

## **Links between School Police, School Social Workers, and Youth Experiences with Law**

### **Enforcement: Evidence from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study**

Michael Evangelist

Amanda Geller

Jane Waldfogel

#### **Abstract**

The theory of a “school to prison pipeline” posits that harsh disciplinary practices in schools may heighten the risk that youth are involved with the carceral system. We examine one part of that pipeline, analyzing the links between two different types of school staff – school police officers and school social workers - and students’ experiences with law enforcement. Using data from a large and diverse national sample of 15-year-olds from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, we find that students in schools with greater numbers of school police officers are more likely to experience police stops, are stopped more frequently, and are more likely to be arrested, whereas students in schools with greater numbers of school social workers are less likely to experience police stops and are stopped less frequently. These results are robust to controlling for student demographics, past student behavior, and other school context characteristics.

The theory of a “school to prison pipeline” posits that harsher school disciplinary practices lead to greater risk of students being involved with the carceral system (Wald and Losen 2003; Hirschfeld 2008; Sykes et al. 2015; Devlin and Gottfredson 2018). The deployment of police in schools has drawn particular criticism from legal, public health, and social work scholars (see e.g., Cameron, 2006; McCarter, 2017; Dutil, 2020; González and Kaeser, 2021; Henning, 2021; Thyberg and Newhill, 2022). In contrast, the role of school social workers in the risk of subsequent carceral involvement has been less examined.

In this paper, we provide new evidence about the links between these two types of school staff and the likelihood and frequency of student police stops and the likelihood of arrests, using data on a large and diverse national sample of 15- year-olds from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. To briefly preview our main results, we find that greater numbers of school police are associated with a higher likelihood of youth involvement with law enforcement, while greater numbers of school social workers are associated with a lower likelihood of such involvement.

The paper begins with a brief overview of the literature on school police and school social workers. We then describe our data and methods, present our results, and conclude.

### *School Police Officers*

In principle, the deployment of police officers in schools, often referred to as school resource officers (SROs), can both improve school safety and discipline and foster positive relationships between law enforcement and youth (Owens 2017). School police are thought to play a three part role, as educators, informal counselors, and law enforcers (Raymond 2010; Canady, James, and Nease 2012; Devlin and Gottfredson 2016 and 2018; Hirschfeld 2018b;

Gottfredson et al. 2020). As such, their presence might not only enhance safety and reduce disciplinary problems through deterrence, but also provide students with a positive experience with law enforcement and improve broader police-community relationships (Owens 2017).

However, concerns have been raised that presence of SROs increases the likelihood that students are referred to law enforcement for relatively minor behavioral problems (which otherwise would be handled by school staff) and that these behaviors are then escalated to arrestable offenses (Hirschfield 2008; Bracy 2010; Curran et al. 2019). Supporting these concerns, there is evidence that students in schools with SROs receive harsher punishments and are more likely to be referred to law enforcement than students in schools without SROs (Brown 2018; Devlin and Gottfredson 2018). There is also evidence that arrest rates are higher in schools with police presence and that this association is stronger for Blacks than for Whites and Hispanics (Homer and Fisher 2020; Gonzalez and Kaeser 2021).

### *School Social Workers*

School social workers are thought to improve student well-being by providing direct support for students and by addressing student and family problems that might interfere with students' school engagement and achievement. Their role is distinct from that of school guidance counselors, who are tasked with academic advising and placement, and that of school psychologists, who handle testing and planning for students with special learning needs. In theory, there are two potential pathways by which the presence of school social workers might act to reduce police involvement: by providing services that improve student behavior; and by providing an alternative response to disruptive student behavior (see e.g., Cameron 2006; McCarter 2016; Dutil 2020; Henning 2021; Thyberg and Newhill, 2022). However, we know relatively little from empirical research about the extent to which the presence of school social

workers is associated with reductions in harsh discipline and subsequent involvement with law enforcement and the carceral system.

### *The Present Study*

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to analyze the associations between these two distinct types of school staff and students' experiences with law enforcement. Based on findings from prior research, we hypothesize that greater numbers of police in a student's school will be linked with a greater likelihood that a young person is stopped by the police or arrested. In contrast, because social workers provide direct support to youth and may also offer an alternative to harsh disciplinary responses, we hypothesize that greater numbers of social workers in a school will be associated with a lower likelihood that a young person is stopped by the police or arrested.

## **Methods**

### *Data*

The data for this study come from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS), a population-based birth cohort study of children born between 1998 and 2000 in 20 large U.S. cities (Reichman et al. 2001). The study over-sampled non-marital births and the sample is racially and ethnically diverse (50% Black, 24% Hispanic, 26% white or other). We specifically draw on data from the FFCWS age-15 interviews conducted in 2013-2015 with the youth and their primary caregivers (PCGs).

We also draw on restricted data on school characteristics from the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), data on deadly gun violence incidents near school and home from the Gun Violence Archive, and information on

neighborhood characteristics from the American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>1</sup> The school and neighborhood data were linked to the FFCWS based on the school the youth attended and the youth's home address (respectively). We primarily used the 2015-2016 CRDC and NCES data corresponding to the school year when youth were interviewed.<sup>2</sup> However, because of a CRDC data collection error in 2015-2016, we relied on the 2017-2018 CRDC data for the policing variable.<sup>3</sup> The Gun Violence Archive data were gathered by an independent research group that tracks incident-level information on deadly gun violence episodes; we used data that FFCWS downloaded from their Archive covering all deadly incidents between January 1, 2014 and October 5, 2017.

FFCWS interviewed 3,444 youth at age 15. We excluded 584 youth who did not have 2015-2016 CRDC data (e.g., missing school codes or school did not complete CRDC survey), including 194 private school students (because CRDC did not collect data from private schools). We failed to match an additional 454 students with the 2017-2018 CRDC data on school police.<sup>4</sup> Finally, we excluded 23 youth who were missing data on the remaining school context variables and 52 youth missing data on one of the person-level outcomes or controls. Using casewise deletion to drop observations with missing values on survey responses and contextual data left 2,331 youth remaining for the main analysis.

### *Law Enforcement Involvement*

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on the restricted data see the FFCWS website at <https://fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/restricted>.

<sup>2</sup> Most youth (62%) in the analytic sample were interviewed during the 2014-2015 school year. If the NCES data were missing for a given school year, missing values were filled in by borrowing successively from the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2013-2014, and 2016-2017 data.

<sup>3</sup> FFCWS performed a special merge of the 2017-2018 CRDC data for this study.

<sup>4</sup> For example, mismatches could have occurred if CRDC school identifiers changed from the 2015-2016 survey to the 2017-2018 survey. The CRDC is administered every other year.

