Who Gets a Second Chance? Effectiveness and Equity in Supervision of Criminal Offenders

Evan K. Rose*

June 8, 2020

Abstract

Most convicted criminals are sentenced to probation and allowed to return home. On probation, however, a technical rule violation such as not paying fees can result in incarceration. Rule violations account for more than 30% of all prison spells in many states and are significantly more common among black offenders. I test whether technical rules are effective tools for identifying likely reoffenders and deterring crime and examine their disparate racial impacts using administrative data from North Carolina. Analysis of a 2011 reform eliminating prison punishments for technical violations reveals that 40% of rule breakers would go on to commit crimes if their violations were ignored. The same reform also closed a 33% black-white gap in incarceration rates without substantially increasing the black-white reoffending gap. These effects combined imply that technical rules target riskier probationers overall, but disproportionately affect low-risk black offenders. To justify black probationers' higher violation rate on efficiency grounds, their crimes must be roughly twice as socially costly as that of white probationers. Exploiting the repeat-spell nature of the North Carolina data, I estimate a semi-parametric competing risks model that allows me to distinguish the effects of particular types of technical rules from unobserved probationer heterogeneity. Rules related to the payment of fees and fines, which are common in many states, are ineffective in tagging likely reoffenders and drive differential impacts by race. These findings illustrate the potentially large influence of facially race-neutral policies on racial disparities in criminal justice outcomes.

^{*}Ph.D. Candidate, U.C. Berkeley Department of Economics; ekrose@berkeley.edu. I thank Pat Kline, David Card, Danny Yagan, and Chris Walters for their help and encouragement. This paper has benefited tremendously from comments and suggestions from Alessandra Fenizia, Fred Finan, Ingrid Haegele, Jonathan Holmes, Hilary Hoynes, Peter Jones, Nick Li, Juliana Londoño-Vélez, Maxim Massenkoff, Justin McCrary, Conrad Miller, Steven Raphael, Emmanuel Saez, Jonathan Schellenberg, Yotam Shem-Tov, Francis Wong, and seminar participants at the University of California at Berkeley. I am grateful to the North Carolina Department of Public Safety and Administrative Office of the Courts for their help in securing and understanding the data, as well as to Ginny Hevener, Linda Mitterling, George Pettigrew, Alan Pistick, Cara Stevens, and the officers of the 14th Probation District for their feedback and patience.

1 Introduction

For many black men, encounters with police, courts, and prisons are as common as employment. Black high school dropouts, for example, are almost as likely to be incarcerated as to be holding a job. Recent research has studied racial disparities in decisions by police, judges, prosecutors, and juries (Fryer, 2019; Arnold, Dobbie and Yang, 2018; Rehavi and Starr, 2014; Anwar, Bayer and Hjalmarsson, 2012) and how arrest, conviction, and incarceration affect economic outcomes (Agan and Starr, 2018; Dobbie, Goldin and Yang, 2018; Harding et al., 2018; Chetty et al., 2018; Bayer and Charles, 2018; Mueller-Smith and Schnepel, 2019; Bhuller et al., 2019). However, less attention has been paid to the impact of probation, the most common way criminals are punished in the United States. Every year, more than 3.7 million probationers are sent home after conviction on the condition that they obey strict technical rules. Breaking these rules, which forbid alcohol and drugs, entail frequent meetings with a probation officer, and require timely payment of fees and fines levied by the court, can result in incarceration. Such "technical violations" account for more than 30% of prison spells in many states (CSG, 2019) and are significantly more common among black men. This "second chance" sentence is therefore a key driver of incarceration overall and of racial disparities in prison exposure.¹

Technical rules, however, are the primary tools the probation system uses to monitor convicted offenders and promote rehabilitation. Despite the costs, punishing rule breaking with incarceration may therefore be effective if violations are a strong indicator of future criminal behavior, making them good "tags" for criminal risk, or if the threat of harsh punishments encourages compliance with beneficial rules. The *effectiveness* of enforcing probation's technical rules thus depends on how well violations serve as predictors of future crime and on the behavioral responses to potential punishments. The *equity* implications depend on racial differences in the association between rule breaking and criminality (Kleinberg et al., 2017; Kleinberg, Mullainathan and Raghavan, 2017) and on differences in any behavioral responses to punishments.

This paper examines the effectiveness and equity of the probation system. I test whether technical rules target probationers who would otherwise commit crimes, measure their deterrence effects, and examine racial differences in targeting and deterrence. To do so, I examine a major 2011 reform in North Carolina that eliminated incarceration punishments for nonpayment of cash fees and fines, drug and alcohol use, and other rule violations. As a result, many probationers who would have been imprisoned for rule breaking prior to the reform were instead permitted to remain in their communities. Measuring the resultant increases in crime thus allows me to assess how effectively rule breaking identified and incapacitated would-be reoffenders and measure any behavioral response to the change in enforcement. Analyzing the reform separately by race allows me to assess equity by examining differences in incapacitation and deterrence effects between black and white probationers.

¹These concerns became headline news in 2017 when the musician Meek Mill was incarcerated for breaking the terms of a decade-old probation sentence over technical violations that included riding a dirt bike without a helmet and traveling for performances. Jay-Z, writing in the New York Times, argued "What's happening to Meek Mill is just one example of how our criminal justice system entraps and harasses hundreds of thousands of black people every day...Instead of a second chance, probation ends up being a land mine, with a random misstep bringing consequences greater than the crime" (Nov. 17, 2017).

I begin with a reduced-form analysis of the impacts of the 2011 reform. The analysis examines incarceration and criminal arrests over the first year of probation for successive cohorts who started their probation spells within four years of the reform. To control for any time trends in crime, probationers' outcomes are compared to those of individuals convicted of similar offenses and placed on unsupervised probation, an alternative punishment regime. Unsupervised probationers provide a useful control group because they are not subject to most technical rules and thus were unaffected by the reform. Their outcomes track the treated group's closely over the full pre-reform period.

Difference-in-differences estimates reveal that prison punishments for technical rule violations in the first year of a spell declined by 5.5 percentage points (p.p.) as a result of the reform, a 33% drop relative to the pre-reform mean of 15.4%. Arrests increased by 2.0 p.p. overall. Remarkably, the reform's impact on black offenders' rule-breaking incarceration was nearly twice as large as its impact on white offenders'. As a result, black-white gaps in prison punishments for technical rule violations were practically eliminated, and thousands more black probationers were allowed to remain in their community. Yet black probationers saw only slightly larger increases in arrests after the reform than white probationers. The reform, therefore, eliminated racial gaps in incarceration for rule breaking without impacting racial gaps in reoffending rates.

To interpret these results, I develop a simple empirical model that describes the relationship between two binary events: whether a probationer is incarcerated for technical rule violations and whether he is arrested for a crime. Rule breakers' criminal activity is not observed because their outcomes are censored by incarceration. If the reform eliminates this censoring but does not impact underlying propensities to reoffend, then it is possible to recover the accuracy, type-I (i.e., false positive), and type-II (i.e., false negative) error rates associated with using technical violations as tags of future criminality. Validation tests support the assumption of no impact on underlying behavior by showing that mechanical changes in censoring alone fully account for observed increases in arrests. Nevertheless, I show later that results change little when using a semi-parametric competing hazards model to relax this exclusion restriction (Cox, 1962; Tsiatis, 1975; Heckman and Honoré, 1989; Honoré, 1993; Abbring and Van Den Berg, 2003).

Applying this framework to the reduced form results implies that roughly 37% of individuals who escaped incarceration for rule breaking due to the reform were arrested instead. This estimate of the accuracy (i.e., the probability of offending conditional on breaking a rule) of the drug and administrative rules affected by the reform is roughly 10 p.p. higher than mean arrest rates. Using rule breaking as a tag for criminal risk therefore does meaningfully better than random chance. Yet both type-I and type-II errors are large, at 6% and 94%, respectively, implying rules catch a non-trivial fraction of non-reoffenders and few potential reoffenders.

The effectiveness of technical violations as tags for risk varies substantially race. Roughly 50% of white probationers spared incarceration were arrested, while among black probationers the arrest rate was only 30%. The implied accuracy of technical rules is therefore 66% higher in the white population. In fact, among black offenders accuracy is close to mean reoffending rates, implying rule breaking is no better signal of future criminality than a coin flip. While type-II error rates are similar in both groups, type-I error rates are three times higher in the black population. Substantially more black offenders who would not have offended in the first year of their spell were therefore incarcerated due to technical rules.

Additional results suggest these race gaps reflect the disparate *impact* of facially race-neutral rules rather than disparate *treatment* by those who enforce them. For example, there is no disparity in how black and white probationers are punished conditional on breaking the same technical rule. Moreover, technical rules for which officers have wide enforcement discretion and those for which violations are detected automatically both exhibit large race gaps. There is also no evidence of caseworker-probationer race match effects. This setting thus highlights the potential importance of how rules and policies are designed rather then how they are applied by practitioners for explaining racial disparities (Bushway and Forst, 2013; Neal and Rick, 2016). Substantial evidence of disparate treatment, which has been the focus of the economics literature on taste-based and statistical discrimination (Becker, 1957; Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973), remains in other criminal justice settings however (Abrams, Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2012; Rehavi and Starr, 2014; Fryer, 2019; Arnold, Dobbie and Yang, 2018).²

The binary outcome framework abstracts from the reality that arrests and rule violations can occur throughout a probation spell and well beyond one year. To examine racial differences in the effectiveness of technical violations at multiple horizons, I generalize the model to allow for a latent risk of crime and rule violations across a series of periods (e.g., months of a probation spell). By comparing the pre- and post-reform regimes, it is still possible to estimate accuracy and error rates in this dynamic setting. The estimates show that black offenders are targeted more aggressively by technical rules regardless of whether and when they would be otherwise be rearrested. There are especially large racial differences for probationers who would only be rearrested three years after starting probation or later (and possibly never). While black offenders are more likely to reoffend overall and to reoffend earlier in their spells, a decomposition shows that racial differences in reoffending risk explain less than 10% of racial differences in the likelihood of incarceration for technical violations.

I use these results to conduct a partial cost-benefit analysis that compares the costs of incarcerating a technical rule breaker to the social costs of crime they would commit and any attendant punishments if allowed to remain free. The results show that for every \$100 the state spends incarcerating technical rule breakers, it saves \$30 it would have spent on incarceration for new offenses. To justify the state's use of incarceration for technical rule breaking, the social costs of crime averted by incarcerating a rule breaker must fill the gap, implying a break-even valuation of roughly \$40,000 per arrest. Because black probationers are targeted more aggressively, break-even valuations for black offenders are roughly twice as large as for white offenders. Using estimates from the existing literature, I find that the social cost of averted offenses falls near or below this benchmark. Importantly, however, these calculations also assign no value to the impact of the reform on racial disparities.

While this quasi-experimental evidence is highly informative, several important issues are more difficult to address. First, the timing of arrests and rule violations are potentially crucial drivers of

²Parallel work by Sakoda (2019), using a similar difference-in-differences strategy to the approach taken here, finds that eliminating post-release supervision for a sub-population of low-risk offenders in Kansas reduced overall rates of and racial disparities in reincarceration. The author finds no effects on new convictions for felony offenses. My analysis complements this work by studying the full probation population, expanding the set of reoffending outcomes observed, developing and applying a framework for interpreting the impacts of technical rules, and exploring the impacts of different types of technical rules, rule timing, and the sources of racial disparities.

effectiveness and any disparate impacts. For example, if all arrests happen early in spells but all rule violations happen later, rules are unlikely to be useful for incapacitating reoffenders even when the propensity to reoffend is tightly correlated with the propensity to break rules. Yet estimating the timing of rule breaking and reoffending is difficult since observed variation over a spell mixes changes in behavior with changes in the population still on probation. Second, probationers may respond directly to changes in enforcement, an effect ruled out in the reduced-form analysis. And finally, different types of rules may have very different effects. The reform however, impacted multiple rules simultaneously, making it difficult to use the quasi-experimental variation to estimate the accuracy and error rates of, for example, drug or fees and fines violations specifically.

I address these questions using a semi-parametric model of competing hazards. In the model, probationers have latent risks of rearrest and incarceration for rule breaking. Both risks evolve over the course of a spell, allowing for state dependence in behaviors. They also depend on observable characteristics such as age and criminal history and on unobserved probationer-specific random effects. The multiple-spell nature of my data allows me to flexibly model the distribution of this unobserved heterogeneity and its correlation across risks (Heckman and Honoré, 1989; Honoré, 1993; Abbring and Van Den Berg, 2003). Each risk can also shift in response to the 2011 reform to directly capture any behavioral responses rather than ruling them out. To disaggregate rule types, an extension breaks the risk of rule-driven incarceration into separate risks for particular rule categories that also depend on both observable and unobservable factors. By estimating the model completely separately by race and gender, this approach can therefore capture rich differences in the relationship between rule breaking, reoffending, and rule enforcement across populations.

The estimates show that state dependence and unobserved heterogeneity are important features of the data. Arrest hazards decline throughout the spell. Incarceration for rule violations, however, peaks roughly nine months into the spell. These patterns help explain the higher errors rates estimated in the reduced form: as a consequence of simple dynamic selection, most rule breakers have already revealed themselves to pose limited criminal risk by virtue of not reoffending earlier in their spell. Nevertheless, individuals who are observably and unobservably more likely to reoffend are also more likely to break technical rules. Younger offenders, for example, pose both higher criminal and rule-breaking risk. However, the connection between rule breaking and criminal risk is substantially weaker for black offenders. Black probationers who would not be rearrested within three years are roughly 60% more likely to be incarcerated for rule breaking than comparable whites.

The estimates show limited evidence of behavioral responses to changes in enforcement. Weekly average latent arrest hazards are less than 0.1 p.p. higher after the change in policy. Violation behavior changes little as well, with very small estimated *decreases* in the risk of drug violations and failure to pay fees and fees. Probationers, police, and judges therefore do not appear responsive to weaker enforcement regimes. Moreover, estimated behavioral responses are similar across race groups, suggesting disparities in technical violations are not justified by larger deterrent effects among black offenders. These limited behavioral responses are consistent with a series of randomized controlled trials showing that intensive monitoring and more stringent supervision conditions typically fail to impact behaviors (Hennigan et al., 2010; Barnes et al., 2012; Boyle et al., 2013; Hyatt and Barnes, 2017).

Estimates of the impact of specific types of rules shows that all rules tend to target black offend-

ers more aggressively. However, rules related to cash fees and fines are particularly problematic. Not enforcing them would increase the share of future reoffenders who break technical rules and decrease the share of future non-reoffenders incarcerated for doing so. Hence, eliminating this type of rule provides a double social benefit by improving the effectiveness of the probation regime overall and reducing existing disparities. Since the 2011 reform directly addressed financial rules, it had large impacts on disparities within more limited impacts on crime. Other rule types, such as drug abuse and reporting rules, tend to perform better.

Taken together, my results show how facially race-neutral policies—in this case common sense rules designed to promote public safety—can generate large racial disparities not justified by the policies' ultimate goals. In some contexts, opting to give local decision makers more discretion instead of relying on uniform rules may increase policies' effectiveness and fairness by taking advantage of agents' superior information and encouraging effort (Aghion and Tirole, 1997; Kuziemko, 2013; Duflo et al., 2018). North Carolina's reform shows that holding discretion fixed, however, there is the potential to redesign rules themselves to improve outcomes. Poorly designed rules and policies are a potentially powerful explanation for many observed racial disparities in criminal justice, where the use of detailed guidelines to constrain decisions has become increasingly popular.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. I first describe the probation system both nationally and in North Carolina, explain the sources and content of my data, and estimate observational racial disparities in Section 2. Section 3 lays out the empirical model. Section 4 presents the main results that analyze the 2011 reform. Section 5 estimates a competing risk model for probation violations and crime. Section 6 concludes.

2 Setting and data

2.1 The probation system

Over the past several decades, the US probation system has grown in tandem with incarceration rates. The national probation population now stands at 3.67 million, a 230% increase over levels in 1980. Since probation spells can be quite short, this population turns over quickly—1.6 million individuals entered probation in 2016, and 1.9 million individuals exited (Kaeble, 2018). Many millions more US residents living today have thus likely served a probation sentence at some point in the past.³

The size of the probation system reflects the popularity of probation as a criminal sentence. In the 75 largest counties in the US, 51% of felony defendants receive probation as part of their sentences, with higher rates for non-violent property and drug offenders (Reaves, 2013). Misdemeanor defendants, who account for the bulk of cases processed in state courts, receive probation at even higher rates. While probation is common overall, it is used most often for young and first-time offenders facing their first serious criminal case. In North Carolina, for example, 78% of first-time

³Roughly 870,000 individuals are currently serving parole sentences in the US. Parole is qualitatively similar to probation, but typically follows an incarceration spell. Probationers, on the other hand, most often go directly back into the community upon conviction with no intervening prison spell. For much of the last 25 years, North Carolina has operated a very limited parole system, opting to release most incarcerated individuals with no supervision. I thus focus exclusively on the probation system in this analysis.

felons are placed on probation, along with 70% of 16-25 year-old offenders.⁴

Probation spells typically last between one and three years (Reaves, 2013). Over this period, offenders must comply with a set of conditions imposed by the court as "reasonably necessary to ensure that the defendant will lead a law-abiding life or to assist him to do so" (NC General Statues §15A-1343). In North Carolina, these conditions include a set of standard "regular" rules: pay fees and fines ordered by the court, including a monthly fee for supervision itself and repayment for any indigent defense provided, remain within the jurisdiction of the court unless given permission to travel, report regularly to a probation officer, submit to drug and alcohol tests and warrantless searches, and attempt to remain gainfully employed. Occasionally, judges impose special conditions such as substance abuse treatment programs and electronic monitoring.⁵ Of course, all probationers are also required to commit no new criminal offenses during their spell. As is clear from North Carolina's statute, public safety is a primary motivation for enforcing technical rules in probation. Interviews conducted with probation officials, probationers, judges, and attorneys across the country by the University of Minnesota's Robina Institute show that many other jurisdictions have a similar focus Robina Institute (2016).

North Carolina, like many other states, operates two forms of probation: supervised and unsupervised. Supervised probationers are assigned a probation officer who is personally responsible for monitoring them. These officers oversee 60-80 offenders at a time, conducting regular interviews, drug tests, searches, and arrests. Most officers have four-year degrees in a criminal justice related field. Roughly 50% of officers are female and 40% are black. Unsupervised probationers are not assigned a probation officer. They are technically subject to the same rules as their supervised peers, except those related to supervision, such as reporting regularly to an officer. While in many cases judges have discretion to assign either supervised or unsupervised probation, unsupervised probation tends to be reserved for misdemeanants and individuals convicted of driving while intoxicated or with a revoked license (descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1 and discussed further below). Due to the lack of monitoring, unsupervised probationers are rarely subject to technical rule violations and thus were largely unaffected by North Carolina's 2011 reform, making them a useful control group.

When a offender breaks a technical rule, they must report to a local judge for a violation hearing. Judges can respond by "revoking" probation and sending the individual to jail or prison for the duration of their original, suspended sentence. I cal this type of punishment technical rule-driven incarceration or simply rule-driven incarceration. Judges can also modify specific conditions, extend the supervision term, and issue verbal reprimands and warnings. In practice, judges closely follow probation officers' recommendations, agreeing to revoke in 85% of hearings where the officer favors doing so. Revocation is also very common. Over the 2000s, for example, probationers remanded to prison without a new criminal conviction accounted for $\sim 40\%$ of new state prison spells.

⁴Individuals granted deferred prosecution are also typically placed on probation. Unlike regular probationers, however, after successfully completing their spell their records may be cleared.

⁵The full set of regular and special probation conditions are listed in North Carolina's general statutes, available at: https://www.ncleg.net/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/PDF/ByArticle/Chapter_15A/Article_82.pdf.

2.2 2011 reform

In 2011, North Carolina made major changes to the state's criminal justice system by passing the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA).⁶ Among the most consequential changes was the introduction of strong limits on courts' authority to revoke probation. For all probation violations occurring on or after December 1, 2011, supervision could be revoked only for new criminal offenses, for fleeing supervision, or if the defendant had two or more violations in the past. Previously, judges could revoke for any technical violation, including non payment of fees and fines, not reporting, or failing drug and alcohol tests. This change dramatically reduced prison punishments for technical violations and provides an important source of variation used throughout this study.

JRA also made several other changes to the probation and parole system. Probation officers received expanded authority to impose conditions such as additional community service in response to failures to comply with certain conditions. JRA also introduced a new violation response— Confinement in Response to Violation (CRV)—that imposes confinement for up to 90 days, although this appears to be used relatively infrequently, especially in the years just after the reform took effect. Finally, JRA also made several changes to other parts of the court system, including increasing the scope of post-release supervision (i.e., parole), adjusting some sentencing enhancements, and re-defining some conditions of supervision. Since the focus of this paper is on the probation system, most of these changes are beyond the scope of this study.⁷

2.3 Data sources

This project primarily analyzes administrative data sets provided by the North Carolina Department of Public Safety (DPS). The core data consist of records for the universe of individuals serving supervised probation sentences that started between 2006 and 2018 (inclusive). These data detail individual demographics, the duration of the probation spell, the original convictions that resulted in the probation spell, and the probation officers assigned to the individual over the course of the spell. The data also record all violations (coded in dozens of unique categories), the probation officer's recommended response, and the ultimate disposition.

In addition to these records, I utilize data on all criminal court cases disposed from 2006 to the present provided by the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Because police officers are the charging agency in North Carolina, these records capture close to the universe of arrests.⁸ I use the AOC data to measure new criminal offenses, the type and length of any

⁶The law reflected several years of work by the Council of State Governments' Justice Center (CSG). After studying North Carolina's corrections system, the CSG concluded that rule-driven incarceration was responsible for hundreds of millions of dollars of corrections costs annually (CSG, 2011). Law makers passed the JRA in an effort to reduce these costs and lower projected correctional spending in the future.

⁷A useful feature of the JRA reforms is that changes to revocation authority applied to all *probation violations* after December 1, 2011. Other changes largely applied to sentences for *offenses committed* after December 1. This allows me to study the effects of the change to revocations while holding other factors constant by looking in a relatively narrow window around December 1, which I do in robustness checks. Appendix Table A11, for example, shows that similar results hold when examining effects on the reform within just one year after it took effect, when the vast majority of offenders were not subject to additional changes.

