (Astorne-Figari and Speer, 2019), women who are less tolerant of harassment may already have switched out of male-dominated majors with negative reputations, leaving in the major those who are more committed to persisting. This may be the case as only 15 percent of women are in male-dominated majors. We do not have the appropriate data to either rule in or rule out any of these potential explanations.

To determine whether the shifts induced by reports of faculty sexual misconduct affect students' long-term earnings potential, we associate each major by institution with median earnings by major and institution 5 years after graduation from the College Scorecard and each major with expected lifetime earnings from Webber (2014, 2018) . We consider these measures of "expected earnings," but note that they are based solely on major and institution, not students' personal characteristics. Figure 3 shows the distribution of majors by the share of degrees granted to men and 5-year and lifetime median expected earnings. Outside of health professions, there is a clear gradient, with earnings rising with the share of graduates who are male.

Panel B of Table 5 shows whether the expected earnings of graduates change after exposure to reported faculty sexual misconduct, for the recent time period.[19] Since this analysis follows on from the majors by gender analysis above, we retain the post-report indicator for these outcomes. Perhaps surprisingly, given the shift away from majors dominated by men, there is *no* change in expected earnings in either earnings measure.

[19] Appendix Tables A.12–A.13 show all time periods.

This contradiction can be understood when we investigate the impact on completion of specific majors in Figure 4. Panel A of this figure shows the percentage-point change on a campus for the share of majors by broad field, as calculated from the four-year cumulative impact from the CITS model, for the recent period.[20] We group majors into seven areas: STEM, business/economics, health, social science, education, humanities, and arts, ordered by expected earnings. Focusing on recent incidents, which show the largest change in majors, we do see a statistically significant decline in degree completion in high-earning STEM fields for men. However, there is also a decline in education and arts majors. These fields tend to be associated with low earnings for the majority of graduates (Webber, 2014). Increases come from business/economics majors, which have relatively high earnings, and social sciences, which tend to be in the middle of the earnings distribution, for both genders. There is also a statistically significant increase in humanities for men. Thus, it appears two phenomena are happening at once: Students shift away from male-dominated, high-earning STEM majors, showing their willingness to accept a compensating differential in terms of lower pay for less risk of exposure to hostility. Concurrently, students shift away from the education and arts. Arts in particular include fields with disproportionately high reported incidents in the ASMD and with many opportunities for one-on-one or out-of-classroom interaction between faculty and students. Here, students are surrendering creative pursuits for the compensating differential of safety. While they may be "better off" in terms of earnings, it is not possible to measure the potential loss to creative output from dissuasion of students from pursuing their preferred field. It is also the case that the majors that students shift into are across the earnings distribution, so that there is no clear overall impact on earnings.

5 Conclusion

Faculty gender-based misconduct causes immeasurable harm to the individuals directly affected by the unethical, and in some cases illegal, actions of those in power. While the full extent of the suffering caused by faculty sexual misconduct cannot be measured, discouragement and spillover effects can be. Reports of faculty sexual misconduct have little impact on applications or enrollment at the affected institutions. However, we document a 4.7 percent decline within institutions in degree completions in the field where the incident was reported, driven by a 7.9-percent decline in recent incidents (those occurring in and after

[20] A version of the figure with all three time periods is Appendix Figure A.5.

2015). The decline in focal field majors shifts students out of majors dominated by men but results in no change in expected earnings, as measured by earnings associated with major and major×institution. This is because students exit both high-earning STEM fields *and* arts fields, which tend to be low-earning but disproportionately represented in the ASMD. This implies that students are willing both to give up expected pecuniary returns and creative aspirations to improve their safety and reduce exposure to gender-based hostility.

Gender wage gaps persist in the US economy despite the gains for women over recent decades, and they are attributable, in part, to occupational and industry segregation (Blau and Kahn, 2017). This occupational segregation may be due to "preferences" for hours of work or flexibility, as well as being shaped by gender norms. However, this paper shows that part of these preferences reflect the desire to avoid sexual harassment, adding to LePage et al.'s (2025) evidence that anticipated discrimination shapes economic choices and can have long-lasting impacts on students' careers.

References

Abeysekera, A. and C. S. Fernando (2024). The spillover effects of sexual harassment in us s&p 500 firms. *Available at SSRN 4903136*.

Adams-Prassl, A., K. Huttunen, E. Nix, and N. Zhang (2024). Violence against women at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 139*(2), 937–991.

Andrews, R. J., S. A. Imberman, M. F. Lovenheim, and K. Stange (2024). The returns to college major choice: Average and distributional effects, career trajectories, and earnings variability. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1–45.

Anelli, M., K. Shih, and K. Williams (2023). Foreign students in college and the supply of stem graduates. *Journal of Labor Economics 41*(2), 511–563.

Arcidiacono, P. (2004). Ability sorting and the returns to college major. *Journal of Econometrics 121*(1–2), 343–375.

Arcidiacono, P., V. J. Hotz, and S. Kang (2012). Modeling college major choices using elicited measures of expectations and counterfactuals. *Journal of Econometrics 166*(1), 3–16.

Astorne-Figari, C. and J. D. Speer (2019). Are changes of major major changes? The roles of grades, gender, and preferences in college major switching. *Economics of Education Review 70*, 75–93.

Blair-Loy, M. and E. A. Cech (2022). *Misconceiving merit: Paradoxes of excellence and devotion in academic science and engineering*. University of Chicago Press.

Blau, F. D. and L. M. Kahn (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of economic literature 55*(3), 789–865.

Bleemer, Z. and A. Mehta (2022). Will studying economics make you rich? a regression discontinuity analysis of the returns to college major. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 14*(2), 1–22.

Bondestam, F. and M. Lundqvist (2020). Sexual harassment in higher education–a systematic review. *European journal of higher education 10*(4), 397–419.

Borusyak, K., X. Jaravel, and J. Spiess (2024). Revisiting event-study designs: robust and efficient estimation. *Review of Economic Studies 91*(6), 3253–3285.

Callaway, B. and P. H. Sant'Anna (2020). Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*.

Cantalupo, N. C. and W. C. Kidder (2018a). A systematic look at a serial problem: Sexual harassment of students by university faculty. *Utah Law Review*, 671 – 786.

Cantalupo, N. C. and W. C. Kidder (2018b). Systematic prevention of a serial problem: Sexual harassment and bridging core concepts of bakke in the metoo era. *University of California Davis Law Review 52*, 2349.

Cantor, D., B. Fisher, S. Chibnall, S. Harps, R. Townsend, G. Thomas, H. Lee, V. Kranz, R. Herbison, and K. Madden (2019). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct.

Carrell, S. E., M. E. Page, and J. E. West (2010). Sex and science: How professor gender perpetuates the gender gap. *Quarterly Journal of Economics 125*(3), 1101–1144.

Cengiz, D., A. Dube, A. Lindner, and B. Zipperer (2019). The effect of minimum wages on low-wage jobs. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 134*(3), 1405–1454.

Chakraborty, T. and N. Lohawala (2021). Women, violence and work: Threat of sexual violence and women's decision to work. *Review of Development Economics*.

Chen, F. and W. Long (2024). Silence breaking: sex crime reporting in the metoo era. *Journal of Population Economics 37*(1), 30.

Cheng, I.-H. and A. Hsiaw (2022). Reporting sexual misconduct in the# metoo era. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics 14*(4), 761–803.

Cici, G., M. Hendriock, S. Jaspersen, and A. Kempf (2021). # metoo meets the mutual fund industry: Productivity effects of sexual harassment. *Finance Research Letters 40*, 101687.

Clancy, K. B., R. G. Nelson, J. N. Rutherford, and K. Hinde (2014). Survey of academic field experiences (SAFE): Trainees report harassment and assault. *PLoS One 9*(7), e102172.

Conzelmann, J., S. Owen, and A. Simon (2025). College majors and programs: Choices and returns. In D. Harris (Ed.), *Live Handbook of Education Policy Research*. Association for Education Finance and Policy.

De Chaisemartin, C. and X. d'Haultfoeuille (2020). Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects. *American economic review 110*(9), 2964–2996.

Deshpande, M. and Y. Li (2019). Who is screened out? application costs and the targeting of disability programs. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 11*(4), 213–248.

Dupas, P., A. S. Modestino, M. Niederle, J. Wolfers, S. D. Collective, et al. (2021). Gender and the dynamics of economics seminars. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Eberhardt, M., G. Facchini, and V. Rueda (2023). Gender differences in reference letters: Evidence from the economics job market. *The Economic Journal 133*(655), 2676–2708.