The primary study outcome is an indicator for whether the youth experienced a police stop by the age-15 interview. Youth were counted as having experienced a stop if they answered yes to the question “Have you ever been stopped by the police while on the street, at school, in a car, or some other place?” Other outcomes include the number of stops and the location of the stop (school and street). Finally, we examine an indicator for whether youth reported having been arrested or taken into custody by the police.

#### *School Resource Officers and School Social Workers*

Our primary independent variables capture school staff that may be linked with the risk of experiencing a police stop as well as the nature of the stop. Drawing on the CRDC data, we created two variables capturing: 1) the total number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) school police (sworn law enforcement officers) per 1,000 students enrolled in the school; and 2) the total number of FTE social workers per 1,000 students enrolled in the school. Critically, CRDC specifies that school police are career law enforcement officers with arrest authority (Civil Rights Data Collection 2018).

#### *Contextual Controls*

An important analytic challenge is that the presence of police officers and social workers in schools is potentially endogenous, in that schools where many students engage in problematic behavior may be more likely to have a larger police and social worker presence. We attempted to mitigate some of these concerns by adding controls for the percentage of students who receive free lunch at the school (using data from NCES), the number of deadly gun violence incidents in the previous 180 days occurring within 400 meters of the school, and a measure of concentrated disadvantage for the youth’s home neighborhood (using data from the ACS). Following Wodtke, Harding, and Elwert (2011), the neighborhood disadvantage score was constructed using

principal component analysis to reduce the following census tract characteristics to a single dimension: poverty, female-headed households, unemployment, less than high school degree, bachelor's degree or higher, and public benefit receipt.<sup>5</sup> Finally, we also controlled for the percentage of students at the school who are Black (using data from NCES). To the extent that a greater share of Black students threatens white dominance, white people may use means of social control (i.e., policing) to maintain social advantage (Blumer, 1958; Blalock 1967; King and Wheelock 2007; Welch and Payne 2010). We recognize that these steps mitigate but do not fully resolve the endogeneity issue; therefore, the associations we will describe in the results section should be considered descriptive rather than causal.

### *Student-Level Controls*

All models controlled for a robust set of youth and family characteristics that have been included in prior studies of police stops and arrests (Geller 2021; Jackson et al. 2021), such as sex at birth, self-reported race (Black, white, Hispanic, multiracial, and other race), age at interview, mother's educational attainment at baseline (less than high school, high school, some college, and college), number of children in household, household income-to-poverty ratio, and material hardship. Critically, we also accounted for youth characteristics that could have increased the likelihood of a police encounter, including PCG-reported externalizing behavior, self-reported delinquency, and disability status (Henning 2021).

### *Analysis Plan*

The main analysis uses multivariable regression to estimate the links between school police officers, school social workers, and the five outcomes of interest (stopped by the police, number of police stops, stopped at school, stopped on the street, and arrested). All models

---

<sup>5</sup> Wodtke, Harding, and Elwert (2011) also used the percent employed in professional or managerial occupations, which was not available in the restricted FFCWS.

control for the individual and contextual factors described earlier. All continuous school and neighborhood context variables were standardized to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one. Because the number of stops was a count with a large number of zeros, negative binomial models were used for this outcome. Logistic regression was used for the remaining binary outcomes. To facilitate interpretation, we report results for the logistic regression models as average marginal effects (AMEs) to illustrate the change in the probability of experiencing an outcome for a one-unit change in the predictor.<sup>6</sup>

## Results

### *Descriptive Statistics*

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for the student, school, and neighborhood characteristics of our analytic sample.<sup>7</sup> In addition, in the last four columns, we grouped schools attended by FFCWS youth into four categories, including schools with both police and social workers, police only, social workers only, and no police or social workers. These categorizations allow us to explore differences between schools based on staffing decisions.

Turning to the outcome summarized at the top of the table, 27% of youth experienced a police stop with youth experiencing 0.76 stops on average<sup>8</sup>. Stops at school were relatively rare, affecting 7% of youth, while 22% of youth reported having been stopped on the street.

---

<sup>6</sup> Technically, the AMEs for continuous variables like age represent the change in probability of the outcome for a instantaneous change. The instantaneous and one-unit changes are often similar (Long and Freese 2014), which is the case in this study.

<sup>7</sup> The school context variables were standardized for the multivariable regression analysis but left unstandardized for the descriptive statistics presented in Table 1.

<sup>8</sup> Notably, police contact is more prevalent in our sample than in the national estimates provided by Geller (2021). This increased prevalence is driven by our use of the unweighted FFCWS sample, which includes the oversample of nonmarital births, and youth born in four strategically selected cities, as well as the sixteen randomly selected cities in the national FFCWS sample. These four cities (Newark, Milwaukee, Detroit, and Oakland) have histories of police-community tensions, and taken together, higher rates of youth-reported police contact than the national sample cities.



The school characteristics at the bottom of the table indicate that there were on average 0.67 police officers and 0.67 social workers per 1,000 students. The counts for the final four columns indicate that among FFCWS youth, 53% attended a school with a police presence while 43% attended a school with a social work presence.

The final four columns show that there were relatively modest differences in the probability of being stopped across the four staffing categories. However, it is notable that the probability of being stopped and of being stopped on the street was highest for youth in schools with no police or social workers, while the number of stops was highest at schools with police and social workers. Hispanic and White FFCWS youth were overrepresented in schools with police only while Black youth were overrepresented in schools with social workers only. It is also notable that self-reported delinquency was lowest in schools with police only, which is consistent with earlier research suggesting that police in schools may act as a deterrent (Canady, James, and Nease 2012). Finally, schools with only social workers appear to be more disadvantaged than other schools. Relative to other youth, youth in schools with only social workers have the lowest incomes, most children present in the household, and greater material hardship. The school context variables also show that youth in these schools have the highest proportion of students receiving free lunch and Black student enrollment as well as the highest rates of deadly gun violence incidents and neighborhood disadvantage. Schools with no police or social workers also had relatively high proportions or rates for these school context factors. In contrast schools with police and social workers or police only were comparatively advantaged, perhaps a reflection of having the financial resources to support additional staff.

