Speaker 1: 00:00 A bit, but anything else that you wanted to make sure that we covered that we, we

Speaker 2: 00:04 talk to [inaudible]?

Speaker 3: 00:06 Um, no, no, I think, I think the stuff that I sent along is probably okay. It's a every week we cover a lot in that.

Speaker 1: 00:12 I think that's probably unfair. All right, good. And then you, oh, go ahead.

Speaker 3: 00:18 So quick question. When you ask them where they don't want to talk about, what can you do people give you?

Speaker 1: 00:25 So we have had some authors who have gone and done a ton of these and they just go, you know, hired everybody this, right? And so here you go. Well fine, we don't need to talk about that. I mean, Annie Duke was, you know, everybody, she did the *Thinking in Bets* in the, in the beginning programmer. That was the story about the Seattle Seahawks decision to throw on the two yard line in the Superbowl that got intercepted. And that was the beginning of her. And we always talk about that and I'm just kind of tired of talking about that. So that's, that's an example, right?

Speaker 2: 00:59 That Madden politics volunteers comes up a bunch. Yeah. With our guests, whether they're from the u s or abroad, um, you know, politics, dominate conversations and they're just like, I don't want to go there. Yeah,

Speaker 3: 01:11 okay. That's fair. All right, fair.

Speaker 1: 01:14 All right. So yeah,

Speaker 3: 01:15 nothing, nothing really.

Speaker 1: 01:17 Okay. So we do, we do a long format, so we go down different rabbit holes if you've listened to the show at all, you know, sometimes we go way off topic on various different things and we just follow wherever we want to go. And then we always start off with a speed round, so we'll start with a quick speed round or basically, hey, do you like coffee or tea kind of thing. And then you can go, oh yeah, whatever that is answer quick and then we'll come back in and um, do that. And

Speaker 2: 01:43 anything else, Tim, I'm looking over at, I know we're, we're, we will definitely talk about music though. All right. We will,

Speaker 3:	01:50	I love that. That's great.
Speaker 1:	01:52	We'll talk about at that point I'll, I'll zone out, so, okay. All right.
Speaker 2:	01:58	All right then. Alex, you and I can have a good conversation at that point. Okay. So let's, uh, let's get started with the speed round.
Speaker 1:	02:13	Alright. Alex bike or Unicycle?
Speaker 3:	02:16	A bike.
Speaker 2:	02:18	Okay. Electric Guitar or Acoustic Guitar.
Speaker 3:	02:21	Oh, that's so hard. Um, acoustic for practice. Electric for performances.
Speaker 1:	02:28	Oh, good, good answer. All right. If you had to live life without a phone or a laptop,
Speaker 2:	02:36	which would you choose
Speaker 3:	02:42	Phone?
Speaker 1:	02:43	That was, that was a stressed component there.
Speaker 3:	02:48	My, my lizard brain was like, keep the phone, keep the phone. And at that point I was like, I shouldn't keep the phone. So that's, that's probably a, yeah. Get rid of the phone. Don't satisfied with your bread.
Speaker 2:	03:00	Yeah. We've got a funny story from Danny up in higher hammer on that when he said he was sort of forced to live without a phone for awhile and after he came back from living without a phone, he was like, I don't need it. I can actually do without it, which was pretty cool. Okay. Last, last sweet run. Prison recidivism. Uh, is it a result of primarily a result of new crimes or rule violations?
Speaker 3:	03:25	Ooh, technically it's new crimes, but they, they basically compete 50, 50, so I think it's like 48% technical violations. 52% new crimes.
Speaker 2:	03:35	All right. So let's dig that a little bit. Because you are on a project that is all about, uh, helping reduce that recidivism into the prison system. So you want to talk a little bit about what that is? Just kind of give the listeners a big picture overview.