Ersoy, F. and J. D. Speer (2025). Opening the black box of college major choice: Evidence from an information intervention. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 231*, 106800.

Folke, O. and J. Rickne (2022). Sexual harassment and gender inequality in the labor market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 137*(4), 2163–2212.

Fricke, H., J. Grogger, and A. Steinmayr (2018). Exposure to academic fields and college major choice. *Economics of Education Review 64*, 199–213.

Goodman-Bacon, A. (2021). Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing. *Journal of Econometrics*.

Hastings, J. S., C. A. Neilson, and S. D. Zimmerman (2013). Are some degrees worth more than others? evidence from college admission cutoffs in chile. Working Paper 19241, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Hengel, E. (2022). Publishing while female: Are women held to higher standards? evidence from peer review. *The Economic Journal 132*(648), 2951–2991.

Jogani, C. and G. Ruiz Sanchez (2023). An empirical analysis of sexual harassment case outcomes in academia. *Economics Bulletin*.

Johnson, C. A. (2023). The purpose of whisper networks: a new lens for studying informal communication channels in organizations. *Frontiers in Communication 8*, 1089335.

Kirkeboen, L. J., E. Leuven, and M. Mogstad (2016). Field of Study, Earnings, and Self-Selection. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics 131*(3), 1057–1111.

Kugler, A. D., C. H. Tinsley, and O. Ukhaneva (2021). Choice of majors: Are women really different from men? *Economics of Education Review 81*, 102079.

Lafortune, J., J. Rothstein, and D. W. Schanzenbach (2018, April). School finance reform and the distribution of student achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 10*(2), 1–26.

Lavy, V. and E. Sand (2018). On the origins of gender gaps in human capital: Short-and long-term consequences of teachers' biases. *Journal of Public Economics 167*, 263–279.

Lepage, L.-P., X. Li, and B. Zafar (2025, April). Anticipated discrimination and major choice. Working Paper 33680, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Li, H. and X. Xia (2024). Grades as signals of comparative advantage: How letter grades affect major choices. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 227*, 106717.

Li, X. (2025). Learning the major: The role of early specialization in educational and labor market outcomes. Unpublished manuscript.

Libarkin, J. (2025). Academic sexual misconduct database. Retrieved January 25, 2025, from https://academic-sexual-misconduct-database.org.

Lindo, J. M., D. E. Marcotte, J. E. Palmer, and I. D. Swensen (2019). Any press is good press? The unanticipated effects of Title IX investigations on university outcomes. *Economics of Education Review 73*.

Liu, V., S. Mishra, and E. M. Kopko (2021). Major decision: The impact of major switching on academic outcomes in community colleges. *Research in Higher Education 62*(4), 498–527.

Lovenheim, M. and J. Smith (2023). Returns to different postsecondary investments: Institution type, academic programs, and credentials. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Volume 6, pp. 187–318. Elsevier.

Lyle, D. S. (2007). Estimating and interpreting peer and role model effects from randomly assigned social groups at west point. *Review of Economics and Statistics 89*(2), 289–299.

McLaughlin, H., C. Uggen, and A. Blackstone (2017). The economic and career effects of sexual harassment on working women. *Gender & Society 31*(3), 333–358. PMID: 29056822.

Meyers, M. S., E. T. Horton, E. A. Boudreaux, S. B. Carmody, A. P. Wright, and V. G. Dekle (2018). The context and consequences of sexual harassment in southeastern archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice 6*(4), 275–287.

Moylan, C. A. and L. Wood (2016). Sexual harassment in social work field placements: Prevalence and characteristics. *Affilia 31*(4), 405–417.

National Academies of Sciences, E. and Medicine (2018). *Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Patnaik, A. (2021). *Pricing, income and college major choice*. Ph. D. thesis, Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Patnaik, A., G. Pauley, J. Venator, and M. Wiswall (2024). The impacts of same and opposite gender alumni speakers on interest in economics. *Economics of Education Review 102*, 102579.

Patnaik, A., M. Wiswall, and B. Zafar (2021). College majors. *The Routledge handbook of the economics of education*, 415–457.

Patterson, R. W., N. G. Pope, and A. Feudo (2023). Timing matters: Evidence from college major decisions. *Journal of Human Resources 58*(4), 1347–1384.

Rooney, P. and J. Smith (2019). The impact of highly publicized campus scandals on college outcomes. *Contemporary Economic Policy*.

Roth, J., P. H. Sant'Anna, A. Bilinski, and J. Poe (2023). What's trending in difference-in-differences? a synthesis of the recent econometrics literature. *Journal of Econometrics 235*(2), 2218–2244.

Seymour, E. and N. M. Hewitt (1997). *Talking about leaving*, Volume 34. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Shauman, K. A. (2016). Gender differences in the early career outcomes of college graduates: The influence of sex-type of degree field across four cohorts. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences 2*(4), 152–193.

Shin, S. and J. Park (0). Consistent perpetrations, inconsistent sanctions: A quantitative study on colleges' responses to sexual misconduct by faculty. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence 0*(0), 08862605251415151. PMID: 41641826.

Sloane, C., E. Hurst, and D. Black (2019, October). A cross-cohort analysis of human capital specialization and the college gender wage gap. Working Paper 26348, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Stinebrickner, T. R. and R. Stinebrickner (2014). Academic performance and college dropout: Using longitudinal expectations data to estimate a learning model. *Journal of Labor Economics 32*(3), 601–644.

Sun, L. and S. Abraham (2021). Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*.

Urban Institute. Education Data Explorer (version 0.2.0). Center on Education Data and Policy, Available at: https://educationdata.urban.org/data-explorer/, accessed September 25, 2019.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Retrieved via the Education Data Explorer on September 25, 2019.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2022, April). Sexual harassment in our nation's workplaces. Data highlight no. 2, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Office of Enterprise Data and Analytics (OEDA), Washington, DC.

VanHeuvelen, T., N. Quadlin, and J. Wald (2026). Regrets, she's had a few: Gender and regret of computer science and engineering degrees. *Social Science Research 135*, 103298.

Webber, D. A. (2014). The lifetime earnings premia of different majors: Correcting for selection based on cognitive, noncognitive, and unobserved factors. *Labour economics 28*, 14–23.

Webber, D. A. (2018). Expected lifetime earnings for different majors. Available at: http://www.doug-webber.com/data.html.

Weiner, J. (2019, Oct 13). Also known as Emily Doe. *New York Times Book Review*, 12.

Widmann, R., M. E. Rose, and M. Chugunova (2025, 09). Sexual misconduct, accused scientists, and their research. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1–29.

Wing, C., S. M. Freedman, and A. Hollingsworth (2024, January). Stacked difference-in-differences. Working Paper 32054, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Wiswall, M. and B. Zafar (2015). Determinants of college major choice: Identification using an information experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies 82*(2), 791–824.

Wu, A. H. (2020). Gender bias among professionals: an identity-based interpretation. *Review of Economics and Statistics 102*(5), 867–880.


Yue, H. and X. Fu (2017). Rethinking graduation and time to degree: A fresh perspective. *Research in Higher Education 58*(2), 184–213.

Zacchia, G. and I. Zuazu (2023). The wage effect of workplace sexual harassment: Evidence for women in Europe. *Institute for New Economic Thinking Working Paper Series* (205).

Zafar, B. (2011). How do college students form expectations? *Journal of Labor Economics 29*(2), 301–348.


Zheng, H. and K. A. Weeden (2023). How gender segregation in higher education contributes to gender segregation in the us labor market. *Demography 60*(3), 761–784.

Figure 1: Prevalence of Reported Incidents over Time and by Major




Notes: This figure shows the count of ASMD reports by year (Panels A-C) and the count of ASMD reports by major in the institution×major analysis sample.

Figure 2: Event Study Estimates of Undergraduate Degree Completion by Gender in Different Time Periods




Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure 3: Distribution of Majors by Share of Degrees Granted to Men and Expected Earnings



Notes: "Other health" includes "allied health" and health services; chiropractic; communication disorders sciences/services; health administration; mental health, therapy, and counseling; public health; medical illustration; bioethics; and nutrition and dietetics.