⁸In Charlotte-Mecklenberg, where I have collected jail booking records directly from the Sheriff, 93.3% of arrests appear in the AOC data. The remaining 6.7% of Charlotte records reflect events unlikely to be captured in AOC data, such as federal prison transfers.

incarceration sentences meted out as a result, and criminal histories. I also use the AOC data to identify my control group, individuals placed on unsupervised probation. I combine this data with additional records from the DPS that detail all sentences to supervised probation and incarceration from the 1970s to the present as an additional source of criminal history information.

Lastly, in some descriptive regressions I use scores on standardized, state-wide tests administered in math and reading at the end of grades three through eight. These data are housed at the North Carolina Education Research Data Center (NCERDC) and were linked to North Carolina criminal records for related work in Rose, Schellenberg and Shem-Tov (2019). Test scores are only available for about a third of the sample, since not all offenders were educated in the state at times covered by the NCERDC data.

All data are linked using a combination of personal and administrative identifiers. This includes full name and date of birth in all cases, but also partial social security numbers, driver's license numbers, and unique codes assigned to individuals by the State Bureau of Investigation, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the DPS.

Throughout the analysis, I define rule-driven incarceration as having probation revoked without an intervening arrest in AOC data. Although most probation violations for new criminal behavior are accompanied by a new criminal charge in court records, occasionally they are not. This definition thus avoids relying on violation codes themselves to define rule-driven incarceration, which is attractive because violation coding may vary across groups or be affected by the reform. Alternative definitions of rule-driven incarceration, such as revocation for violations consisting exclusively of non-criminal behaviors, yield similar results.

2.4 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics for the treated and control samples are provided in Table 1. Both groups are young, with 50% of the sample 30 or under at the start of their spell, predominately male, and overrepresent minorities relative to North Carolina's population. Supervised probation spells last about 20 months on average and are the result of a relatively even mix of felony, misdemeanor, and driving while intoxicated or driving with a revoked license offenses. The treated sample has very limited criminal histories, with the median defendant having just one prior misdemeanor conviction and no prior sentences to supervised probation or incarceration. As expected, unsupervised probationers were convicted of less severe offenses and have more limited criminal histories. Despite these differences, I show below that control units' outcomes closely track those of treated units for many years leading up to the reform, supporting their use as a counterfactual.

Almost all probationers break at least one rule during their spell. As shown in Table 2, the majority of probation spells include at least one violation, with citations for non-payment of fees and fines occurring in 50%. The next most common violation is for not reporting to a probation officer—for example by missing a weekly check-in at the local probation office. This violation occurs in 29% of spells. Drug violations and treatment program failures are also common, occurring in 18% and 16% of spells, respectively. New misdemeanor arrests are the fourth most common violation; new felony arrests are the 11th. Strikingly, probationers are twice as likely to be cited for moving or changing jobs without notifying their probation officer as for committing a new felony crime.

Rather than work with the full list of detailed violation types, I categorize them into four groups: Drug related, administrative, absconding, and new crime. The top violations in each category are reported in Appendix Table A1. Drug related violations are predominately for failing a drug test, dropping out of a substance abuse program, or admitting to drug use. Administrative violations are predominately for non-payment of fees, not reporting, moving without permission, breaking curfew, failing to secure employment, etc. Absconding is a special violation issued when probation officers can no longer locate the offender. Arrest warrants are issued for absconders, and they are typically caught soon after. After the JRA reforms, offenders could only be incarcerated for new crime or absconding violations. Beforehand, they could be revoked for any violation.

2.5 Racial disparities

Racial disparities are a pervasive feature of the US criminal justice system. As shown in Figure 1, for example, black men who did not complete high school are almost as likely to be incarcerated as at work and are employed half as frequently as similarly educated white men. Probation contributes to these patterns. Black offenders are more likely to face technical violations of virtually all types. These disparities are summarized in Figure 2, which reports the coefficients from regressions of a black indicator on an indicator for an event occurring within the probation spell using the North Carolina data. The blue bars report the coefficient when no additional controls are added, while the regressions underlying the red bars feature a battery of other controls, including covariates capturing demographics, geography, criminal history, and standardized math and reading test scores.⁹ The first blue bar, for example, shows that black probationers are 17 p.p. more likely to face administrative violations, a 30% increase relative to the white mean. After including all controls, this difference drops to about 10 p.p. In all cases, however, the black coefficient remains large and statistically significant after including controls. Similar patterns have been documented in multiple other jurisdictions (Jannetta et al., 2014).

Because black offenders face more technical violations, they are also more likely to be incarcerated for breaking technical rules. The black effect for this outcome is roughly 10% of the white mean after including the full suite of control variables. However, the final two bars show that black offenders also more likely to be arrested. These effects are correlated across geographies, as shown in Figure 3. Each dot in this figure plots the black coefficient from a pair of regressions—one with any technical violation and one with any arrest as the outcome—estimated separately for each of the 30 probation districts in North Carolina. In parts of the state where black offenders are more likely to commit crime relative to their white peers, they are also more likely to face technical violations. This pattern suggests that at least part of the racial disparities in technical violations may in fact reflect that potential criminals are also very likely to break technical rules.

⁹Tables showing full regression results, including the effect of adding controls sequentially, are available starting with Appendix Table A2. Test scores available due to related work in North Carolina described in Rose, Schellenberg and Shem-Tov (2019).

3 Defining effective rules and biased rules

In this section, I provide a framework for assessing the effectiveness and equity of rules when viewed as simple tools for predicting socially costly behavior. In my context, these rules—curfews, limitations on travel, and bans on drug and alcohol use, etc.—are intended to identify offenders who are not committed to rehabilitation and thus likely to commit socially costly crimes. The same ideas, however, apply to other contexts, including bail setting (Kleinberg et al., 2017), parole release (Kuziemko, 2013), background screening, and rule breaking in non-criminal contexts, such as in classroom. I then show how with the use of an instrument one can construct a test for biases in accuracy and type-II error rates, as well as a method for quantifying the contribution of any bias to aggregate disparities in outcomes.

3.1 Illustration of approach

To build intuition, consider a simple one-period model. Individuals are either technically imprisoned due to technical rule violations or not. Individuals who are not imprisoned have the opportunity to commit crimes. Let Y_i^* be a latent binary outcome that equals 1 if individual *i* would offend if not incarcerated. Let R_i be a binary outcome that equals one if an individual is incarcerated for technical rule violations. Throughout this section, I suppress an additional subscript *s* for "spell," treating each person-spell observation as a separate unit for simplicity.

Effectiveness depends on the shares of criminals and "innocents" technically imprisoned, or $\Gamma_1 = Pr(R_i = 1 | Y_i^* = 1)$ and $\Gamma_0 = Pr(R_i = 1 | Y_i^* = 0)$, respectively. In this one-period model, these parameters correspond to true positive (i.e., 1– type-II error) and false positive (i.e., type-I error) rates, respectively, and govern how useful technical rules are as tags for criminal risk. When Γ_1 is close to one, all individuals who would commit a crime also commit technical violations, making it easy to use rules to identify and imprison potential offenders. When Γ_0 is sufficiently high, however, technical rules may catch more innocents than criminals. Thus, for any level of total rule-driven incarceration cost (i.e., $Pr(R_i = 1)$), more effective rules have higher Γ_1 (or equivalently lower Γ_0), implying they ensure a greater share of criminals and let more innocents go free. In other words, more effective rules are better classifiers of criminal risk.

My primary concept of equity depends on how Γ_1 and Γ_0 vary across groups. A high Γ_1 for black offenders but low Γ_1 for white offenders, for example, implies that rules target black criminals aggressively, while letting relatively more white offenders off the hook. Higher Γ_0 for one group, on the other hand, implies more non-reoffenders are imprisoned. Unbiased rules are those for which both Γ_1 and Γ_0 do not depend on race, which implies that differences in rule-driven incarceration across groups arise solely because of differences in $Pr(Y_i^* = 1)$, the underlying targeted behavior.

Similar notions of equity have been explored recently in work on "algorithmic fairness" (Corbett-Davies et al., 2017; Kleinberg et al., 2017; Berk et al., 2018). A standard result in this literature is that it is impossible to simultaneously equalize type-I and type-II error rates and predictive accuracy (e.g., $Pr(Y_i^* = 1|R_i = 1)$) across groups unless an algorithm either perfectly predicts the outcome or outcome rates are the same across groups.¹⁰ Although I will consider accuracy in what follows as well, I focus on type-I and type-II errors because they are most closely connected to the concept of "disparate impact" discrimination in employment law. Type-I errors are also particularly troubling in the criminal justice context, where the presumption of innocence is a core value.

How can Γ_1 and Γ_0 be estimated? Data on rule-driven incarceration and offending identify $Pr(R_i = 1)$ and $Pr(Y_i^* = 1 | R_i = 0)$, but not $Pr(Y_i^* = 1 | R_i = 1)$, since these individuals are incapacitated and their criminal outcomes are therefore censored. Despite this, we can always construct an indicator for being *observed* offending, or $Y_i = Y_i^*(1 - R_i)$. Now suppose that we have a binary instrument Z_i that satisfies two assumptions:

- 1. $E[R_i|Z_i=1]=0$
- 2. $E[Y_i^*|Z_i] = E[Y_i^*]$

That is, the instrument eliminates the possibility of rule-driven incarceration and is mean independent of Y_i^* . The latter assumption implies that when $Z_i = 1$ and technical violations are not punished with imprisonment, probationers do not respond by committing more crime. Such responses are potentially plausible. For example, offenders might use more drugs when failed drug tests are not punished with prison time, which could increase crime. I relax this assumption later in the paper and show that any behavioral responses to weaker punishments for rule breaking are small.

With an instrument that satisfies these two assumptions, it is easy to see that

$$\frac{E[Y_i|Z_i = 1] - E[Y_i|Z_i = 0]}{E[Y_i|Z_i = 1]} = \frac{Pr(Y_i^* = 1) - Pr(Y_i^* = 1, R_i = 0)}{Pr(Y_i^* = 1)}$$

$$= \frac{Pr(Y_i^* = 1, R_i = 1)}{Pr(Y_i^* = 1)}$$

$$= Pr(R_i = 1 \mid Y_i^* = 1) = \Gamma^1$$
(1)

A simple rescaling of the reduced form effect of Z_i thus reveals Γ_1 . Since $Pr(R_i = 1)$ is observed, we can also easily estimate Γ_0 . The intuition is that because crime is uncensored when $Z_i = 1$, any increases in offending vs. when $Z_i = 0$ must come from individuals who would have offended but were incarcerated instead. Normalizing by uncensored arrest rates yields the fraction of would-be offenders thwarted by technical rules.¹¹

By estimating both objects in the black and white populations separately, one can readily test whether technical rules satisfy the notion of equity put forward above. With race specific estimates of Γ_1 and Γ_0 , one can also decompose differences in $Pr(R_i = 1)$, or rule-driven incarceration, into

$$Pr(Y_i^* = 1 | R_i = 1) = \Gamma_1 \frac{Pr(Y_i^* = 1)}{Pr(R_i = 1)} = \frac{\Gamma_1}{\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_0(Pr(Y_i^* = 1)^{-1} - 1)}$$

Hence unless $\Gamma_0 = 0$ for both groups or $Pr(Y_i^* = 1)$ is the same, accuracy will differ.

¹¹This derivation is a variation on standard Abadie (2002) results for recovering complier means of potential outcomes. Specifically, let $Y_i^* = Y_i(0)$ be offending when $R_i = 0$ and $Y_i(1) = 0$ be offending when $R_i = 1$. Then two-stage least squares estimates of the effect of $1 - R_i$ on $(1 - R_i)Y_i$ using the reform Z_i recover $E[Y_i(0)|R_i(1) < R_i(0)]$, or the mean reoffending rate of individuals shifted out of incarceration due to the reform (i.e., accuracy). I use Y_i^* to connect the notation here to the duration models that follow, but all results could also be presented using potential outcomes instead.

¹⁰To see this, note that:

a share attributable to targeting and a share attributable to risk. Specifically, letting $B_i \in \{0, 1\}$ denote race, we have:

$$\underbrace{Pr(R_i = 1|B_i = 1) - Pr(R_i = 1|B_i = 0)}_{\text{difference in rule-driven incarceration}} = (2)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1} \underbrace{Pr(Y_i^* = k|B_i = 0)}_{\text{white risk}} \underbrace{Pr(R_i = 1|Y_i^* = k, B_i = 1) - Pr(R_i = 1|Y_i^* = k, B_i = 0)}_{\text{difference in targeting}} + \underbrace{Pr(R_i = 1|Y_i^* = k, B_i = 1)}_{\text{black targeting}} \underbrace{Pr(Y_i^* = k|B_i = 1) - Pr(Y_i^* = k|B_i = 0)}_{\text{difference in risk}}$$

Thus the total difference is comprised of a component driven by differences in risk $(Pr(Y_i^* = 1)$ and $Pr(Y_i^* = 0))$ and a component driven by differences in targeting. As always with Oaxaca-style analyses, it is possible to construct alternative decompositions by adding and subtracting other composite terms (Oaxaca and Ransom, 1999). Here, I decompose the difference using the white risk distribution and the black targeting rates as the baseline.

The analysis below extends the one-period approach in two ways. First, I incorporate multiple periods. This requires allowing both R_i and Y_i^* to be integer-valued variables indicating how many days into a spell a probationer would be incarcerated for rule breaking or reoffend, rather than the simple binary measures used above. The logic remains the same, however—one simply rescales the difference in crime when $Z_i = 1$ vs. $Z_i = 0$ at each horizon, generating a measure of the share of offenders targeted at that point.

Second, I account for the fact that the reform does not completely eliminate technical rules. In the one period example, this implies that $E[R_i | Z_i = 1] > 0$. As a result, I need to introduce a notion of compliers for the reform. These are individuals who *could* be incarcerated for breaking rules if assigned $Z_i = 0$ but would not be if $Z_i = 1$. Because the reform affected only drug and administrative rules, these compliers are simply individuals at risk of breaking these rules alone.

3.2 Full model

Let $Y_i^* \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., \infty\}$ measure the time in days it would take individual *i* to be arrested for a new criminal offense from the start of her probation spell absent any intervention. An infinite duration implies the individual would never be arrested. $R_i^* \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., S_i\} \cup \{\infty\}$ measures days to rule-driven incarceration. This event must occur between 0 and S_i , which is the length of the probation spell. Individuals are targeted by rule-driven incarceration whenever $R_i^* < Y_i^*$, implying they would be imprisoned before they get a chance to commit their crime. Unlike in the single period model, here both objects are latent.

The multi-period version of the bias definition introduced above implies that unbiased rules should target black and white potential criminals similarly at each value of Y_i^* .¹² That is:

¹²This restriction is implied by a stronger definition of bias that requires $R_i^* \perp race_i \mid Y_i^*$. This definition generates many other restrictions, such as that $Pr(R_i^* < l \mid Y_i^* = k, race_i) = Pr(R_i^* < l \mid Y_i^* = k) \forall l < k$. Since these restrictions are not testable given my variation, I focus on the weaker definition.

Definition 1 Racially unbiased technical rules satisfy:

$$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* \mid Y_i^* = k, race_i) = Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* \mid Y_i^* = k) \ \forall \ k$$

Relying on Y_i^* to define risk is akin to a single index restriction. That is, I assume that Y_i^* characterizes risk completely, including the frequency and severity of future offending. Similar assumptions are used in other recent work on racial bias in criminal justice, such as Dobbie, Goldin and Yang (2018), in the spirit of a Becker (1968) outcomes tests. An alternative interpretation of this assumption is that I focus on the extensive margin of *any* offending rather than cumulative measures, as is common in the literature.

Because Y_i^* is unobserved, it is difficult to test the assumption directly. However, I show below that it is not the case that black offenders targeted by rule-driven incarceration (i.e., with $R_i^* < Y_i^*$) commit more severe or more frequent offenses. The increases in crime by crime type across race groups are highly similar after the reform, with black offenders in fact seeing slightly smaller increases in felonies. Moreover, estimated increases in the total cost of crime, where each offenses is assigned a social costs estimate taken from the literature, are statistically indistinguishable between the two groups.

3.3 Impacts of the reform

The reform shifts R_i^* . I model this by allowing each offender to have two *potential* times to ruledriven incarceration: one pre-reform, where drug and administrative rules are enforced, and one post-reform, when they are not. I denote these $R_i^*(0)$ and $R_i^*(1)$, respectively. This setup is an example of the standard Neyman-Rubin potential outcomes model, where, for example, treatment status is indexed by a binary instrument. As usual, only one potential outcome is ever observed for each spell, so that in single-spell data $R_i^* = Z_i R_i^*(1) + (1 - Z_i) R_i^*(0)$.

I make three assumptions about the impacts of the reform. These assumptions are analogous to the standard monotonicity and independence / exclusion assumptions made in estimation of local average treatment effects, or LATEs (Angrist, Imbens and Rubin, 1996), but adapted to the duration context.

Assumption 1. (Monotonicity) $R_i^*(1) \ge R_i^*(0) \ \forall i$ Assumption 2. (Exogeneity) $R_i^*(0), R_i^*(1) \perp Z_i$ Assumption 3. (Exclusion) $Y_i^* \perp Z_i$

Assumption 1 implies that the reform does not *reduce* anyone's time to technical imprisonment. This assumption seems highly plausible in my setting, since the reform simply eliminated prison punishments for some technical rules without introducing additional ones. Assumption 1 does, however, rule out changes in probationers', caseworkers', or judges' behavior that would lead to offenders being technically imprisoned earlier in their spell (for example, by fleeing supervision). I find no empirical evidence that behaviors change in such a way.

Assumption 2 requires that potential rule-driven incarceration durations are independent of exposure to the reform, Z_i . This assumption is supported by a battery of balance and validation

checks grounding the claim that individuals placed on probation before the reform provide a good counterfactual for those serving sentences afterwards. There is no evidence of changes in the characteristics of offenders entering probation before and after the reform, no sharp changes in the quantity of offenders on probation, and no trends in technical violations' frequency or type in anticipation of the reform.

Assumption 3 requires that the reform has no direct effect on Y_i^* and was introduced in the one-period model above. It rules out offenders adjusting their criminal behavior because probation overall has become a more lenient punishment as a result of the reform. This implies that offenders also do not increase proscribed behaviors, such as drug use, that may have an indirect effect on crime. Doing so would require probationers to be forward looking. This idea finds little support in the data. The risk of breaking a rule (regardless of the ultimate punishment) does not change after the reform takes effect, for example, despite the fact that the incentives to break some rules (e.g., passing drug tests) changed substantially. Nor do arrest hazards.

Table 3 demonstrates this by estimating a post-reform effect in Cox proportional hazards models for arrests and rule-breaking. When studying arrests, these regressions treat any technical rule violation as a source of censoring. Doing so removes any arrests that occur after a rule violation and hence may have been censored by incarceration pre-reform. If no increases in arrest hazards are detected, this implies that increases in offending post-reform are explained by the mechanical change in incarceration (i.e., censoring) rather then offenders being rearrested more frequently or earlier in the spells (see Figure 4 for a graphical illustration).

Analogous regressions can be estimated to test whether the censoring event—namely technical violations—increases after the reform. The results show no change in any behaviors. While perhaps surprising, these results are consistent with a series of randomized controlled trials demonstrating that probationers' offending and drug test failure rates do not respond to stricter monitoring or more intensive probation conditions (Hennigan et al., 2010; Barnes et al., 2012; Boyle et al., 2013; Hyatt and Barnes, 2017). Nevertheless, while I impose this assumption initially, in the final part of the paper I relax it and test for behavioral responses directly. I find very limited evidence of any response.

Because the reform did not completely eliminate technical imprisonment, it did not shift R_i^* for all individuals. Specifically, probationers who flee supervision can be still be incarcerated both before and after the reform. To account for this, it useful to introduce an indicator $D_i = 1$ for individuals who could be "caught" by the drug and administrative rules impacted by the reform. These individuals have $Y_i^* < R_i^*(1)$ and are the compliers alluded to above. Individuals with $D_i = 0$ have $R_i^*(1) < Y_i^*$ and thus would be caught by technical rules even after drug and administrative violations are no longer enforced. There is no information in the variation induced by the reform about their criminal outcomes.

3.4 Testing for targeting gaps

This framework allows me to use the same logic illustrated above to test whether drug and administrative rules target similar shares of black and white offenders. To do so, I estimate rescaled reduced form effects of Z_i on a composite outcome $Y_i^k = 1\{R_i^* \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\}$, which is an indicator for

having an observed offending time of k (and hence not being technically imprisoned beforehand). The result, Γ_k , can be interpreted as the multi-period version of Γ_1 studied in the one-period model above. It measures the share of time k offenders who are caught by technical rules. As such, it is also simply the percentage decrease in offenses at each horizon k as a result of imposing technical rules.¹³

Proposition 1 Under Assumptions 1-3, the rescaled reduced form effect at each horizon k yields:

$$\Gamma_k = \frac{E[Y_i^k | Z_i = 1] - E[Y_i^k | Z_i = 0]}{E[Y_i^k | Z_i = 1]}$$
$$= Pr(R_i^*(0) < Y_i^* | Y_i^* = k, D_i = 1)$$

I leave the short proof of this result for Appendix A1. The intuition is that if offending at time k increases after the reform, it must be because individuals who counterfactually would be technically incarcerated before k now have the opportunity to commit crimes instead. Thus the increase in observed arrests at time k is the product of the probability of having arrest duration k and the conditional probability of breaking the drug and administrative rules impacted by the reform before k. Dividing by the post-reform mean of Y_i^k eliminates the first probability. The result conditions on $D_i = 1$ because the reform did not affect violations for fleeing supervision, so there is no information on individuals incarcerated due to these rules in the reform.

As shown above, race-specific estimates of Γ_k can also be used to measure the contributions of differences in criminal risk and differences in targeting to aggregate racial disparities. In the full model, however, individuals who would never be arrested have $Y_i^* = \infty$. Given a limited time window K over which outcomes are measured, I can at most observe whether $Y_i^* \ge K$. Hence in the full decomposition, the summation in Equation 2 runs from 1 to K and includes a residual component that captures the contributions of all individuals who would offend at time K + 1 or later (and possibly never).

