

# **Online Appendix**

## **Does Peacetime Military Service Affect Crime?**

Karsten Albæk

SFI – The Danish National Centre for Social Research, DK-1052 Copenhagen, Denmark,

[kal@sfi.dk](mailto:kal@sfi.dk)

Søren Leth-Petersen

University of Copenhagen, DK-1353 Copenhagen, Denmark, [soren. leth-petersen@econ.ku.dk](mailto:soren. leth-petersen@econ.ku.dk)

Daniel le Maire

University of Copenhagen, DK-1353 Copenhagen, [daniel.le.maire@econ.ku.dk](mailto:daniel.le.maire@econ.ku.dk)

Torben Tranæs

SFI – The Danish National Centre for Social Research, DK-1052 Copenhagen, Denmark,

[ttr@sfi.dk](mailto:ttr@sfi.dk)

**Table A1** presents means of the covariates that we have available from administrative registers for Danes belonging to the 1964 cohort living in the Eastern and Western part of Denmark. The purpose is to show whether the population in Eastern Denmark, which is the population we use in the analysis in the paper, differs from that in Western Denmark. The most striking difference is that people living in the Eastern part of Denmark tend to have a slightly higher crime rate than people living in the Western part of Denmark. Furthermore, among non-offending youths, individuals from the Eastern part of Denmark have more education and a higher fraction of non-cohabiting parents. The comparison of average characteristics between individuals from the Eastern and Western parts of the country is based on all the individuals recorded in the gross population registers. The table also displays the average values of characteristics of the individuals that enter our final sample. Compared with the total 1964 cohort of men from the Eastern part of Denmark, the final sample has very similar characteristics, except that the men included in our sample commit slightly fewer crimes in the period 1982-1990. Table A1 is referenced in footnote 4 and 6 in the paper.

**Appendix table A1. Sample means for the 1964 cohort in the Eastern and Western parts of Denmark**

	Youth offenders			Non-offending youths		
	Estimation sample	East	West	Estimation sample	East	West
Accumulated property crime, 1982-1990	1.222 (1.621)	1.466 (1.844)	1.358 (1.938)	0.200 (0.635)	0.244 (0.739)	0.150 (0.569)
Accumulated violent crime, 1982-1990	0.217 (0.594)	0.301 (0.702)	0.269 (0.675)	0.0313 (0.201)	0.047 (0.261)	0.038 (0.222)
Education, 1981: High-school, dummy	0.074 (0.261)	0.057 (0.232)	0.038 (0.191)	0.226 (0.418)	0.203 (0.402)	0.131 (0.337)
Education, 1981: Vocational education, dummy	0.178 (0.382)	0.149 (0.356)	0.149 (0.356)	0.118 (0.322)	0.114 (0.318)	0.125 (0.331)
Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy	0.401 (0.49)	0.382 (0.486)	0.339 (0.474)	0.431 (0.495)	0.415 (0.493)	0.350 (0.477)
Parent has short higher education, 1981, dummy	0.037 (0.188)	0.030 (0.171)	0.028 (0.165)	0.040 (0.196)	0.039 (0.193)	0.034 (0.18)
Parent has long higher education, 1981, dummy	0.108 (0.311)	0.104 (0.306)	0.093 (0.29)	0.200 (0.4)	0.186 (0.389)	0.133 (0.34)
Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	0.226 (0.419)	0.239 (0.427)	0.005 (0.067)	0.139 (0.346)	0.147 (0.354)	0.001 (0.025)
Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	0.006 (0.079)	0.006 (0.075)	0.353 (0.478)	0.004 (0.062)	0.001 (0.036)	0.248 (0.432)
Living in rural area, 1981, dummy	0.204 (0.403)	0.206 (0.405)	0.631 (0.483)	0.259 (0.438)	0.272 (0.445)	0.748 (0.434)
Received social assistance benefits, 1980, dummy	0.014 (0.116)	0.014 (0.116)	0.016 (0.127)	0.00661 (0.081)	0.003 (0.053)	0.003 (0.054)
Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy	0.102 (0.329)	0.111 (0.34)	0.107 (0.342)	0.032 (0.182)	0.034 (0.189)	0.026 (0.164)
Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy	0.049 (0.222)	0.047 (0.219)	0.036 (0.201)	0.014 (0.122)	0.016 (0.132)	0.017 (0.133)
Non-cohabiting parents. 1981, dummy	0.190 (0.393)	0.197 (0.398)	0.165 (0.371)	0.124 (0.33)	0.123 (0.329)	0.076 (0.265)
Number of observations	951	1,601	1,535	10,593	15,792	22,338

Notes: Accumulated crime measures the number of crimes that have been accumulated over the period 1982-1990. Education variables for both children and parents measure the highest level of completed education in 1981. Standard deviations are given in parentheses.