Table 2 presents the results from multivariable regression models predicting the probability of being stopped, the number of stops, and the probability of being stopped at school,

stopped on the street, and arrested. All models control for the full set of individual and contextual variables described earlier. Consistent with prior research using these same data (Jackson, Testa, and Vaughn 2020; Geller 2021), girls had a lower probability of experiencing any kind of police stop or arrest and reported fewer stops than did boys. Likewise, youth-reported delinquency was also strongly predictive across all five outcome models. In contrast to earlier studies (Jackson et al., 2020; Geller, 2021), we also controlled for youth externalizing behavior (PCG reports), finding that this factor too was highly predictive of all outcomes, even after accounting for delinquency. And, contrary to previous work finding that disabled youth are more likely to have police encounters (United States Department of Education 2018), we found that these youth experienced fewer stops and were less likely to be stopped on the street. Lastly, greater material hardship was associated with a greater likelihood of being stopped and stopped at school.

Moving to our primary independent variables for school staffing, a one standard deviation increase in the police FTE per 1,000 students was associated with a marginally significant 1.4 percentage point increase in the probability of being stopped by the police—a 5% increase relative to the mean probability of being stopped (27%). Likewise, a one-standard-deviation increase in police FTE was associated with a statistically significant 0.12 increase in the number of stops, 0.8 percentage point increase in being stopped at school, 1.8 percentage point increase in being stopped on the street, and a 0.6 percentage point increase in the probability of an arrest. Relative to the sample mean, these represent a 16% increase in the number of stops, an 11% increase in being stopped at school, an 8% increase in being stopped on the street, and a 13% increase in arrests.

In contrast, a one standard deviation increase in social worker FTE per 1,000 students was associated with a statistically significant 2 percentage point decline in the probability of

being stopped and 0.12 fewer stops. There was also a marginally significant 1.2 percentage point decline in the probability of being stopped on the street.

The other school and neighborhood controls had no consistent or statistically significant associations with the outcomes. The one exception was Black student enrollment, which was associated with a lower probability of being stopped at school and a greater probability of being stopped on the street.

### *Supplemental Analyses*

In the online appendix, we report results from supplemental analyses to check the robustness of our results. In Appendix Tables A1-A5, we stratified the analyses by race (Black, Hispanic, and white) and gender. Overall, the results from the stratified analyses were qualitatively similar to the main results. The estimated associations between school staff and law enforcement involvement were relatively modest for Black youth, although the association between police in schools and stops in the street was particularly strong for this group. In contrast, for Hispanic youth, the presence of social workers was associated with a substantially lower probability of being stopped or stopped at school and in the number of stops. For white youth, social workers were associated with a greater probability of being stopped on the street, which is the only anomalous finding in the table. Stratifying the analyses by gender revealed that for girls in particular, school police were associated with a higher probability and greater number of police stops. Social workers were associated with fewer stops and a lower risk of being stopped in school for girls, while for boys, there was a substantial reduction in the overall probability of being stopped (but not specifically in school).

Secondly, in Appendix Table B1 we replaced the number of FTE per 1,000 students with binary indicators for whether police or social workers were present in school. The results were

directionally consistent with the main results but statistically insignificant in many cases. This finding suggests that it is not only the presence of these staff members but also the intensity of their presence that matters. In addition, because the number of police officers and social workers per 1,000 students was highly skewed, we also generated a three-category indicator variable to divide these variables into low, medium, and high groups. Appendix Table B2 shows that in this case, the results were directionally consistent (but insignificant or marginally significant in most cases) with the main analyses but appear to be driven by the difference between the highest and lowest categories. In Table B3, we excluded students who attended special schools because of academic or disciplinary problems. Excluding these students, who may have been particularly likely to have had police interactions and thus might have skewed the main results, did not substantially alter the main findings.

In addition, the presence of police and social workers in schools could be correlated with an increased presence of other support staff that have could have been the main drivers of the results. However, Appendix Tables C1 and C2 shows that controlling for the presence of guidance counselors and psychologists did not materially alter the main results. Finally, in Appendix Tables D1-D7, we sequentially added other indicators of school disciplinary policies from the CRDC, including in-school suspensions, single instances of out-of-school suspensions, multiple out-of-school suspensions, total out-of-school suspensions, expulsions with educational services, expulsions without educational services, and referrals to law enforcement. The addition of these covariates, expressed as the standardized number of instances per 1,000 students, did not fundamentally alter the main results.

## **Discussion**

Using data from a large and diverse national sample of 15-year-olds from the FFCWS, we provide new evidence about the links between school staffing and students' involvement with law enforcement. We find that youth in schools with more police officers are more likely to be stopped by the police, are more frequently stopped, and are more likely to be arrested. In contrast, youth in schools with more social workers are less likely to be stopped by the police and are less frequently stopped.

### *Limitations*

Although our substantive findings are consistent across multiple robustness tests, our study has limitations that lead us to interpret our findings cautiously. First, like all survey research, our study is limited by our understanding of how our respondents interpreted the survey questions. To the extent that youth have varying thresholds for what they consider being “stopped by police”, beyond a routine interaction that does not leave a lasting impression, we are unable to observe these differences. It is also not clear where “stops on the street” occur and specifically whether these involve stops near schools or in students' neighborhoods. It also bears noting that although our analysis controls for youth characteristics from across their lifetimes, we only observe one cross-section of their school characteristics and their experiences with police. We therefore cannot make causal inferences from our models, though our results are promising and suggest that that school staffing may be able to make a difference in interrupting the school-to-prison pipeline.

### *Directions for Future Research*

Although beyond the scope of the current analysis, our findings raise several questions for future research. Little is currently known about how school staffing decisions are made and funded, and given the decentralized nature of education in the United States, it is likely that these

decisions are addressed in different ways across districts and states. As noted in past research (and utilized for analytical purposes), there have been periods of significant federal money available to support a police presence in schools (Owens, 2017). To the extent that districts have external funding available for school resource officers, are they able to conserve money to hire social workers and other support staff? The extent to which the hiring of police officers and social workers are treated as complements or substitutes is worth exploring to inform future staffing decisions. In addition, to the extent that schools hire both police and social workers, as was the case for more than 20% of our analysis sample, an understanding of how these roles interact with each other (or don't) would be valuable both for organizational purposes, and to understand the unique effects that each of these types of school personnel might have on youth.