4 Results

First, I analyze the effects of the 2011 JRA reform on rule-driven incarceration and arrests over a one-year time horizon using a difference-in-differences estimator. This analysis implements the oneperiod model used to illustrate my approach in the previous subsection. This one-period analysis is also sufficient to conduct a simple cost-benefits analysis of the effectiveness of technical rules as tags for potential reoffenders and to compare the relative social return to enforcing rules across race groups. I then present estimates from the full model over a three-year time horizon, including tests for bias and a decomposition of aggregate racial disparities.

4.1 Unadjusted time series

I analyze the 2011 JRA reform using two possible outcomes for each probation spell: 1) new criminal arrest; and 2) rule-driven incarceration. These events are mutually exclusive—a offender cannot

¹³Ignoring dynamics effects on repeat offending, of course.

be technical revoked if they are arrested first by definition. For each probationer, I measure which event occurs first (if any) and the time to the event. I then calculate the share of probationers technically incarcerated and the share arrested over the course of their spell.

Figure 5 plots the raw data for these two outcomes in Panels A and B, respectively, for threemonth cohorts of supervised probationers. These cohorts all start their spells within four years of the reform's effective date, which is marked with the black solid line. The leftmost line in Panel A, for example, plots the share of probationers starting their spells in the beginning of 2007 who were technically incarcerated over the next 365 days. By the end of that period, where the line ends, roughly 15% of the cohort was imprisoned for technical violations. Similar shares experience the same fate in each cohort for the next 12 quarters.

Cohorts beginning probation within a year of the reform, however, begin to see reductions in rule-driven incarceration. These cohorts were affected because the reform's limitations on technical imprisonment applied by the violation date and not the probationer's start or offense date. Thus these cohorts spend a portion of their spell under the new policy regime and see reductions in rule-driven incarceration as a result. The more time each cohorts spends under the new regime, the larger the reductions. Probationers who begin their spell after the reform are fully exposed to its changes. For these cohorts, rule-driven incarceration reduces to 9%, a 33% drop relative to the pre-reform mean. Rule-driven incarceration then stabilizes for the next several years.

The large decrease in rule-driven incarceration means many more probationers had the opportunity to commit crimes instead of being imprisoned. Panel B plots the share who did so. After a slight decline over several years, offending is relatively flat in the 4 quarters before the reform. It then jumps up slightly for spells interrupted by the reform and remains 1-2 p.p. higher afterwards. Thus while the reform sharply reduced rule-driven incarceration, these gains came at a cost. A meaningful share—roughly 30%—of probationers spared rule-driven incarceration in the first year of their probation spells were arrested instead.

This simple interrupted time series analysis may be misleading if selection into probation changed as a result of the reform or if changes in aggregate crime coincided with its implementation. Figure 6 shows that the first threat is not a concern. Predicted offending rates formed using all available covariates are stable over the four years before and after the reform and I cannot reject the null the predicted 1-year crime rates are identical for spells starting in the year before vs. after the reform. Appendix Figure A2 shows that the quantity of offenders on supervised and unsupervised probation also did not change discretely around the reform, indicating that judges' sentencing behavior was unaffected. Thus, although probation overall became more lenient after the reform, there is no evidence that either judges changed their sentencing behavior or potential offenders changed their crime choices in response. Nevertheless, I return to this important point in the final section of the paper, where I estimate behavioral responses to the reform directly.

4.2 Difference-in-differences estimates

To account for potential time-varying confounders, I use a difference-in-differences approach that compares supervised probationers' outcomes to unsupervised probationers'. Panel C of Figure 5 plots the difference in these groups' one-year rule-driven incarceration and arrest rates (i.e., the end-points of the lines in Panels A and B).¹⁴ Specifically, it plots estimates of β_l^T from the linear regression:

$$Y_{is}^{j} = \alpha + \sum_{l=-16}^{16} 1\{S_{is} = l\}(\beta_{l} + \beta_{l}^{T}T_{is}) + e_{i}$$
(3)

where Y_{is}^{j} measures whether individual *i* in spell *s* experienced outcome *j* (either arrest or ruledriven incarceration), S_{is} measures how many quarters before or after the reform's effective date *i* started probation, and T_{is} is an indicator for being on supervised probation. The β_{l}^{T} effects are normalized relative to the cohort starting four quarters before the reform, the last group to spend the entirety of their first year of probation under the old regime. The dotted red line marks the first cohort of probationers who start after the reform took effect.

Because unsupervised offenders are not assigned probation officers, less than 1% of them experience rule-driven incarceration in the first year of their spell. As a result, the reform had virtually no impact on this group. The blue line in Panel C thus closely tracks the declines in Panel A—decreases of roughly 6 p.p. after a prolonged period of no substantial changes. Because unsupervised probationers saw no decline in rule-driven incarceration, their arrest rates evolved smoothly over the reform. Beforehand, their outcomes tracked supervised probationers' closely for three plus years. The red line reflects this pattern, showing increases of 2 p.p. with no evidence of pre-trends.

To obtain point estimates of the reform's effects, I collapse Specification 3 to a simple differencein-difference comparison using probation spells that begin 1-3 years before the reform and 0-2 years afterwards, thus using two years of pre/post data while omitting cohorts whose first year of probation was interrupted by the reform and were therefore only partially affected.¹⁵ These results are presented in Panel A of Table 4. The estimated effect on revocation is 5.5 p.p and easily distinguishable from zero at conventional confidence levels. The increase in arrests is roughly 2 p.p. Thus, over this one-year horizon 30-40% of probationers spared rule-driven incarceration find themselves arrested instead. For both outcomes, it makes little difference whether demographic and criminal history controls are included. Moreover, the small coefficients on the post indicators show that over this narrow window, results would be similar if only treated units were included.

Are these effects small or large? A simple benchmark for the reform's expected effects uses the share of probationers arrested pre-reform, which was 29%. If a similar share of probationers spared rule-driven incarceration instead commit crimes, we would expect offending to go up by roughly 1.6%. The observed increase falls slightly above this simple benchmark, suggesting individuals targeted by rule-driven incarceration are somewhat more risky than average. Since rule-driven incarceration occurs over the course of a probation spell, however, this benchmark is potentially too high. For example, in the extreme case where all rule-driven incarceration occurs on day 355 of the spell, the reform would only give offenders *one* extra day to commit crimes in their first year, and finding any increase would be surprising. I return to this question in Section 5, where I estimate arrest and rule-driven incarceration hazards directly and show that they are highly correlated across individuals.

¹⁴The raw rates for unsupervised probationers are presented in Appendix Figure A3.

¹⁵I use these partially affected cohorts in estimation of the dynamic model that follows.

In the last two rows of Panel A, I use these results to estimate false positive (Γ_0) and false negative rates $(1 - \Gamma_1)$, treating the full first year of the spell as a single period.¹⁶ Specifically, $Y_i^* = 1$ if an individual would commit a crime in the first year of probation and is zero otherwise. The estimated false negative rate shows that just 6.5% of potential criminals are caught by drug and administrative rules affected by JRA reforms. The estimated false positive rate shows that 5.8% of non-offenders (over the one-year horizon), however, violate the same rules. Of course, many of these individuals may offend later, a fact I account for in the full model estimates that follow. Nevertheless, in this simplified setting rules appear almost as likely to target non-reoffenders as reoffenders.

Remarkably, the reform's impact on black offenders' rule-driven incarceration was nearly twice as large as its impact on white offenders'. As a result, the reform eliminated raw racial disparities in rule-driven incarceration. Panel A of Figure 7 demonstrates this result by plotting rule-driven incarceration rates in the sample used for difference-in-differences estimation separately by race. While black offenders were 30-40% more likely to face technical imprisonment over the first year of their spell before the reform, afterwards the race gap is reduced to less than 1%.

Because many more black offenders were spared rule-driven incarceration, one might expect crime in the black population to increase more than in the white population after the reform. Panel B of Figure 7 shows that this did not happen. While more probationers in both groups were arrested after the reform, the racial gap does not change substantially. Race-specific difference-indifference estimates in Panels B and C of Table 4 imply that the arrest rate among white offenders who, but for the reform, would have been imprisoned for technical violations is above 55%. However, the correspond figure among black offenders is only 30%.

Appendix Table A10 shows that the increase in crimes by crime type do not differ substantially across the two race groups. In fact, the absolute increase in felony offenses is *smaller* in the black population than in the white population, and a larger share of the total increase is accounted for by traffic related offenses. It therefore does not appear that black probationers targeted by technical violations pose lower average risk, but higher risk for more socially costly crimes such as felonies.

Estimates of false negative and false positive rates by race are reported the bottoms of Panels B and C. False negatives are similar by race—roughly 93%—indicating that similar shares of potential reoffenders in both groups are targeted by rules over a one-year period. False positive rates are three times higher for black offenders, however, implying that far more innocent black offenders are technically incarcerated relative to white offenders. In the one-period model, therefore, there is evidence of substantial bias.

Table 5 uses these results to conduct the simple Oaxaca decomposition exercise described in the previous section. This analysis measures the relative contributions of risk (i.e., $Pr(Y_i^* = 1)$) and targeting (i.e., $Pr(R_i = 1|Y_i^* = 1)$) to aggregate racial gaps in technical violations among the complier population for the reform.¹⁷ As expected, the first two rows show that rates of rule-driven incarceration and offending are both higher in the black population. The next two rows, however,

 $^{^{16}}$ Appendix A2 shows how additive time effects can be incorporated into the model to justify using the difference-indifference estimates to do so. Using this design introduces a negligible bias, which I estimate to be on the order of 10% of the main post-x-treat effect.

¹⁷Appendix Section A3 provides complete details on how the decomposition is calculated.

show that in total risk explains a very small share of the aggregate gap. While black offenders' higher likelihood of offending contributes slightly, it is more than fully offset by harsh treatment of non-offenders. This implies that the bulk of differences in rule-driven incarceration are in fact driven by differences in how non-offenders are targeted. The last row of the table confirms this, showing that differences in false positive rates explain 105% of the aggregate gap.

4.3 Impacts of specific rule types

Which types of technical rules generate these racial differences? This question is difficult to answer without additional structure or assumptions. The reform impacted a bundle of technical rules. Although decreases in incarceration for each rule type are observable, only overall increases in arrests can be estimated. These increases may be driven by probationers who would have otherwise been incarcerated for drug, fees and fines, or other violations, or some combination thereof. This makes it impossible to use the quasi-experimental variation alone to estimate accuracy and error rates for specific types of rules.

One could also simply attempt to estimate the raw correlation between arrests and different types of rule violations. Prior to the reform, this exercise is difficult because many rule breakers are incarcerated for their violations, censoring their reoffending outcomes. The reform alleviates this problem by making incarceration for rule violations less frequent, but even after it takes effect some probationers who break rules are incarcerated for absconding or accumulated violations later in their spells. Nevertheless, it is still possible to examine rule violation propensities among offenders arrested, not arrested, and censored due to rule-driven incarceration.

Appendix Table A12 does so by reporting the frequency of rule violations for these three groups in the post-reform data. If not for censoring, these shares would reflect the true and false positive rates associated with using each rule type as a predictor of criminal risk. The estimates show that black probationers who do *not* reoffend are more likely to break all rule types than black probationers who do (i.e., false positive > true positive rates). The differences are particularly stark for fees and fines violations: 36% of black probationers who complete their spells without arrest incur a financial violation, vs. 13% of black probationers who reoffend. Fees and fines violations would thus appear to be important drivers of disparate impacts.

Individuals incarcerated for rule violations, however, complicate this analysis. Had they not been incarcerated, these probationers might have gone on to both break different rules and be rearrested. Accounting for such censoring can meaningfully alter estimates of the signal value of particular rule types. For example, if all black probationers incarcerated for technical violations would have instead failed to pay fees and fines and reoffended, the estimated true positive rate from fees and fines would more than double. Section 5.4 returns to this issue and uses a competing hazard model to account for such censoring and unbundle the impact of different rule types.

4.4 Triple-difference estimates

The previous results demonstrate that technical rules have remarkably different impacts on black and white offenders. However, black and white offenders may differ in important observable characteristics, including their age and gender composition, extent of criminal history, and geographic distribution throughout North Carolina. To examine how sensitive the previous results are to accounting for such observable differences, I estimate a triple-difference version of specification 3:

$$Y_{is}^{j} = \underbrace{\alpha + \beta_{1}T_{is} + \beta_{2}P_{is} + \beta_{3}T_{is}P_{is}}_{\text{D-in-D regressors}} + \underbrace{B_{i}(\beta_{4}\alpha + \beta_{5}T_{is} + \beta_{6}P_{is} + \beta_{7}T_{is}P_{is})}_{\text{Interaction with black indicator}} + \underbrace{X_{is}(\beta_{8}\alpha + \beta_{9}T_{is} + \beta_{10}P_{is} + \beta_{11}T_{is}P_{is})}_{\text{Adjustments for observables}} + e_{i}$$
(4)

where $P_{is} = 1\{S_{is} \ge 0\}$, i.e., a "post" indicator, $B_i = 1$ if offender *i* is black, and X_{is} is a set of observable characteristics that does not include race. β_7 captures differential changes in the outcome Y_{is}^j for treated black vs. white offenders before vs. after the reform relative to changes experienced before vs. after the reform by untreated offenders. If $\beta_7 = 0$, then "post-x-treat" coefficients in a standard difference-in-differences specification estimated separately for black and white offenders would be identical. Including X_{is} allows me to make this black-white comparison after adjusting for observable characteristics. For example, the reform may have also had different impacts on men and women. By including a gender indicator in X_{is} , estimating specification 4 tests whether racial differences in the impact of the reform still persist after accounting for differences in gender shares between the two race groups.

Table 6 reports estimates of β_7 , labeled "treat-x-post-x-black", and β_3 , labeled "treat-x-post" for varying sets of controls X_{is} . The first two columns omit X_{is} entirely. As shown earlier, black offenders experience much larger declines in incarceration for rule breaking but see increases in reoffending that are indistinguishable from white offenders'.¹⁸ Columns 3 and 4 add demographic controls, so that only black and white offenders of the same age and gender are compared. Black offenders continue to see roughly two times larger decreases in incarceration, but identical increases in reoffending. The next sets of column pairs add criminal history controls, indicators for the probation district where the offender is being supervised, and indicators for zip code of residence at the time of the original conviction. Even after adjusting for all these factors, black offenders continue to see substantially larger decreases in incarceration but no similar changes in reoffending rates.

These results need not imply that *race itself*—as in the color of one's skin—drives the differential impact of probation's technical rules. As argued in Section 4.7 below, the evidence in fact suggests that racial disparities in this setting do not arise due to racial bias on the part of police, judges, or probation officers, and instead reflect differences in behavior between black and white offenders. However, Table 6 shows that such differences are not easily explained with straightforward observable characteristics, including reasonable proxies for income such as residential neighborhood. This suggests that the behavioral differences between black and white offenders that drive technical rules' disparate impact may reflect other more nuanced and contextual factors, such as access to informal credit that could be used to pay off fees and fines.

¹⁸The post-x-treat coefficients reported here are identical to the post-x-treat estimates in Panel B of Table 4 columns 1 and 3. Adding the treat-x-post-x-black coefficients reproduces the post-x-treat estimates in Panel C columns 1 and 3.

4.5 Cost-benefit analysis

When the state incarcerates an offender for technical violations, it must pay close to \$100 a day to do so.¹⁹ If the state instead opts to leave the offender in the community, she may then commit a crime and be sentenced to incarceration as a result. The social value of technically incarcerating individual i can thus be written as:

$$V_{i} = \underbrace{-J_{i}}_{\text{Cost of tech. incar.}} + \underbrace{Pr(Y_{i}^{*} = 1 | R_{i} = 0)}_{\text{Pr(offend) if not incar.}} \left[\underbrace{E[U(Y_{i}^{*}) | R_{i} = 0, Y_{i}^{*} = 1]}_{\text{Cost of crime}} + \underbrace{J_{i}^{\prime}}_{\text{Cost of new sent.}} \right]$$
(5)

where J_i is the cost of the technical jail/prison spells, R_i and Y_i^* , as before, are indicators for ruledriven incarceration and offending, $U(Y_i^*)$ represents the social cost of this crime, and J'_i represents the total cost of incarceration as a result of the new crime, including any resulting revocation.

Enforcing technical violations for a group offenders is beneficial if $E[V_i] > 0$. I assess this criterion for offenders affected by the 2011 JRA reforms in two ways. First, I use changes in observed costs of incarceration and offending rates over a fixed horizon to back out a "break-even" $E[U(Y_i^*)|R_i = 0, Y_i^* = 1]$ that sets $E[V_i] = 0$ for this population. That is, I solve for:

$$E[U(Y_i^*)|R_i = 0, Y_i^* = 1] = \frac{\triangle E[-J_i \cdot R_i] - \triangle E[(1 - R_i)J_i']}{\triangle E[Y_i^*]}$$
(6)

This exercise asks what the *minimum* social cost of crime would be to justify the state's use of rule-driven incarceration for the drug and administrative rules impacted by the reform. The numerator captures the change in net incarceration costs—spending on rule-driven incarceration minus spending on crime-driven incarceration. The denominator divides this gap by the increase in crime to arrive at break-even valuation for these marginal offenses.

In a second approach, I use existing estimates from the literature to benchmark crime costs and compare it to these break-even values. This analysis assigns a cost to each category of arrest ranging from \$500 (for simple drug possession) to close to \$20 million (for homicides) primarily sourced from Cohen et al. (2011).²⁰ I then compare the change in net incarceration costs due to the reform to estimated increases in costs of crime.

This analysis omits several other factors that might contribute to the aggregate costs and benefits of rule-driven incarceration. In particular, the foregone earnings of incarcerated offenders, the utility costs of imprisonment, and the court costs associated with processing rule-driven incarceration are excluded. The excluded potential benefits mainly relate to deterrence effects. As shown earlier, however, there is little evidence that the reform impacted the perceived punitiveness of probation enough to shift potential criminals' offending calculus. Nor is there any change in technical violation behavior after the reform, including for payment of fees or fines.²¹ On net, therefore, I view this analysis as providing a lower bound on costs while capturing most potential benefits.

¹⁹2018 average daily cost per inmate for the North Carolina Department of Public Safety (https://www.ncdps.gov/ adult-corrections/cost-of-corrections). Supervision costs roughly \$5 a day in 2018.

²⁰See Appendix Table A18 for a detailed list of crime costs and their sources. Each arrest is assigned a lower and upper bound for costs based on existing estimates and the categorization of the offense.

²¹There is no data available on collection rates for court costs in North Carolina. Surveys in other districts have found overall repayment rates ranging from 50% to 9% in other states (Pepin, 2016).

Importantly, these cost-benefit calculations also place no weight on racial equity. Since the reform dramatically reduced black-white gaps in rule-driven incarceration, this is a potentially important factor. Indeed, the more policy makers value reducing black-white disparities, the more attractive the reform becomes regardless of its impact on crime. A full social welfare analysis of the reform—including putting a price on racial equity—is beyond the scope of this paper, however.

I consider costs and benefits of rule-driven incarceration that begins and arrests that occur in the first year of a probation spell. Extending to longer windows tends to reduce the benefits of ruledriven incarceration because many imprisoned individuals will be released and have the opportunity to reoffend. However, because the suspended sentences activated by rule-driven incarceration are usually 3-4 months long, these results are highly similar to comparing the cumulative change in offending over the first year of a spell to the cumulative changes in incarceration costs over the same horizon.

The results are reported in Table 7. The first column reports the change in spending on ruledriven incarceration spells activated in the first year of a probation spell after the reform took effect. This declined by \$680 per probationer on average. The second column reports the increase in costs of incarceration attributable to new crimes committed in the first year of a spell. This is relatively close to zero because the majority of new crimes after the reform do not merit an actual prison sentence. The estimates thus imply that for every dollar the state spent on rule-driven incarceration, it saved roughly 30 cents it would have spent on prison costs anyway.

Column 4 reports the implied break-even valuations discussed above. These average about \$40k per offense. Although this may seem relatively low, consider that the modal offense committed by a probationer is a relatively minor misdemeanor. In fact, excluding all misdemeanor and traffic offenses raises the marginal valuation to \$100k. Columns 5 and 6 report the estimated costs of new crimes generated by the reform. Unfortunately, due to the wide dispersion in reported costs of crime, these estimates are relatively noisy. The point estimates, however, suggest that costs may fall at or below break-even valuations.

The remainder of Table 7 repeats the same exercise for various sub-populations. The second and third rows, which compare black and white probationers, provide a concise summary of the degree to which drug and administrative violations target black offenders more aggressively. The decrease in spending on rule-driven incarceration in the black population is roughly twice as large as in the white population, while increases in the costs of incarceration attributable to new crimes are only slightly larger. Combined with similar increases in reoffending rates for both groups shown earlier, the result is that implied break-even valuations for black offenders are 2-3 times larger than for white offenders. Unfortunately, estimates in Columns 5 and 6 are too noisy to ask whether differences in costs of crime justify these disparities. However, racial gaps in break-even valuations are even larger when only felony offenses are considered in Column 4, suggesting that differences in the severity of crime committed are unlikely to justify the gap. The final two rows of Table 7 shows that similar but more extreme patterns hold when considering black and white men.

4.6 Full model estimates

The analysis thus far has treated the first year of probation as a single period. This section generalizes these results to examine racial differences in the impact of technical rules at multiple horizons both within and beyond one year using the full model described in Section 3.2. Doing so is potentially important if there are large racial differences in the timing of reoffending, or if racial gaps at one year are counterbalanced by differences at other horizons.

Rather then estimating the full model at the daily level, I construct estimates of Γ_k with k binned into 90 day intervals to gain precision. I thus test for bias conditioning on Y_i^* falling somewhere within this interval rather than at k exactly, although results are not sensitive to the exact bin size. I bin all k beyond three years into a final period capturing censored values of Y_i^* —that is, individuals who would reoffend more than three years after starting probation, or possibly never. I continue to include unsupervised probationers as controls to ensure that the results are robust to time-trends in offending.

If drug and administrative violations are unbiased, Γ_k should not vary by race for all horizons k. Figure 8 plots estimates Γ_k for k up to three years and for a final period indicating $Y_i^* > 3$ years. Although at the shortest durations drug and administrative violations target black and white probationers similarly, large gaps appear later. For all k above six months except one, black probationers are more likely to be targeted. Thus we can clearly reject that Γ_k does not depend on race, and therefore that drug and administrative rules are unbiased.