**Tables A2 and A3** present results from regressions of baseline characteristics on lottery number deciles for youth offenders and non-offending youths. The purpose is to test whether baseline characteristics are balanced across the lottery number deciles that we use as the basis for constructing instruments. Specifically, we regress each of the baseline characteristics reported in table 1 in the paper on draft cohort dummies and dummies for the lottery number deciles, and conduct F-tests for the joint insignificance of decile dummies. These tests are conducted separately for youth offenders and non-offending youths. We find across all covariate regressions, except one, that the parameters of the decile indicators are jointly insignificant, which is consistent with the notion that the lottery truly randomizes people into service.

**Appendix table A2. Regressing baseline characteristics on draft lottery number deciles, youth offenders**

	Education. 1981: High-school, dummy	Education. 1981: Vocational education, dummy	Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy	Parent has short higher education, 1981, dummy	Parent has long higher education, 1981, dummy	Weight kg/10, at examination	Height in cm/10, at examination	Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	Living in rural area, 1981, dummy	Received social assistance benefits. 1980, dummy	Test score from examination, standardized	Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy	Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy	Non cohabiting parents. 1981, dummy
Draft age 19	-0.065** (-2.26)	-0.118*** (-2.92)	0.017 (0.39)	-0.013 (-0.73)	0.023 (0.90)	0.111 (1.41)	0.093 (1.49)	0.014 (0.39)	0.007* (1.92)	-0.037 (-0.98)	-0.02 (-0.90)	0.02 (0.24)	0.006 (0.21)	-0.014 (-0.64)	-0.002 (-0.06)
Draft age 20	-0.092*** (-2.98)	-0.262*** (-6.54)	0.041 (0.73)	-0.012 (-0.54)	0.018 (0.54)	0.181* (1.75)	0.164** (2.10)	0.038 (0.79)	0.000 (0.23)	-0.067 (-1.48)	-0.046** (-2.02)	0.096 (0.87)	-0.008 (-0.21)	-0.031 (-1.31)	-0.003 (-0.08)
Draft age 21	-0.092** (-2.36)	-0.218*** (-4.04)	-0.073 (-0.92)	0.062 (1.30)	0.037 (0.70)	0.269* (1.90)	0.152 (1.30)	0.065 (0.90)	0.021 (1.01)	0.034 (0.47)	-0.045 (-1.59)	0.309* (1.93)	0.001 (0.02)	-0.047 (-1.62)	0.021 (0.32)
Draft age 22+	-0.018 (-0.29)	-0.102 (-1.32)	0.01 (0.11)	-0.017 (-0.50)	0.083 (1.24)	0.09 (0.69)	0.129 (1.14)	-0.007 (-0.09)	0.028 (1.02)	-0.033 (-0.43)	0.048 (0.83)	0.194 (1.10)	-0.014 (-0.21)	-0.007 (-0.16)	0.011 (0.14)
Lottery no., 1st decile	-0.007 (-0.28)	0.028 (0.71)	0.092* (1.81)	0.008 (0.45)	-0.007 (-0.23)	-0.028 (-0.31)	-0.015 (-0.23)	-0.041 (-1.03)	0.013 (1.10)	0.002 (0.04)	0.010 (0.45)	-0.007 (-0.07)	-0.036 (-1.23)	0.026 (0.94)	0.006 (0.15)
Lottery no., 2nd decile	0.02 (0.62)	0.013 (0.31)	-0.039 (-0.71)	0.007 (0.34)	-0.012 (-0.33)	-0.032 (-0.30)	-0.059 (-0.74)	-0.002 (-0.05)	0.007 (0.60)	0.043 (0.87)	0.018 (0.69)	-0.106 (-1.02)	0.009 (0.22)	0.072** (2.07)	0.014 (0.32)
Lottery no., 3rd decile	-0.039* (-1.75)	0.042 (0.94)	0.028 (0.52)	0.024 (1.07)	-0.04 (-1.39)	0.045 (0.51)	-0.023 (-0.31)	0.054 (1.13)	0.007 (0.66)	0.011 (0.26)	0.057* (1.84)	-0.100 (-0.98)	-0.065** (-2.47)	-0.004 (-0.21)	0.091* (1.94)
Lottery no., 4th decile	0.008 (0.25)	0.004 (0.10)	0.035 (0.61)	0.068** (2.08)	0.041 (1.01)	-0.067 (-0.62)	-0.002 (-0.03)	0.01 (0.20)	-0.004 (-1.40)	-0.087** (-2.21)	-0.017 (-0.90)	0.188 (1.57)	-0.019 (-0.55)	-0.030** (-2.09)	0.024 (0.51)
R-squared	0.016	0.043	0.007	0.018	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.004	0.011	0.009	0.016	0.012	0.005	0.015	0.005
F-test, all parameters on lottery deciles =0, p-value	0.313	0.915	0.305	0.365	0.370	0.833	0.960	0.419	0.274	0.098	0.166	0.180	0.331	0.014	0.472
No. of observations	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951	951