#### References

- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *The Pacific Sociological Review* 1 (1):3-7. doi: 10.2307/1388607.
- Bracy, Nicole L. 2010. "Circumventing the Law: Students' Rights in Schools With Police." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 26 (3):294-315. doi: 10.1177/1043986210368645.
- Brown, Ben. 2018. "Evaluations of School Policing Programs in the USA." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of School Discipline, Surveillance, and Social Control*, edited by Jo Deakin, Emmeline Taylor and Aaron Kupchik, 327–349. Palgrave.
- Canady, M., B. James, and J. Nease. 2012. *To protect and educate: The school resource officer and the prevention of violence in schools*. Hoover, AL: National Association of School Resource Officers.
- Civil Rights Data Collection. 2018. 2017–18 Civil Rights Data Collection – School Form. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights.
- Curran, F. Chris, Benjamin W. Fisher, Samantha Viano, and Aaron Kupchik. 2019. "Why and When Do School Resource Officers Engage in School Discipline? The Role of Context in Shaping Disciplinary Involvement." *American Journal of Education* 126 (1):33-63. doi: 10.1086/705499.
- Devlin, Deanna N., and Denise C. Gottfredson. 2018. "Policing and the School-to-Prison Pipeline." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of School Discipline, Surveillance,*

- and Social Control*, edited by Jo Deakin, Emmeline Taylor and Aaron Kupchik, 291-308. Palgrave.
- Geller, Amanda. 2021. "Youth–Police Contact: Burdens and Inequities in an Adverse Childhood Experience, 2014–2017." *American Journal of Public Health* 111 (7):1300-1308. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2021.306259.
- Gottfredson, Denise C., Scott Crosse, Zhiqun Tang, Erin L. Bauer, Michele A. Harmon, Carol A. Hagen, and Angela D. Greene. 2020. "Effects of school resource officers on school crime and responses to school crime." *Criminology & Public Policy* 19 (3):905-940. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12512>.
- Henning, Kristin. 2021. *The Rage of Innocence: How America Criminalizes Black Youth*: Pantheon.
- Hirschfield, Paul J. 2008. "Preparing for prison?: The criminalization of school discipline in the USA." *Theoretical Criminology* 12 (1):79-101. doi: 10.1177/1362480607085795.
- Jackson, Dylan B., Alexander Testa, and Michael G. Vaughn. 2020. "Low self-control and the adolescent police stop: Intrusiveness, emotional response, and psychological well-being." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 66:101635. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2019.101635>.
- Jackson, Dylan, Alexander Testa, Jelena Todić, and Jonathan Leos-Martinez. 2021. "Exclusionary School Discipline during Childhood and Adolescent Police Encounters." *Deviant Behavior*:1-20. doi: 10.1080/01639625.2021.1891843.
- King, Ryan D., and Darren Wheelock. 2007. "Group Threat and Social Control: Race, Perceptions of Minorities and the Desire to Punish." *Social Forces* 85 (3):1255-1280. doi: 10.1353/sof.2007.0045.
- Long, J. Scott, and Jeremy Freese. 2014. *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Owens, Emily G. 2017. "Testing the School-to-Prison Pipeline." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 36 (1):11-37.
- United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. 2018. 2015–16 Civil Rights Data Collection: School Climate and Safety. Washington, DC.
- Welch, Kelly, and Allison Ann Payne. 2010. "Racial Threat and Punitive School Discipline." *Social Problems* 57 (1):25-48. doi: 10.1525/sp.2010.57.1.25.
- Wodtke, Geoffrey T., David J. Harding, and Felix Elwert. 2011. "Neighborhood Effects in Temporal Perspective: The Impact of Long-Term Exposure to Concentrated Disadvantage on High School Graduation." *American Sociological Review* 76 (5):713-736.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study sample (n=2,331)

					Mean/Proportion			
	Mean/Proportion	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Police and social workers (n=538)	Police only (n=712)	Social worker only (n=468)	No police or social workers (n=613)
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>								
Stopped by police	0.27	0.45	0.00	1.00	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.30
Number of police stops	0.76	2.54	0.00	50.00	0.85	0.73	0.73	0.72
Stopped at school	0.07	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.07
Stopped in street	0.22	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.23	0.18	0.22	0.23
Arrested	0.04	0.20	0.00	1.00	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04
White	0.19	0.40	0.00	1.00	0.18	0.27	0.11	0.19
Black	0.51	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.56	0.35	0.69	0.51
Hispanic	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.31	0.11	0.21
Other race	0.02	0.15	0.00	1.00	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02
Multiracial	0.06	0.24	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.07
Age	15.58	0.61	14.42	18.33	15.63	15.52	15.60	15.59
Externalizing behavior	0.22	0.25	0.00	1.55	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.21
Delinquency	1.07	1.64	0.00	12.00	1.11	0.96	1.14	1.11
Any disability	0.22	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.23	0.26	0.18	0.20
PCG - Less than high school	0.16	0.37	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.16	0.18	0.18
PCG - High school	0.21	0.40	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.19
PCG - Some college	0.45	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.47	0.44	0.45	0.44
PCG - College	0.18	0.39	0.00	1.00	0.20	0.19	0.15	0.20
Number of children in household	2.64	1.56	1.00	13.00	2.64	2.63	2.74	2.59
Income-to-poverty ratio	2.39	2.56	0.00	41.89	2.39	2.64	2.11	2.32
Material hardship	1.24	1.75	0.00	10.00	1.29	1.11	1.35	1.24
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>								
School police officers per 1000 students	0.67	1.03	0.00	14.71	1.24	1.26	0.00	0.00
School social workers per 1000 students	0.66	1.43	0.00	26.67	1.22	0.00	1.89	0.00
Proportion free lunch	0.51	0.27	0.00	1.00	0.44	0.44	0.63	0.57
Black student enrollment share	0.38	0.34	0.00	1.00	0.35	0.23	0.58	0.41
Deadly gun violence incidents	1.06	0.24	1.00	2.00	1.03	1.02	1.12	1.09
Neighborhood disadvantage	-0.09	1.97	-4.03	7.42	-0.40	-0.62	0.67	0.21



Table 2. Regression models predicting law enforcement involvement at age 15 in Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study sample

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.010	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.012		0.160		0.022		0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.027		-0.280		0.016		-0.030		0.026	+
Other race	-0.081		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.800	**	0.039		0.002		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.210	**	0.012		0.007		0.012	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.047	**	0.100	**	0.078	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.360	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.016		-0.049	**	0.006	
High school	0.002		-0.110		0.007		-0.032		-0.004	
Some college	0.009		0.035		0.010		-0.026		0.002	
College	0.016		-0.064		0.003		0.003		-0.008	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.022		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School Staffing</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.120	**	0.008	*	0.018	**	0.006	**
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.120	**	-0.007		-0.012	+	-0.002	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
Proportion free lunch	-0.011		-0.057		0.006		-0.003		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.014		-0.014	+	0.036	**	0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.036		0.030		-0.020		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.068		0.220		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.260	
Observations	2,331		2,331		2,331		2,331		2,276	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