Figure 4: Shift in Majors, Recent Time Period (Impact 4 Years after Incident)



Notes: Each point and confidence interval in Panel A of this figure reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of faculty sexual misconduct on the percentage of majors at an institution in an overarching category. The coefficients are the total impact on the percentage of degree completions in a broad major degree completion four years after the incident as calculated from the parametric estimates of Equation 2. Panel B shows the share of majors in each major group. Recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Table 1: Reported Incidents from the Academic Sexual Misconduct Database

	Observations
Reported Incidents in the Academic Sexual Misconduct Database	1254
Matched to an IPEDS identifier	1221
Limited to faculty	843
Limited to reported incidents between 1983 and 2023	816
Matched to an academic field	766
Duplicates by institution, year, and field eliminated	733
Limited to 4-year public or nonprofit institutions	671
Limited to student victims	555
Matched to institution by major analysis file	443
Matched to institution analysis file	256

Notes: This table reports the sample restrictions we impose on the Academic Sexual Misconduct Database. The database reflects incidents reported as of August 22, 2024. The last rows correspond to the number of reports in the institution by academic field–level and institution analyses, respectively.

Table 2: Institutional Characteristics by Academic Sexual Misconduct Database Status

				Comparison Institutions	
	All	Never ASMD	Ever ASMD	Institution by Major Sample	Institution Sample
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Private Institution	0.660	0.721	0.357	0.256	0.185
Most Selective	0.128	0.088	0.329	0.410	0.333
Selective	0.272	0.242	0.423	0.482	0.556
Offers Graduate Program(s)	0.723	0.693	0.873	0.974	0.963
Percent of Students Female	0.541	0.540	0.545	0.539	0.531
Religiously Affiliated	0.350	0.391	0.148	0.059	0.012
Urban	0.500	0.482	0.592	0.662	0.617
Member NCAA	0.417	0.338	0.815	0.957	0.975
Offers Residential Housing	0.708	0.671	0.894	0.961	0.963
Historically Black College or University	0.034	0.034	0.038	0.013	0.049
Tuition ($2010)	15814	15884	15515	14096	12355
First-Year First-Time Enrollment	798	499	2021	2769	1967
Observations	2571	2145	426	305	81

Notes: This table reports institutional characteristics from the 2010 IPEDS. The sample includes 4-year public or nonprofit postsecondary institutions. Selectivity comes from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Comparison institutions in Column (4) are the comparisons for the institution by major level analysis; those in Column (5) are comparisons for the institution level analysis.

Table 3: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log)

	All Degrees			In-Field Degrees		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
(A) All Incidents						
Trend	-0.002	0.000	-0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Post event× years elapsed	0.003	0.001	0.002	-0.008	-0.011	-0.012^{+}
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Impact 4 years after event	0.013	0.004	0.009	-0.032	-0.044	-0.047+
	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	6.792	6.537	7.398	3.411	3.162	4.026
N (observations)	301,572	301,572	301,572	1,557,157	1,557,157	1,557,157
N (institutions)	337	337	337	401	401	401
N (incidents)	256	256	256	443	443	443
(B) Early Incidents						
Trend	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.005	-0.007	-0.004
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)
Post event× years elapsed	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	-0.001	-0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Impact 4 years after event	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.006	-0.003	-0.016
	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.043)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	6.818	6.572	7.410	3.180	2.950	3.799
N (observations)	179,783	179,783	179,783	753,940	753,940	753,940
N (institutions)	223	223	223	352	352	352
N (incidents)	143	143	143	191	191	191
(C) Recent Incidents						
Trend	-0.002	0.002	-0.000	0.004	0.006	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)
Post event× years elapsed	0.007	0.001	0.004	-0.019*	-0.018^{+}	-0.020*
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Impact 4 years after event	0.029	0.005	0.017	-0.077*	-0.071+	-0.079*
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.039)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	6.760	6.494	7.383	3.582	3.319	4.194
N (observations)	121,789	121,789	121,789	803,217	803,217	803,217
N (institutions)	194	194	194	356	356	356
N (incidents)	113	113	113	252	252	252

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Comparison units in Columns 4–6 are limited to the same major as the focal major. The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table 4: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Robustness, Impact 4 Years after Event

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Main Specification	-0.032	-0.044	-0.047+	0.006	-0.003	-0.016	-0.077*	-0.071+	-0.079*
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.039)
Exclude Same-State	-0.032	-0.044	-0.047+	0.008	-0.002	-0.014	-0.078*	-0.072+	-0.079*
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.039)
Alternative Comparison	-0.029	-0.048+	-0.050+	0.018	0.004	-0.006	-0.073+	-0.073+	-0.082*
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.041)
Ever Treated Institutions	-0.004	-0.031	-0.026	0.035	0.004	0.006	-0.055+	-0.044	-0.056+
	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.032)
Add Fac/Staff Victims	-0.029	-0.032	-0.039	0.006	0.012	-0.008	-0.076*	-0.069+	-0.075*
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.037)
Shorter Window	-0.040	-0.041	-0.053	0.025	0.017	0.002	-0.093+	-0.084	-0.097+
	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.052)	(0.048)	(0.042)	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.054)
Balanced Panel	-0.012	-0.030	-0.034	0.025	0.017	-0.000	-0.066	-0.098	-0.084
	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.043)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.069)

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ $p<0.10$ * $p<0.05$ ** $p<0.01$ *** $p<0.001$).

Table 5: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Major Share by Gender and Expected Earnings (Natural Log), Recent Incidents (2015–2023)

(A) Majors by Gender	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
Trend	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.002	0.000	-0.001	0.000	-0.009^{+}	-0.004
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Post	0.002	0.004	0.004	-0.020**	-0.030**	-0.024**
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.008)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.007	0.004	-0.000	-0.019	-0.065**	-0.040*
	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.016)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	0.394	0.157	0.293	0.146	0.361	0.240
N (observations)	121,776	121,780	121,789	121,776	121,780	121,789
N (institutions)	193	194	194	193	194	194
N (incidents)	112	113	113	112	113	113
(B) Expected Earnings	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)	Women (10)	Men (11)	All (12)
Trend	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post event× years elapsed	0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Impact 4 years after event	0.005	0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	11.007	11.143	11.071	14.660	14.717	14.686
N (observations)	121,776	121,780	121,789	121,776	121,780	121,789
N (institutions)	193	194	194	193	194	194
N (incidents)	112	113	113	112	113	113

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. Recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).


Online Appendix

The Consequences of Faculty Sexual Misconduct

Sarah R. Cohodes and Katherine B. Leu


Appendix A: Additional Tables and Figures

Figure A.1: College Degrees and Incidents




Notes: This figure shows the prevalence of college degree awards and reported and verified sexual misconduct incidents across states.

Figure A.2: Share of Men in Major×Years and Academic Sexual Misconduct Database Major×Years




Notes: This figure shows the proportion of men in each major×year in IPEDS (light shading) and the proportion of men in major×years with incidents (dark shading, with repeats).

Figure A.3: Characteristics of the Consequences of Reported Incidents in the Academic Sexual Misconduct Database



Notes: This figure shows information about the extent of repeated incidents within departments, news coverage, and perpetrator outcomes related to ASMD incidents.


Figure A.4: Major Size and Male Share in 2010



Note: Bars are labeled with the male share in the major.

Notes: This figure shows the size and male share of each major, based on the number of graduates from each major in 2010.

Figure A.5: Shift in Majors (Impact 4 Years after Incident)



Notes: Each point and confidence interval in this figure reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of faculty sexual misconduct on the percentage of majors at an institution in an overarching category. The coefficients are the total impact on the percentage of degree completions in a broad major degree completion four years after the incident as calculated from the parametric estimates of Equation 2. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Table A.1: Institutional Characteristics and Academic Sexual Misconduct Database Incidents

	Ever ASMD (1)	Timing of Incident (2)
Private Institution	-0.089**	0.161
	(0.032)	(2.536)
Most Selective	0.207***	1.409
	(0.030)	(2.247)
Selective	0.060**	4.038*
	(0.020)	(1.796)
Offers Graduate Program(s)	0.076***	1.098
	(0.015)	(2.020)
Percent of Students Female	-0.051	1.005
	(0.033)	(5.805)
Religiously Affiliated	-0.059**	2.920
	(0.018)	(2.015)
Urban	0.082***	-1.181
	(0.016)	(1.144)
Member NCAA	0.065***	-2.312
	(0.019)	(1.900)
Offers Residential Housing	0.008	-0.893
	(0.020)	(2.409)
Historically Black College or University	-0.015	0.430
	(0.044)	(2.742)
Log Tuition	-0.025	0.032
	(0.018)	(1.362)
Log Enrollment	0.056***	1.688+
	(0.006)	(0.899)
N	2092	407

Notes: This table reports the predictors of whether an institution has any misconduct incidents (Column 1) or when an institution has an incident if it has one. The sample includes 4-year public or nonprofit postsecondary institutions. Institutional characteristics come from the 2010 IPEDS. Selectivity comes from Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.2: Academic Sexual Misconduct Database Incident Characteristics

Incident characteristic	Percentage
Perpetrator is male	97%
Perpetrator is female	3%
Female victim(s) only	89%
Male victim(s) only	6%
Both female and male victims	4%
Multiple victims	56%
Single victim	44%
More than 5 news articles	41%

Notes: This table reports basic information on misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023.