Notes: The table presents OLS regression results of baseline characteristics on draft age dummies and draft lottery number decile dummies. The F-test of difference of decile parameters reports p-values for a test that all parameters on lottery number deciles are equal to zero.

**Appendix table A3. Regressing baseline characteristics on draft lottery number deciles, non-offending youths**

	Education 1981: High-school, dummy	Education 1981: Vocational education, dummy	Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy	Parent has short higher education, 1981, dummy	Parent has long higher education, 1981, dummy	Weight kg/10, at examination	Height in cm/10, at examination	Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	Living in rural area, 1981, dummy	Received social assistance benefits, 1980, dummy	Test score from examination, standardized	Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy	Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy	Non cohabiting parents, 1981, dummy
Draft age 19	-0.149*** (-10.96)	-0.028*** (-2.61)	0.035** (2.45)	-0.002 (-0.38)	-0.016 (-1.35)	0.088*** (3.53)	0.062*** (3.47)	0.002 (0.19)	0.000 (-0.27)	-0.017 (-1.32)	-0.009*** (-2.81)	-0.025 (-0.84)	0.014*** (3.15)	0.000 (-0.09)	-0.001 (-0.10)
Draft age 20	-0.269*** (-18.78)	-0.107*** (-9.79)	0.077*** (4.53)	0.000 (0.05)	-0.052*** (-3.84)	0.210*** (6.95)	0.042* (1.95)	0.009 (0.79)	0.002 (0.89)	-0.015 (-1.02)	-0.007* (-1.94)	-0.138*** (-4.03)	0.005 (0.91)	-0.003 (-0.85)	-0.031*** (-2.81)
Draft age 21	-0.210*** (-11.24)	-0.120*** (-9.69)	0.076*** (3.38)	0.007 (0.70)	0.001 (0.04)	0.228*** (5.39)	0.055* (1.91)	0.008 (0.51)	0.004 (1.06)	-0.040** (-2.03)	-0.012*** (-3.17)	0.027 (0.61)	0.011 (1.36)	-0.006 (-1.14)	-0.023 (-1.58)
Draft age 22+	-0.073*** (-3.19)	-0.090*** (-6.20)	0.018 (0.74)	0.013 (1.21)	0.050** (2.35)	0.226*** (5.11)	0.129*** (4.17)	-0.018 (-1.09)	0.004 (0.98)	-0.035 (-1.63)	-0.009** (-2.11)	0.164*** (3.16)	0.016* (1.77)	-0.007 (-1.31)	-0.006 (-0.37)
Lottery no., 1st decile	0.003 (0.23)	0.007 (0.67)	-0.018 (-1.09)	-0.002 (-0.31)	0.026* (1.84)	-0.001 (-0.03)	-0.005 (-0.21)	0.009 (0.71)	0.002 (0.67)	-0.003 (-0.22)	0.000 (0.04)	-0.001 (-0.04)	0.003 (0.42)	0.004 (0.92)	-0.002 (-0.14)
Lottery no., 2nd decile	-0.015 (-1.09)	-0.009 (-0.84)	0.001 (0.03)	-0.002 (-0.35)	-0.006 (-0.43)	0.043 (1.43)	0.017 (0.79)	-0.028*** (-2.58)	0.000 (0.18)	0.011 (0.76)	0.006* (1.66)	-0.046 (-1.41)	0.021*** (2.86)	0.001 (0.26)	-0.007 (-0.63)
Lottery no., 3rd decile	0.004 (0.26)	0.009 (0.83)	-0.013 (-0.76)	-0.001 (-0.16)	-0.004 (-0.31)	-0.004 (-0.15)	0.024 (1.08)	0.011 (0.94)	-0.001 (-0.29)	-0.031** (-2.19)	-0.001 (-0.34)	-0.011 (-0.35)	0.009 (1.40)	0.006 (1.25)	-0.003 (-0.26)
Lottery no., 4th decile	-0.019 (-1.43)	-0.007 (-0.65)	0.002 (0.12)	-0.005 (-0.87)	0.01 (0.76)	-0.027 (-0.90)	-0.012 (-0.57)	-0.013 (-1.12)	0.003 (1.23)	0.017 (1.17)	-0.001 (-0.20)	-0.016 (-0.49)	0.008 (1.18)	-0.003 (-0.82)	-0.001 (-0.05)
R-squared	0.036	0.016	0.003	0.000	0.004	0.007	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.001	0.001
F-test, all parameters on lottery deciles =0, p-value	0.454	0.453	0.744	0.957	0.263	0.346	0.532	0.025	0.631	0.050	0.383	0.754	0.248	0.357	0.974
No. of observations	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593