## **ONLINE APPENDIX**

Table A1. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for Black youth, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.220	***	-1.270	***	-0.026	+	-0.210	***	-0.037	**
Age	0.033		0.230	*	0.006		0.006		0.014	
Externalizing behavior	0.088	+	0.830	***	0.033		0.091	+	0.077	***
Delinquency	0.076	***	0.370	***	0.027	***	0.059	***	0.014	***
Any disability	-0.088	**	-0.560	***	0.009		-0.094	***	0.001	
High school	-0.059		-0.290		0.001		-0.068	+	0.001	
Some college	-0.058		-0.130		0.011		-0.072	+	0.005	
College	-0.033		-0.110		0.011		-0.018		-0.001	
Number of children in household	0.001		-0.042		-0.001		-0.001		-0.001	
Income-to-poverty ratio	-0.006		-0.052		0.001		-0.010		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.004		-0.008		0.005		0.003		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.015		0.068		0.006		0.020	*	0.003	
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.018		-0.085	*	-0.005		-0.009		0.002	
Proportion free lunch	-0.002		-0.025		0.010		0.009		0.014	
Black student enrollment share	0.019		0.038		-0.019	*	0.031	+	0.002	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.003		0.024		0.028		-0.012		-0.002	
Neighborhood disadvantage	-0.012		-0.035		-0.001		-0.015		-0.007	
Outcome mean	0.310		0.890		0.072		0.260		0.051	
R-squared	0.150		0.095		0.190		0.140		0.230	
Observations	1,190		1,190		1,190		1,190		1,190	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A2. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for Hispanic youth, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.100	**	-0.550	*	-0.007		-0.120	***	-0.012	
Age	0.032		0.210	+	0.011		0.012		0.007	
Externalizing behavior	0.250	***	1.040	***	0.089	*	0.180	***	0.110	***
Delinquency	0.059	***	0.390	***	0.023	***	0.045	***	0.012	**
Any disability	0.012		-0.220		0.031		-0.020		0.016	
High school	0.050		0.410		-0.015		0.007		0.012	
Some college	0.075	+	0.420	+	-0.015		0.050		-0.002	
College	0.040		-0.022		-0.015		0.021		-0.008	
Number of children in household	-0.001		0.032		0.000		-0.001		0.006	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.003		-0.031		-0.001		-0.012		-0.002	
Material hardship	0.029	*	0.180	*	0.005		0.022	*	0.006	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.020		0.180	*	0.022	*	0.018		0.027	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.078	*	-0.650	**	-0.052		-0.070	*	-0.053	
Proportion free lunch	0.017		0.150		0.014		0.014		0.006	
Black student enrollment share	0.032		0.092		-0.042		0.054	*	-0.003	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.008		-0.330		0.000		-0.058		0.000	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.024		0.079		-0.007		0.012		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.230		0.560		0.073		0.170		0.049	
R-squared	0.240		0.140		0.250		0.270		0.370	
Observations	491		491		473		491		473	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.  
+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A3. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for White youth, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.110	**	-0.940	***	-0.047	**	-0.092	**	-0.018	
Age	0.051		0.088		0.028	*	0.009		0.008	
Externalizing behavior	-0.027		0.540		0.002		0.002		0.079	*
Delinquency	0.076	***	0.420	***	0.013	***	0.053	***	0.004	
Any disability	0.022		0.110		0.036		0.034		0.005	
High school	0.041		-0.600		0.017		0.004		0.000	
Some college	0.087		-0.270		0.013		-0.001		-0.053	
College	0.094		-0.370		0.056		0.009		-0.044	
Number of children in household	0.011		-0.035		-0.013	+	0.002		0.006	+
Income-to-poverty ratio	-0.001		0.019		-0.016	+	0.000		-0.002	
Material hardship	0.009		0.051		0.000		-0.002		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.028		0.360	*	0.005		0.027		-0.020	
School social workers per 1000 students	0.052		0.320		0.004		0.042	+	-0.013	
Proportion free lunch	-0.070	*	-0.170		0.022		-0.074	**	0.006	
Black student enrollment share	0.030		0.120		-0.023		0.028		-0.014	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	0.000		-23.000	***	0.000		0.000		0.000	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.087	*	0.380	+	-0.008		0.090	**	0.008	
Outcome mean	0.220		0.540		0.040		0.160		0.015	
R-squared	0.150		0.110		0.310		0.160		0.550	
Observations	452		454		452		452		369	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A4. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for girls, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>					
Black	-0.005	0.066	0.035 **	-0.009	0.005
Hispanic	-0.011	0.014	0.043 *	-0.038	0.016
Other race	-0.080	-1.040	0.000	0.000	0.000
Multiracial	0.050	1.270 ***	0.025	0.004	-0.004
Age	0.036 +	0.370 **	-0.009	0.014	0.006
Externalizing behavior	0.170 ***	1.580 ***	0.029	0.140 ***	0.049 ***
Delinquency	0.056 ***	0.390 ***	0.016 ***	0.039 ***	0.008 ***
Any disability	-0.002	-0.280	0.016	-0.024	0.010
High school	0.000	0.006	0.020	-0.044	-0.002
Some college	0.019	0.150	0.024 +	-0.016	0.014
College	0.001	-0.340	0.016	-0.018	-0.006
Number of children in household	0.004	-0.014	0.000	0.001	-0.001
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001	0.011	-0.004	0.002	-0.002
Material hardship	0.004	0.058	0.002	0.003	-0.001
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>					
School police officers per 1000 students	0.028 **	0.150 *	0.011 ***	0.026 **	0.003
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.017	-0.170 **	-0.008 *	-0.007	-0.001
Proportion free lunch	-0.030 +	-0.140	-0.006	-0.011	0.015 *
Black student enrollment share	0.026 +	0.070	-0.002	0.027 *	-0.002
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.081 *	-0.980 *	-0.001	-0.072 *	-0.015
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.009	0.110	0.001	0.010	-0.006
Outcome mean	0.170	0.390	0.043	0.130	0.025
R-squared	0.150	0.093	0.210	0.160	0.310
Observations	1,126	1,126	1,107	1,107	1,107