Table A.3: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Institutional Outcomes (Natural Log)

	Applications			1st-Year 1st-Time Enrollment			Total	Total	Instructional
	Women	Men	All	Women	Men	All	Revenue	Expenditures	Staff
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Trend	0.002	0.004	0.003	-0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	-0.001
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Post event$\times$ years elapsed	-0.004	-0.005	-0.004	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002	-0.001	-0.003	0.004
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.017	-0.018	-0.018	-0.002	-0.013	-0.009	-0.002	-0.012	0.015
	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.012)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	8.547	8.274	9.116	6.703	6.514	7.311	19.705	19.660	6.811
N (observations)	206,794	206,794	207,263	286,487	286,489	286,499	238,452	233,084	277,619
N (institutions)	295	294	295	334	334	335	334	334	336
N (incidents)	216	215	216	254	254	255	254	254	256

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.4: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), by Incident Outcome

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All	Not Serious	Serious	All	Not Serious	Serious	All	Not Serious	Serious
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Trend	0.001	-0.005	0.003	-0.004	-0.017	0.003	0.004	0.002	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.006)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.012^{+}	-0.006	-0.015^{+}	-0.004	0.008	-0.010	-0.020*	-0.005	-0.025*
	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.017)	(0.011)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.026	-0.061+	-0.016	0.031	-0.040	-0.079*	-0.021	-0.098*
	(0.028)	(0.051)	(0.033)	(0.043)	(0.068)	(0.055)	(0.039)	(0.070)	(0.046)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	4.026	4.075	4.003	3.799	3.725	3.840	4.194	4.390	4.113
N (observations)	1,553,771	465,748	1,088,023	753,940	245,074	508,866	799,824	220,667	579,157
N (institutions)	401	328	379	352	317	338	356	312	347
N (incidents)	442	138	304	191	65	126	251	73	178

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. Incident outcomes are considered serious if the perpetrator is no longer employed (through retirement, resignation, firing, or contract nonrenewal), if there is a criminal or civil court judgment, or if the perpetrator has died by suicide. Incident outcomes are not serious if they are a suspension, revocation of an honor, demotion, warning, or a required training or are not categorized. The p-value is 0.564 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.411 for the early time period, and 0.351 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.5: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), by Intensity of News Coverage

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All	Low News	High News	All	Low News	High News	All	Low News	High News
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Trend	0.001	0.007	-0.007	-0.004	-0.001	-0.012	0.004	0.016*	-0.005
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.018)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.005)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.012+	-0.024**	0.003	-0.004	-0.011	0.014	-0.020*	-0.039**	-0.004
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.030)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.013)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.094**	0.011	-0.016	-0.042	0.055	-0.079*	-0.157**	-0.016
	(0.028)	(0.033)	(0.049)	(0.043)	(0.038)	(0.120)	(0.039)	(0.056)	(0.053)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	4.026	4.014	4.041	3.799	3.895	3.532	4.194	4.164	4.218
N (observations)	1,553,771	897,645	656,126	753,940	545,748	208,192	799,824	351,890	447,934
N (institutions)	401	365	346	352	337	319	356	331	329
N (incidents)	442	251	191	191	139	52	251	112	139

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. High news coverage is defined as 5 or more articles covering an incident. The p-value is 0.081 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.440 for the early time period, and 0.067 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.6: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), by Number of Victims

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All (1)	Single (2)	Multiple (3)	All (4)	Single (5)	Multiple (6)	All (7)	Single (8)	Multiple (9)
Trend	0.001	0.001	0.000	-0.004	-0.014	0.003	0.004	0.011	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.005)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.012^{+}	-0.019	-0.008	-0.004	-0.001	-0.006	-0.020*	-0.024^{+}	-0.016
	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.021)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.013)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.076	-0.032	-0.016	-0.003	-0.023	-0.079*	-0.095+	-0.063
	(0.028)	(0.054)	(0.028)	(0.043)	(0.086)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.058)	(0.051)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	4.026	3.944	4.086	3.799	3.644	3.915	4.194	4.169	4.212
N (observations)	1,553,771	650,111	903,660	753,940	319,566	434,374	799,824	330,545	469,279
N (institutions)	401	356	354	352	329	327	356	331	330
N (incidents)	442	188	254	191	81	110	251	107	144

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. Incidents are considered to have multiple victims if the associated news reports mention multiple victims. The p-value is 0.477 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.826 for the early time period, and 0.675 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.7: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), in STEM and Non-STEM Fields

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All	Not STEM	STEM	All	Not STEM	STEM	All	Not STEM	STEM
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Trend	0.001	-0.001	0.004	-0.004	-0.007	0.006	0.004	0.004	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.011)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.012^{+}	-0.014	-0.009	-0.004	-0.003	-0.005	-0.020*	-0.019^{+}	-0.021
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.019)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.054	-0.035	-0.016	-0.014	-0.020	-0.079*	-0.077+	-0.085
	(0.028)	(0.034)	(0.049)	(0.043)	(0.053)	(0.063)	(0.039)	(0.045)	(0.074)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	4.026	4.000	4.102	3.799	3.830	3.704	4.194	4.130	4.370
N (observations)	1,553,771	1,172,039	381,732	753,940	575,524	178,416	799,824	596,508	203,316
N (institutions)	401	379	328	352	337	316	356	345	314
N (incidents)	442	332	110	191	147	44	251	185	66

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. STEM fields include astronomy, biology, chemistry, computer science, engineering, geology, mathematics, medicine, meteorology, natural resources, other health, other physical sciences, physics, and science technologies. All other majors are marked as non-STEM. The p-value is 0.747 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.944 for the early time period, and 0.926 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.8: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), by Institution Selectivity

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All	Less Selective	Most Selective	All	Less Selective	Most Selective	All	Less Selective	Most Selective
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Trend	0.001	0.008	-0.008	-0.004	0.008	-0.015	0.004	0.007	-0.002
	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.012^{+}	-0.023**	-0.002	-0.004	-0.027*	0.018	-0.020*	-0.015	-0.027
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.018)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.090**	-0.006	-0.016	-0.107*	0.072	-0.079*	-0.058	-0.108
	(0.028)	(0.033)	(0.047)	(0.043)	(0.053)	(0.067)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.072)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	4.026	3.788	4.303	3.799	3.472	4.141	4.194	4.003	4.436
N (observations)	1,553,771	911,093	642,678	753,940	440,865	313,075	799,824	470,223	329,601
N (institutions)	401	255	146	352	220	132	356	217	139
N (incidents)	442	442	442	191	191	191	251	251	251

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. Institutions are considered as Most Selective if they are categorized as such by Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. The p-value is 0.144 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.035 for the early time period, and 0.550 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.9: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), by Size of Department

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	All (1)	Not Large Department (2)	Large Department (3)	All (4)	Not Large Department (5)	Large Department (6)	All (7)	Not Large Department (8)	Large Department (9)
Trend	0.001	0.012^{+}	-0.007	-0.004	0.013	-0.017^{+}	0.004	0.009	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.004)
Post event$\times$ years elapsed	-0.012^{+}	-0.028*	-0.002	-0.004	-0.034*	0.018	-0.020*	-0.009	-0.023^{+}
	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.012)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.050+	-0.111*	-0.009	-0.016	-0.138*	0.072	-0.079*	-0.038	-0.093+
	(0.028)	(0.045)	(0.037)	(0.043)	(0.054)	(0.064)	(0.039)	(0.064)	(0.049)
Mean at $t^{*} = -1$	4.026	2.712	4.919	3.799	2.683	4.689	4.194	2.739	5.070
N (observations)	1,553,771	705,630	847,495	753,940	355,062	398,726	799,824	350,564	448,769
N (institutions)	401	373	332	352	336	317	356	340	318
N (incidents)	442	442	437	191	191	190	251	251	247