Notes: The table presents OLS regression results of baseline characteristics on draft age dummies and draft lottery number decile dummies. The F-test of difference of decile parameters reports p-values for a test that all parameters on lottery number deciles are equal to zero.

**In tables A4 and A5** we investigate the importance of including covariates for estimating the effect of crime in table 4 in the paper. Table A4 shows results for property crime, and table A5 for violent crime. We do this by expanding the covariate set in three steps to end with the specification that we have presented in table 4 in the paper. The regressions show that including covariates is useful for gaining precision of the estimate of military service on crime.

**Appendix table A4. Exploring the role of covariates for estimating the effect of property crime, 1982-1990**

	Youth offenders						Non-offending youths					
	OLS			2SLS			OLS			2SLS		
Military enrollment	-0.265**	-0.287***	-0.285***	-0.373*	-0.392*	-0.438**	0.014	0.012	0.014	0.021	0.019	0.016
	(-2.52)	(-2.77)	(-2.78)	(-1.67)	(-1.79)	(-2.05)	(1.13)	(0.91)	(1.08)	(0.85)	(0.78)	(0.64)
Draft age 19	-0.149	-0.132	-0.233	-0.15	-0.135	-0.229	-0.006	-0.003	-0.014	-0.005	-0.003	-0.014
	(-1.00)	(-0.90)	(-1.58)	(-1.01)	(-0.92)	(-1.58)	(-0.30)	(-0.17)	(-0.77)	(-0.27)	(-0.14)	(-0.74)
Draft age 20	-0.515***	-0.451**	-0.597***	-0.523***	-0.460***	-0.605***	-0.004	-0.007	-0.014	-0.003	-0.006	-0.014
	(-2.93)	(-2.56)	(-3.26)	(-3.00)	(-2.62)	(-3.35)	(-0.19)	(-0.30)	(-0.62)	(-0.15)	(-0.25)	(-0.60)
Draft age 21	-0.411*	-0.292	-0.458**	-0.424*	-0.309	-0.486**	-0.069***	-0.057**	-0.066***	-0.067***	-0.055**	-0.065***
	(-1.84)	(-1.31)	(-2.00)	(-1.88)	(-1.36)	(-2.11)	(-2.82)	(-2.35)	(-2.70)	(-2.72)	(-2.24)	(-2.64)
Draft age 22 or older	0.137	0.213	0.123	0.135	0.217	0.131	-0.062**	-0.04	-0.046	-0.061**	-0.039	-0.045
	(0.38)	(0.61)	(0.36)	(0.38)	(0.63)	(0.39)	(-2.08)	(-1.35)	(-1.56)	(-2.04)	(-1.31)	(-1.52)
Test score from examination, standardized		-0.354***	-0.284***		-0.357***	-0.287***		-0.090***	-0.066***		-0.090***	-0.067***
		(-5.66)	(-4.24)		(-5.77)	(-4.33)		(-13.00)	(-9.19)		(-13.00)	(-9.29)
Test score from examination, standardized, squared		-0.088*	-0.078*		-0.091**	-0.081*		0.013**	0.016***		0.013**	0.016***
		(-1.93)	(-1.71)		(-2.03)	(-1.82)		(2.42)	(2.93)		(2.48)	(2.97)
Height in centimeters/10, at examination		-0.076	-0.071		-0.078	-0.075		-0.011	-0.008		-0.011	-0.008
		(-0.76)	(-0.68)		(-0.79)	(-0.73)		(-0.86)	(-0.63)		(-0.85)	(-0.62)
Weight in kilograms/10, at examination		-0.066	-0.057		-0.066	-0.058		-0.032***	-0.030***		-0.033***	-0.030***
		(-0.87)	(-0.75)		(-0.88)	(-0.77)		(-3.80)	(-3.57)		(-3.86)	(-3.62)
Education, 1981: High-school, dummy			-0.412**			-0.405**			-0.062***			-0.061***
			(-2.46)			(-2.45)			(-4.84)			(-4.78)
Education, 1981: Vocational education, dummy			-0.355***			-0.351***			0.029			0.028
			(-2.73)			(-2.75)			(1.25)			(1.22)
Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy			-0.153			-0.145			-0.037**			-0.036**
			(-1.32)			(-1.27)			(-2.34)			(-2.29)
Parent has short-term higher education, 1981, dummy			-0.122			-0.121			-0.053**			-0.051**
			(-0.59)			(-0.60)			(-2.05)			(-2.01)
Parent has long higher education, 1981, dummy			-0.235			-0.239			-0.031*			-0.029*
			(-1.38)			(-1.42)			(-1.74)			(-1.65)
Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy			-0.034			-0.032			0.112***			0.114***
			(-0.26)			(-0.24)			(4.89)			(5.02)



Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy			1.536 (1.37)			1.545 (1.41)			0.021 (0.20)			0.013 (0.13)
Living in rural area, 1981, dummy			-0.396*** (-3.19)			-0.379*** (-3.13)			-0.057*** (-4.21)			-0.055*** (-4.15)
Received social assistance benefits, 1980, dummy			0.852** (1.99)			0.879** (2.05)			0.044 (0.58)			0.049 (0.66)
Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy			0.296* (1.86)			0.301* (1.92)			0.227*** (3.90)			0.229*** (3.96)
Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy			0.487* (1.73)			0.503* (1.81)			0.082 (1.40)			0.083 (1.41)
Non-cohabiting parents, 1981, dummy			0.099 (0.73)			0.093 (0.70)			0.122*** (5.35)			0.120*** (5.31)
R-squared	0.016	0.051	0.094	0.015	0.05	0.092	0.001	0.025	0.043	0.001	0.025	0.043
No. of observation	951	951	951	951	951	951	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593

Notes: Robust t-statistics in parenthesis. \* p<0.10. \*\* p<=0.05. \*\*\* p<0.01. For explanations relating to the explanatory variables, see notes to table 1. This table re-estimates the specifications reported in table 4 in the paper while varying the covariate set. Columns 3, 6, 9, and 12 are identical to the specifications reported in table 4 in the paper.