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for boys, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)					
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested					
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Black	0.035	0.240	0.012	0.040	0.029					
Hispanic	-0.039	-0.410	+	-0.010	-0.023	0.034				
Other race	-0.110	-1.100	**	0.039	-0.067	0.000				
Multiracial	0.077	0.150		0.061	-0.004	0.022				
Age	0.044	*	0.120	0.027	*	0.006	0.018	*		
Externalizing behavior	0.075		0.690	**	*	0.066	0.100	***		
Delinquency	0.085	***	0.350	***	0.028	***	0.070	***	0.015	***
Any disability	-0.050	+	-0.340	*	0.018	-0.070	*	0.006		
High school	0.009		-0.180		-0.008	-0.012		-0.007		
Some college	0.005		-0.080		-0.007	-0.028		-0.012		
College	0.036		0.006		-0.010	0.032		-0.011		
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.020		-0.005	0.003		0.005		
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.019		-0.004	-0.012		-0.007		
Material hardship	0.019	*	0.044		0.007	+	0.009	0.002		
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	-0.001		0.120	*	0.003		0.009	0.008	*	
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.030	*	-0.088		-0.012		-0.022	+	-0.005	
Proportion free lunch	0.010		0.048		0.019	+	0.005	0.002		
Black student enrollment share	0.016		0.010		-0.025	*	0.044	*	0.004	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	0.068		0.390		0.061		0.055	0.024		
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.006		0.022		-0.007		-0.009	0.000		
Outcome mean	0.370		1.100		0.091		0.300	0.059		
R-squared	0.120		0.076		0.190		0.130	0.240		
Observations	1,205		1,205		1,205		1,205	1,169		

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.  
 + p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A6. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15 for disabled youth, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>									
<b>Girl</b>	-0.110	*	-0.770	***	-0.043		-0.120	**	-0.028
Youth Characteristics									
Black	-0.120	+	-0.320		-0.010		-0.120	*	0.001
Hispanic	-0.003		-0.350		0.024		-0.020		0.061
Other race	0.000		-17.300	***	0.000		0.000		0.000
Multiracial	0.120		0.270		0.024		-0.097		-0.008
Age	0.086	**	0.460	***	0.020		0.036		0.026
Externalizing behavior	0.014		0.330		0.077	+	0.009		0.120
Delinquency	0.085	***	0.400	***	0.037	***	0.068	***	0.023
High school	0.019		-0.072		0.061		-0.015		0.055
Some college	-0.086		-0.480	+	0.023		-0.094	+	0.034
College	-0.005		-0.044		-0.028		0.025		0.032
Number of children in household	-0.003		-0.017		-0.021	+	0.005		0.014
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.003		-0.024		0.000		0.001		-0.002
Material hardship	0.033	**	0.120	**	0.000		0.028	**	0.007
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>									
School police officers per 1000 students	-0.002		0.130	*	0.021	*	-0.005		0.009
School social workers per 1000 students	0.002		-0.071		0.007		0.026	+	0.008
Proportion free lunch	-0.014		-0.130		-0.002		-0.034		-0.012
Black student enrollment share	0.053	+	0.130		-0.001		0.095	***	0.014
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.150		-0.820	+	-0.017		-0.170		-0.042
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.140		-0.008		-0.002		0.011
Outcome mean	0.370		1.100		0.091		0.300		0.059
R-squared	0.210		0.130		0.250		0.220		0.280
Observations	507.000		514.000		507.000		507.000		507.000