Speaker 3:	03:52	Yeah. So big picture overview. Uh, [inaudible] we have a, a very big criminal justice system. A lot of people are incarcerated. We have, we are the most incarcerated country in the world. Give about 2.3 million people, uh, in the, in the prison and in jail system right now. Um, but what I think a lot of people don't recognize is that are our corrections system is actually about 6.6 billion people and about 4.5, sorry, a million people in about 4.5 million of those individuals. Yeah, that was a very big number.
Speaker 2:	04:22	I was going to say in jail. It's crazy. It's crazy.
Speaker 3:	04:30	Um,
Speaker 2:	04:32	yeah,
Speaker 3:	04:33	being supervised in the community. So, um, we have, uh, about, um, uh, about three, three and a half million people under community supervision in probation. So that's, you know, people who didn't go to prison but were sentenced to community supervision and then another 800,000 that are on parole, which is a, a post release supervision. And what's kind of wilds the considers that, you know, I think that we as a country recognize that incarceration is not just problematic from a social justice standpoint, but also really expensive and much more expensive than some of these other options. Um, and it causes a lot of trauma for individuals who have to go through the incarcerated system. So we prefer to be able to keep them in community and help them out through that process. ==What we find is ironically, the, the supervisory system is actually one of the largest contributors to incarceration that [inaudible] nationally about 45% of all new entrance to prison comes through the supervisory system. And so if we're really serious about trying to reduce the number of people that we incarcerate, um, we should be focusing very much in trying to improve outcomes for those individuals who are under community supervision.==
Speaker 2:	05:48	So tell us about the supervisory system. Can you give us a little more detail about what the supervisory system is?
Speaker 3:	05:57	Yeah, so, so basically, uh, when, when someone is either put on probation or parole, they have a set of conditions that they need to meet. And these are things like certain number of meetings with a parole or probation officer. Maybe they have curfew requirements, maybe they have to do drug testing on a regular basis. But there are also other sorts of conditions such as not interacting with people who have prior criminal records. It may require going to various sorts of treatment, um, and, and

basically maintaining what we would consider to be a good stable law abiding life with some physicians. But on top of you, um, and for some individuals, this requires a lot of checking in with your probation and parole officer and a lot of oversight. But for a lot of individuals, you're sort of put into this system, uh, you may have consequences for either abiding or not abiding, but you don't really have a lot of people paying attention to you or providing you support. And that's a, that's one of the key problems right now as a system.

Speaker 4: 06:54 And so you're working on a program to, to help with some of that. So I'll explain a little bit about that program and what you're, what you're trying to do.

Speaker 3: 07:01 Yeah. So one of the things that we know is that we can, we can help reduce the likelihood that people will go either into the, the prison system or get kind of trapped in the criminal justice system by engaging them with programs and services that can address some of the needs that they have and some of the risks that they may face in community. Um, so as you can imagine, a lot of people who are involved in the criminal justice system go in because they may have a, they may be facing poverty or other sorts of conditions of scarcity. They have, may have mental health issues. They may have substance abuse issues, they may have past trauma that is causing them to have behavioral issues better, better, sort of unaddressed. Um, and in, in, in the context of they were in before. A lot of these things are not really addressed by their community or, or by the, the, the sort of context around them. Um, and once they're in the criminal justice system, unfortunately a lot of people still don't have a lot of those needs and risks managed or appropriately met.

Speaker 4: 08:03 Yes.

Speaker 3: 08:03 We're really trying to do, yeah, go ahead.

Speaker 4: 08:05 Well, no, this is a really interesting aspect because you mentioned about getting trapped into the system. So I'm, I'm, I'm curious if you could talk more about how you, you, you mentioned a variety of things that are, uh, are reasons why people get into, uh, the [inaudible] system, how they become incarcerated in the first place. And tell us more about the, the trap. How do, how is it that people are unable to get out of it?

Speaker 3: 08:29 Yeah. So, you know, I'm a, as a behavioral scientist, practicing behavioral scientists who I think very much about what motivates the behaviors that we see. And oftentimes what this

==really comes down to is that your context, the environment that you're in, that social reality, that political reality, that economic reality is going to very much impact the decisions and actions that you take.== And so you can imagine if someone who, who comes from an environment where, uh, their needs are not being met, they're under these, these economic conditions of scarcity be psychological conditions of scarcity and also facing potential trauma, that they're very likely gonna put themselves in positions where they may have to commit a crime or do something that that is not okay in order to survive or, or meet some other needs that they have in that environment. Um, and in some sense it's just a coping mechanism.