**Appendix table A5. Exploring the role of covariates for estimating the effect of violent crimes, 1982-1990**

	Youth offenders						Non-offending youths					
	OLS			2SLS			OLS			2SLS		
Military enrollment	-0.056 (-1.44)	-0.065* (-1.66)	-0.073* (-1.88)	-0.085 (-1.03)	-0.089 (-1.09)	-0.089 (-1.11)	0.001 (0.20)	0.000 (-0.11)	0.000 (-0.11)	-0.004 (-0.45)	-0.004 (-0.52)	-0.004 (-0.55)
Draft age 19	-0.056 (-0.91)	-0.062 (-1.01)	-0.079 (-1.30)	-0.06 (-1.00)	-0.061 (-1.05)	-0.076 (-1.32)	-0.004 (-0.67)	-0.004 (-0.77)	-0.005 (-0.92)	-0.004 (-0.73)	-0.005 (-0.81)	-0.005 (-0.95)
Draft age 20	-0.172*** (-2.67)	-0.175*** (-2.70)	-0.197*** (-2.92)	-0.171*** (-2.65)	-0.168*** (-2.60)	-0.192*** (-2.87)	0.003 (0.38)	0.000 (-0.05)	0.001 (0.07)	0.001 (0.16)	-0.002 (-0.24)	-0.001 (-0.12)
Draft age 21	-0.213*** (-3.06)	-0.212*** (-3.05)	-0.238*** (-3.35)	-0.213*** (-3.01)	-0.206*** (-2.93)	-0.235*** (-3.29)	0.005 (0.46)	0.004 (0.42)	0.005 (0.52)	0.005 (0.46)	0.004 (0.44)	0.006 (0.55)
Draft age 22 or older	0.028 (0.17)	0.042 (0.26)	0.038 (0.25)	-0.04 (-0.28)	-0.013 (-0.09)	0.011 (0.08)	-0.018** (-2.26)	-0.015** (-1.98)	-0.015* (-1.85)	-0.018** (-2.32)	-0.016** (-2.03)	-0.015* (-1.89)
Test score from examination, standardized		-0.083*** (-4.20)	-0.057*** (-2.84)		-0.074*** (-3.96)	-0.051*** (-2.64)		-0.018*** (-8.63)	-0.014*** (-6.24)		-0.018*** (-8.69)	-0.014*** (-6.28)
Test score from examination, standardized, squared		-0.006 (-0.37)	0.002 (0.14)		-0.007 (-0.46)	0.001 (0.07)		0.001 (0.80)	0.002 (1.15)		0.001 (0.85)	0.002 (1.18)
Height in centimeters/10, at examination		-0.062 (-1.46)	-0.04 (-0.96)		-0.059 (-1.52)	-0.043 (-1.09)		-0.005 (-1.09)	-0.004 (-0.87)		-0.005 (-1.24)	-0.004 (-1.02)
Weight in kilograms/10, at examination		0.116*** (3.59)	0.107*** (3.36)		0.106*** (3.44)	0.103*** (3.34)		0.005* (1.80)	0.005* (1.75)		0.005* (1.82)	0.005* (1.76)
Education. 1981: High-school, dummy			-0.117*** (-2.71)			-0.116*** (-2.72)			-0.007* (-1.94)			-0.007* (-1.87)
Education. 1981: Vocational education, dummy			-0.048 (-0.95)			-0.055 (-1.16)			0.017** (2.18)			0.018** (2.23)
Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy			-0.073* (-1.65)			-0.083* (-1.91)			-0.007 (-1.30)			-0.007 (-1.40)
Parent has short-term higher education, 1981, dummy			0.024 (0.29)			0.023 (0.30)			-0.017** (-2.28)			-0.017** (-2.35)
Parent has long higher education, 1981, dummy			-0.115** (-2.53)			-0.116*** (-2.58)			-0.011** (-2.08)			-0.011** (-2.17)
Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy			-0.169*** (-4.02)			-0.169*** (-4.09)			0.01 (1.40)			0.01 (1.46)
Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy			-0.061 (-0.34)			-0.065 (-0.36)			0.003 (0.14)			0.003 (0.13)
Living in rural area, 1981, dummy			-0.102* (-1.96)			-0.100** (-2.02)			-0.008* (-1.74)			-0.008* (-1.75)
Received social assistance			0.408*			0.398*			-0.015			-0.014

benefits, 1980, dummy			(1.87)			(1.84)			(-0.99)			(-0.95)
Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy			0.081 (1.03)			0.07 (0.97)			0.023 (1.31)			0.019 (1.16)
Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy			0.198 (1.49)			0.183 (1.47)			0.014 (0.54)			0.014 (0.55)
Non-cohabiting parents, 1981, dummy			-0.054 (-1.28)			-0.028 (-0.71)			0.021*** (2.88)			0.020*** (2.84)
R-squared	0.016	0.051	0.094	0.015	0.05	0.092	0.001	0.025	0.043	0.001	0.025	0.043
No. of observation	951	951	951	951	951	951	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593	10,593

Notes: Robust t-statistics in parenthesis. \* p<0.10. \*\* p<=0.05. \*\*\* p<0.01. For explanations relating to the explanatory variables, see notes of table 1. This table re-estimates the specifications reported in table 4 in the paper while varying the covariate set. Columns 3, 6, 9, and 12 are identical to the specifications reported in table 4 in the paper