How important is this bias for the raw racial differences in rule-driven incarceration? As in the one-period example, two factors contribute to these race gaps—the distribution of risk Y_i^* and the conditional probability each risk level is targeted by rule-driven incarceration. The latter factor is exactly Γ_k . Appendix A1 also shows that the distribution of risk among compliers can be calculated using $E[Y_i^k|Z_i = 1]$ for each k. Having estimates of both objects allows me to decompose racial differences in drug and administrative violations into the contributions of each factor.

The results of this exercise are reported in Table 8. The first two columns report the share of technical probationers targeted by drug and administrative violations and their risk distributions separately by race. The first row corresponds to the effect of the reform—i.e., the quantity of rule-driven incarceration due to drug and administrative rules over the full course of the probation spell. The next four rows show the quantity of offenders targeted by such rules who have arrest durations less than 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, etc. For example, the last row says that 25% of white offenders targeted by drug and administrative rules would otherwise be arrested three years later or beyond (including never), while 42% of targeted black offenders would do the same.

The next columns reports the differences between black and white offenders in each row and a decomposition into the relative contributions of Γ_k and the distribution of risk types. This decomposition is akin to asking how many white offenders would be subject to rule-driven incarceration if they were targeted like black offenders and vice versa. Because black offenders are riskier on average, differences in risk explain a non-zero portion of race gaps in technical imprisonment. However, differences targeting—the Γ_k estimated above—explain the majority of the differences. As shown in the first row, black technical imprisonment for drug and administrative violations would have been 90% lower if they were targeted like white offenders, but their risk left the same.

4.7 Behaviors or biased responses?

In general, racial disparities in technical violations could arise for two reasons. First, black offenders may be more likely to exhibit the proscribed behaviors. For example, black offenders may have more limited wealth and income and thus find it more difficult to pay fees and fines. Likewise, some populations may have less access to transport, making it more difficult to report to probation officers. In these cases, however, disparities reflect genuine differences in behavior across the populations, whatever their root cause. Alternatively, caseworkers and judges may respond more aggressively to identical behaviors when the offender is black instead of white.

Several pieces of evidence suggest that racial disparities are largely driven by differences in behaviors rather then responses to them. First, there is limited cross-officer variation in black offenders' likelihood of technical violations relative to whites. As shown in Appendix Table A9, controlling for assigned officer has no measurable impact on the black effect for technical violations and only slightly increases the R^2 , despite adding hundreds of parameters. Relatedly, as Appendix Table A9 also shows, there is no consistent evidence of same-race effects—black officers are as likely to cite black offenders for administrative violations as white offenders.²² Meaningful same-race effects have been found in other criminal justice contexts (e.g., West (2018)).

Second, racial disparities are large for technical violation categories where officers have relatively limited discretion as well as those where they have more. For example, relative to their mean incidence, black offenders are equally more likely to face violations for not reporting as for failing drug tests. While officers could fairly easily ignore a forgotten meeting, drug tests are initiated with an automated form produced by the Department of Public Safety's offender tracking computer system and thus harder to sweep under the rug.²³ Black effects divided by the white mean for all violation categories are presented in Appendix Figure A1. This is consistent with officers closely following detailed guidelines in the NC Department of Community Corrections' policy manual, which specify appropriate responses to different probationer behaviors.

Third, racial disparities in incarceration for technical violations are entirely driven by how often offenders pick up violations, not how those violations are punished. Conditional on the violation type, probation officers are equally likely to recommend revocation for black and white offenders and judges are equally likely to grant it, as shown in Appendix Table A8. In fact, simple fixed effects capturing violation types explains 40% of the variation in revocations, implying limited discretion overall in incarceration punishments for technical violations.

 $^{^{22}}$ For drug violations, black officers treat black offenders slightly *more* harshly on average. There is no same-race effect in revocations overall, however, and small negative same race effect for technical revocations.

²³I shadowed probation officers at work in Durham, N.C. for several days during the summer of 2018. Officers rely heavily on their forms and computer systems. They are primarily incentivized to ensure that all appropriate policies and procedures are followed in each case. Many interactions with offenders consist of probation officers clicking through automated forms on their desktop computers while the probationer answers a standard set of questions. Most officers described their responsibilities as ensuring that their caseload respects all conditions imposed in their sentences, not helping to identify and incapacitate the riskiest offenders.

5 Competing hazards analysis

The previous results demonstrate that the technical rules affected by North Carolina's 2011 reform proxy for latent criminality, but target black offenders substantially more aggressively. This analysis, however, leaves several important questions unanswered. For example, the timing of arrests and rule violations are potentially important drivers of effectiveness and may contribute to disparate impacts. Probationers may also respond to weaker punishment regimes by increasing rule violations or criminal activity, an effect ruled out by the exclusion restriction imposed previously. Different rules may also have different impacts both overall and on specific race groups.

Answering these questions is difficult using the quasi-experimental variation alone. Estimating timing, for example, requires separating the impacts of state dependence and unobserved heterogeneity on observed variation in behaviors over the course of a spell. Because the reform impacted a bundle of technical rules simultaneously, it is also difficult to estimate the effects of specific rule types directly. This section therefore introduces a semi-parametric model of competing hazards for technical violations and criminal offending that provides a solution. The model accounts for censoring over the course of a spell and the resulting changes in the population still on probation, providing a direct characterization of how the propensity to break technical rules—both overall and of specific types—relates to the propensity to reoffend, as well as how these behaviors change over the course of a spell and in response to the reform.

5.1 Basic setup

I model individuals' latent hazards of new criminal arrest, Y_{is}^* , and incarceration for technical rule breaking, R_{is}^* , using a mixed logit specification. Specifically, the discrete-time hazards for individual *i* in period *t* of their *s*th probation spell are given by:

$$Pr(Y_{is}^{*} = t | Y_{is}^{*} \ge t, X_{is}, U_{i}^{Y}) = \Lambda \left(\theta_{0}^{Y}(t) + X_{ist}^{\prime}\beta^{Y} + U_{i}^{Y}\right)$$
(7)

$$Pr(R_{is}^* = t | R_{is}^* \ge t, X_{is}, U_i^R) = \Lambda \left(\theta_0^R(t) + X_{ist}' \beta^R + U_i^R\right)$$
(8)

 $\theta_0^Y(t)$ and $\theta_0^R(t)$ are baseline hazards for each outcome shared by all individuals. No restrictions are placed on the shape of these baseline hazards. In practice, I estimate a high degree polynomial in duration, although results are similar if dummies for fixed intervals are used instead. X_{ist} are individual covariates, such as age and criminal history, that potentially vary between and within spells. U_i^Y and U_i^R are unobserved, individual-specific heterogeneity terms that will be treated as random effects. Both are constant across spells, an assumption that provides an important source of identification discussed further below. However, because X_{ist} can include covariates such as a the number of previous spells, age, or calendar time, the same individual need not have the same hazard in repeated spells. In essence, therefore, only relative risk across individuals with the same observables is assumed constant across repeat spells.

This model can be viewed as a logit version of the canonical proportional hazard model introduced by Cox (1972).²⁴ In this case, the log odds of arrest in period t conditional on not being arrested before t are linear in the baseline hazard, covariates, and unobserved heterogeneity (and

²⁴Efron (1988) studies a logit version of discrete time hazard models.

likewise for incarceration for rule breaking in period t). The two outcomes' hazards can be correlated through observables. For example, younger offenders may both be more likely to be arrested and to break technical rules, implying β^Y and β^R for age are both negative. The hazards may also be correlated due to unobservable heterogeneity U_i^R and U_i^Y . If offenders with high U_i^Y have high U_i^R as well, then even among observably equivalent offenders those more likely to be arrested are also most likely to break technical rules, and vice versa. With knowledge of $\theta_0^Y, \theta_0^R, \beta^Y, \beta^R$ and the joint distribution of U_i^Y and U_i^R , it is straightforward to characterize how the risk of criminal arrest and technical rule breaking are related. One can calculate, for example, the likelihood that an offender incarcerated for rule breaking in the first year of their spell would have gone on to be arrested instead if left in their community.

Identification of $\theta_0^Y, \theta_0^R, \beta^Y$, and β^R comes from the empirical hazards. Identification of the unobserved heterogeneity components U_i^Y and U_i^R comes from repeated observations of individuals. Individuals have repeated observations because they frequently reoffend and are re-sentenced to probation, providing arrest and technical rule breaking outcomes in two or more spells.²⁵ The joint distribution of survival times across multiple spells pins down the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity. If there is no unobserved heterogeneity, then the joint distribution should factor into the product of marginal survival time distributions for each spell. If, on the other hand, individuals who are arrested quickly in their first spell are also likely to be arrested quickly in their second, there must be a sub-population with high U_i^Y . The same logic applies to the joint distribution of survival times across arrests and technical violations.²⁶

Because X_{ist} can also include an indicator for whether period t falls before or after the 2011 reform, one can also easily examine how each hazard responded to the change in policy. The coefficient on a post-reform indicator in the hazard for R_{is}^* should be large and negative, because the reform made incarceration for rule breaking much less likely. The coefficient on a post-reform indicator in the hazard for Y_{is}^* , however, measures behavioral responses in reoffending to the reform and could take any sign. A positive estimate, for example, implies that offenders became more likely to commit crimes under the new regime. Any behavioral reoffending response is also identified due to repeated spells and the empirical hazards pre-reform. This variation alone pins the parameters of the model. Given these parameters, the decline in incarceration for rule breaking generated by the reform should generate predictable increases in crime. If crime in fact increases by *more* than what would be predicted by the decrease in censoring due to rule breaking alone, then some behavioral response to the reform is necessary to rationalize the data. As I show below, however, there is little evidence for increases in latent reoffending risk after the reform, consistent with my assumptions in the reduced form analysis.

 $^{^{25}\}mathrm{As}$ shown in Table 1, there are 1.33 spells per person in the treated sample.

²⁶Formal identification results were developed following Cox (1962) and Tsiatis (1975)'s original result that generally correlated unobserved heterogeneity across risks is not identified. Heckman and Honoré (1989) proved that when covariates are included, unobserved heterogeneity is identified with sufficient variation in X_i and under some regularity conditions. When the data contain multiple observations per person, these conditions can be relaxed substantially and no covariates are needed (see Honoré (1993) and Proposition 3 of Abbring and Van Den Berg (2003)). These results were developed for the standard continuous time proportional hazard model (i.e., $h_{is}(t) = \psi(t)exp(X'_{ist}\beta + U_i)$). The discrete-time logit specification used here can be viewed as an approximation to the discrete-time hazard yielded by such models, which takes the log-log form (i.e., $1 - exp(-exp(\theta_0(t) + X'_{ist}\beta + U_i))$). The log-log link ln(-ln(1-p)) is extremely close to the logit transform ln(p/(1-p)) for small p.

5.2 Estimation

My goal is to characterize racial differences in the equity and effectiveness of probation's technical rules. I therefore estimate the model separately by race (black vs. white) and gender (male vs. female). Doing so allows the joint distribution of unobserved heterogeneity, as well as the impact of observable characteristics, to have unrestricted differences across these groups.²⁷

In the baseline specification, I include a fifth order polynomial in weekly duration. Rather than incorporating untreated probationers to account for time variation in offending, I include simple time trends in the intercept of the duration polynomial, although results are not sensitive to this choice. Observables X_{ist} include indicators for whether the individual has multiple spells, a spell indicator interacted with duration (allowing the baseline hazard to differ in the first vs. second spell), a third-order polynomial in age, and an indicator for whether period t falls after the reform. I discretize time to the weekly level for computational speed and censor spells after three years.

To model the unobserved heterogeneity, I follow Heckman and Singer (1984) and approximate the joint distribution of U_i^Y and U_i^R with mass points. That is, each individual belongs to one of K types, each with different U_k^Y and U_k^R . I then estimate the population shares of each type and the location of the mass points. While I normalize types so that the first has the lowest unobserved criminal offending risk, I make no restrictions on the relative risk of rule violations across types. This allows, for example, types with very high offending risk to have either high or low risk of technical rule breaking. In the baseline estimates, I allow for four total types.²⁸

The likelihood in finite mixture models is not concave, making maximization difficult. To ensure the results reflect a global optimum, I run estimate the model many times using a large number of random starting points and keep the results that produce the largest value of the log likelihood. To ensure that the results are robust to sensible alternative choices, I also estimate a version of the model with continuous heterogeneity that is a generalization of a standard bivariate probit. This version specifies that:

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_i^Y \\ U_i^R \end{pmatrix} \sim N(\alpha, \Sigma) \tag{9}$$

The continuous heterogeneity version has the convenient feature that unobserved racial differences in the correlation between arrest and rule-breaking risks are neatly summarized by the covariance terms in Σ . Estimation of both versions is conducted in Python using the Boyd-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno algorithm and the analytic gradient, which is straightforward to compute. Expectation Maximization algorithm estimation of the mixture version yields identical results, but is significantly slower.

 $^{^{27}}$ In this sense, although the unobserved heterogeneity terms are treated as random effects, they are "correlated" random effects for the observables of interest (i.e., race).

²⁸Adding additional types increases the likelihood but does not change any of the core conclusions discussed below. As the number of types increases, however, optimization becomes more likely to become stuck in local maxima. Results with up to six types are available upon request.

5.3 Results

Estimates of the mixture model for men are presented in Table 9. The table reports coefficient estimates and standard errors for each outcome separately by race, as well as the race-specific location and population shares of the unobserved types. Given the logit formulations, the coefficients can be interpreted as partial effects on the log-odds of the weekly hazard for the relevant outcome.

Estimates of baseline hazards show negative duration dependence in arrest risks and positive duration dependence in technical violation. Since these coefficients are difficult to interpret on their own, Figure 9 plots average outcome-specific hazards for black and white men over the three years of a spell. As expected, black men have both higher arrest and technical violation hazards. The degree of duration dependence in arrest hazards for both groups is relatively minor, decreasing roughly 0.3 percentage points over the first year before flattening out slightly. Technical violation risk, however, peaks mid-way through the first year of a spell before declining to close to zero.

Estimates of type effects and their associated probabilities show that unobserved heterogeneity is an important feature of the data. Among black men, for example, the lowest criminal risk type comprises 12% of the population and has a 3.5 log point lower weekly odds of offending then the highest risk type, which makes up 8% of the population. White men show similar degrees of unobserved heterogeneity, although as shown in Figure 9 their average arrest risk is lower. Black and white women also show wide variation and qualitatively similar patterns in arrest risk. I focus on men in what follows since they make up the bulk of offenders and capture the cross-race patterns well.²⁹

The estimated type effects on technical violation show large degrees of unobserved heterogeneity and a strong correlation with arrest risk. The highest criminal risk black males, for example, have 1.04 log point higher weekly odds of facing technical violations than the lowest risk types. Low-risk white men have even lower risk of technical violations, with 6% of the population belonging to a type that is relatively low arrest risk and virtually never subject to technical violations. However, both black and white men show evidence of imperfect correlation between technical violation and arrest risks, indicating that not all variation in technical violations is driven by criminal propensities. That is, both dimensions of heterogeneity cannot be collapsed into single factor with separate loadings.

Comparing the model's cause specific hazards to Kaplan-Meier (KM) (Kaplan and Meier, 1958) estimates of the same objects, which are presented in Appendix Figure A4, further illustrates the impact of unobserved heterogeneity in this setting. The KM estimator is simply the weekly probability of failure for each cause conditional on not failing due to *any* cause previously. KM only accurately estimates hazards when there is no unobserved heterogeneity. In this case, unobserved heterogeneity and the positive correlation in risks both depresses the KM hazard estimates overall for each cause and exacerbates observed negative duration dependence, as is expected (Van Den Berg, 2001). KM estimates of arrest hazards, for example, suggest declines in risk of close to 66% for black men over the first year of a spell.

The combination of state dependence and unobserved heterogeneity helps explain why technical rules are not more useful tools for identifying potential reoffenders and produced large error rates in the reduced-form analysis. The highest risk probationers are significantly more likely to reoffend

²⁹Results for women are presented in Appendix Table A13.

early in their spells. Over time, the population that remains on probation shifts towards individuals with lower risk of reoffending. Thus, when the risk of technical violations peaks, the riskiest offenders have already "selected out" of the pool of offenders at risk to break rules, and disproportionately more lower risk offenders remain. These patterns highlight a general lesson about using dynamic signals such as technical violations to predict a future misconduct: one of the most potent signals may be the time elapsed since last misconduct itself.

Estimates of the effect of the reform on hazards in Table 9 are reported in the rows labeled "Post reform." As expected, these estimates show large effects of the reform on the odds of incarceration for technical violations, which is 0.51 log points and 0.4 log points lower for black and white men, respectively, after the change in the law. Consistent with the assumptions in the reduced form analysis, however, the reform had limited impacts on the underlying propensity to reoffend. Estimates for both genders are small and positive. In Appendix Figure A6, I plot the implied effect of these responses on average hazards. Pre- and post-reform arrest hazards are barely distinguishable; the mean difference s less than 0.1 p.p. at the pre-reform distribution of covariates. Moreover, these responses diminish as more flexible controls for calendar time are included in the model or more types are added. Thus the model shows limited evidence for real behavioral responses to the reform, suggesting our previous assumption of zero response was a reasonable approximation. Moreover, as discussed below, the model continues to show large racial differences in the impact of technical rules while allowing for such behavioral responses.

Are the model's function form restrictions consistent with the data? I test the model's fit in multiple ways. First, Figure 10 compares the model's predicted increases in arrests as a result of the reform to difference-in-difference estimates of the reform's effects, an exercise similar in spirit to testing the fit of control function-based reproductions of non-parametric estimates of treatment effects (Kline and Walters, 2016; Rose and Shem-Tov, 2019). For each race-by-gender group, I estimate the increase in observed offending after 90, 180, 270, and 360 days using the same specification as in the difference-in-differences analysis, yielding a total of 16 points. I then simulate increases in offending and technical violation hazards and the effects of the reform on both. While difference-in-difference estimates are noisy, the model does a good job of capturing the basic pattern of effects.

Second, Appendix Figure A4 shows that the empirical hazards implied by the model closely match KM estimates. This is an important validation check, since it implies that the estimated distribution of unobserved heterogeneity, which is primary identified by repeated spells, generates empirical hazards that closely match patterns in the full population, which primarily includes offenders with just one spell. Appendix Figure A5 shows that model also does a good job of matching outcomes for the population of offenders with two spells alone as well. This plot compares model-based vs. observed joint probabilities of a given combination of outcomes (e.g., arrest or incarceration for technical violations) and timing (e.g., in the first quarter of the spell) in the first and second spell. Model predictions closely track observed probabilities, although the model may slightly underestimate the likelihood of arrest in the first quarter of both spells (the rightmost points).

While it is difficult to read directly from the estimates in Table 9, the model also shows that

black offenders are targeted more aggressively by technical rules. To demonstrate this, I plot modelbased estimates of Γ_k , or the likelihood probationers who would otherwise be rearrested at time k are incarcerated for technical violations before k, as studied in the reduced form analysis. To make the plot, I simulate arrest and technical violation failure times separately by race using the pre-reform distribution of covariates and plot $Pr(R_{is}^* < k | Y_{is}^* = k)$. Figure 11 show results for kup to 1080, with k > 1080 shown as a single final point at the rightmost extreme of the figure. Unlike in the earlier reduced-form analysis, the Γ_k defined by the model here captures the impact of all technical violations, not just those impacted by the 2011 reform. The pattern remains the same, however: Black men are more likely to be targeted by technical violations regardless of their offending risk.

Part of this racial difference in targeting is driven by differences in observed characteristics, such as age and criminal history, while the remainder is driven by unobserved heterogeneity. Appendix Figure A7 shows that unobserved heterogeneity is responsible for most of the bias. This plot reproduces Figure 11, but holds each race group's covariates fixed at the sample mean. The patterns change little, with black offenders more likely to be targeted by incarceration for technical violations regardless of their risk. Black offenders who would not reoffend within three years, for example, are roughly 10 p.p. more likely to be incarcerated for rule violations than observably equivalent whites.

Estimates of the model with continuous heterogeneity are presented in Appendix Tables A14 for men and A15 for women. Results change little, including important conclusions about state dependence over the spell and racial differences in the correlation between risks. The correlation between unobserved rearrest and incarceration for technical violations risk for black offenders is 0.2, for example, but is 65% higher for white offenders. The mixture model, however, generates slightly higher log likelihoods, indicating a better fit to the data.

What would happen if policy makers further reduced incarceration punishments for technical violations? Switching from the post-reform regime to no incarceration punishments for rule violations would generate further reductions in incarceration and further increases in reoffending. For black men, eliminating all incarceration punishments implies increases in three-year rearrest rates of roughly 7.7 p.p. and decreases in rule-driven incarceration of 15 p.p. For white men, it implies increase in rearrests of 5.0 p.p. and decreases in rule-driven incarceration of 11.2 p.p. Notice that for both white and black men, the implied accuracy of the rules enforced after the 2011 reform is roughly 50%. Hence cost benefit analyses of reducing technical rules further are thus likely to yield similar results to the previous analysis of the impacts of the 2011 reform itself, but without the benefit of large reductions in racial disparities.

5.4 Disaggregating violation types

To account for multiple types of rules, one could simply extend the existing model to include more outcomes. For example, R_{is}^* could be broken up into separate hazards for incarceration for breaking drug-related rules, absconding, etc., turning the two-outcome competing risk model estimated above into an N-outcome model. The joint distribution of unobserved heterogeneity and the impact of observables on each hazard would govern how specific types of rules violations are connected to

latent criminality.

Doing so, however, would throw out useful information about how breaking different types of rules relates to criminal risk. Because not all rule breaking results in incarceration, offenders often break a rule, are punished with a warning, and are rearrested later in their spell. If this happens more often for offenders who break drug rules than for offenders who fail to pay fees and fines, then the former may be more strongly connected to criminal risk than the later. This variation is difficult to use in the reduced form because some offenders break rules and go unpunished only to be incarcerated for other violations later in their spell (see Section 4.3). I cannot observe whether these individuals would have otherwise gone on to reoffend, making it difficult to measure the accuracy and error rates of specific types of rules. The hazard formulation here accounts for this censoring.