Speaker 3:	09:15	You know, if we're, we're under some economic duress and we have to feed our children, we're going to be more likely to steal something to do that than we are to, to, you know, try to get a job. Can I take a much longer period of time? Um, and so what we find is that yeah, you're coming from that situation, you go into the incarcerated system, um, or you've put on supervision and yeah, either you face even greater trauma or are put under in positions now under this situation that you're already facing a lot of serious resources and, and increased need, um, that people will return back to those environments and, and continue to basically do the things that they had done before. Um, so without intervention, that context, listen, change, if that context doesn't change, then people are going to very likely continue to exhibit the behaviors that we see.
Speaker 1:	10:03	And so is there, so what is the solution to this? What are you working on to try to, uh, stop that re recidivism and that kind of being stuck in that trap of going around and around and being stuck in the context that you just talked about?
Speaker 3:	10:20	Yeah, so in, in mostly urban environments. I mean, I think that the, the rural challenges a is a separate issue and something that really needs to be thought about with this sort of greater, greater depth and sensitivity. But, um, in, in urban environments and a lot of cities, there are community based organizations, there are service providers, human service providers that can help to address some of the needs and risks that people face in their environment. I mean, literally helping people get jobs, helping people to manage their, their substance abuse issues, be able to exhibit more prosocial psychotic psychological behaviors. So, you know, not getting, uh, angry very quickly or managing your emotions when you're having an interaction with someone that isn't going to what you expected to. Um, and, and these have been proven to reduce

		the likelihood that people go back into the incarcerated system and go back into criminal justice system, right?
Speaker 3:	11:11	Because they're addressing those underlying needs that create the instability in the first place. Um, but what we also find is that a lot of folks, I'm either coming out of prison or even in supervision, aren't connected with those programs and services despite having significant needs. And so what this intervention does is it reduces a lot of the search process, helps people identify programs and services that they can take, can take advantage of, and then uses what's called an implementation intention framework. Really helping people to make plans and commitments around engaging with those programs and services in the future to increase the likelihood that they'll then follow through. So the whole hope here is not only are weak helping people identify programs, but then identifying them and then providing some nudges along the way, we can help them over the long term and then receive the maximum benefit they can get from, from those programs and services.
Speaker 1:	11:58	We just, we interviewed Roger Dooley has a new book coming out called friction, right? So basically you're talking about reducing the friction of being able to get these services, uh, and, and make sure that people are using them appropriately. So it sounds really fascinating from that perspective, you know, um, the other interesting piece, you talked about implementation, uh, components of that. The, the, if this blank happens, then I will be doing, are you using basically if
Speaker 4:	12:26	and so as you're working through some of these.
Speaker 3:	12:28	So, so thankfully, no, I think that those are, it's sort of a state attitude about this. So folks like **Todd Rogers** and **Katie Milkman** have done a really great job of expanding how we think about these implementation intentions.
	Kurt	And the real basic components are, uh, you have a plan in place, you have a trigger event that happens and then you implement that plan when that trigger occurs, if then framework is really helpful. It's saying, if this occurs, then do this. Right?
	Alex	And so it's super explicit. Um, but oftentimes the triggers that we want to have in our environments, maybe things that we have to kind of make up or describe on our own or, or provide to an individual at that moment when they're supposed to be taking action. So a lot of what we're really trying to focus on is helping people decide about a behavior that they want to exhibit in the future and then delivering some sort of either

==reminder or notification or something. At the appropriate time to trigger that action that they're then going to take.== Um, but again, it's super, it's super being very concrete about saying, I intend to do this at this time, this way, and you know, when I deliver this message, I'm going to then go ahead and actually follow through with that intention.