**Table A6** attempts to quantifying whether there is an anticipation effect whereby people, having drawn their lottery number and learned whether they will enter or not, will change their behavior. To do this we have performed a “reduced form” estimate where we regress crime on a dummy indicating whether people have drawn a lottery number in decile 1-4 in the draft lottery number distribution. We have then made an event analysis where we measure the effect relative to the time of the draft lottery. We have followed the same approach as for constructing table 5 in the paper: We compare observations for people who have participated in the draft lottery with observations for people who have not. For example, for estimating the first year effect we pick all observations for individuals aged 18-20, classify observations for individuals who participate in the lottery in a given year and draw a low lottery number (decile 1-4) as treatment group observations and observations for people who have not yet participated in the draft lottery or who have drawn a high lottery number (decile 5-10) as control group observations. We control for year fixed effects as well as the baseline characteristics that were also used in the estimations underlying the results presented in table 5 in the paper. We only present estimates for  $t-1$ ,  $t$ ,  $t+1$  and  $t+2$ , where  $t$  is the draft lottery year. The background for doing this is that in order to learn about anticipation effects we need to estimate the effect of having attended the draft lottery (and drawn a low number) but without yet having entered service. As we move forward the fraction of people who enter service increases sharply, and when we move past three periods following the draft lottery, most people have entered service, and we are then not estimating anticipation effects. We estimate two versions. In the first version we include all observations. In the second set of estimates we exclude observations pertaining to individuals who have started doing service. In both cases, the effects are insignificant at any of the points in time relative to the lottery date. These results suggest that anticipation effects are not important for criminal activity. Table A6 is referenced in footnote

14 in the paper.

**Appendix table A6. Property crime and time since draft lottery, 18-20 year olds, youth offenders**

	1-year before	1st year	2nd year	3rd year
All	-0.022 (-0.59)	-0.023 (-1.01)	-0.018 (-0.77)	-0.025 (-1.11)
Without persons enrolled	-0.022 (-0.59)	-0.017 (-0.72)	0.009 (0.26)	-0.022 (-0.65)
No. of observations	1132	2023	1250	1033
No. of eligible	320	363	363	362
No. persons enrolled	0	52	318	384
Share of non-eligible enrolled	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.28

Notes: Each parameter estimate is an estimate from a separate regression using the same control variables as in Table 4 and year dummies. *t*-statistics are given in parenthesis. These are clustered at the person level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

A critical assumption underlying the estimates presented in table 5 in the paper is that the timing of entry is unrelated to the unobserved factors determining crime. To assess whether this assumption is likely to be critical for the results we have split the sample into two groups; those who enter service while aged 19-20 and those who enter service while aged 21-22. The results are presented in **table A7**. Across the different entry ages we find the same overall pattern as in table 5. Splitting the sample generally leaves the parameters less precisely estimated. However, the results do not indicate that the parameter estimates presented in table 5 are driven by any particular age of entry. This table is referenced in footnote 15 in the paper.

**Appendix table A7. Property crime and time since military enrollment for 19-22 years, youth offenders, aged 19-20 and 21-22**

Enrollment age	2-years before	1-year before	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year	6th year	7th year	8th year
19-20 years	-0.095 (-1.00)	-0.14 (-1.32)	-0.198* (-1.76)	-0.108 (-1.39)	-0.038 (-0.57)	-0.113** (-2.02)	-0.081 (-1.38)	-0.042 (-0.68)	-0.051 (-0.92)	-0.001 (-0.02)
21-22 years	-0.235 (-1.18)	0.012 (0.09)	-0.139 (-1.21)	-0.195** (-2.10)	-0.235** (-2.51)	-0.126 (-1.26)	-0.081 (-0.81)	0.015 (0.16)	0.169* (1.75)	0.142 (1.43)
No. observations:										
19-20 years	968	1847	1848	1575	1467	1420	1389	1374	1366	1354
21-22 years	1567	1295	1294	1250	1221	1206	1198	1189	1184	1178

Notes: Each parameter estimate is an estimate from a separate regression using the same control variables as in Table 3 and time dummies. *t*-statistics are given in parenthesis. These are clustered at the person level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

**Table A8** presents results from regressions of entry age on the baseline characteristics. The purpose is to assess whether there is systematic selection with respect to the age at which people enter military service. The age of entry is naturally related to the age at which people have attended the draft lottery. However, for youth-offenders there appears to be no strong association between entry age and baseline characteristics. For non-offending youths the entry age is linked to education and educational background, i.e. the education of the parents, test score, and living in Copenhagen. This table is referenced in footnote 15 in the paper.