Specifically, I decompose the latent risk of incarceration for breaking technical rules into two components:

$$Pr(R_{is}^* = t | R_{is}^* \ge t) = Pr(V_{ist}^k = 1 | R_{is}^* \ge t) Pr(I_{ist} = 1 | V_{ist}^k = 1, R_{is}^* \ge t)$$
(10)

Here, $V_{ist}^k = 1$ is an indicator for breaking a technical rule of type k at duration t, and I_{ist} is an indicator for being incarcerated as a result. An individual can have $V_{ist}^k = 1$ multiple times within a spell, or have $V_{ist}^k = 1$ and be rearrested subsequently, allowing me to capture the variation discussed above. I model both components using a similar logit structure:

$$Pr(V_{ist}^{k} = 1 | X_{ist}, U_{i}^{V^{k}}, R_{is}^{*} \ge t) = \Lambda \left(\theta_{0}^{V^{k}}(t) + X_{ist}^{\prime}\beta^{V^{k}} + U_{i}^{V^{k}}\right)$$
(11)

$$Pr(I_{ist} = 1 | V_{ist}^k = 1, X_{ist}, U_i^{V^k}, R_{is}^* \ge t) = \Lambda \left(\theta_0^I(t) + X_{ist}' \beta^I\right)$$
(12)

The θ_0 terms terms describe how the risk of type k rule violations and incarceration punishments evolves within a spell. The relationship between β^Y and β^{V^k} determines how observable characteristics drive correlations between the risk of breaking type k rules and the risk of criminal arrest. If, for example, the coefficient on a measure of age is positive for both, then older offenders are both more likely to break rules and to be rearrested, increasing the usefulness of using type k rules as a tag for criminal risk. The relationship between $U_i^{V^k}$ and U_i^Y determines unobservable correlations in the risk of arrest and rule-breaking. Consistent with the reduced-form results showing that the decision to incarcerate conditional on breaking a rule is largely formulaic, unobservables do not enter the likelihood of punishment for rule breaking.³⁰

I break rule violations into four types: reporting violations, such as absconding and missing regular meetings with a probation officer; drug and alcohol violations, such as failing a drug screen; fees and fines violations; and all others. There is a natural hierarchy to violation types that I use to make violation events mutually exclusive across these categories. For example, offenders who stop reporting almost always have unpaid fees. Offenders who fail a drug test are billed for the costs of the test, leading to more unpaid fees. Hence I code violations as reporting violations if there is any reporting violation, as drug violations if there is a drug violation but no reporting violation. I continue to approximate the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity components

³⁰The model could easily be extended to allow unobservables to enter this equation as well.

using mass points. Since there are four types of violations (along with the possibility of criminal arrest) each type now has five separate U_i components. I also include the same covariates as before, but allow the violation type and the number of previous violations to affect the risk of incarceration in Equation 12.

Parameter estimates from this version of the model for men are reserved for Appendix Tables A16 and A17. These estimate show substantial evidence of unobserved heterogeneity and state dependence as well. Encouragingly, estimated baseline arrest hazards are almost identical to the two-outcome model, suggesting that both models capture similar degrees of unobserved heterogeneity in criminality (all baseline hazards are plotted in Appendix Figure A8). Other hazards have the expected shapes, with reporting and drug / alcohol violations peaking halfway through the first year of a spell. Fees and fines violations are concentrated towards the end of a first year, when many spells are coming to a close and financial obligations are due.

As in the previous analysis, the covariates X_{ist} include an indicator for whether period t falls after the 2011 reform took effect. The coefficients on this indicator in this expanded model continue to show economically small increases in the risk of rearrest as a result of the change in policy. The risks of reporting violations, drug violations, and fees and fines violations also change little. Drug violations and fees and fines violations, for example, show small and statistically insignificant declines in frequency after to the reform. Incarceration risk conditional on breaking a rule, however, drops dramatically. The odds of incarceration for failing to pay a fee, for example, are 1.2 log points lower for white men after the reform. This extension of the model therefore also supports the assumptions made earlier that the reform primarily impacts incarceration risk conditional on breaking a rule, but not offenders' criminal or rule-breaking behavior.

To study how each individual violation type relates to criminal risk, I simulate the effects of enforcing particular subsets of rule types (e.g., just drug violations, drugs and fees and fines, etc.) with incarceration. Figure 12 shows the results of this exercise. The x-axis plots the share of probationers who would reoffend over the first three years of a spell but break the enforced subset of technical rules before doing so. In other words, the x-axis measure share of would-be reoffenders caught by technical rules, or the true positive rate. The y-axis plots the share of non-reoffenders over the same period who do not violate any rules. The technical rule "regime" enforced in each point is indicated in the labels: "F" for fees / fines violations, "D" for drug / alcohol violations, "R" for reporting violations, and "O" for all other rules.³¹

Rules' effectiveness improves moving to the top-right corner of the graph, indicating that the rules catch more would-be offenders and imprison fewer non-offenders. The dotted gray line starts at (0, 1) and has a slope of -1. This line reflects what would be achieved by randomly incarcerating a fraction of probationers at the start of their spells, which naturally would catch equal shares of reoffenders and non-reoffenders. Consistent with the previous analysis, the regime using all rules ("FDRO") that corresponds to the pre-reform policy is roughly as likely to catch black reoffenders as non-reoffenders. This pre-reform regime does substantially better than this random guess frontier for white offenders.

Figure 12 illustrates several other interesting features of technical rules. First, using rules related to fees and fines is almost always dominated by not doing so for both race groups. For

³¹Other rules include violations rarely charged, such as failing to pursue vocational training are contacting a victim.

black offenders, for example, regimes that use fees and fines lie below and to the left of regimes that do not. Many sets of rule dominate using fees and fines alone. Switching from enforcing fees to enforcing drug violations, for example, would result in catching 2-3 p.p. more would-be reoffenders and imprisoning 12 p.p. fewer non-reoffenders Adding fees and fines to many regimes for black offenders in fact generates *worse* outcomes than a random guess, pulling outcomes within the frontier denoted by the gray line. Eliminating fees and fines violations thus offers a clear improvement over the current status quo.³² North Carolina's reform achieved some of this impact by addressing this violation category.

Second, most regimes for black men are interior to those of white men, indicating that all rule types generally have a tougher time discriminating between black offenders and innocents. Some rules, however, appear to be particularly unfair to black offenders. While fees and fines, for example, reduce the effectiveness of all almost all regimes for white offenders, the decreases in true negative and true positive rates when using them in combination with other rules are smaller than for black offenders. Hence, dropping fees and fines rules thus not only improves effectiveness but also reduces disparities, as in North Carolina's 2011 reform. Indeed, the post-reform regime for black men ("R") now does better than random guessing. For white offenders, the pre- vs. post-reform shift appears to largely fall along possibility frontier.

Third, drug and reporting rules both appear to perform similarly. Using them in combination tends to simply increase the aggressiveness of the regime overall, trading off increases in the share of would-be reoffenders incarcerated for increases in the share of non-reoffenders locked up. The regimes that tend to produce the most similar results for black and white offenders, however, include simply using drug violations or reporting violations alone. The optimal technical rule regime depends on how policy makers assign benefits to catching would-be offenders and costs to incarcerating innocents. If the former is assigned more weight than the later, combinations of drug, reporting, and all other rules will be preferred. If the latter is assigned more weight, on the other hand, relying on smaller subsets of rules will be optimal.

At least part of the relative performance of rules is attributable to the timing of violations. Fees and fines violations, for example, tend to accumulate later in the spell, when most individuals who are likely to reoffend have already done so (see Appendix Figure A8). As a result, the population at risk to fail to pay fees and fines is meaningfully positively selected. Timing is only partly responsible for the patterns in Figure 12, however. It is straightforward to simulate the share of reoffenders who would break technical rules of each type at any point in their spell instead of the share who break rules before being rearrested. Producing a version of the figure with this quantity on the x-axis shows similar patterns (see Appendix Figure A9). In fact, for black men, fees and fines violations remain *negatively* correlated with criminal risk: those cannot pay are less likely to reoffend than those who can.

³²Ignoring impacts on collection, as discussed above.

6 Conclusion

This paper studies the probation system. Probation is the primary way the US criminal justice system gives convicted offenders a second chance to avoid prison and get back to work. Probationers return home, but are subject to technical rules that forbid drugs and alcohol, require payment of fees and fines, and limit travel, among other constraints. Rule violators can be sent to prison, making probation an important driver of incarceration. Since black men are significantly more likely to break rules, probation also drives racial disparities in prison exposure.

I use a 2011 reform in North Carolina that reduced prison punishments for technical rules to study whether rule violations are strong predictors of future crime and deter reoffending and to examine how their predictive power and deterrence effects differ across racial groups. I find that while rule violations are correlated with criminality overall, they are significantly less predictive of future offending among black probationers. As a result, North Carolina's reform closed black-white gaps in imprisonment for breaking technical rules without affecting black-white gaps in crime. Using a semi-parametric model of competing risks, I find that rules related to fees and fines are particularly poor predictors of future crime and drive racial disparities. I also find harsh punishments for rule violations have negligible deterrence effects that do not differ by race.

Many states continue to use technical violations extensively today, as shown in Figure 13. This figure lists the top 20 US states ranked by the share of state prison admissions due to technical violations of probation and parole from data collected recently by the Council of State Governments Justice Center (CSG, 2019). In Kentucky, South Dakota, Kansas, Missouri, Utah, and Wyoming, technical violations among probationers and parolees account for more than 40% of all new prison spells. Many other states sit at well over 25%, including New York, Ohio, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Most of these states—those with blue bars—have no statutory limitations on which technical violations can lead to prison time. Those that do—the gray bars—have simple "hardship" exceptions for fees and fines violations. Reduced reliance on fees and fines in probation is therefore likely to be an attractive reform for many jurisdictions. Indeed, related reforms have become increasingly popular in other areas of the criminal justice system, such as California's recent efforts to eliminate cash bail for pre-trial detention.

More broadly, my results show how ostensibly race-neutral policies—in this case the imposition of common sense rules designed to encourage desistance from crime and promote public safety can generate large racial disparities not justified by the policies' ultimate goals. Poorly designed rules and policies are a potentially powerful explanation for many observed racial disparities in criminal justice and beyond. Fortunately, correcting bias due to disparate impact may be easier than changing biased decision makers' behavior—be they cops, judges, or prosecutors—since doing so is a matter of simply changing the rules themselves. The findings presented here provide clear evidence that such changes are both feasible and can have large, persistent impacts on racial disparities.

References

- **Abadie, Alberto.** 2002. "Bootstrap Tests for Distributional Treatment Effects in Instrumental Variable Models." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457): 284–292.
- Abbring, Jaap H., and Gerard J. Van Den Berg. 2003. "The Nonparametric Identification of Treatment Effects in Duration Models." *Econometrica*, 71(5): 1491–1517.
- Abrams, David S., Marianne Bertrand, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2012. "Do Judges Vary in Their Treatment of Race." *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 41(2): 1239–1283.
- Agan, Amanda, and Sonja Starr. 2018. "Ban the Box, Criminal Records, and Racial Discrimination: A Field Experiment." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(1): 191–235.
- Aghion, Philippe, and Jean Tirole. 1997. "Formal and Real Authority in Organizations." Journal of Political Economy, 105(1): 1–29.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Alan B. Krueger. 1995. "Split-Sample Instrumental Variables Estimates of the Return to Schooling." Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 13(2): 225–235.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Guido W. Imbens, and Donald B. Rubin. 1996. "Identification of Causal Effects Using Instrumental Variables." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 91(434): 444–455.
- Anwar, Shamena, Patrick Bayer, and Randi Hjalmarsson. 2012. "The Impact of Jury Race in Criminal Trials." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 127(2): 1017–1055.
- Arnold, David, Will Dobbie, and Crystal S Yang. 2018. "Racial Bias in Bail Decisions." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(4): 1885–1932.
- Arrow, Kenneth. 1973. "Higher education as a filter." Journal of Public Economics, 2(3): 193–216.
- Barnes, Geoffrey C., Jordan M. Hyatt, Lindsay C. Ahlman, and Daniel T.L. Kent. 2012. "The effects of low-intensity supervision for lower-risk probationers: updated results from a randomized controlled trial." *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35(2): 200–220.
- Bayer, Patrick, and Kerwin Kofi Charles. 2018. "Divergent Paths: A New Perspective on Earnings Differences Between Black and White Men Since 1940." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(3): 1459–1501.
- Becker, Gary S. 1957. The Economics of Discrimination. University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, Gary S. 1968. "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach." Journal of Political Economy, 76(2): 169–217.
- Berk, Richard, Hoda Heidari, Shahin Jabbari, Michael Kearns, and Aaron Roth. 2018. "Fairness in Criminal Justice Risk Assessments: The State of the Art." Sociological Methods & Research, 0049124118782533.
- Bhuller, Manudeep, Gordon B. Dahl, Katrine V. Løken, and Magne Mogstad. 2019. "Incarceration, Recidivism, and Employment." *Journal of Political Economy*, Forthcoming.
- Boyle, Douglas J., Laura M. Ragusa-Salerno, Jennifer L. Lanterman, and Andrea Fleisch Marcus. 2013. "An Evaluation of Day Reporting Centers for Parolees." Criminology & Public Policy, 12(1): 119–143.
- Bushway, Shawn D., and Brian Forst. 2013. "Studying Discretion in the Processes that Generate Criminal Justice Sanctions." Justice Quarterly, 30(2): 199–222.
- Chalfin, Aaron, and Justin McCrary. 2017. "Criminal Deterence: A Review of the Literature." Journal of Economic Literature, 55(1): 5–48.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Maggie R. Jones, and Sonya R. Porter. 2018. "Race and Economic Opportunity in the United States: An Intergenerational Perspective." *NBER Working Paper No.* 24441.
- Cohen, Mark A., Roland T. Rust, Sara Steen, and Simon T. Tidd. 2011. "Willingness-To-Pay For Crime Control Programs." *Criminology*, 42(1): 89–110.
- Corbett-Davies, Sam, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. 2017. "Algorithmic Decision Making and the Cost of Fairness." *KDD '17*, 797–806. New York, NY, USA:ACM.
- Cox, David R. 1962. Renewal Theory. Methuen.
- Cox, D. R. 1972. "Regression Models and Life-Tables." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), 34(2): 187–220.
- **Dobbie, Will, Jacob Goldin, and Crystal S. Yang.** 2018. "The Effects of Pretrial Detention on Conviction, Future Crime, and Employment: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges." *American Economic Review*, 108(2): 201–40.
- **Duflo, Esther, Michael Greenstone, Rohini Pande, and Nicholas Ryan.** 2018. "The Value of Regulatory Discretion: Estimates From Environmental Inspections in India." *Econometrica*, 86(6): 2123–2160.
- Efron, Bradley. 1988. "Logistic Regression, Survival Analysis, and the Kaplan-Meier Curve." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83(402): 414–425.
- Fryer, Roland G. 2019. "An Empirical Analysis of Racial Differences in Police Use of Force." Journal of Political Economy, 127(3): 1210–1261.
- Harding, David J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, Anh P. Nguyen, and Shawn D. Bushway. 2018. "Imprisonment and Labor Market Outcomes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *American Journal of Sociology*, 124(1): 49–110.
- Heckman, James, and Burton Singer. 1984. "A Method for Minimizing the Impact of Distributional Assumptions in Econometric Models for Duration Data." *Econometrica*, 52(2): 271–320.
- Heckman, James J., and Bo E. Honoré. 1989. "The Identifiability of the Competing Risks Model." *Biometrika*, 76(2): 325–330.
- Hennigan, Karen, Kathy Kolnick, Tian Siva Tian, Cheryl Maxson, and John Poplawski. 2010. "Five Year Outcomes in a Randomized Trial of a Community-Based MultiAgency Intensive Supervision Juvenile Probation Program." Technical Report.
- Honoré, Bo E. 1993. "Identification Results for Duration Models with Multiple Spells." *Review* of *Economic Studies*, 60(1): 241–46.
- Hyatt, Jordan M., and Geoffrey C. Barnes. 2017. "An Experimental Evaluation of the Impact of Intensive Supervision on the Recidivism of High-Risk Probationers." *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(1): 3–38.
- Jannetta, Jesse, Justin Breaux, Hellen Ho, and Jeremey Porter. 2014. "Examing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Probation Revocation." Urban Institute Washington, D.C.
- Kaeble, Danielle. 2018. "Probation and Parole in the United States, 2016." Bureau of Justice Statistics BJC Bulletin NCJ 251148.

- Kaplan, E. L., and Paul Meier. 1958. "Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 53(282): 457–481.
- Kleinberg, Jon, Himabindu Lakkaraju, Jure Leskovec, Jens Ludwig, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2017. "Human Decisions and Machine Predictions"." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(1): 237–293.
- Kleinberg, Jon, Snedhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. 2017. "Inherent Trade-Offs in the Fair Determination of Risk Scores." New York, NY, USA.
- Kline, Patrick, and Christopher R. Walters. 2016. "Evaluating Public Programs with Close Substitutes: The Case of Head Start*." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4): 1795–1848.
- Kuziemko, Ilyana. 2013. "How Should Inmates Be Released From Prison? An Assessment of Parole Versus Fixed Sentence Regimes." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1): 371–424.
- Miller, T., M. Cohen, and B. Wiersema. 1996. "Victim costs and consequences: A new look." U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice Research Report NCJ-155282.
- Mueller-Smith, Michael. 2015. "The Criminal and Labor Market Impacts of Incarceration." *Working Paper.*
- Mueller-Smith, Michael, and Kevin T. Schnepel. 2019. "Diversion in the Criminal Justice System." Working Paper.
- Neal, Derek, and Armin Rick. 2016. "The Prison Boom and Sentencing Policy." The Journal of Legal Studies, 45(1): 1–41.
- Oaxaca, Ronald L., and Michael R. Ransom. 1999. "Identification in Detailed Wage Decompositions." The Review of Economics and Statistics, 81(1): 154–157.
- **Pepin, Arthur W.** 2016. "The End of Debtors' Prisons: Effective Court Policies for Successful Compliance with Legal Financial Obligations." Conference of State Court Administrators Policy Paper.
- Phelps, Edmund S. 1972. "The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism." The American Economic Review, 62(4): 659–661.
- Reaves, Brian A. 2013. "Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, 2009 Statistical Tables." Bureau of Justice Statistics State Court Processing Statistics NCJ 243777.
- Rehavi, M. Marit, and Sonja B. Starr. 2014. "Racial Disparity in Federal Criminal Sentences." Journal of Political Economy, 122(6): 1320–1354.
- **Robina Insitute.** 2016. "Probation Revocation And Its Causes: Profiles of State and Local Jurisdictions." University of Minnesota Policy Paper.
- Rose, Evan K., and Yotam Shem-Tov. 2019. "Does Incarceration Increase Crime?" Working Paper.
- Rose, Evan K., Jonathan Schellenberg, and Yotam Shem-Tov. 2019. "The Effects of Teacher Quality on Criminal Behavior." *Working Paper*.
- Ruggles, Steven, Sarah Flood, Ronald Goeken, Josiah Grover, Erin Meyer, Jose Pacas, and Matthew Sobek. 2019. "PUMS USA: Version 9.0 [dataset]." *Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS*.
- Sakoda, Ryan. 2019. "Efficient Sentencing? The Effect of Post-Release Supervision on Low-Level Offenders." Unpublished manuscript.
- The Council of State Governments Justice Center. 2011. "Justice Reinvestment in North Carolina."

- **The Council of State Governments Justice Center.** 2019. "Confined and Costly: How Supervision Violations are Filling Prisons and Burdening Budgets."
- **Tsiatis, Anastasios.** 1975. "A Non-identifiability Aspect of the Problem of Competing Risks." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 72(1): 20–22.
- Van Den Berg, Gerard J. 2001. "Duration models: specification, identification and multiple durations." In *Handbook of Econometrics*. Vol. 5 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. J.J. Heckman and E.E. Leamer, Chapter 55, 3381–3460. Elsevier.
- West, Jeremy. 2018. "Racial Bias in Police Investigations." Working Paper.

Figures



Figure 1: Male High School Dropouts: Employment and Incarceration

Notes: Figure constructed using the 2013-2017 5-year public use American Community Survey data (Ruggles et al., 2019). Includes White and African-American men aged 20-40 with less than 12 years of education. All estimates constructed using IPUMS person weights. Blue bars are means of an indicator for being at work at the time of enumeration. Red bars are means of an indicator for being enumerated in institutional group quarters, which includes adult correctional facilities, mental institutions, and homes for the elderly, handicapped, and poor. Breakouts for correctional facilities alone are not available in public use data, but adult correctional facilities account for 95% of the total institutional group quarters population for men 18-54 in the 2013-2017 ACS, according to Census Bureau tabulations.



Figure 2: Racial Disparities in Probation Outcomes

Notes: Regressions include all supervised probationers starting spells in 2006-2010. W mean refers to the white mean of the dependent variable, which is an indicator for the relevant outcome occurring at any point in the spell. Admin includes violations such as non-payment of fees and fines. Drug includes drug-related violations. Absconding is fleeing supervision. Technical revocations are incarceration for rule breaking without a preceding arrest. Adjusted estimate is from an OLS regression with controls for gender, 20 quantiles of age effects, district fixed effects, fixed effects for the offense class of their focal conviction, a linear control for the length of the supervision spell, fixed effects for prior convictions and revokes, a linear control for previous incarceration duration, and the most recent math and reading standardized test scores (normalized to have mean 0 and standard deviation 1 in the full test-taker population) observed between grades 3 and 8.



Figure 3: Relationship Between Racial Gaps in Technical Violations and Arrests Across North Carolina

Notes: Regressions include all spells starting in 2006-2010. Each dot plots the coefficient on a black indicator from two regressions estimated separately in each of the 30 probation districts in the state. The outcome in the first regression is an indicator for any criminal arrest within three years of starting probation. The outcome in the second regression is an indicator for any drug or administrative violation in the spell. All regressions include the demographic, sentencing, and criminal history controls used in Figure 2. To avoid mechanical relationships, I randomly split the sample in half and run regressions for each outcome in separate samples, as in a split-sample IV estimate (Angrist and Krueger, 1995). The positive slope indicates that racial gaps in technical violations and racial gaps in arrest risk are positively correlated across the state, as would be expected if criminally riskier probationers incur more technical violations.