Speaker 4:	13:32	Yeah. I, I was, uh, I'm gonna make sure that the BSBA paper that, uh, uh, Todd and Katie wrote is in our show in our, uh, episode links because it's really a great paper and it really gets into this, the, the nuances of, of, of taking if you know then or if, and really breaking it down into more situational things. And I really liked the way you talked about how you're looking at it from an urban, you're, you're trying to, uh, solve this problem on an urban level and, uh, are sort of pushing off in saying the, um, the more rural side really is going to revolve around a whole separate different set of circumstances. And another set of problems, um, is that when think about just the, the people who are coming out of the, of the, or the system or they're coming into parole if they live in an urban environment versus a rural environment.
Speaker 3:	14:23	So say that again. I think I missed the question.
Speaker 4:	14:25	So you're, you're, so you're, you're saying that that the rural versus urban issues are potentially significantly different.
Speaker 3:	14:34	So the big difference is simply that in, in the same way that we have food deserts in some portions of cities, um, a lot of these rural environments have sort of service provider deserts in the sense that, you know, while there may be a job placement program that exists in New York or readily available abuse treatment programs, those sorts of things may not exist in, in a, in a rural environment, in the middle of the country. And so what we find is that when people are going back, there's literally no systems of supports. Um, even sort of traditional systems of supports. Like, for instance, church or religious organization may not be well set up to be able to provide the kinds of services necessary. Um, and so, you know, we, we do have a very different kind of challenge. Um, we have a hypothesis about wishes that the same kind of implementation intention framework can be helpful, but we have to be very clear about what kinds of options people have, what sorts of plans that they can take on when, you know, for instance, you have a craving but you have no AA meeting that you can go to or if you have a, you know, a moment of anger, um, but you haven't been able to go through a facilitated anger management program.

Speaker 3:	15:41	Um, and, and that's something that we're beginning to think about. And actually this, this ties potentially really nicely with some of the work that a crime lab and U Chicago and, and people like [inaudible] are doing and working on, which is really looking at it. How do you help people, um, become more situationally aware. And how do you then use that situational awareness to be able to facilitate some of these implementation intentions?
Speaker 4:	16:06	How long has a Virgil been up and running?
Speaker 3:	16:10	So we're, we're at the very early stages of this. Um, we, we sort of actually, it's sort of a weird, disjointed, longest story, but we began this work back in 2013, um, in South Africa. We were under contract, ideas42 was under contract by, uh, the, the premier of the Western Cape to try to do a number of pieces of work within and around Cape Town, one of which was trying to reduce crime and violence and some of the townships around Cape Town. Around 2010 or so, there was a big uptick in violent crime within some of the townships. And this was the first time that this level of violence, it didn't seen posted apartheid. And so it was a really big deal and people were trying to figure out why this was happening and what we could do about it. Um, we did some work to better understand the decisions and actions that were leading to the violent crimes that we were seeing.
Speaker 3:	17:00	And you know, we found some really interesting sort of pieces of evidence that helped us to, to make more sense of that situation. One was that most of the violent crime that we were seeing, both the victims and the perpetrators themselves were quite young. So within that kind of 16 to 24 year old range. But we also found is that a lot of the crimes were happening during very specific times of the week and during very specific times of the day. So we find that the majority of these activities were occurring on nights and weekends. Um, and, and oftentimes when we, when we did a little bit more investigation, we found that they were actually happening in very localized places that as well. Um, and so, okay, when we, when we chatted with some of the youth who were involved in gangs or I'm involved in these sorts of environments, something they would tell us is that they would go to what they call these ship beans, which are informal, where people might be doing drugs or just hanging out.
Speaker 3:	17:53	There may be prostitution. It's not a very desirable place to go, but it's just where you showed up when you were a kid because you knew that you might be able to see your friends. And it was just a social environment. Um, but at the same time it was the

sort of place where under the cover of darkness, in the context of strangers, opportunistic crime would happen. Uh, what we also recognize was that there was no real distinction between a perpetrator and victim that often the perpetrators were victims at one point. And sometimes those victims have perpetrated before. Um, and really the, the nature of the crime was much more opportunistic than anything else. And again, like you can imagine this, right? You're in a situation where someone has money out and because they took money out in the public space, you're going to take it from them.