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001



Table B1. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Categorical indicators for presence of school police officers and social workers, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.000	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.015		0.160		0.024		0.016		0.018	
Hispanic	-0.026		-0.260		0.013		-0.028		0.024	+
Other race	-0.079		-0.990	**	0.039		-0.067		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.780	**	0.041		0.001		0.010	
Age	0.037	*	0.220	**	0.014	+	0.006		0.013	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.880	***	0.046	**	0.099	**	0.077	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.360	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.030		-0.350	**	0.016		-0.047	*	0.006	
High school	0.006		-0.089		0.008		-0.028		-0.002	
Some college	0.010		0.017		0.010		-0.026		0.003	
College	0.015		-0.068		0.004		0.001		-0.007	
Number of children in household	0.006		-0.020		-0.002		0.003		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.012	*	0.044		0.005	*	0.007		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
Police and social worker [Ref. No police or social workers]	-0.021		0.160		-0.006		-0.002		0.008	
Police only	-0.016		0.150		0.022		-0.017		0.024	*
Social worker only	-0.052	*	-0.071		-0.025	+	-0.035		-0.003	
Proportion free lunch	-0.012		-0.041		0.006		-0.003		0.010	+
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.006		-0.011		0.034	**	0.002	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.028		-0.140		0.028		-0.029		0.002	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.009		0.110		-0.002		0.002		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.068		0.220		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.092		0.200		0.160		0.270	
Observations	2331		2331		2331		2331		2276	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table B2. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Winsorized school police officers and social workers per 1000 students, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.010	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.012		0.160		0.023		0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.028		-0.280		0.015		-0.030		0.026	+
Other race	-0.082		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.067		0.000	
Multiracial	0.060		0.800	**	0.039		0.001		0.009	
Age	0.039	**	0.220	**	0.013	+	0.008		0.012	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.048	**	0.100	**	0.078	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.030		-0.360	**	0.017		-0.049	*	0.006	
High school	0.003		-0.110		0.007		-0.031		-0.004	
Some college	0.010		0.030		0.010		-0.026		0.002	
College	0.015		-0.071		0.002		0.002		-0.009	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.021		-0.002		0.003		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.021		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.041		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.009		0.120	*	0.007		0.015		0.008	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.025	*	-0.140	**	-0.014	+	-0.014	+	-0.003	
Proportion free lunch	-0.010		-0.055		0.007		-0.003		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.021	+	0.018		-0.013	+	0.036	**	0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.032		0.032		-0.021		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.110		-0.002		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.068		0.220		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.160		0.260	
Observations	2,331		2,331		2,331		2,331		2,276	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest. Winsorized cut points set at 1th and 99th percentiles.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table B3. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Drop schools for academic or disciplinary problems, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-0.990	***	-0.030	**	-0.150	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.012		0.140		0.025	+	0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.025		-0.270		0.018		-0.027		0.026	+
Other race	-0.080		-1.010	**	0.039		-0.065		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.780	**	0.041	+	0.003		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.210	**	0.013	+	0.007		0.012	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.910	***	0.048	**	0.100	**	0.078	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.011	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.350	**	0.015		-0.049	**	0.006	
High school	-0.001		-0.140		0.004		-0.035		-0.005	
Some college	0.008		0.032		0.009		-0.028		0.001	
College	0.015		-0.058		0.002		0.003		-0.009	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.022		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.026		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.012	*	0.045		0.005	+	0.007		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.010		0.093	*	0.009	*	0.014	*	0.006	**
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.110	**	-0.009	+	-0.013	+	-0.002	
Proportion free lunch	-0.012		-0.071		0.006		-0.005		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.022	+	0.027		-0.013	+	0.037	**	0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.019		-0.055		0.030		-0.021		0.002	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.110		-0.003		0.003		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.750		0.067		0.210		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.093		0.200		0.160		0.260	
Observations	2,318		2,318		2,318		2,318		2,263	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.  
+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table C1. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, School counselors added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.000	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.013		0.180		0.023		0.016		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.026		-0.260		0.016		-0.030		0.026	+
Other race	-0.080		-0.980	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.810	**	0.039		0.002		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.210	**	0.013		0.007		0.011	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.048	**	0.100	**	0.077	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.360	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.350	**	0.016		-0.049	**	0.006	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.007		-0.032		-0.004	
Some college	0.009		0.034		0.010		-0.026		0.002	
College	0.016		-0.060		0.003		0.003		-0.008	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.020		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.045		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.016	*	0.140	***	0.009	*	0.019	**	0.006	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.017	+	-0.071	+	-0.006		-0.011		-0.002	
School counselors per 1000 students	-0.008		-0.096	*	-0.003		-0.003		0.000	
Proportion free lunch	-0.012		-0.067		0.006		-0.004		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.014		-0.014	+	0.036	**	0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.018		-0.066		0.029		-0.020		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.098		-0.003		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.068		0.220		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.095		0.200		0.170		0.260	
Observations	2,331		2,331		2,331		2,331		2,276	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table C2. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, School psychologists added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.010	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.012		0.160		0.022		0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.027		-0.280		0.016		-0.030		0.026	+
Other race	-0.081		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.800	**	0.039		0.002		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.210	**	0.012		0.007		0.011	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.047	**	0.100	**	0.077	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.360	***	0.023	***	0.055	***	0.011	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.016		-0.050	**	0.006	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.007		-0.031		-0.003	
Some college	0.009		0.035		0.010		-0.026		0.002	
College	0.016		-0.064		0.003		0.002		-0.008	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.022		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.120	**	0.008	*	0.017	*	0.005	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.022	*	-0.110	*	-0.009		-0.015	+	-0.004	
School psychologists per 1000 students	0.004		-0.007		0.002		0.006		0.004	+
Proportion free lunch	-0.011		-0.057		0.006		-0.003		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.014		-0.014	+	0.036	**	0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.037		0.030		-0.019		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.068		0.220		0.042	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.260	
Observations	2,331		2,331		2,331		2,331		2,276	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D1. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, In-school suspension added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.010	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.022		0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.026		-0.280		0.017		-0.029		0.025	+
Other race	-0.085	+	-1.020	**	0.035		-0.071		0.000	
Multiracial	0.059		0.790	**	0.039		-0.001		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.220	**	0.012		0.009		0.014	**
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.048	**	0.100	**	0.076	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.030		-0.350	**	0.016		-0.047	*	0.007	
High school	0.002		-0.110		0.007		-0.031		-0.003	
Some college	0.009		0.042		0.010		-0.026		0.003	
College	0.015		-0.061		0.003		0.003		-0.008	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.024		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.023		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.016	*	0.120	**	0.008	*	0.020	**	0.005	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.021	*	-0.120	**	-0.008		-0.013	+	-0.002	
In-school suspensions per 1000 students	-0.013		-0.037		-0.002		-0.016	+	0.004	+
Proportion free lunch	-0.009		-0.051		0.006		0.000		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.013		-0.014	+	0.035	**	0.000	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.018		-0.047		0.030		-0.022		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.190		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D2. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Single out-of-school suspension added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-1.010	***	-0.030	**	-0.160	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.022		0.015		0.017	
Hispanic	-0.028		-0.280		0.017		-0.032		0.026	+
Other race	-0.082		-1.000	**	0.034		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.790	**	0.040		0.001		0.011	
Age	0.039	*	0.220	**	0.013		0.010		0.014	**
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.046	**	0.099	**	0.074	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.016		-0.048	*	0.008	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.007		-0.032		-0.002	
Some college	0.008		0.033		0.010		-0.027		0.003	
College	0.015		-0.068		0.004		0.002		-0.005	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.004	+	0.006		0.000	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.120	**	0.007	+	0.018	*	0.004	+
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.120	**	-0.008	+	-0.013	+	-0.002	
Single out-of-school suspensions per 1000 students	0.002		-0.011		0.008		-0.001		0.008	*
Proportion free lunch	-0.012		-0.051		0.003		-0.002		0.006	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.017		-0.016	*	0.035	**	-0.003	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.016		-0.044		0.035		-0.021		0.006	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D3. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Multiple out-of-school suspensions added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.170	***	-1.010	***	-0.030	**	-0.160	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.023		0.015		0.019	+
Hispanic	-0.028		-0.280		0.017		-0.032		0.027	*
Other race	-0.082		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.060		0.790	**	0.040		0.001		0.012	
Age	0.038	*	0.220	**	0.013		0.010		0.014	**
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.046	**	0.099	**	0.075	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.015		-0.048	*	0.007	
High school	0.001		-0.120		0.008		-0.032		-0.002	
Some college	0.008		0.032		0.011		-0.027		0.004	
College	0.014		-0.069		0.004		0.002		-0.005	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.110	**	0.008	*	0.017	**	0.005	**
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.110	**	-0.008	+	-0.013	+	-0.003	
Multiple out-of-school suspensions per 1000 students	-0.003		-0.027		0.006	*	-0.001		0.005	**
Proportion free lunch	-0.010		-0.051		0.005		-0.002		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.021	+	0.020		-0.016	*	0.035	**	-0.002	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.018		-0.059		0.035		-0.021		0.006	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001