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. The p-value is 0.073 for the group comparison across both time periods, 0.012 for the early time period, and 0.515 for the recent time period. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.10: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Share of Majors

	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
Trend	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Post	0.003	0.003	0.004	-0.011**	-0.020***	-0.015***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.004)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.002	-0.001	0.001	-0.008	-0.018+	-0.013+
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.007)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	0.413	0.172	0.309	0.115	0.309	0.202
N (observations)	301,484	301,487	301,497	301,484	301,487	301,497
N (institutions)	336	337	337	336	337	337
N (incidents)	255	256	256	255	256	256

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Majors dominated by women are those at the 25th percentile or lower in terms of share of degrees granted to men in an institution and year; majors dominated by men are those at the 75th percentile or higher in terms of share of degrees granted to men in an institution and year. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.11: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Share of Majors in Different Time Periods

	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
(A) Early Incidents						
Trend	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.000	0.003^{+}	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Post	0.005	0.002	0.005	-0.003	-0.005	-0.004
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.001	-0.004	-0.001	-0.004	0.006	0.000
	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	0.429	0.184	0.323	0.091	0.267	0.171
N (observations)	179,708	179,707	179,708	179,708	179,707	179,708
N (institutions)	223	223	223	223	223	223
N (incidents)	143	143	143	143	143	143
(B) Recent Incidents						
Trend	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.002	0.000	-0.001	0.000	-0.009^{+}	-0.004
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Post	0.002	0.004	0.004	-0.020**	-0.030**	-0.024**
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.008)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.007	0.004	-0.000	-0.019	-0.065**	-0.040*
	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.016)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	0.394	0.157	0.293	0.146	0.361	0.240
N (observations)	121,776	121,780	121,789	121,776	121,780	121,789
N (institutions)	193	194	194	193	194	194
N (incidents)	112	113	113	112	113	113

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Majors dominated by women are those at the 25th percentile or lower in terms of share of degrees granted to men in an institution and year; majors dominated by men are those at the 75th percentile or higher in terms of share of degrees granted to men in an institution and year. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.12: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Expected Earnings (Natural Log)

	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
Trend	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Post event× years elapsed	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Post	-0.000	-0.000	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Impact 4 years after event	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	11.012	11.145	11.074	14.657	14.718	14.686
N (observations)	301,484	301,487	301,497	301,484	301,487	301,497
N (institutions)	336	337	337	336	337	337
N (incidents)	255	256	256	255	256	256

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The outcome is the 5-year median expected earnings (natural log) associated with the college major by institution from the College Scorecard in Columns 1–3 and lifetime expected earnings (natural log) associated with the college major from Webber (2018) in Columns 4–6. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.13: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Expected Earnings (Natural Log) in Different Time Periods

	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
(A) Early Incidents						
Trend	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Post event× years elapsed	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Impact 4 years after event	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	11.017	11.147	11.077	14.655	14.718	14.685
N (observations)	179,708	179,707	179,708	179,708	179,707	179,708
N (institutions)	223	223	223	223	223	223
N (incidents)	143	143	143	143	143	143
(B) Recent Incidents						
Trend	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post event× years elapsed	0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Post	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Impact 4 years after event	0.005	0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	11.007	11.143	11.071	14.660	14.717	14.686
N (observations)	121,776	121,780	121,789	121,776	121,780	121,789
N (institutions)	193	194	194	193	194	194
N (incidents)	112	113	113	112	113	113

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 2, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The outcome is the 5-year median expected earnings (natural log) associated with the college major by institution from the College Scorecard in Columns 1–3 and lifetime expected earnings (natural log) associated with the college major from Webber (2018) in Columns 4–6. The sample includes four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.14: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Exposure Redefined on Basis of Incident Year

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.005	-0.003	0.006	0.004	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.003	0.002	0.000	-0.004	0.002	-0.001	0.005	0.011	0.012
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.013	0.007	0.000	-0.015	0.006	-0.004	0.020	0.044	0.048
	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.033)	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.052)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.356	3.142	3.974	3.237	3.024	3.847	3.660	3.444	4.297
N (observations)	1,552,171	1,552,171	1,552,171	1,137,823	1,137,823	1,137,823	414,348	414,348	414,348
N (institutions)	393	393	393	371	371	371	329	329	329
N (incidents)	407	407	407	294	294	294	113	113	113

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. This table redefines exposure based on the timing of the misconduct occuring, if reported. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.15: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Excluding Same-State Comparison Institutions

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	-0.000	0.001	0.000	-0.005	-0.007	-0.004	0.004	0.006	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.008	-0.011	-0.012^{+}	0.002	-0.000	-0.004	-0.019*	-0.018^{+}	-0.020*
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.032	-0.044	-0.047+	0.008	-0.002	-0.014	-0.078*	-0.072+	-0.079*
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.039)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.411	3.162	4.026	3.180	2.950	3.799	3.582	3.319	4.194
N (observations)	1,503,139	1,503,139	1,503,139	729,650	729,650	729,650	773,489	773,489	773,489
N (institutions)	401	401	401	352	352	352	356	356	356
N (incidents)	443	443	443	191	191	191	252	252	252

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. This table excludes comparison institutions located in the same state as the treated institution. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.16: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Comparing to Alternative Comparisons

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	0.003	0.004	0.003	-0.004	-0.006	-0.004	0.008	0.010*	0.009+
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.007	-0.012+	-0.012+	0.005	0.001	-0.002	-0.018+	-0.018+	-0.021*
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.029	-0.048+	-0.050+	0.018	0.004	-0.006	-0.073+	-0.073+	-0.082*
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.041)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.411	3.162	4.026	3.180	2.950	3.799	3.582	3.319	4.194
N (observations)	416,721	416,721	416,721	198,771	198,771	198,771	217,950	217,950	217,950
N (institutions)	341	341	341	223	223	223	243	243	243
N (incidents)	443	443	443	191	191	191	252	252	252

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. The estimates in this table restrict comparisons to departments in institutions with a high propensity to ever have an incident. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.17: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Comparing to Other-Major-Treated Institutions

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	-0.004	-0.002	-0.003	-0.009^{+}	-0.008^{+}	-0.008^{+}	-0.001	0.003	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Post event$\times$ years elapsed	-0.001	-0.008	-0.007	0.009	0.001	0.002	-0.014^{+}	-0.011	-0.014^{+}
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.008)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.004	-0.031	-0.026	0.035	0.004	0.006	-0.055+	-0.044	-0.056+
	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.032)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.618	3.343	4.225	3.404	3.178	4.028	3.768	3.459	4.363
N (observations)	123,353	123,353	123,353	57,622	57,622	57,622	65,731	65,731	65,731
N (institutions)	287	287	287	275	275	275	276	276	276
N (incidents)	427	427	427	185	185	185	242	242	242

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. The estimates in this table restrict comparisons to departments in institutions with incidents in other academic fields. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.18: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Including Academic-Field Specific Misconduct with Faculty/Staff Victims

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	0.000	0.001	0.001	-0.003	-0.006	-0.003	0.004	0.006	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.007	-0.008	-0.010	0.001	0.003	-0.002	-0.019*	-0.017+	-0.019*
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.029	-0.032	-0.039	0.006	0.012	-0.008	-0.076*	-0.069+	-0.075*
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.037)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.459	3.226	4.086	3.216	3.012	3.849	3.641	3.386	4.263
N (observations)	725,285	725,285	725,285	350,626	350,626	350,626	374,659	374,659	374,659
N (institutions)	410	410	410	353	353	353	358	358	358
N (incidents)	526	526	526	225	225	225	301	301	301

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. The estimates in this table add in reports of incidents of faculty sexual misconduct where the victim is another faculty or staff member, that can be linked to an academic field. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.19: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Shorter Time Window

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	0.003	0.001	0.003	-0.005	-0.008	-0.004	0.009	0.008	0.008
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Post event$\times$ years elapsed	-0.010	-0.010	-0.013	0.006	0.004	0.000	-0.023^{+}	-0.021	-0.024^{+}
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.040	-0.041	-0.053	0.025	0.017	0.002	-0.093+	-0.084	-0.097+
	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.052)	(0.048)	(0.042)	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.054)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.417	3.164	4.031	3.198	2.957	3.813	3.581	3.318	4.192
N (observations)	1,040,483	1,040,483	1,040,483	475,060	475,060	475,060	565,423	565,423	565,423
N (institutions)	400	400	400	351	351	351	356	356	356
N (incidents)	443	443	443	190	190	190	253	253	253