| Speaker 3: | 18:36 | Uh, had the money not been there, had maybe there've been more people around paying attention. You may not have taken that action. And, and really what we recognized was that a lot of the crimes that we were seeing were happening because of these sort of automatic moments. Yeah. Elizabeth has this great quote that if you were to yeah, t change just 10 seconds of decision making for someone, that could have been the difference between them committing a crime or not committing a crime. And so we took this to recognize that we had an opportunity to help people get away from these environments. And that was really the key insight that is you recognize that some of these, these moments are very contextual, that you go to this place at this certain time of the day under the cover of darkness in the context of strangers and crime occurs. |

| Speaker 3: | 19:22 | That if you can remove people from those environments to where those sorts of situational factors may not be nearly as much as at play, you might be able to help them to reduce the likelihood that they're going to either become a victim or victimized somebody. And so we built a tool understanding that people were often defaulting to these locations, right? They weren't really thinking about it. There was no deliberative plan that was going on. And instead what we did is we created a tool that would help them too, identify alternative choices. So expand their choice set. And then when they found something that they wanted to do, they'd be able to go through this implementation intention framework, making a decision about when it would happen, where it would happen, what things they might need to be able to facilitate it, and then to invite their friends as a form of additional commitment. |

| Speaker 3: | 20:03 | Um, and we implemented this as a sort of small RCT pilot, um, with some youth who were involved in it. You can appointment program through the Western Cape. And what we found was that the youth who used our tool as opposed to being just told about crime statistics and their community exhibited lower rates, it's self-reported, binds you lower rates of crime and |

violence, uh, and also felt safer during the week. Um, and so we took this insight and then tried to bring it to the United States, which is where a lot of this work now began. Very cool.

Speaker 4: 20:36 That is just absolutely terrific. So that was the, um, that was the catalyst to get you thinking about, well, let's bring it back to the United States and do something, but instead of a, but you are applying it in this parole environment and the supervision model. Uh, and uh, okay. So let's get back to, uh, how far you are at rolling it out. So, uh, I love you sort of, where are you, where are you?

Speaker 3: 20:59 We've spent the last year doing a lot of research here in New York and other places around the country to really better understand how well the insights from, from Cape Town map onto the context that we're seeing here in the United States. Um, one of the other things that we tried to do initially was very similar to Cape Town Focus, this intervention on youth. Um, but what we found in doing a deployment was that youth were not really interested in safety strategies. You know, what we were doing was basically providing them diversions that they could take advantage of, most of which were municipally provided. So, you know, library programs or public parks programs or something along those lines. And kids have substitutes, which are way better than what we were able to provide in the form of their friends or Facebook or whatever. It happens though outside of that. So, you know, really what we were dealing with was undesirable problem.

Speaker 3: 21:47 That the options that we were providing just weren't great. Um, and it caused us to take a step back and try to make sense of, you know, where else might we be able to apply this idea and make it more impactful and effective. And we thought about folks who would have a stronger intention to take on these sorts of programs and services. We're really looking for strategies to help them stabilize and keep themselves safe. One of the frameworks that we use at ideas42 actually I don't think I even introduced what I did is pretty to is, so

Speaker 4: 22:18 let's do that. Let's for those listeners who don't know who ideas42 is, tell us a little bit about this wonderful organization.