Figure 4: Illustration of Test of Behavioral Responses (i.e., $E[Y_i^* \mid Z_i] = E[Y_i^*]$)

Notes: Figure illustrates the test for behavioral responses conducted in Table 3. Prior to the reform, individuals may be incarcerated for a rule violation such as a failed drug test. Any subsequent potential arrests would therefore be unobserved. After the reform, failed tests no longer result in incarceration, revealing previously censored arrests. By deleting all arrests that occur after technical violation, however, one can undo the impact of the reform on censoring due to rule-driven incarceration. If arrests still increase in this new measure, offenders must also respond behaviorally to the reform by increasing their criminal activity. Table 3 detects no evidence of these behavioral responses.



Figure 5: Effects of Reform on Technical Rule-Driven Incarceration and Crime

Notes: Panels A and B include all supervised probationers starting their spells within four years of the reform. Each line represents a three-month cohort of probationers who start their spells where the line intersects the x-axis. The y-axis measures the share of this cohort experiencing the relevant outcome over the following year. Incarceration for technical violations is an indicator for having probation revoked for rule violations with no intervening criminal arrest. Arrest is an indicator for a criminal arrest before incarceration for any rule violations. Events are therefore mutually exclusive. Panel C plots mean one-year rule-driven incarceration and arrest rates for supervised probationers minus the same measure for unsupervised probationers. The same cohort definitions are used. Effects are normalized relative to the cohort starting four quarters before the reform, indicated by the solid red line. This is the last cohort to spend the full first year of their probation spells under the pre-reform regime. The dotted red line indicates the first cohort whose first year of probation falls completely post-reform.



Figure 6: Predicted Arrest Rates Around Implementation of Reform

Notes: Includes all supervised probationers starting their spells within four years of the reform. Each line represents a three-month cohort of probationers who start their spells where the line intersects the x-axis. The y-axis measures the predicted share of this cohort arrested over the first year of their spells formed using linear regressions of arrest within t days on 5-year age bins interacted with race and gender, indicators for criminal history, and indicators for the original arrest offense. The regression is estimated for all $t \leq 365$ in the unsupervised (i.e., control group) probation population starting spells within 4 years of the reform. Treated (i.e., supervised) probationers' actual outcomes are reproduced in the light grey lines in the background.



Figure 7: Effects of Reform by Race

Notes: Includes all supervised probationers starting their spells either 1-3 years before (pre) or 0-2 years after the reform (post). The y-axis measures the share of each group experiencing the relevant outcome over the first year of their probation spell. Incarceration for technical violations is an indicator for having probation revoked for rule violations with no intervening criminal arrest. Arrest is an indicator for a criminal arrest before incarceration for any rule violations.



Figure 8: Estimates of Targeting Bias in Drug and Administrative Violations

Notes: Figure plots estimates and 95% confidence intervals for Γ_k by race using the core diff-in-diff sample. Γ_k estimates the likelihood of rule-driven incarceration before time k among probationers who would be otherwise be rearrested at time k. Higher values for black probationers indicate that among probationers who would otherwise be rearrested at the same time, technical rules target black probationers more aggressively. Γ_k is estimated using the ratio of coefficients from estimates of the core diff-in-diff specification in Table 4. The outcome for each k is Y_i^k , an indicator for being rearrested within k and k + 89 days of probation start without any intervening technical incarceration. The numerator is the coefficient on post-x-treat. The denominator is the sum of coefficients on post-x-treat, treat, and the constant. The final estimate for $k \geq 1080$ is computed using 1 - an indicator for being rearrested within 1080 days as the outcome. Spells starting pre-reform with sentenced lengths that imply finishing post reform are dropped, since these spells are only partially affected.



Figure 9: Average Hazards for Arrest and Rule-Driven Incarceration

Notes: Figure plots average baseline weekly hazard rates for each outcome implied by estimates of the mixed logit competing risks model. The baseline hazard reflects the risk of each event for the *same individual* conditional on the event not happening previously. Hazards are calculated for an individual with mean levels of observables and averaged over the distribution of unobserved heterogeneity using estimates from finite mixture version of the model. See text for details on sample and specification of unobserved heterogeneity.



Figure 10: Model-based Replication of Difference-in-Difference Estimates

Notes: Figure compares difference-in-difference estimates of increases in observed arrests at 90, 180, 270, and 360 days for each race-by-gender group to the competing risk model's prediction of the same object. Vertical lines reflect 95% confidence intervals for the diff-in-dif estimates, while the orange line lies on a 45 degree angle. The diff-in-diff estimates are constructed using the sample sample and specification as in the reduced-form analysis and with no covariates included. Model predictions come from simulating observed arrests at each horizon with and without the "post-reform" coefficients turned on. Covariates are fixed at the empirical distribution in the pre-reform period.



Figure 11: Targeting Bias in the Competing Risks Model

Notes: Figure plots estimates of Γ_k , the likelihood of rule-driven incarceration before time k among probationers who would be otherwise be rearrested at time k, from simulating outcomes in the competing risks model. Simulations use the pre-reform empirical distribution of covariates for each race-gender group and the estimated race-gender specific distributions of unobserved heterogeneity. Γ_k is the share of observations across simulations who have arrest failure times equal to k but technical incarceration failure times $\langle k$. Higher values for black probationers indicate that among probationers who would otherwise be rearrested at the same time, technical rules target black probationers more aggressively. The final dots at the right of the graph plot the probability of technical violation failure times ≤ 1080 conditional on having arrest failure times > 1080 (and possibly infinite).



Figure 12: Efficiency and Equity of Technical Violation Rule Types

Notes: Figure plots estimates of the share of potential reoffenders over a three year period who break technical rules before they reoffend (x-axis) against the share of non-reoffenders who do not break technical rules. Estimates come from simulating the model estimated in Section 5.4 using a different set of rules. Each point is labeled with a combination of "F" for fees / fines violations, "D" for drug / alcohol violations, "R" for reporting violations, and "O" for all other, reflecting the sets of rules enforced in the simulation. The dotted gray line starts at (1,0) and has a slope of -1. This line reflects what would be achieved by randomly incarcerating a fraction of probationers at the start of their spells, which naturally would catch equal shares of reoffenders and non-reoffenders.



Figure 13: Top States by Share of Prison Admissions Due to Technical Violations

Notes: Figure plots the share of state prison admissions due to technical violations of probation and parole using data from the Council of State Governments Justice Center (CSG, 2019) for the 20 states with the highest shares. States with blue bars have no statutory limits on which technical violations can result in prison time, while states with grey bars restrict incarceration for failure to pay fees and fines when the defendant can demonstrate a financial "hardship."

Tables

	Superv	Supervised (treated)			Unsupervised (control)		
	Mean	Sd.	p50	Mean	Sd.	p50	
Demographics:							
Age at start	32.059	10.85	29.83	32.707	10.77	30.29	
Male	0.738	0.44	1.00	0.732	0.44	1.00	
Black	0.435	0.50	0.00	0.355	0.48	0.00	
White	0.490	0.50	0.00	0.522	0.50	1.00	
Other race	0.074	0.26	0.00	0.124	0.33	0.00	
Sentence:							
Sup. length (m)	19.449	9.58	18.17	14.841	8.77	12.00	
Felon	0.429	0.49	0.00	0.032	0.18	0.00	
Misd.	0.318	0.47	0.00	0.502	0.50	1.00	
DWI / DWLR	0.208	0.41	0.00	0.457	0.50	0.00	
Criminal history:							
Crim. hist. score	2.059	2.97	1.00	0.988	1.76	0.00	
Prior sentences	1.917	3.28	0.00	1.251	2.69	0.00	
Prior inc. spells	0.860	2.22	0.00	0.497	1.74	0.00	
N	708623			895090			
Individuals	531099			661103			

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Notes: Treated and control samples include all supervised and unsupervised probation spells beginning between 2006 and 2018, respectively. Felon, misdemeanor, and DWI / DWLR measure the most serious offense that resulted in the spell, with DWL / DWLR referring to driving while intoxicated and driving with license revoked. A small share of spells result from offenses with no classification. Criminal history score is a weighted sum of prior convictions used by North Carolina's sentencing guidelines. A prior misdemeanor conviction is typically worth 1 point, while a prior felony is worth two or more. Prior sentences refer to previous sentences to supervised probation or incarceration. Prior incarceration spells refers to previous incarceration in state prison.

	Violation	Share of violations	Share of spells
	Any violation	1.000	0.618
1	Not paying fees	0.343	0.496
2	Not reporting	0.129	0.286
3	Positive drug test	0.085	0.184
4	Fleeing supervision	0.064	0.163
5	New misdemeanor charge	0.063	0.138
6	Treatment / program failure	0.061	0.156
7	Moving / job change without notifying	0.034	0.084
8	Not completing community service	0.033	0.102
9	Breaking curfew	0.028	0.065
10	No employment	0.023	0.059
11	New felony charge	0.019	0.040
12	Admitting drug use	0.009	0.023
13	No education / training	0.007	0.018
14	Travelling without permission	0.006	0.014
15	Possessing drugs	0.006	0.013
16	Electronic monitoring failure	0.004	0.010
17	Refuse drug test	0.003	0.008
18	Disobeying curfew	0.003	0.008
19	Possessing weapons	0.002	0.006
20	Contacting drug users	0.002	0.005
	All others	0.162	0.558

Table 2: Frequency of Top 20 Probation Violations

Notes: Includes all treated observations starting probation in 2006-2010. Share of violations measures share of all violation recorded over this period. Share of spells measures the share of probation spells with any violation of the listed type.

	Arre	est	Any vi	olation	Drug	g use	Fees and	l fines
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Post reform	-0.000972	0.00133	-0.0230*	-0.0180	0.0163	0.0225	-0.0000153	0.00582
	(0.0117)	(0.0117)	(0.0101)	(0.0101)	(0.0176)	(0.0176)	(0.0118)	(0.0118)
N	152734	152734	152734	152734	152734	152734	152734	152734
Controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes

Table 3: Behavioral Responses to Reform

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Table reports estimates of Cox proportional hazard regressions using all supervised probation spells starting within one year of the reform. "Post reform" is a time-varying indicator for whether the period within the spell falls after Dec. 1, 2011. Each pair of columns considers the listed behavior as failure and the other behaviors as a source of independent censoring. In columns 1 and 2, for example, all arrests after an initial rule violation are ignored. If rule breaking and arrests are unaffected by the reform's decrease in punishments for rule violations, then the populations at risk at each duration and measured hazards should also be unaffected. See Figure 4 for a graphical illustration of the test. Controls include demographic and criminal history covariates where indicated. All spells are censored at 365 days.

	A. All off	enders		
	Incar. for	tech. viols.	Ar	rest
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Post-reform	-0.00172***	-0.00203***	-0.00787***	-0.00699***
	(0.000274)	(0.000290)	(0.00167)	(0.00159)
Treated	0.147^{***}	0.136***	0.0306***	-0.0156***
	(0.00105)	(0.00102)	(0.00166)	(0.00164)
Post-x-treat	-0.0546***	-0.0546***	0.0199^{***}	0.0198^{***}
	(0.00137)	(0.00136)	(0.00242)	(0.00233)
N	546006	546006	546006	546006
Pre-reform treated mean	.154	.154	.286	.286
Accuracy			.365(.044)	.365(.042)
False negative rate $(1 - \Gamma_1)$.935~(.008)	.935(.007)
False positive rate (Γ_0)			.058 $(.004)$.058(.004)
	B. Non-black	c offenders		
Post-reform	-0.000522	-0.000867**	-0.00688***	-0.00661***
	(0.000317)	(0.000336)	(0.00199)	(0.00190)
Treated	0.126^{***}	0.114***	0.0442***	-0.000306
	(0.00131)	(0.00127)	(0.00208)	(0.00207)
Post-x-treat	-0.0366***	-0.0371***	0.0201***	0.0182***
	(0.00175)	(0.00174)	(0.00304)	(0.00295)
N	328784	328784	328784	328784
Pre-reform treated mean	.131	.131	.264	.264
Accuracy			.549(.083)	.543 $(.079)$
False negative rate $(1 - \Gamma_1)$.929 $(.01)$.93(.01)
False positive (Γ_0)			.027 $(.005)$.027 $(.005)$
	C. Black o	ffenders		
Post-reform	-0.00389***	-0.00411***	-0.0117^{***}	-0.0111***
	(0.000509)	(0.000538)	(0.00295)	(0.00281)
Treated	0.172^{***}	0.164^{***}	-0.00603*	-0.0467***
	(0.00168)	(0.00168)	(0.00274)	(0.00268)
Post-x-treat	-0.0760***	-0.0756***	0.0232***	0.0237***
	(0.00217)	(0.00216)	(0.00399)	(0.00383)
N	217222	217222	217222	217222
Pre-reform treated mean	.181	.181	.314	.314
Accuracy			.305(.052)	.306(.049)
False negative rate $(1 - \Gamma_1)$.931 (.011)	.931 $(.011)$
False positive rate (Γ_0)			.095~(.007)	.094 $(.007)$

Table 4: Difference-in-Differences Estimates of Reform Impacts

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Includes all treated and untreated probation spells beginning 1-3 years before the reform and 0-2 years afterwards. Post is indicator for starting probation after Dec. 1, 2011, the date JRA reforms took effect. Demographic controls include five-year age bins and indicators for race and gender. Criminal history controls include fixed effects criminal history points and prior sentences to supervised probation or incarceration. Controls are included in columns52 and 4.

	Overall rates		Decon	nposition
	White	Black	Difference	Share of gap
Probability of incarceration for	r rule viol	ations		
$Pr(R_i = 1 D_i = 1)$	0.040	0.085	0.045	100.0%
Distribution of risk				
$Pr(Y_i^* = 1 D_i = 1)$	0.314	0.377	0.063	9.7%
$\Pr(Y_i^* = 0 D_i = 1)$	0.686	0.623	-0.063	-13.4%
Probability of rule-driven inca	r conditio	nal on risk		
$Pr(R_i = 1 Y_i^* = 1, D_i = 1)$	0.071	0.069	-0.002	-1.3%
$Pr(R_i = 1 Y_i^* = 0, D_i = 1)$	0.027	0.095	0.068	105.0%

Table 5: Decomposition of Racial Gaps in Technical Violations Using One-Period Model

Notes: Table decomposes the difference in technical rule-driven incarceration risk between black and white probationers into the contributions of differences in arrest risk and differences in the likelihood of violation conditional on arrest risk. The decomposition applies to the population with $D_i = 1$, or the set of potential "compliers" to the reform. These are individuals who are not incarcerated for breaking rules still punished with prison time even after the reform. Estimates are based on core difference-in-differences results without controls from Table 4. The decomposition calculates the contribution of differences in risk using black targeting rates as baseline, and differences in targeting using white risk as baseline. The first row is -1 times the race-specific post-x-treat effect for technical violations. The second row is the sum of the constant, treat, and post-x-treat effects from difference-in-differences estimates for arrests. Both rows are re-scaled by 1 minus the sum of the constant, treat, and post-x-treat effects for technical violations. The final two rows are calculated as described in the text. Appendix Section A3 provides complete details on how the decomposition is calculated.

	(1) Arrest	(2)TV Inc	(3) Arrest	(4)TV Inc	(5) Arrest	(6)TV Inc	(7) Arrest	(8) TV Inc	(9) Arrest	(10) TV Inc
Treat-x-post	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0201^{***} \\ (0.00304) \end{array}$	-0.0366^{***} (0.00175)	0.0129 (0.00784)	-0.0388^{***} (0.00496)	0.0192^{*} (0.00786)	-0.0341^{***} (0.00496)				
Treat-x-post-x-black	0.00311 (0.00501)	-0.0394^{***} (0.00279)	0.00185 (0.00497)	-0.0375^{***} (0.00278)	-0.000708 (0.00504)	-0.0356^{***} (0.00284)	-0.00110 (0.00513)	-0.0352^{***} (0.00292)	-0.00283 (0.00563)	-0.0323^{***} (0.00311)
N	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006	546006
Demographics				\mathbf{Yes}		${ m Yes}_{ m Voc}$	${ m Yes}_{{ m Vos}}$	${ m Yes}_{ m Voc}$	${ m Yes}_{{ m Vos}}$	${ m Yes}_{ m Voc}$
Probation district						103	Yes	Yes	I GD	102
Residence zipcode									Yes	Yes
Standard errors in paren * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *	theses $^{**} p < 0.001$									
Notes: Includes all tre-	ated and unt	treated prob	ation spells	heøinning 1-	-3 vears hefe	re the reform	n and 0-2 ve	ears afterwar	rds. Post is	indicator

Table 6: Triple Difference Estimates of Differential Effect on Black Offenders

57

for starting probation after Dec. 1, 2011, the date JRA reforms took effect. Demographic controls include five-year age bins and indicators for gender. Criminal history controls include fixed effects for criminal history points. All controls are interacted with treatment, post, and treatment times post indicators.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	\triangle in rev. \$	\bigtriangleup indir. $\$$	Break-even	Break-even fel.	Cost lb	Cost ub
All	-676***	246^{*}	39,813***	100,863**	23,512	195,295
	(26)	(118)	(10,079)	(31, 183)	(36, 126)	(109, 304)
Non-black	-450***	213	$24,991^*$	$50,\!576^*$	2,114	$47,\!363$
	(34)	(128)	(10, 343)	(22, 161)	$(39,\!639)$	(120, 331)
Black	-957***	296	$50,037^{**}$	188,899	$36,\!439$	$339,\!574$
	(40)	(224)	(17, 379)	$(107,\!553)$	(62, 285)	(189, 895)
Non-black men	-533***	197	$31,\!863^*$	$55,798^{*}$	-13,146	39,561
	(43)	(164)	(13, 243)	(23, 950)	(43, 565)	(136, 574)
Black men	$-1,085^{***}$	376	$44,156^{*}$	149,230	38,920	$340,\!983$
	(50)	(297)	(17, 615)	$(87,\!676)$	(68, 152)	(206, 603)

Table 7: Cost-Benefit Analysis of Reform

Notes: Table calculates the minimum mean social costs of arrests necessary for the state to "breakeven" on changes in incarceration costs and arrest rates induced by the reform. Column 1 estimates the decrease in spending on incarceration for technical violations per probationer due to the reform. Column 2 estimates the increase in spending on incarceration for new arrests. Columns 3 and 4 calculate implied break-even costs of an arrest for all arrests and for felony arrests only, respectively. Columns 5 and 6 report estimated increases in the costs of crime due to the reform when each arrest is assigned a dollar social cost using estimates from the literature. Includes all treated and untreated probation spells beginning 1-3 years before the reform and 0-2 years afterwards. Includes same controls as in Table 4.

	Overal	l rates	Decon	nposition
	White	Black	Difference	Share of gap
Probability of incarceration for rule	violatio	ns		
$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* D_i = 1)$	0.045	0.100	0.056	100.0%
Distribution of risk				
$Pr(Y_i^* < 360 D_i = 1)$	0.313	0.363	0.05	6.5%
$Pr(Y_i^* < 720 D_i = 1)$	0.426	0.488	0.061	10.1%
$Pr(Y_i^* < 1080 D_i = 1)$	0.498	0.558	0.060	11.0%
$Pr(Y_i^* \ge 1080 D_i = 1)$	0.502	0.442	-0.060	-9.6%
Total contribution				1.5%
Probability of rule-driven incar conditional on risk				
$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* Y_i^* < 360, D_i = 1)$	0.070	0.077	0.007	4.5%
$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* Y_i^* < 720, D_i = 1)$	0.063	0.106	0.043	34.6%
$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* Y_i^* < 1080, D_i = 1)$	0.073	0.110	0.037	34.3%
$Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* Y_i^* \ge 1080, D_i = 1)$	0.017	0.088	0.072	64.3%
Total contribution				98.5%

 Table 8: Full Decomposition of Racial Gaps in Technical Violations

Notes: Table decomposes the difference in the risk of incarceration for technical violations between black and white probationers into the contributions of differences in arrest risk and differences in the likelihood of rule-driven incarceration conditional on arrest risk using the multi-period model described in Section 3. The decomposition applies to the population with $D_i = 1$, or the set of potential "compliers" to the reform. These are individuals who are not incarcerated for breaking rules still punished with prison time even after the reform. The first row reports the share of white and black compliers caught by the drug and administrative rules affected by the reform and the black rate minus the white rate. The remainder of the table decomposes this differences into the share explained by targeting (differences in Γ_k) and risk (differences in $Pr(Y_i^* = k)$). The rows under "Distribution of Risk" show the share of compliers by race with Y_i^* falling in certain ranges, the black-white gap, and the contribution of this gap to the total disparity. The rows under "Probability of rule-driven incar conditional on risk" show mean values of Γ_k for compliers with Y_i^* in certain ranges (weighted by the distribution of Y_i^*), the gap, and the contribution of this gap to the total disparity. Since crime is measured up to a max of a 3 year horizon, risk distributions are not observed beyond this point. Y_i^* is therefore binned in 90-day intervals up to 3 years with a final bin reflecting 3 years or later. Additional details are available in Section A3.