**Appendix table A8. Explaining the enrollment age for persons enrolled**

	Youth offenders	Non-offending youths
Draft age 19	0.948*** (6.03)	0.944*** (20.10)
Draft age 20	1.930*** (9.92)	1.914*** (32.87)
Draft age 21	3.080*** (11.19)	2.911*** (36.09)
Draft age 22 or older	2.227*** (4.66)	2.168*** (16.17)
Education, 1981: High-school, dummy	0.329 (1.12)	0.023 (0.40)
Education, 1981: Vocational education, dummy	-0.18 (-1.42)	-0.197*** (-5.39)
Parent has vocational education, 1981, dummy	-0.029 (-0.27)	0.114*** (3.23)
Parent has short-term higher education, 1981, dummy	-0.247 (-1.09)	0.339*** (3.34)
Parent has long-term higher education, 1981, dummy	0.179 (0.84)	0.087 (1.58)
Weight in kilograms/10, at examination	-0.130* (-1.74)	-0.016 (-0.78)
Height in centimeters/10, at examination	0.151 (1.40)	-0.035 (-1.07)
Living in Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	-0.009 (-0.07)	0.113** (2.15)
Living in large city other than Copenhagen, 1981, dummy	2.08 (1.46)	0.35 (1.64)
Living in rural area, 1981, dummy	-0.176* (-1.70)	-0.004 (-0.10)
Received social assistance benefits, 1980, dummy	-0.666 (-1.63)	0.023 (0.13)
Test score from examination, standardized	0.016 (0.20)	0.090*** (4.59)
Test score from examination, standardized, squared	-0.043 (-0.98)	0.014 (0.93)
Has criminal brother aged 18-20 years in 1980-1981, dummy	-0.047 (-0.46)	0.005 (0.08)
Has criminal brother aged 21-25 years in 1980-1981, dummy	-0.194 (-1.33)	0.075 (0.80)
Non-cohabiting parents, 1981, dummy	-0.134 (-1.25)	-0.019 (-0.38)
R-squared	0.389	0.334
No. of observations	408	4135

Notes: Robust t-statistics in parenthesis. \* p<0.10, \*\* p<=0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01



**Table A9** presents results from estimating equation (2) for the subsample of individuals who are not youth offenders. Generally, both OLS and 2SLS estimates are small in size and insignificant, and we conclude that military service does not have any effect on property crime for non-offending youths. For violent crimes, there seems to be a negative first year effect for non-offending youths, but the effect is very small and only significant at the ten percent level in the 2SLS estimation. This table is referenced in connection with the description of the results in table 5.

**Appendix table A9. Crime relative to time of military service for non-offending youths aged 19-22**

	2-years before	1-year before	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year	6th year	7th year	8th year
Property Crime										
OLS	0.002 (0.68)	0.003 (0.92)	0.003 (0.96)	0.002 (0.55)	0.001 (0.47)	0.003 (1.05)	0.001 (0.53)	0.001 (0.55)	0.005** (-2.43)	-0.001 (-0.66)
2SLS	0.019 (1.31)	0.012 (1.00)	0.009 (0.79)	0.015 (1.61)	0.008 (1.05)	0.010 (1.47)	0.004 (0.58)	0.006 (0.86)	-0.005 (-0.83)	-0.004 (-0.78)
Violent Crime										
OLS	0.001 (0.52)	-0.001 (-0.63)	-0.002** (-2.50)	0.000 (-0.13)	0.002 (1.57)	0.001 (0.70)	0.000 (0.39)	0.000 (0.23)	-0.002* (-1.78)	0.002 (1.47)
2SLS	0.000 (0.02)	0.000 (-0.10)	-0.007* (-1.85)	-0.001 (-0.45)	0.002 (0.60)	0.000 (-0.07)	-0.002 (-0.96)	0.002 (0.83)	0.002 (0.69)	0.006** (2.03)
No. of observations	28,986	36,281	36,271	32,961	31,268	30,487	30,030	29,770	29,585	29,435
No. treated	3,061	3,818	3,825	3,820	3,809	3,805	3,792	3,772	3,756	3,743

Notes: Each parameter estimate is an estimate from a separate regression using the same control variables as in Table 4 and year dummies. t-statistics are given in parenthesis. These are clustered at the person level. \* p<0.10. \*\* p<0.05. \*\*\* p<0.01