Table D4. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Total out-of-school suspensions added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-1.010	***	-0.030	**	-0.160	***	-0.024	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.023		0.015		0.018	+
Hispanic	-0.028		-0.280		0.017		-0.032		0.027	*
Other race	-0.082		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.060		0.790	**	0.040		0.001		0.012	
Age	0.039	*	0.220	**	0.013	+	0.010		0.014	**
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.046	**	0.099	**	0.074	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.016		-0.048	*	0.007	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.008		-0.032		-0.002	
Some college	0.008		0.032		0.011		-0.027		0.004	
College	0.014		-0.071		0.005		0.002		-0.004	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.004	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.120	**	0.007	*	0.017	**	0.005	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.110	**	-0.008	+	-0.013	+	-0.003	
Total out-of-school suspensions per 1000 students	-0.001		-0.026		0.008	*	-0.001		0.007	**
Proportion free lunch	-0.011		-0.049		0.004		-0.002		0.007	
Black student enrollment share	0.021		0.021		-0.016	*	0.035	**	-0.003	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.057		0.036		-0.021		0.007	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.100		-0.003		0.003		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D5. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Expelled with services added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-1.010	***	-0.030	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.023		0.015		0.018	
Hispanic	-0.028		-0.280		0.015		-0.032		0.025	+
Other race	-0.081		-1.000	**	0.038		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.790	**	0.042	+	0.001		0.011	
Age	0.038	*	0.220	**	0.010		0.009		0.012	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.046	**	0.098	**	0.076	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.015		-0.048	*	0.006	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.007		-0.032		-0.004	
Some college	0.008		0.034		0.010		-0.027		0.003	
College	0.015		-0.066		0.003		0.003		-0.007	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.023		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.110	**	0.007	*	0.017	*	0.005	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.020	*	-0.120	**	-0.006		-0.012	+	-0.001	
Expelled with services per 1000 students	0.003		-0.002		0.008	**	0.003		0.004	*
Proportion free lunch	-0.011		-0.055		0.005		-0.002		0.009	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.013		-0.014	+	0.035	**	0.000	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.039		0.032		-0.020		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.011		0.100		-0.002		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D6. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Expelled without services added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-1.010	***	-0.031	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.012		0.160		0.023		0.015		0.018	
Hispanic	-0.027		-0.280		0.017		-0.030		0.026	+
Other race	-0.081		-1.000	**	0.036		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.790	**	0.039		0.001		0.010	
Age	0.039	**	0.220	**	0.012		0.010		0.013	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.900	***	0.048	**	0.099	**	0.077	***
Delinquency	0.072	***	0.370	***	0.023	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.015		-0.048	*	0.007	
High school	0.002		-0.120		0.007		-0.032		-0.003	
Some college	0.009		0.034		0.011		-0.026		0.004	
College	0.015		-0.066		0.004		0.003		-0.007	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.001	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.023		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.042		0.005	+	0.006		0.001	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.012		0.110	*	0.005		0.016	*	0.005	+
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.019	*	-0.120	**	-0.006		-0.012	+	-0.002	
Expelled without services per 1000 students	0.007		0.010		0.005	*	0.005		0.002	
Proportion free lunch	-0.011		-0.055		0.006		-0.002		0.009	
Black student enrollment share	0.020		0.012		-0.014	*	0.035	**	0.000	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.017		-0.039		0.030		-0.020		0.002	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.100		-0.004		0.002		-0.004	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table D7. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Referred to law enforcement added, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
<b>Youth Characteristics</b>										
Girl	-0.160	***	-1.010	***	-0.030	**	-0.160	***	-0.025	**
Black	0.011		0.160		0.022		0.015		0.018	
Hispanic	-0.029		-0.280		0.015		-0.032		0.025	+
Other race	-0.082		-1.000	**	0.035		-0.066		0.000	
Multiracial	0.061		0.790	**	0.040		0.001		0.010	
Age	0.038	*	0.220	**	0.011		0.010		0.013	*
Externalizing behavior	0.120	***	0.910	***	0.044	**	0.097	**	0.075	***
Delinquency	0.071	***	0.370	***	0.022	***	0.056	***	0.012	***
Any disability	-0.031		-0.360	**	0.016		-0.048	*	0.007	
High school	0.003		-0.120		0.008		-0.031		-0.003	
Some college	0.009		0.032		0.010		-0.026		0.003	
College	0.016		-0.068		0.003		0.003		-0.007	
Number of children in household	0.005		-0.023		-0.002		0.002		0.002	
Income-to-poverty ratio	0.001		-0.022		-0.004		-0.005		-0.005	
Material hardship	0.011	*	0.043		0.004		0.006		0.000	
<b>School and Neighborhood Characteristics</b>										
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014	+	0.110	**	0.008	*	0.017	**	0.006	*
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.018	*	-0.120	**	-0.006		-0.012	+	-0.002	
Referred to law enforcement per 1000 students	0.010		-0.019		0.009	*	0.007		0.002	
Proportion free lunch	-0.013		-0.052		0.003		-0.004		0.008	
Black student enrollment share	0.019		0.016		-0.016	*	0.034	**	-0.001	
1+ Deadly gun violence incidents	-0.015		-0.046		0.037		-0.019		0.003	
Neighborhood disadvantage	0.010		0.100		-0.002		0.003		-0.003	
Outcome mean	0.270		0.760		0.067		0.220		0.043	
R-squared	0.160		0.094		0.200		0.170		0.270	
Observations	2,327		2,327		2,327		2,327		2,272	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table E1. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, In-school suspensions, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	Low				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.023	0.057	0.016 *	0.020	0.000
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.031 *	-0.086	-0.008	-0.019	0.002
Observations	672	672	672	672	653

  

	Medium				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.009	0.033	0.005	0.013	0.007
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.007	-0.130	-0.044 **	-0.011	-0.012
Observations	804	804	804	804	775

  

	High				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.023 *	0.220 ***	0.006	0.031 ***	0.006
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.021	-0.098	-0.002	-0.007	0.002
Observations	844	851	844	844	844

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.  
 + p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table E2. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Total out-of-school suspensions, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	Low				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.027	0.220 *	-0.001	0.033 *	-0.009
School social workers per 1000 students	0.007	0.050	-0.002	0.002	-0.004
Observations	747	747	713	747	565

  

	Medium				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.010	0.110	0.013	0.007	0.032 **
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.046 **	-0.240 *	-0.037 *	-0.033 *	-0.011 +
Observations	754	773	754	754	607

  

	High				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Stopped	Number of Stops	Stopped-School	Stopped-Street	Arrested
School police officers per 1000 students	0.017 +	0.099 *	0.009 +	0.019 *	0.004
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.018	-0.110 **	-0.005	-0.007	0.002
Observations	807	807	807	807	801

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table E3. Regression models predicting police contact at age 15, Referred to law enforcement-low, Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

	Low									
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
School police officers per 1000 students	-0.001		0.078		-0.003		0.005		0.002	
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.031	+	-0.200	**	-0.005		-0.022	+	-0.001	
Observations	820		820		820		820		802	

  

	Medium									
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
School police officers per 1000 students	0.014		0.110	+	0.011		0.027	*	0.008	*
School social workers per 1000 students	0.008		0.031		-0.023		0.018		0.005	
Observations	723		723		723		723		700	

  

	High									
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Stopped		Number of Stops		Stopped-School		Stopped-Street		Arrested	
School police officers per 1000 students	0.029	+	0.150	**	0.015	*	0.032	*	0.010	+
School social workers per 1000 students	-0.027	+	-0.150	**	-0.009		-0.022		-0.006	
Observations	784		784		784		784		770	

Standard errors clustered at school level. Negative binomial model used to estimate number of stops (column 2). All other results are average marginal effects from logistic regression models. Observations were dropped from Model 5 because Other race category perfectly predicts arrest.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001