	Blac	ek men	Whi	te men
	Arrest	Incar for TVs	Arrest	Incar for TVs
Duration	-0.17 (0.11)	3.78(0.17)	-0.87 (0.10)	2.86(0.20)
$Duration^2$	-1.85(0.73)	-21.78 (1.26)	2.16(0.68)	-18.56 (1.54)
$Duration^3$	4.98 (1.86)	42.21 (3.53)	-4.40 (1.75)	36.76(4.40)
$Duration^4$	-4.79(2.03)	-37.99(4.16)	4.87(1.93)	-33.68(5.21)
$Duration^5$	1.56(0.79)	12.94(1.72)	-2.08(0.76)	11.63(2.17)
Has 2 spells	0.85(0.01)	0.77(0.02)	1.21(0.01)	1.09(0.02)
Second spell	-0.19(0.03)	0.09(0.04)	-0.34(0.03)	-0.03(0.05)
Second spell x dur.	-0.13 (0.12)	-0.02(0.22)	-0.02 (0.12)	0.22(0.21)
Second spell x dur. ²	0.60(0.71)	-1.56(1.36)	-0.13(0.65)	-2.86(1.27)
Second spell x dur. ³	-1.42(1.73)	4.96(3.60)	0.14(1.57)	8.22 (3.30)
Second spell x dur. ⁴	1.38(1.85)	-5.57(4.15)	0.08(1.67)	-9.01(3.75)
Second spell x dur. ⁵	-0.46(0.72)	2.11(1.71)	-0.11 (0.64)	3.43(1.53)
Calendar time	-0.02(0.01)	-0.22(0.02)	$0.05\ (0.01)$	-0.05(0.02)
Calendar time ²	-0.00(0.01)	-0.15(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	-0.08(0.01)
Age	-2.50(0.13)	-3.35(0.20)	-2.91(0.13)	-2.07(0.22)
Age^2	4.14(0.28)	6.67(0.43)	5.50(0.27)	4.40(0.48)
Age^3	-2.03(0.16)	-3.49(0.24)	-2.90(0.15)	-2.53(0.26)
Post reform	0.05~(0.01)	-0.51 (0.03)	$0.04\ (0.01)$	-0.40 (0.03)
Type locations				
Type 1	-6.92(0.00)	-7.02(0.08)	-7.72(0.00)	-8.55(0.20)
Type 2	-5.43(0.00)	-7.25(0.09)	-5.87(0.00)	-8.17(0.16)
Type 3	-5.41(0.00)	-5.46(0.08)	-5.82(0.00)	-6.27(0.09)
Type 4	-3.45(0.06)	-5.98(0.19)	-3.72(0.05)	-6.61(0.24)
Type shares				
Type 1	0.12(0.01)		0.06~(0.00)	
Type 2	$0.58\ (0.03)$		0.58~(0.04)	
Type 3	$0.23\ (0.03)$		$0.30 \ (0.04)$	
Type 4	0.08~(0.00)		0.06~(0.00)	
Total spells	173,441		207,388	
Total individuals	$139,\!373$		174,775	
Log likelihood	-715877.466		-739260.018	

Table 9: Mixture Model Parameter Estimates for Men

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1 and mean 0) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 7-day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the weekly hazard log odds.

Appendix

A1 Proof of Proposition 1

The numerator of Γ_k is derived as follows:

$$\begin{split} &E[1\{R_i^* \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\}|Z_i = 1] - E[1\{R_i^* \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\}|Z_i = 0] \\ &= E[1\{R_i^*(1) \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\} - 1\{R_i^*(0) \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\}] \\ &= Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) < k \le R_i^*(1)) \end{split}$$

The denominator is:

$$E[1\{R_i^* \ge k\}1\{Y_i^* = k\}|Z_i = 1] = Pr(Y_i^* = k, k \le R_i^*(1))$$

Taking the ratio of these two objections coverts the joint probability to the desired conditional probability.

$$\frac{Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) < k \le R_i^*(1))}{Pr(Y_i^* = k, k \le R_i^*(1))} = Pr(R_i^*(0) < k | Y_i^* = k, D_i = 1)$$

The notation for $D_i = 1$ is equivalent to writing $Pr(R_i^*(0) < k | Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(1) \ge k)$.

A2 Additive time effects

Since the instrument Z_i is a simple indicator for beginning probation prevs. post reform, neglected time effects are a form of violation of the exclusion restriction, which requires that $Y_i^* \perp Z_i$. This violation can be accounted for if the control group provides a good measure of the effect of Z_i on Y_i^* in the compliers group, so that it can be differenced off.

Let S_i be a binary indicator for whether the individual is on supervised vs. unsupervised probation and thus is in the treated vs. control group, respectively. Let the population shares with offending durations k be given by:

$$Pr(Y_i^* = k | Z_i, S_i) = \alpha_k + \beta_k^1 Z_i + \beta_k^2 S_i$$

Observed offending rates in the post period (i.e., the Y_i^k used in estimation of Γ_k) be given by:

$$Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(1) \ge k | Z_i, S_i) = Pr(Y_i^* = k | R_i^*(1) \ge k, Z_i, S_i) Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | Z_i, S_i)$$
$$= (\alpha_k + \beta_k^1 Z_i + \beta_k^2 S_i) Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | Z_i, S_i)$$

Observed offending rates in the pre period are given by:

$$Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) \ge k | Z_i = 0, S_i) = \left(\alpha_k + \beta_k^2 S_i\right) Pr(R_i^*(0) \ge k | Z_i, S_i)$$

Because the control group is virtually never subject to technical incarceration, both $Pr(R_i^*(1) \geq$

 $k|Z_i, S_i)$ and $Pr(R_i^*(0) \ge k|Z_i, S_i)$ are equal to 1 when $S_i = 0$. Taking the difference-in-difference between these two probabilities and across S_i thus yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(1) \ge k | Z_i = 1, S_i = 1) - \Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(1) \ge k | Z_i = 1, S_i = 0) \\ - \Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) \ge k | Z_i = 0, S_i = 1) - \Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) \ge k | Z_i = 0, S_i = 0) \\ = \left(\alpha_k + \beta_k^1 + \beta_k^2\right) \Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | S_i = 1) - \alpha_k - \beta_k^1 \\ - \left(\alpha_k + \beta_k^2\right) \Pr(R_i^*(0) \ge k | S_i = 1) + \alpha_k \\ = \left(\alpha_k + \beta_k^2\right) \left(\Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | S_i = 1) - \Pr(R_i^*(0) \ge k | S_i = 1)\right) + \beta_k^1 \left(\Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | S_i = 1) - 1\right) \\ = \left(\alpha_k + \beta_k^2\right) \Pr(R_i^*(0) < k \le R_i^*(1) | S_i = 1\right) + \beta_k^1 \left(\Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | S_i = 1) - 1\right) \\ = \Pr(Y_i^* = k, R_i^*(0) < k \le R_i^*(1) | S_i = 1\right) + \beta_k^1 \left(\Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k | S_i = 1) - 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the difference-in-differences estimator yields the correct probability plus a bias term. This term reflects the fact that although Z has the same effect on the $Pr(Y_i^* = k)$ for both treatment and control units, the effect is partially muted in the treatment group by the fact that $Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k|S_i = 1) < 1$, so that only a portion of the effect of Z is revealed, whereas the full effect is revealed in the control group. This bias term is decreasing in $Pr(R_i^*(1) \ge k|S_i = 1)$. Empirically, this value is roughly 0.9 at one-year horizons. Thus practically speaking this size of any bias is roughly 10% of the estimated post-effect, which is very small as well.

A3 Calculation of Oaxaca decomposition

I use the primary results from Table 4 to construct the one-period Oaxaca decomposition. The first row, which reports $Pr(R_i = 1|D_i = 1)$ by race is -1 times the coefficient on post-x-treat, which is an estimate of $Pr(R_i(0) = 1, D_i = 1)$, rescaled by the probability of being a complier, or $Pr(D_i = 1)$. This probability is easily estimated as one minus the share of individuals incarcerated for technical violations in the first year of their spell in the post period. That is, the sum of the constant, the treated indicator, and the post-x-treat indicator from Column 1.

The second row reports estimates of $Pr(R_i = 1|D_i = 1)$. This object is estimated as the probability of offending within the first year of a probation spell after the reform, or the sum of the constant, the treated indicator, and the post-x-treat indicator from Column 3, again re-scaled by the estimate of $Pr(D_i = 1)$. The third row is 1 minus the second row.

The fourth row is simply the re-scaled reduced form discussed in Section 3. It is the coefficient on treat-x-post from Column 3 divided by the sum of the coefficients on post-x-treat, treat, and the constant from Column 3.

The fifth row is estimated by first subtracting the coefficient on post-x-treat in Column 3 from -1 times the coefficient on post-x-treat from Column 1. This object reflects $Pr(R_i(0) = 1, Y_i^* = 0, D_i = 1)$. Rescaling by complier probability converts to $Pr(R_i(0) = 1, Y_i^* = 0 | D_i = 1)$. I then divide by 1 minus the sum of coefficients on post-x-treat, treat, and the constant from Column 3 divided by the complier probability. This estimates $Pr(Y_i^* = 0 | D_i = 1)$. The ratio gives the desired object, $Pr(R_i = 1 | Y_i^* = 0, D_i = 1)$.

The Oaxaca decomposes the differences in $Pr(R_i = 1|D_i = 1)$ as described in Section 3, but

with all objects conditioning on $D_i = 1$.

Calculation of the multi-period Oaxaca is analogous. The estimate of $Pr(R_i^* < Y_i^* | D_i = 1)$ is the post-x-treat effect on ever being imprisoned for technical violations. The complier probability is 1 minus the probability of any imprisonment for technical violations in the post period. Risk distributions are given by diff-in-diff estimates of increases in offending in each 90-day time bin, rescaled by complier probabilities. Targeting is estimated as discussed on Section 3.

Since outcomes are only observed for 3 years, share of compliers with $Y_i^* \ge 1080$ is simply 1 minus the sum of complier shares with $Y_i^* < 1080$. Targeting for this population is calculated as in the one-period version, but treating the first three years of a spell as single period.

Table 8 performs the same Oaxaca decomposition, but summing over all k (instead of the binary indicator). The targeting parameters reports are averages over the relevant time bins, weighted by estimated distributions of risk.

Figure A1: Coefficient on Black Indicator by Detailed Violation Type



Notes: Sample and specification are the same as in Column 5 of Table A2, except the black coefficient is divided by the white mean of the dependent variable.



Figure A2: Sample Densities Around Reform

Notes: Figure plots the share of treated and untreated units in each quarter before and after the 2011 reforms for the core difference-in-differences estimates.



Figure A3: Effect of Reform on Unsupervised Probationers' Rule-Driven Incarceration and Crime

Notes: Includes all unsupervised probationers starting their spells over the included time window. Each line represents a three-month cohort of probationers starting their spells where the line intersects the x-axis. The y-axis measures the share of this cohort experiencing the relevant outcome over the following year. Incarceration for technical violations is an indicator for having probation revoked with no intervening arrest. Arrest is an indicator for being arrested before being revoked. Treated (i.e., supervised) probationers' outcomes are reproduced in the light grey lines in the background.

Figure A4: Competing Risks Model Fit to Kaplan-Meier Estimates of Hazards



Notes: Figure plots Kaplan-Meier estimates of the cause-specific hazard for spells beginning three to one year before the reform and model simulations of the same object. The Kaplan-Meier estimator in this context is simply the weekly probability of arrest or technical incarceration conditional on neither event happening previously. Model based estimates are simulations of the sample probabilities.



Figure A5: Competing Risks Model Fit to Joint Distribution of Exits Across Repeated Spells

Notes: Figure plots the observed vs. predicted probabilities of failure types and times for black and white probationers with two probation spells. Each point in the figure is a separate failure combination across the two spells, with failure times grouped at the quarterly level. The rightmost points, for example, are the joint probabilities of being arrested in the first quarter of both spells. Other dots reflect the probability of arrest in the first quarter of the first spell, and technical incarceration of the first quarter of the second, etc. Failure times up to 12 quarters are included, yielding 12.12 combinations of possible failure times across the spells, and 4 combinations of failure types (e.g., arrest arrest, arrest tech incar, etc.) and therefore 576 points per group.



Figure A6: Impact of Reform on Baseline Hazards in Competing Risks Model

Notes: Figure plots arrest hazards for offenders with average values of the covariates implied by estimates of the competing risks model. See text for details on sample and specification of unobserved heterogeneity used in estimation.



Figure A7: Targeting Bias in the Competing Risks Model Based on Unobserved Heterogeneity Only

Notes: Figure plots estimates of Γ_k , the likelihood of rule-driven incarceration before time k among probationers who would be otherwise be rearrested at time k, from simulating outcomes in the competing risks model. Observables are held constant at their mean levels for men in the sample. Γ_k is the share of observations who have arrest failure times equal to k but technical violation failure times $\langle k$. Higher values for black probationers indicate that among probationers who would otherwise be rearrested at the same time, technical rules target black probationers more aggressively. The final dots at the right of the graph plot the probability of technical violation failure times ≤ 1080 conditional on having arrest failure times > 1080 (and possibly infinite).



Figure A8: Average Risks for Multiple Violation Outcomes

Notes: Figure plots baseline risks of committing each violation type implied by the multi-outcome competing risks model. See text for details on sample and specification of unobserved heterogeneity used in estimation. Mean weakly risks are similar but not identical to the baseline hazard, since the partial effects of unobserved heterogeneity on the hazard depend on baseline levels in the logit formulation.





Notes: Figure plots estimates of the share of potential reoffenders over a three year period who would break technical rules at any point in their spell if their arrest was ignored (x-axis) against the share of non-reoffenders who do not break technical rules. Estimates come from simulating the model estimated in Section 5.4 using a different set of rules. Each point is labeled with a combination of "F" for fees / fines violations, "D" for drug / alcohol violations, "R" for reporting violations, and "O" for all other, reflecting the sets of rules enforced in the simulation. The dotted grey-line starts at (1,0) and has a slope of -1. This line reflects what would be achieved by randomly incarcerating a fraction of probationers at the start of their spells, which naturally would catch equal shares of re-offenders and non-reoffenders.

Violation type	Violation	Share of category
Absconding	-	1
Drug related	Positive drug test	0.526
	Treatment / program failure	0.295
	Admitting drug use	0.071
	Possessing drugs	0.036
	Contacting drug users	0.022
New criminal offense	New misdemeanor charge	0.716
	New felony charge	0.263
	New DWI charge	0.013
	New drug charge	0.007
Technical	Not paying fees	0.427
	Not reporting	0.202
	Other	0.099
	Moving / job change without notifying	0.058
	Breaking curfew	0.055
	Not completing community service	0.047
	No employment	0.043
	No education / training	0.012
	Traveling without permission	0.011

Table A1: Violation Categorization

Notes: Includes all treated observations starting probation in 2006-2010.
		Outcome:	Administra	ative violatio	on in spell	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Black	0.174^{***}	0.190***	0.177^{***}	0.145^{***}	0.137^{***}	0.101***
	(0.00172)	(0.00184)	(0.00185)	(0.00183)	(0.00195)	(0.00371)
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122
R-squared	0.0309	0.0473	0.0697	0.114	0.128	0.107
Dep. var white mean	0.512	0.512	0.512	0.512	0.512	0.512
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes
Test score controls						Yes
Logit coefficient	0.734	0.817	0.779	0.665		
Logit AME	0.172	0.188	0.175	0.142		

Table A2: Effect of Race on Administrative Violations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Regressions include all spells beginning in 2006-2010. Demographic controls include gender, 20 quantiles of age, and probation district fixed effects. Sentence controls include fixed effects for the offense class of the focal conviction and a linear control for the length of their supervision spell. Criminal history controls include fixed effects for criminal history points and previous sentences to supervised probation or incarceration. Zip code FE are fixed effects for zip code at the time of initial arrest. Test score controls include the latest math and reading standardized test scores (normalized to have mean 0 and standard deviation 1 in the full population) observed from grades 3 to 8. Logit coefficient and AME are the coefficient and average marginal effects from logit estimations of the same specification. These are omitted for the last two columns where the number of fixed effects is high.

		Outc	ome: Drug	violation in	spell	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Black	0.0608***	0.0677***	0.0653***	0.0448***	0.0423***	0.0212***
	(0.00162)	(0.00171)	(0.00173)	(0.00173)	(0.00184)	(0.00388)
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122
R-squared	0.00450	0.0241	0.0396	0.0614	0.0723	0.0695
Dep. var white mean	0.257	0.257	0.257	0.257	0.257	0.257
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes
Test score controls						Yes
Logit coefficient	0.298	0.340	0.331	0.233		
Logit AME	0.0603	0.0675	0.0646	0.0444		

Table A3: Effect of Race on Drug Violations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05,** p < 0.01,*** p < 0.001

Notes: See notes to Table A2.

	Outcome: Absconded in spell						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Black	0.0422***	0.0503***	0.0427***	0.0232***	0.0151^{***}	0.0132***	
	(0.00135)	(0.00143)	(0.00144)	(0.00144)	(0.00153)	(0.00317)	
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122	
R-squared	0.00318	0.0176	0.0279	0.0555	0.0683	0.0725	
Dep. var white mean	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.147	
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes	
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes	
Test score controls						Yes	
Logit coefficient	0.303	0.367	0.310	0.181			
Logit AME	0.0418	0.0498	0.0417	0.0235			

Table A4: Effect of Race on Absconding Violations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: See notes to Table A2

			Outcome:	Revoked		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Black	0.104^{***}	0.118***	0.105***	0.0672***	0.0599***	0.0518***
	(0.00170)	(0.00179)	(0.00181)	(0.00177)	(0.00188)	(0.00390)
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122
R-squared	0.0118	0.0397	0.0595	0.121	0.133	0.127
Dep. var white mean	0.296	0.296	0.296	0.296	0.296	0.296
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes
Test score controls						Yes
Logit coefficient	0.459	0.543	0.488	0.339		
Logit AME	0.102	0.117	0.103	0.0669		

Table A5: Effect of Race on Revocations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05,** p < 0.01,*** p < 0.001

Notes: See notes to Table A2

		Outcom	e: Technica	l revocation	in spell	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Black	0.0627***	0.0710***	0.0649***	0.0485***	0.0418***	0.0316***
	(0.00139)	(0.00147)	(0.00150)	(0.00150)	(0.00159)	(0.00334)
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122
R-squared	0.00664	0.0153	0.0219	0.0404	0.0503	0.0484
Dep. var white mean	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes
Test score controls						Yes
Logit coefficient	0.426	0.488	0.448	0.345		
Logit AME	0.0619	0.0704	0.0641	0.0485		

Table A6: Effect of Race on Technical Revocations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: See notes to Table A2

		Outcome: Arrested in spell						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
Black	0.0627***	0.0690***	0.0562***	0.0284***	0.0300***	0.0310***		
	(0.00172)	(0.00182)	(0.00184)	(0.00183)	(0.00194)	(0.00402)		
N	315167	315167	315167	315167	315167	89122		
R-squared	0.00423	0.0284	0.0453	0.0788	0.0893	0.0742		
Dep. var white mean	0.330	0.330	0.330	0.330	0.330	0.330		
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	Yes		
Zip code FE					Yes	Yes		
Test score controls						Yes		
Logit coefficient	0.272	0.308	0.253	0.133				
Logit AME	0.0623	0.0688	0.0555	0.0282				

Table A7: Effect of Race on Criminal Arrests

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: See notes to Table A2

|--|

	Oute				:)	
	Oute	come: Revoke	ea (conditio	nal on violation)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Black	-0.00444*	0.00829^{***}	0.00304	-0.0112***	0.00241	
	(0.00180)	(0.00193)	(0.00195)	(0.00193)	(0.00208)	
N	296369	296369	296369	296369	296369	
R-squared	0.0000205	0.0225	0.0308	0.0562	0.406	
Dep. var white mean	0.401	0.401	0.401	0.401	0.401	
Demographic controls		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sentence controls			Yes	Yes	Yes	
Criminal history controls				Yes	Yes	
Violations FE					Yes	
Logit coefficient	-0.0185	0.0358	0.0139	-0.0479		
Logit AME	-0.00444	0.00838	0.00323	-0.0108		

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05,** p < 0.01,*** p < 0.001

Notes: Includes all violation hearings for spells beginning in 2006-2010. Controls are as defined in Table A2, except for violations FE, which are fixed effects for the unique violations categories disposed at the hearing. Logit coefficient and AME are the coefficient and average marginal effects from logit estimations of the same specification. These are omitted for specifications where the number of fixed effects is high.

		Outcome: Any outcome in spell							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
	Adm	Adm	Drug	Drug	Rev.	Rev.	Tech rev.	Tech rev.	
Black	0.092***	0.091***	0.026***	0.024***	0.040***	0.041***	0.031***	0.033***	
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	
Black x black off		0.0028		0.0075^{*}		-0.0041		-0.0044	
		(0.004)		(0.003)		(0.003)		(0.003)	
N	306418	306418	306418	306418	306418	306418	306418	306418	
W mean	0.37	0.37	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.12	0.12	
Demo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Crim hist	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Zip FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Off FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Table A9: Officer-Offender Race Match Effect in Violations

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Includes all spells starting in 2006-2010. Officer race is coded using the race of the first officer assigned in the spell. Controls are as defined in Table A2. Outcomes are an indicator for the listed event happening within the first year of a spell.

		Black			Not-black	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Any	Misd/fel	Fel	Any	Misd/fel	Fel
Post-reform	-0.0111***	-0.00925***	0.00208	-0.00661***	-0.00188	0.00325***
	(0.00281)	(0.00274)	(0.00168)	(0.00190)	(0.00178)	(0.000963)
Treated	-0.0467^{***}	-0.0411***	-0.00294	-0.000306	0.00161	0.00738^{***}
	(0.00268)	(0.00262)	(0.00163)	(0.00207)	(0.00195)	(0.00110)
Post-x-treat	0.0237^{***}	0.0211^{***}	0.00578^{*}	0.0182^{***}	0.0181^{***}	0.00936^{***}
	(0.00383)	(0.00374)	(0.00237)	(0.00295)	(0.00279)	(0.00163)
N	217222	217222	217222	328784	328784	328784
Pre-reform treated mean	.314	.29	.092	.264	.226	.062
Demographic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table A10: Effect of Reform by Crime Type

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Includes all treated and untreated probation spells beginning 1-3 years before the reform and 0-2 years afterwards. Post is indicator for starting probation after December 1, 2011, the date JRA reforms took effect. Demographic controls include five-year age bins and indicators for race and gender. Criminal history controls include fixed effects criminal history points and prior sentences to supervised probation or incarceration.