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. This table constrains the event window to 5 years before and after the event instead of 8. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table A.20: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Shorter Time Window

	All Incidents			Early Incidents			Recent Incidents		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)	Women (7)	Men (8)	All (9)
Trend	-0.004	-0.005	-0.003	-0.006	-0.008	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Post event× years elapsed	-0.003	-0.007	-0.009	0.006	0.004	-0.000	-0.017	-0.024	-0.021
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Impact 4 years after event	-0.012	-0.030	-0.034	0.025	0.017	-0.000	-0.066	-0.098	-0.084
	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.043)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.069)
Mean at $t^* = -1$	3.297	3.045	3.901	3.180	2.925	3.789	3.463	3.217	4.062
N (observations)	784,985	784,985	784,985	464,080	464,080	464,080	320,905	320,905	320,905
N (institutions)	376	376	376	350	350	350	331	331	331
N (incidents)	316	316	316	184	184	184	132	132	132

Notes: The sample includes college information for four-year public and private nonprofit institutions from 1983-84 to 2023-24, with misconduct incidents from 1983 to 2023. Singletons are dropped. This sample also excludes institutions with only one academic major and incidents for which the associated major was classified as other. This table constrains the event window to 5 years before and after the event instead of 8 and retains a balanced panel. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).


Appendix B: Nonparametric Event Study Estimates

Table B.1: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Applications and Enrollment (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates

	Applications			1st-Year 1st-Time Enrollment		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.025	-0.032	-0.033	-0.006	-0.010	-0.014
	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.021)
7 years pre event	0.004	-0.014	-0.003	-0.007	-0.010	-0.013
	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.019)
6 years pre event	-0.001	-0.013	-0.008	-0.002	-0.005	-0.006
	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.017)
5 years pre event	-0.004	-0.012	-0.011	-0.008	-0.006	-0.009
	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.015)
4 years pre event	0.007	0.000	0.002	-0.003	-0.002	-0.003
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.012)
3 years pre event	0.022	0.015	0.018	-0.011	-0.006	-0.009
	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)
2 years pre event	0.004	0.004	0.002	-0.005	-0.004	-0.006
	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)
Event year	0.005	0.008	0.006	-0.012	-0.006	-0.010
	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.015)
1 year post event	-0.005	-0.003	-0.005	-0.003	-0.016	-0.008
	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.013)
2 years post event	-0.013	0.008	0.002	-0.026	-0.031*	-0.027^{+}
	(0.026)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.014)
3 years post event	0.016	0.012	0.011	-0.003	-0.017	-0.007
	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.016)
4 years post event	-0.008	-0.008	-0.005	-0.001	-0.017	-0.006
	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)
5 years post event	0.000	0.016	0.009	-0.014	-0.016	-0.014
	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)
6 years post event	0.002	0.014	0.008	-0.027	-0.030	-0.026
	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.024)
7 years post event	-0.023	-0.004	-0.014	-0.047	-0.049	-0.045
	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.035)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	8.547	8.274	9.122	6.725	6.513	7.330
N (observations)	206,794	206,794	207,253	285,647	285,647	285,647
N (institutions)	295	294	294	293	293	293
N (incidents)	216	215	215	214	214	214


Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Figure B.1: Event Study Estimates of Application and Enrollment, All Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on applications and enrollment (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$).

Figure B.2: Event Study Estimates of Application and Enrollment, Recent Incidents




Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on applications and enrollment (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1985–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.3: Event Study Estimates of Application and Enrollment, Early Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on applications and enrollment (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1985–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.4: Event Study Estimates of Undergraduate Degree Completion by Gender, All Incidents




Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$).

Figure B.5: Event Study Estimates of Undergraduate Degree Completion by Gender, Early Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.6: Event Study Estimates of Undergraduate Degree Completion by Gender, Recent Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions (natural log). Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.7: Event Study Estimates of Degrees by Share of Degrees Granted to Men, All Incidents




Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions in majors dominated by women and men. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$).

Figure B.8: Event Study Estimates of Degrees by Share of Degrees Granted to Men, Early Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions in majors dominated by women and men. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.9: Event Study Estimates of Degrees by Share of Degrees Granted to Men, Recent Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on degree completions in majors dominated by women and men. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.10: Event Study Estimates of Median Earnings by Major, All Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on median earnings by major. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$).

Figure B.11: Event Study Estimates of Median Earnings by Major, Early Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on median earnings by major. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Figure B.12: Event Study Estimates of Median Earnings by Major, Recent Incidents



Notes: This figure shows event study estimates of the impact of an ASMD incident on median earnings by major. Impacts are estimated with a stacked estimator relative to the year before the incident ($t = -1$). Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023.

Table B.2: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Applications and Enrollment (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Early Incidents

	Applications			1st-Year 1st-Time Enrollment		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.012	0.032	-0.003	-0.034	-0.016	-0.035
	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.054)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.027)
7 years pre event	0.012	-0.004	0.006	-0.021	-0.008	-0.023
	(0.042)	(0.052)	(0.042)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.023)
6 years pre event	-0.045	-0.036	-0.044	-0.015	-0.016	-0.021
	(0.046)	(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.021)
5 years pre event	-0.028	-0.035	-0.035	-0.027	-0.010	-0.023
	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.020)
4 years pre event	-0.015	-0.026	-0.023	0.001	-0.008	-0.007
	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.015)
3 years pre event	0.018	0.008	0.011	-0.024^{+}	-0.019	-0.024*
	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.012)
2 years pre event	0.015	0.009	0.012	-0.004	-0.001	-0.005
	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.010)
Event year	0.004	0.008	0.006	0.005	0.006	0.005
	(0.024)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.010)
1 year post event	0.005	0.003	0.003	0.015	0.004	0.010
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.013)
2 years post event	0.018	0.027	0.022	-0.013	-0.014	-0.012
	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.016)
3 years post event	0.012	0.014	0.014	-0.015	-0.024	-0.018
	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.018)
4 years post event	-0.000	0.002	0.003	-0.018	-0.029	-0.022
	(0.049)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.021)
5 years post event	-0.007	0.011	0.003	-0.026	-0.025	-0.025
	(0.051)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.023)
6 years post event	0.010	0.029	0.020	-0.034	-0.034	-0.033
	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)
7 years post event	-0.010	0.012	0.000	-0.053	-0.052	-0.051
	(0.052)	(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.037)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	8.410	8.186	9.009	6.707	6.530	7.328
N (observations)	94,262	94,262	94,708	173,059	173,059	173,059
N (institutions)	185	185	185	185	185	185
N (incidents)	106	106	106	106	106	106

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.3: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Applications and Enrollment (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Recent Incidents

	Applications			1st-Year 1st-Time Enrollment		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.030	-0.059	-0.045	0.020	-0.004	0.006
	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.029)
7 years pre event	0.000	-0.018	-0.008	0.005	-0.011	-0.004
	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.027)
6 years pre event	0.022	-0.001	0.011	0.010	0.005	0.008
	(0.040)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.024)
5 years pre event	0.009	-0.000	0.002	0.011	-0.003	0.004
	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.021)
4 years pre event	0.019	0.016	0.016	-0.006	0.004	0.001
	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.018)
3 years pre event	0.025	0.019	0.023	0.003	0.007	0.007
	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.015)
2 years pre event	-0.002	0.001	-0.004	-0.006	-0.007	-0.006
	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.009)
Event year	0.007	0.009	0.006	-0.032	-0.018	-0.025
	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.033)	(0.027)	(0.030)
1 year post event	-0.012	-0.008	-0.011	-0.026	-0.038	-0.030
	(0.029)	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.023)
2 years post event	-0.039	-0.007	-0.015	-0.045	-0.053*	-0.047+
	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.025)
3 years post event	0.019	0.011	0.009	0.012	-0.008	0.005
	(0.040)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.028)
4 years post event	-0.018	-0.020	-0.016	0.025	0.004	0.018
	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.032)
5 years post event	0.024	0.040	0.031	0.012	0.014	0.014
	(0.060)	(0.052)	(0.054)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.039)
6 years post event	-0.028	-0.035	-0.036	-0.013	-0.014	-0.011
	(0.076)	(0.067)	(0.069)	(0.058)	(0.051)	(0.052)
7 years post event	-0.261	-0.248	-0.252	-0.020	-0.011	-0.008
	(0.175)	(0.154)	(0.161)	(0.082)	(0.081)	(0.072)
Mean at $^* = -1$	8.632	8.328	9.192	6.743	6.496	7.332
N (observations)	112,532	112,532	112,545	112,588	112,588	112,588
N (institutions)	189	188	188	187	187	187
N (incidents)	110	109	109	108	108	108