Speaker 3: 22:25 Sure. So I, I have before all this virtual stuff, I've been working as a vice president for an organization called ideas42 ideas, 42 as a behavioral science nonprofit, we're based in New York with a few offices around the country and actually a burgeoning office hopefully in India soon. And what we do is we apply insights from behavioral science through a design methodology to help

basically help organizations, governments, other service providers tweak their program and service offerings to help improve the likelihood that their end users are going to exhibit the behaviors that they ultimately want them to. Um, again, it's a social good organization. We do a lot of this work and things like the environment and social justice, uh, personal finance, that kind of stuff. Um, but one of the things that we always look towards, uh, and to get around the criticism that we're, you know, sort of a mind manipulators is that we really try to focus on what we called intention action gaps. So the idea is that

Speaker 3:	23:22	people might have an intention to do something. We see that they don't actually exhibit that behavior in real life. And so we ask ourselves what might be going on in the context that's reducing the likelihood that someone's going to follow through on this. Um, and so, uh, this is helpful because what it means is that we're really just helping people to follow through and the things they want to follow through on and not motivating decisions that they wouldn't take on. **Um, there are some times where we have to play with perception because sometimes people have clear misperception, which might be motivating the behaviors that we see**. Uh, but where there's no misperception, it's usually some engineering problem within their environment. There really needs to be a solid four. Um, yes,
Speaker 1:	24:01	people you're, you're, you're actually helping them achieve what they wanna achieve. Yeah. Hold on just a second. Yeah, I can make your phone. Sounds like it's not now. It is. There we go. Sorry. All right. We'll probably, oh man, that's okay. There we go. Yeah. Okay. So let's see. Where should we pick up here? Um, we'll edit intention, the intention, action gap. Let's, let's, let's, *let's pick up there*. So talk to you about, yeah,
Speaker 3:	24:34	we focus on this as an organization, but it was something that I was able to use when trying to evaluate where this, this intervention, this virtual intervention might be most effective. So as I said, you know, you didn't have a strong intention to take on safety strategies. Um, and so trying to solve that by filling in the intention action gap or creating a little engineering a change wasn't really going to do very much. Um, but we did want to find a population. We did have a strong intention to take on these safety strategies and we identified the reentry population is actually being one that was facing actually very similar contexts to these youth, but would have taken because of an experience that they have a very different perspective about what they want to achieve. In the future. And so we then

reoriented this intervention to focus then on people who are coming out of prison in jail, people who are within the criminal justice system. So people who are really trying to not commit crimes in the future, don't want to go back and instead find that stability and continue forward. I'm understanding again that there's a lot of context in the environment that they're in that makes it hard for them to do that.

Kurt: 25:40 You talked about that, the component that you said, hey, there's that ten second component that can change a person's life. And actually we heard Sendhill Mullianathan often talked about, often talked about, same is working with Cook County jailers. And the jailer actually was the one who said, hey, if I could, if I could snip 30 seconds out of these kids' lives, they wouldn't be in jail the way they are today. And I'm just wondering, so as you're thinking about what you're doing, how do you, how do you get people who are in these situations who might, you know, don't want to go, you know, they've, they've been to jail, they don't want to go back to jail. They want to do everything they are, but they're put back into, as you said, into a context that hey, I'm in that same life. I don't have a job. I don't, you know, I still have to feed my family. You know, my buddies are all out there doing stuff. So how do you take those moments and, and how do you put these safety components in so they don't have those 10 seconds or those 30 seconds in their lives moving forward?

Alex: 26:37 Yeah, no, I mean, this is, this is the, the, uh, preeminent challenge that we're faced with right now. Um, but I think that what we're really trying to focus on is getting people at that critical point. Yeah. The intention is strongest so that they're willing to think about their future selves. So again, right, this is very much thinking about not my present self. They're thinking about my future self, making commitments towards that future self in the future, about things that you're going to take advantage of. And then helping them to then follow through on those things with the big overarching goal being that those things that they take advantage of are interventions that are going to help moderate there. Your emotions help them to find those contexts that are gonna remove them from those situational factors that might trigger those actions that we don't want those ten second actions that we don't want. Okay. Basically reducing the likelihood that those things would occur simply because we're removing them from environments where those things are likely to occur.