		White			Black	
		Incarc	eration for t	echnical vio	lations	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	1yr	2yr	3yr	1yr	2yr	3yr
Post-reform	-0.0013**	-0.00087**	-0.00064*	-0.0048***	-0.0041***	-0.0040***
	(0.00048)	(0.00034)	(0.00028)	(0.00077)	(0.00054)	(0.00044)
Troated	0 19***	0 11***	0 11***	0 16***	0 16***	0 16***
Heated	(0.12)	(0.0013)	(0.0010)	(0.0024)	(0.0017)	(0.0014)
	(0.0018)	(0.0013)	(0.0010)	(0.0024)	(0.0017)	(0.0014)
Post-x-treat	-0.042***	-0.037***	-0.036***	-0.070***	-0.076***	-0.079***
	(0.0025)	(0.0017)	(0.0014)	(0.0031)	(0.0022)	(0.0018)
N	165936	328784	488779	109764	217222	319596
R-squared	0.081	0.079	0.078	0.090	0.091	0.092
Pre-reform treated mean	.136	.131	.128	.181	.181	.182
			Δr	rest		
Post-reform	-0.0036	-0.0066***	_0 0081***	-0.0036	-0 011***	-0.019***
	(0.0036)	(0.0000)	(0.0001)	(0.0030)	(0.011)	(0.013)
	(0.0020)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)	(0.0000)	(0.0020)	(0.0021)
Treated	-0.0041	-0.00031	0.0019	-0.044***	-0.047***	-0.049***
	(0.0029)	(0.0021)	(0.0017)	(0.0038)	(0.0027)	(0.0022)
	0.001 datat					
Post-x-treat	0.021^{***}	0.018***	0.018***	0.016^{**}	0.024***	0.029***
	(0.0041)	(0.0029)	(0.0024)	(0.0054)	(0.0038)	(0.0032)
N	165936	328784	488779	109764	217222	319596
R-squared	0.072	0.073	0.072	0.083	0.080	0.079
Pre-reform treated mean	.257	.264	.268	.31	.314	.317
Accuracy	.517	.543	.58	.205	.306	.363
False negative rate	.923	.93	.929	.956	.931	.917
False positive rate	.032	.027	.024	.099	.094	.091
Demographic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Criminal history FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table A11: Impact of Data Window for Measuring Effects of Reform

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Includes all treated and untreated probation spells beginning within 1, 2, and 3 years before the reform and within 0, 1, and 2 afterwards, as indicated in the column header. Post is indicator for starting probation after December 1, 2011, the date JRA reforms took effect. Demographic controls include five-year age bins and indicators for race and gender. Criminal history controls include fixed effects criminal history points and prior sentences to supervised probation or incarceration.

	Reporting	Drug	Fees	Other
White probationers				
Arrest	0.10(0.00)	0.10(0.00)	0.09(0.00)	0.04~(0.00)
Incar for TVs	$0.07 \ (0.00)$	$0.07 \ (0.00)$	0.03(0.00)	0.03~(0.00)
Successful completion	0.09(0.00)	0.11(0.00)	0.20(0.00)	$0.04 \ (0.00)$
Black probationers				
Arrest	0.11(0.00)	0.12(0.00)	0.13(0.00)	0.04~(0.00)
Incar for TVs	0.06~(0.00)	0.09~(0.00)	0.05~(0.00)	0.04~(0.00)
Successful completion	0.14(0.00)	0.17(0.00)	0.36(0.00)	0.05(0.00)

Table A12: Rule Violations By Probation Outcome Post Reform

Notes: Table reports shares of probationers ever breaking rules of given types *prior* to finishing their spell broken down by reason for spell exit and race. Probationers can exit due to an arrest, incarceration for rule violations, or successfully completing their supervision spell. For example, the first row reports the share of white probationers exiting probation due to a criminal arrest who break reporting, drug, fees, and other rules prior their exit. If not for censoring due to incarceration for rule violations, these shares would reflect the true and false positive rates associated with using each rule type as signals of arrest risk.

	Black	women	White women		
	Arrest	Incar for TVs	Arrest	Incar for TVs	
Duration	-0.51(1.68)	3.74(1.95)	-0.74 (0.18)	2.72(0.32)	
$Duration^2$	1.31(6.82)	-21.52(6.58)	0.96(1.15)	-21.03 (2.29)	
$Duration^3$	-2.60(12.19)	40.43 (11.96)	-1.16 (2.92)	47.74 (6.50)	
$Duration^4$	2.63(10.46)	-35.15 (11.31)	1.29(3.19)	-48.69(7.81)	
$Duration^5$	-1.05(3.47)	11.57(4.25)	-0.66(1.25)	18.21(3.31)	
Has 2 spells	1.25(0.03)	1.08(0.07)	1.33(0.02)	1.29(0.04)	
Second spell	-0.30 (0.09)	0.02(0.19)	-0.38(0.05)	0.02(0.07)	
Second spell x dur.	-0.04(0.33)	-0.08(0.62)	-0.25(0.19)	-0.27(0.33)	
Second spell x dur. ²	-1.08(2.32)	-2.14(3.09)	0.89(1.09)	-0.12(2.08)	
Second spell x dur. ³	3.48(5.40)	8.73(7.66)	-1.55(2.58)	1.25(5.55)	
Second spell x dur. ⁴	-4.03(5.32)	-12.41(8.60)	1.17(2.71)	-1.46(6.40)	
Second spell x dur. ⁵	1.62(1.91)	5.83(3.48)	-0.31(1.04)	0.54(2.63)	
Calendar time	$0.01 \ (0.02)$	-0.14(0.05)	0.07(0.01)	$0.07 \ (0.03)$	
Calendar time ²	0.00(0.02)	-0.08(0.03)	$0.01 \ (0.01)$	$0.03 \ (0.02)$	
Age	-1.79(0.27)	-3.91(0.53)	-0.37(0.22)	-0.08(0.43)	
Age^2	3.24(0.57)	8.36(1.04)	0.97(0.46)	0.84(0.91)	
Age^3	-1.71(0.32)	-4.56(0.56)	-0.84(0.25)	-1.01(0.50)	
Post reform	$0.04 \ (0.03)$	-0.56(0.06)	0.05~(0.02)	-0.40 (0.05)	
Type locations					
Type 1	-7.99(0.53)	-8.43(1.05)	-8.14(0.00)	-8.74(0.46)	
Type 2	-6.18(0.14)	-5.39(3.21)	-5.97(0.00)	-7.92(0.07)	
Type 3	-5.89(0.01)	-7.67(1.60)	-5.80(0.01)	-5.69(0.16)	
Type 4	-3.59(1.80)	-6.38(3.03)	-3.60(0.06)	-6.63(0.73)	
Type shares					
Type 1	$0.12 \ (0.03)$		$0.06\ (0.01)$		
Type 2	$0.09\ (0.36)$		0.79~(0.02)		
Type 3	0.73(0.44)		0.09(0.02)		
Type 4	$0.06\ (0.05)$		0.05~(0.00)		
Total spells	53,258		78,695		
Total individuals	$45,\!670$		$67,\!003$		
Log likelihood	-181267.502		-265467.568		

Table A13: Mixture Model Parameter Estimates for Women

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 30 day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the monthly hazard log odds.

	Black men		White men		
	Arrest	Incar for TVs	Arrest	Incar for TVs	
Duration	-0.71 (0.09)	3.93(0.16)	-1.43 (0.09)	3.07(0.18)	
$Duration^2$	$0.43 \ (0.66)$	-22.36(1.22)	4.34(0.66)	-19.27(1.35)	
$Duration^3$	0.75(1.74)	43.30(3.41)	-8.37(1.73)	37.89(3.82)	
$Duration^4$	-1.12(1.93)	-38.94(4.02)	8.33(1.91)	-34.57(4.53)	
$Duration^5$	0.34(0.77)	13.25(1.67)	-3.22(0.75)	11.90(1.89)	
Has 2 spells	0.82(0.01)	0.78(0.02)	1.16(0.01)	1.11(0.02)	
Second spell	-0.20(0.03)	0.09(0.04)	-0.34(0.03)	-0.04(0.05)	
Second spell x dur.	-0.16(0.12)	0.02(0.21)	-0.06(0.12)	0.29(0.20)	
Second spell x dur. ²	0.83(0.71)	-1.79(1.32)	0.14(0.66)	-3.12(1.25)	
Second spell x dur. ³	-1.85(1.73)	5.47(3.50)	-0.34(1.58)	8.71(3.26)	
Second spell x dur. ⁴	1.74 (1.86)	-6.06(4.04)	0.47(1.68)	-9.44 (3.70)	
Second spell x dur. ⁵	-0.58(0.72)	2.28(1.66)	-0.23(0.65)	3.57(1.51)	
Calendar time	-0.02(0.01)	-0.23 (0.02)	0.05(0.01)	-0.05(0.02)	
Calendar time ²	0.00(0.01)	-0.15 (0.01)	0.02(0.01)	-0.09 (0.01)	
Age	-2.53(0.13)	-3.36(0.20)	-2.83(0.12)	-2.12(0.23)	
Age^2	4.21(0.28)	6.70(0.44)	5.34(0.26)	4.50(0.49)	
Age^3	-2.06(0.16)	-3.51(0.24)	-2.81(0.14)	-2.58(0.27)	
Post reform	0.05(0.01)	-0.51 (0.03)	$0.03\ (0.01)$	-0.40 (0.03)	
σ, ho					
Arrest	0.66(0.01)	$0.20 \ (0.03)$	$0.54\ (0.01)$	$0.33\ (0.03)$	
Tech. Incar.		$0.96\ (0.02)$		$1.06\ (0.03)$	
Total spells	173,441		207,388		
Total individuals	$139,\!373$		174,775		
Log likelihood	-716000.129		-739434.749		

Table A14: Continuous Heterogeneity Model Parameter Estimates for Men

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 7 day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the weekly hazard log odds. Unobserved heterogeneity across the two risks is bivariate normal. The σ, ρ estimates correspond to the variance⁰.5 and correlations of each component.

	Black women		White women		
	Arrest	Incar for TVs	Arrest	Incar for TVs	
Duration	-1.14(0.19)	3.91(0.37)	-1.39(0.16)	2.68(0.31)	
$Duration^2$	3.61(1.36)	-22.37(2.68)	3.59(1.10)	-21.05(2.34)	
$Duration^3$	-6.60(3.53)	42.20(7.58)	-6.02(2.88)	48.04(6.77)	
$Duration^4$	5.99(3.87)	-36.81(9.03)	5.53(3.17)	-49.14(8.17)	
$Duration^5$	-2.14(1.52)	12.15(3.80)	-2.07(1.25)	18.40(3.47)	
Has 2 spells	1.20(0.02)	1.08(0.04)	1.27(0.02)	1.27(0.04)	
Second spell	-0.31(0.06)	0.02(0.10)	-0.39(0.04)	$0.03 \ (0.07)$	
Second spell x dur.	-0.11(0.26)	-0.02(0.46)	-0.28(0.19)	-0.28(0.33)	
Second spell x dur. ²	-0.61(1.43)	-2.50(2.86)	1.21(1.07)	-0.16(2.09)	
Second spell x dur. ³	2.60(3.40)	9.54(7.58)	-2.21(2.55)	1.45(5.58)	
Second spell x dur. ⁴	-3.29(3.57)	-13.23(8.70)	1.77(2.69)	-1.72(6.42)	
Second spell x dur. ⁵	1.38(1.36)	6.13(3.54)	-0.51(1.03)	0.65(2.64)	
Calendar time	$0.01 \ (0.02)$	-0.14(0.05)	0.06(0.02)	$0.07 \ (0.03)$	
Calendar time ²	$0.01 \ (0.01)$	-0.08(0.03)	$0.01 \ (0.01)$	0.03(0.02)	
Age	-1.82(0.26)	-3.92(0.47)	-0.28(0.21)	-0.07(0.43)	
Age^2	$3.31 \ (0.55)$	8.40(1.00)	0.77(0.44)	0.82(0.91)	
Age^3	-1.74(0.30)	-4.59(0.54)	-0.72(0.24)	-1.00(0.50)	
Post reform	$0.03\ (0.03)$	-0.57 (0.06)	0.05~(0.02)	-0.40 (0.05)	
σ, ρ					
Arrest	0.72(0.02)	$0.22 \ (0.06)$	$0.53\ (0.02)$	$0.34\ (0.06)$	
Tech. Incar.		$1.24\ (0.09)$		1.09(0.08)	
Total spells	53,258		78,695		
Total individuals	$45,\!670$		$67,\!003$		
Log likelihood	-181323.295		-265536.900		

Table A15: Continuous Heterogeneity Model Parameter Estimates for Women

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 7 day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the weekly hazard log odds. Unobserved heterogeneity across the two risks is bivariate normal. The σ, ρ estimates correspond to the variance⁰.5 and correlations of each component.

	Black man					
	Arrest	Reporting	Drug	Fees/Fines	Other	Revoke viol
	7111030	Tteporting	Diug	1 005/1 1105		
Duration	-0.41(0.38)	3.85(0.22)	6.78(0.21)	9.76(0.28)	-0.44(0.31)	-1.35(0.22)
Duration ²	-0.64(1.78)	-20.65(1.24)	-31.41 (1.34)	-35.44(1.51)	-1.23(2.30)	-0.21(1.57)
Duration ³	2.46(3.68)	39.03(3.14)	58.43(3.45)	55.02(3.45)	5.88(6.17)	4.58(4.23)
Duration ⁴	-2.46(3.52)	-34.64(3.53)	-51.59(3.83)	-41.12(3.50)	-8.99(7.00)	-5.54(4.90)
$Duration^5$	0.75(1.26)	11.71(1.43)	17.42(1.52)	$12.01 \ (1.31)$	4.29(2.82)	1.96(2.03)
Has 2 spells	$0.83\ (0.03)$	0.58(0.02)	0.49(0.03)	$0.28 \ (0.02)$	$0.50 \ (0.04)$	
Second spell	-0.20 (0.06)	0.15(0.04)	-0.15(0.07)	-0.05(0.12)	$0.12 \ (0.07)$	
Second spell x dur.	-0.11 (0.26)	-0.01 (0.19)	$0.22 \ (0.26)$	-0.42(0.38)	-0.38(0.37)	
Second spell x dur. ²	0.66(1.27)	-1.76(1.10)	-1.42(1.37)	1.52(1.67)	2.17(2.19)	
Second spell x dur. ³	-1.64(2.83)	5.84(2.81)	3.53(3.28)	-2.22(3.50)	-4.89(5.50)	
Second spell x dur. ⁴	1.62(2.86)	-6.70(3.15)	-3.50(3.50)	1.42(3.41)	4.82(6.00)	
Second spell x dur. ⁵	-0.55(1.06)	2.61(1.27)	1.19(1.36)	-0.33(1.24)	-1.71(2.35)	
Calendar time	-0.04(0.03)	-0.06(0.02)	$0.06 \ (0.02)$	$0.07 \ (0.01)$	$0.31 \ (0.03)$	
Calendar time ²	-0.01(0.01)	$0.04 \ (0.01)$	-0.11(0.01)	-0.14(0.01)	$0.07 \ (0.02)$	
Age	-2.45(0.13)	-2.52(0.18)	-1.15(0.22)	-0.81(0.19)	-5.00(0.39)	-1.44(0.23)
Age^2	4.08(0.28)	5.19(0.38)	1.60(0.47)	2.11(0.39)	$9.31 \ (0.85)$	2.79(0.50)
Age^3	-2.01(0.16)	-2.87(0.21)	-0.64(0.26)	-1.30(0.21)	-4.65(0.47)	-1.39(0.27)
Post reform	0.05(0.06)	-0.08(0.02)	0.00(0.03)	-0.01(0.02)	-0.29(0.05)	
Num. prev. viol.						0.04(0.01)
Constant						-0.27(0.03)
Drug viol.						-0.72(0.02)
Fees viol.						-1.27 (0.02)
Other viol.						-1.23(0.03)
Post x rep. viol.						-0.64 (0.02)
Post x drug viol.						-1.38 (0.03)
Post x fees viol.						-1.42 (0.04)
Post x other viol.						-1.53(0.07)
Type locations						. ,
Type 1	-5.82(0.02)	-7.14(0.10)	-7.40(0.06)	-6.09(0.03)	-8.08(0.05)	
Type 2	-5.42(0.02)	-5.59(0.04)	-6.66(0.25)	-7.02 (0.10)	-8.60 (0.22)	
Type 3	-5.31 (0.05)	-6.32 (0.06)	-5.17 (0.08)	-6.51(0.24)	-6.88 (0.48)	
Type 4	-4.00(0.26)	-5.18 (0.24)	-5.88 (0.11)	-5.74 (0.10)	-5.88 (0.08)	
Type shares		× /	()	()	()	
Type 1	0.46(0.04)					
Type 2	0.27(0.02)					
Type 3	0.14(0.02)					
Type 4	0.13(0.02)					
Total spells	173.441					
Total individuals	139.373					
T 1.1 1.1 1						

Table A16: Mixture Model With Multiple Violation Types Parameter Estimates for Black Men

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5 when decomposing incarceration risk across violation types. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1 and mean 0) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 7-day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the weekly hazard log odds.

	White men					
	Arrest	Reporting	Drug	Fees/Fines	Other	Revoke viol
Duration	-1.07 (0.10)	3.23 (0.15)	5.95 (0.21)	9.82 (0.31)	-1.34 (0.29)	-1.43 (0.23)
$Duration^2$	3.22(0.69)	-19.35(1.10)	-26.19(1.43)	-37.45(1.76)	6.79(2.16)	0.49(1.68)
$Duration^3$	-6.62(1.78)	37.69(3.02)	46.23 (3.74)	60.76(4.09)	-17.16 (5.92)	3.58(4.61)
$Duration^4$	6.96(1.96)	-34.11(3.50)	-39.64(4.18)	-47.52(4.22)	16.50(6.81)	-4.96(5.40)
$Duration^5$	-2.80(0.77)	11.70 (1.44)	13.23(1.67)	14.51(1.59)	-5.39(2.78)	1.81(2.26)
Has 2 spells	1.22(0.01)	0.85(0.02)	1.00(0.02)	0.59(0.02)	0.77(0.03)	- (-)
Second spell	-0.35 (0.03)	0.12(0.04)	-0.26 (0.07)	-0.23(0.14)	0.05(0.08)	
Second spell x dur.	0.01(0.12)	-0.14 (0.18)	0.27(0.25)	-0.22 (0.39)	-0.08 (0.35)	
Second spell x dur. ²	-0.13 (0.67)	-0.50(1.04)	-1.73 (1.34)	1.06(1.71)	-0.30(2.09)	
Second spell x dur. ³	0.08(1.61)	2.67(2.65)	3.92(3.19)	-1.59(3.61)	1.10(5.25)	
Second spell x dur. ⁴	0.16(1.71)	-3.51(2.95)	-3.27 (3.39)	1.08(3.53)	-0.87(5.75)	
Second spell x dur. ⁵	-0.14 (0.66)	1.47 (1.18)	0.88(1.31)	-0.29 (1.29)	0.16(2.27)	
Calendar time	0.04(0.01)	0.02(0.02)	0.14(0.02)	0.15(0.02)	0.29(0.03)	
Calendar time ^{2}	0.01(0.01)	0.07(0.01)	-0.07 (0.01)	-0.14 (0.01)	0.08(0.02)	
Age	-2.88 (0.13)	-0.72 (0.19)	-2.94 (0.23)	-1.44 (0.22)	-4.34 (0.37)	-0.65(0.26)
Age^2	5.43(0.27)	1.82(0.41)	5.42(0.50)	3.15(0.46)	8.25 (0.78)	1.40 (0.55)
Age^3	-2.86 (0.15)	-1.26(0.23)	-2.75 (0.27)	-1.74 (0.25)	-4.12 (0.43)	-0.86 (0.30)
Post reform	0.04(0.02)	0.05(0.02)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.02)	-0.21 (0.05)	
Num. prev. viol.	× /		~ /	· · · ·		-0.00(0.02)
Constant						-0.35 (0.03)
Drug viol.						-0.70 (0.02)
Fees viol.						-1.19 (0.03)
Other viol.						-1.24 (0.03)
Post x rep. viol.						-0.40(0.02)
Post x drug viol.						-1.21 (0.04)
Post x fees viol.						-1.25 (0.05)
Post x other viol.						-1.45 (0.07)
Type locations						
Type 1	-6.25(0.01)	-6.33(0.07)	-6.59(0.10)	-8.37(0.17)	-8.84(0.23)	
Type 2	-6.25(0.01)	-8.37(0.09)	-8.52(0.08)	-7.48(0.05)	-9.08(0.07)	
Type 3	-5.56(0.01)	-6.64(0.06)	-7.04 (0.10)	-6.22(0.04)	-7.52(0.07)	
Type 4	-4.32(0.03)	-5.69(0.05)	-5.14(0.04)	-6.91(0.12)	-6.42(0.06)	
Type shares						
Type 1	$0.17 \ (0.01)$					
Type 2	0.40(0.02)					
Type 3	0.32(0.01)					
Type 4	0.11(0.00)					
Total spells	207,388					
Total individuals	174,775					
Log likelihood	-1285767.598					

Table A17: Mixture Model With Multiple Violation Types Parameter Estimates for White Men

Notes: Table reports estimates of the mixed logit model described in Section 5 when decomposing incarceration risk across violation types. Duration, age, and calendar time are standardized (s.d. 1 and mean 0) in estimation. Standard errors are the robust "sandwich form" clustered by individual. Hazards are discreteized into 7-day units. Given the logit formulation for the hazard, coefficients can therefore be interpreted as effects on the weekly hazard log odds.

Offense category	Lower bound \$			Upper bound \$		
	Raw estimate	Including discounting	Reference	Raw estimate	Including discounting	Reference
Homicide	7,000,000	7,350,000	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	9,700,000	19,205,337	Cohen et al. (2011)
Rape	142,020	149,121	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	237,000	469,243.8	Cohen et al. (2011)
Assault	38,924	40,870.2	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	70,000	138,595.2	Cohen et al. (2011)
Robbery	$12,\!624$	13,255.2	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	232,000	459,344.1	Cohen et al. (2011)
Arson	38,000	128,681	Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996)	38,000	128,681	Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996)
Burglary	2,104	2,209.2	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	25,000	49498.29	Cohen et al. (2011)
Larceny	473	497	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	370	1,253	Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996)
Theft	473	497	Chalfin and McCrary (2017)	370	1,253	Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996)
Drug	500	990		2,544	2,945	Mueller-Smith (2015)
DWI	500	990		25,842	29,915	Mueller-Smith (2015)
Other	500	990	Cohen et al. (2011)	500	990	Cohen et al. (2011)

Table A18: Estimates of lower and upper bounds of the costs/value of crime

Notes: "Discounting" means updating the cost estimate to 2018 \$, using a rate of 5% as in Mueller-Smith (2015). Offenses without a relevant cost estimate are assigned a value of \$990 (in 2018 \$) as was suggested by Cohen et al. (2011). The lower bounds for drug and DWI offenses were assigned in this way. Note that only Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996) and Cohen et al. (2011) calculated value of crime estimates the other studies used estimates from various other studies including from Miller, Cohen and Wiersema (1996) and Cohen et al. (2011).