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.4: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates

	All Degrees			In-Field Degrees		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.019	0.016	0.022	0.019	0.016	0.022
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.032)
7 years pre event	0.036	0.014	0.029	0.036	0.014	0.029
	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.029)
6 years pre event	0.005	0.039	0.022	0.005	0.039	0.022
	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.026)
5 years pre event	-0.005	0.000	-0.001	-0.005	0.000	-0.001
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.021)
4 years pre event	-0.002	0.006	-0.001	-0.002	0.006	-0.001
	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.023)
3 years pre event	0.032	0.043*	0.038*	0.032	0.043*	0.038*
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.018)
2 years pre event	0.029	0.052**	0.037*	0.029	0.052**	0.037*
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.015)
Event year	0.004	0.013	0.014	0.004	0.013	0.014
	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.019)
1 year post event	0.023	0.017	0.017	0.023	0.017	0.017
	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.022)
2 years post event	0.014	-0.005	0.008	0.014	-0.005	0.008
	(0.030)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.025)	(0.028)
3 years post event	-0.013	-0.005	-0.008	-0.013	-0.005	-0.008
	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.030)
4 years post event	-0.013	-0.009	-0.022	-0.013	-0.009	-0.022
	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.034)
5 years post event	-0.011	-0.027	-0.026	-0.011	-0.027	-0.026
	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.035)
6 years post event	-0.048	-0.033	-0.050	-0.048	-0.033	-0.050
	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)
7 years post event	-0.052	-0.067+	-0.080*	-0.052	-0.067+	-0.080*
	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.038)
Mean at $^* = -1$	3.411	3.162	4.026	3.411	3.162	4.026
N (observations)	1,557,157	1,557,157	1,557,157	1,557,157	1,557,157	1,557,157
N (institutions)	401	401	401	401	401	401
N (incidents)	443	443	443	443	443	443

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Comparison units in Columns 4–6 are limited to the same major as the focal major. The comparison institution by major units are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution by major-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, religious affiliation, urban location, and enrollment), institution by major characteristics (log total degrees, pre-incident degree growth, and average yearly completion rate), and academic field fixed effects. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.5: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Early Incidents

	All Degrees			In-Field Degrees		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.046	0.085	0.051	0.046	0.085	0.051
	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.060)
7 years pre event	0.058	0.067	0.056	0.058	0.067	0.056
	(0.054)	(0.048)	(0.052)	(0.054)	(0.048)	(0.052)
6 years pre event	0.056	0.093*	0.068	0.056	0.093*	0.068
	(0.053)	(0.046)	(0.049)	(0.053)	(0.046)	(0.049)
5 years pre event	0.030	0.050	0.026	0.030	0.050	0.026
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.035)
4 years pre event	-0.003	0.043	0.008	-0.003	0.043	0.008
	(0.046)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.046)	(0.038)	(0.037)
3 years pre event	0.060	0.067+	0.059+	0.060	0.067+	0.059+
	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.030)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.030)
2 years pre event	0.036	0.069*	0.035	0.036	0.069*	0.035
	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.022)
Event year	-0.016	0.010	-0.003	-0.016	0.010	-0.003
	(0.037)	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.037)	(0.032)	(0.026)
1 year post event	0.012	0.052+	0.026	0.012	0.052+	0.026
	(0.040)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.040)	(0.029)	(0.029)
2 years post event	0.036	0.011	0.022	0.036	0.011	0.022
	(0.040)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.040)	(0.034)	(0.033)
3 years post event	0.034	0.017	0.031	0.034	0.017	0.031
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.034)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.034)
4 years post event	-0.004	0.017	-0.011	-0.004	0.017	-0.011
	(0.045)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.045)	(0.040)	(0.039)
5 years post event	0.028	-0.002	0.004	0.028	-0.002	0.004
	(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.041)
6 years post event	-0.017	0.010	-0.019	-0.017	0.010	-0.019
	(0.047)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.041)	(0.043)
7 years post event	-0.031	-0.056	-0.072	-0.031	-0.056	-0.072
	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.046)
Mean at $^* = -1$	3.180	2.950	3.799	3.180	2.950	3.799
N (observations)	753,940	753,940	753,940	753,940	753,940	753,940
N (institutions)	352	352	352	352	352	352
N (incidents)	191	191	191	191	191	191

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Comparison units in Columns 4–6 are limited to the same major as the focal major. The comparison institution by major units are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution by major-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, religious affiliation, urban location, and enrollment), institution by major characteristics (log total degrees, pre-incident degree growth, and average yearly completion rate), and academic field fixed effects. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.6: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Degree Completion (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Recent Incidents

	All Degrees			In-Field Degrees		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.000	-0.033	0.001	0.000	-0.033	0.001
	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.035)
7 years pre event	0.020	-0.024	0.010	0.020	-0.024	0.010
	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.033)
6 years pre event	-0.032	-0.001	-0.011	-0.032	-0.001	-0.011
	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.028)
5 years pre event	-0.030	-0.036	-0.021	-0.030	-0.036	-0.021
	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.026)
4 years pre event	-0.001	-0.020	-0.008	-0.001	-0.020	-0.008
	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.028)
3 years pre event	0.012	0.025	0.023	0.012	0.025	0.023
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.021)
2 years pre event	0.025	0.040	0.037^{+}	0.025	0.040	0.037^{+}
	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.020)
Event year	0.019	0.015	0.028	0.019	0.015	0.028
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.026)
1 year post event	0.032	-0.010	0.011	0.032	-0.010	0.011
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)
2 years post event	-0.004	-0.015	-0.003	-0.004	-0.015	-0.003
	(0.044)	(0.037)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.037)	(0.044)
3 years post event	-0.056	-0.019	-0.043	-0.056	-0.019	-0.043
	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.049)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.049)
4 years post event	-0.017	-0.025	-0.029	-0.017	-0.025	-0.029
	(0.054)	(0.049)	(0.056)	(0.054)	(0.049)	(0.056)
5 years post event	-0.057	-0.041	-0.059	-0.057	-0.041	-0.059
	(0.061)	(0.054)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.054)	(0.061)
6 years post event	-0.100^{+}	-0.099	-0.107*	-0.100^{+}	-0.099	-0.107*
	(0.053)	(0.067)	(0.050)	(0.053)	(0.067)	(0.050)
7 years post event	-0.083	0.002	-0.049	-0.083	0.002	-0.049
	(0.061)	(0.073)	(0.064)	(0.061)	(0.073)	(0.064)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	3.582	3.319	4.194	3.582	3.319	4.194
N (observations)	803,217	803,217	803,217	803,217	803,217	803,217
N (institutions)	356	356	356	356	356	356
N (incidents)	252	252	252	252	252	252

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. Comparison units in Columns 4–6 are limited to the same major as the focal major. The comparison institution by major units are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution by major-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, religious affiliation, urban location, and enrollment), institution by major characteristics (log total degrees, pre-incident degree growth, and average yearly completion rate), and academic field fixed effects. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (Columns 1 through 3) or the institution by major level (Columns 4 through 6) (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.7: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Share of Majors, Nonparametric Estimates

	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.009	0.003	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.005
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)
7 years pre event	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.007	0.004	0.004
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.007)
6 years pre event	0.006	0.003	0.006	0.007	0.008	0.006
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.007)
5 years pre event	0.006	0.003	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.006
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
4 years pre event	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.006	0.003	0.004
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
3 years pre event	-0.000	-0.001	0.000	0.008	0.010	0.009
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)
2 years pre event	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	0.008	0.008	0.008
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Event year	0.002	-0.000	0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)
1 year post event	0.002	0.002	0.002	-0.008^{+}	-0.019***	-0.011*
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.004)
2 years post event	-0.003	0.001	-0.002	-0.009^{+}	-0.021**	-0.013*
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
3 years post event	-0.001	0.002	0.000	-0.009^{+}	-0.022*	-0.013*
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.007)
4 years post event	-0.002	-0.001	-0.003	-0.014*	-0.031**	-0.020*
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.008)
5 years post event	-0.001	-0.004	-0.004	-0.006	-0.017	-0.009
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.008)
6 years post event	-0.012	-0.010^{+}	-0.012^{+}	0.002	-0.010	-0.002
	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.009)
7 years post event	-0.012^{+}	-0.012*	-0.014*	0.000	-0.002	0.001
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.008)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	0.411	0.167	0.307	0.117	0.316	0.205
N (observations)	300,415	300,414	300,415	300,415	300,414	300,415
N (institutions)	293	293	293	293	293	293
N (incidents)	214	214	214	214	214	214

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.8: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Share of Majors, Nonparametric Estimates, Early Incidents

	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.010	-0.002	0.005	-0.002	0.005	0.001
	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
7 years pre event	-0.004	-0.003	-0.002	0.001	0.004	0.001
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.006)
6 years pre event	0.006	0.002	0.005	0.000	0.007	0.002
	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.006)
5 years pre event	0.003	0.000	0.002	-0.002	-0.007	-0.004
	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.006)
4 years pre event	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.006	-0.009	-0.007
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.006)
3 years pre event	0.001	-0.003	-0.001	-0.005	-0.007	-0.006
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.004)
2 years pre event	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Event year	0.003	-0.003	0.001	-0.004*	-0.007+	-0.006*
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.003)
1 year post event	0.006	-0.000	0.005	-0.003	-0.010*	-0.004
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)
2 years post event	0.002	-0.000	0.001	-0.000	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.005)
3 years post event	0.004	-0.001	0.002	-0.005	-0.008	-0.005
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.006)
4 years post event	0.003	-0.007	-0.002	-0.006	-0.004	-0.003
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.007)
5 years post event	0.004	-0.010	-0.003	-0.004	0.003	0.001
	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.007)
6 years post event	-0.006	-0.013+	-0.010	-0.005	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.008)
7 years post event	-0.009	-0.014*	-0.013+	-0.006	0.004	0.001
	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.008)
Mean at $^* = -1$	0.435	0.187	0.329	0.088	0.265	0.167
N (observations)	178,963	178,962	178,963	178,963	178,962	178,963
N (institutions)	185	185	185	185	185	185
N (incidents)	106	106	106	106	106	106

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.9: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Share of Majors, Nonparametric Estimates, Recent Incidents

	Majors Dominated by Women			Majors Dominated by Men		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	0.007	0.007	0.010	0.015	0.008	0.010
	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.013)
7 years pre event	0.007	0.006	0.009	0.012	0.005	0.008
	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.013)
6 years pre event	0.006	0.004	0.006	0.014	0.009	0.011
	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.012)
5 years pre event	0.009	0.005	0.007	0.014	0.016	0.016
	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.011)
4 years pre event	0.009	0.007^{+}	0.010*	0.019^{+}	0.015	0.016
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.011)
3 years pre event	-0.001	0.002	0.001	0.020*	0.027*	0.023*
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)
2 years pre event	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	0.016^{+}	0.018	0.018^{+}
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Event year	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)
1 year post event	-0.001	0.004	0.000	-0.013*	-0.029**	-0.018*
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.008)
2 years post event	-0.009	0.003	-0.005	-0.019*	-0.043**	-0.027*
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.011)
3 years post event	-0.006	0.005	-0.002	-0.016	-0.040*	-0.025^{+}
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.013)
4 years post event	-0.010	0.006	-0.004	-0.027*	-0.068**	-0.044**
	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.016)
5 years post event	-0.011	0.004	-0.007	-0.014	-0.053*	-0.028
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.025)	(0.018)
6 years post event	-0.030*	-0.005	-0.020*	0.014	-0.038	-0.009
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.028)	(0.020)
7 years post event	-0.022^{+}	-0.010	-0.019^{+}	0.020	-0.026	-0.001
	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.024)	(0.031)	(0.025)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	0.388	0.148	0.286	0.145	0.366	0.242
N (observations)	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452
N (institutions)	187	187	187	187	187	187
N (incidents)	108	108	108	108	108	108

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.10: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Expected Earnings (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates

	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
7 years pre event	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002	0.003	0.001	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
6 years pre event	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	0.000	0.001	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
5 years pre event	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002	0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
4 years pre event	-0.000	-0.002	-0.001	0.000	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
3 years pre event	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
2 years pre event	-0.003*	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002^{+}	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Event year	0.001	0.001	0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
1 year post event	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
2 years post event	-0.001	0.002	0.000	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
3 years post event	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.001
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
4 years post event	-0.001	0.004	0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
5 years post event	-0.000	0.004	0.002	-0.000	-0.001	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
6 years post event	0.001	0.003	0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
7 years post event	0.004	0.007^{+}	0.005	-0.002	0.000	-0.001
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	11.004	11.133	11.063	14.654	14.713	14.681
N (observations)	300,415	300,414	300,415	300,415	300,414	300,415
N (institutions)	293	293	293	293	293	293
N (incidents)	214	214	214	214	214	214

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.11: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Expected Earnings (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Early Incidents

	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.004	-0.005	-0.004	-0.001	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
7 years pre event	-0.002	-0.006^{+}	-0.003	0.003	0.001	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
6 years pre event	-0.004	-0.002	-0.003	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
5 years pre event	-0.001	-0.007^{+}	-0.003	-0.000	-0.004	-0.001
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
4 years pre event	-0.002	-0.006*	-0.003	-0.000	-0.004	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
3 years pre event	-0.003^{+}	-0.005*	-0.003*	-0.001	-0.003	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
2 years pre event	-0.003	-0.002	-0.002	-0.000	-0.003*	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Event year	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	0.000	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
1 year post event	-0.003	-0.001	-0.003	0.001	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
2 years post event	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.002	-0.001	0.001
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)
3 years post event	-0.005^{+}	-0.000	-0.003	0.002	0.001	0.002
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
4 years post event	-0.004	0.002	-0.000	0.001	-0.002	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
5 years post event	-0.003	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
6 years post event	-0.002	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
7 years post event	0.000	0.005	0.003	-0.001	0.002	0.001
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	11.002	11.126	11.057	14.649	14.710	14.678
N (observations)	178,963	178,962	178,963	178,963	178,962	178,963
N (institutions)	185	185	185	185	185	185
N (incidents)	106	106	106	106	106	106

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).

Table B.12: Impact of Faculty Sexual Misconduct on Expected Earnings (Natural Log), Nonparametric Estimates, Recent Incidents

	Median 5-year earnings			Median lifetime earnings		
	Women (1)	Men (2)	All (3)	Women (4)	Men (5)	All (6)
8 years pre event	-0.002	-0.002	-0.004	-0.001	0.000	-0.002
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
7 years pre event	-0.000	0.001	-0.001	0.003	0.002	0.002
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
6 years pre event	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	0.001	0.003	0.001
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
5 years pre event	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
4 years pre event	0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
3 years pre event	-0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
2 years pre event	-0.003	0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Event year	0.003	0.005	0.003	-0.001	0.002	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
1 year post event	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.000
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
2 years post event	-0.002	0.005	0.001	-0.002	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
3 years post event	0.007	0.004	0.006	0.000	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)
4 years post event	0.001	0.006	0.002	-0.002	0.001	-0.001
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)
5 years post event	0.004	0.003	0.004	-0.001	-0.004	-0.002
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)
6 years post event	0.004	-0.002	-0.000	-0.005	-0.013^{+}	-0.008^{+}
	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)
7 years post event	0.016	0.007	0.009	-0.005	-0.011	-0.008
	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.006)
Mean at $^{*} = -1$	11.005	11.141	11.069	14.658	14.716	14.685
N (observations)	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452	121,452
N (institutions)	187	187	187	187	187	187
N (incidents)	108	108	108	108	108	108

Notes: Each column in this table reports stacked event study estimates of the impact of reports of faculty sexual misconduct on the outcome for the group listed in the column heading from a separate regression of specification 1, which includes institution by dataset and year by dataset fixed effects. The comparison institutions are those in the top 5% of propensity scores from a logit model in the institution-level data predicting ever-treated status using institutional characteristics (private nonprofit, selectivity, graduate programs, per-student share female, religious affiliation, urban location, NCAA athletics, on-campus housing, HBCU status, tuition, and enrollment), estimated in 2010. Early incidents are those in 1983–2014; recent incidents are those in 2015–2023. The estimates are weighted by the share of treated observations in each stacked dataset. Robust standard errors are clustered at the institution level (+ p<0.10 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001).