Speaker 4: 27:37 So the naysayers would probably claim that people who are coming out of a, of imprisonment and going into the parole

system and then fail really just didn't have the level of commitment or conviction to just do right. And so they deserve to go back. Uh, how, right. What, no, no. Am I, am I misstating? So, uh, so how, how do you, how do you respond to, uh, to the, the naysayers?

Speaker 3:   28:04   Yeah. I mean I, I, I have to say that there are always going to be some people who are going to commit crimes, right? There are always going to be some people who are criminally minded. There are always going to be some people who, you know, in the, in the grit sense, we don't have enough grit to overcome some of the challenges that they face in their environment. [inaudible] are going to be more likely to fail and we may observe that as them not being qualified to stay out, right? But the reality is a lot of the reasons we see people fail are because of things like, I'll just give you a very quick example. Uh, in order to get a job, you have to be able to fill out a W-4. In order to get a W-4, you need to be able to have two forms of identification and one of those forms of identification that you often need in order to get other forms of identification, especially if you don't have any, is a birth certificate.

Speaker 3:   28:54   But I can tell you that not only is it costly to get a birth certificate, but if you were born out of the state that you're in right now, there's very little facilitation to be able to do that. Now you can get some support, but it means going to the right organization and maybe you don't know who that organization is. Right? And so what we're really dealing with is a c and it goes back to how people get trapped. We're going, we're creating. We've created a system where we expect people to be able to figure out how to jump through hoops that they didn't even know existed. And there's no pathway to help describe to them the steps that they can take incrementally to get to those big goals. And so a lot of what we're also doing is helping people like very much describe what those big goals are, but breaking those big goals down into a series of incremental steps that start with things like going into the organization that can help you get your birth certificate. Because if you jumped someone straight to going to a job placement program, they're obviously going to have a very, very difficult time succeeding there. So I think that the people who are claiming that this is a grit problem first look to the environment, understand some of the impossible asks that we're trying to get people to follow through on and then be critical hopefully of the context and the political environment that makes it really hard for people to succeed.

Speaker 1:	30:11	Well, and you talked at the very beginning about you know, the supervise people going back out in the community and some are high touch, but most of them have a have relatively little touch. So they don't have that support. And so what you're doing is saying, hey, we are helping these people understand and work the way through the labyrinth or the maze that is this way of, of trying to move beyond where they were. As you said, jumping through hoops. They didn't even know that existed. So how so help our listeners understand exactly how you're doing that. What are the, what are the touch points that you have with these people in order to help them, you know, get through these hoops?
Speaker 3:	30:51	Yeah. So, so what we've, what we're doing is we're doing an intake initially to understand for each individual what are the risks and needs that you're facing. This helps us to figure out what people might need in their environment and begins the process of directing them. What we then do is help those individuals through a motivational interview process, identify for themselves goals and intentions that they want to set at a broad scale. So these are things like getting a job or, or dealing with my sobriety, um, or being a better father for instance, for my, for my kids. Something along those lines. And based on those goals, what we're, what we are doing is charting what we call pathways. And these are breaking these goals down into again, sets of incremental steps that goes through either government agencies or service providers that can help people meet that step.
Speaker 3:	31:42	And again, it might be something like just going to the benefits office so that you can get healthcare and welfare. So that you have at least some income to support you as you take further steps in the action, uh, for, for a job, uh, for getting a job. It might be directly seeing them to an organization that can help them set up a resume, then directing them to an organization that can provide them with interview clothes and then directing them to an organization that can do job training and placement afterwards. And what we've also baked into this as again, we try to be behavioral because we recognize that failures, even small failures can really derail people. And so we want to in this context, set expectations about where those failures might occur and to help motivate people to persist through them. So one of the sort of cute attributes that we have within the, the job placement a pathway is that we ask people too, yes. Rejection letters that's a, that's a step in the process that we want people to achieve. Because if they don't and they just received one and they consider it to be the end of the process, then they're not going to persist and sending out more. And so

we, we do want to normalize some of the things that can be very painful in this process. Um, but just as a step forward as opposed to some reframe as a step or as opposed to a step back.

| Speaker 2: | 32:51 | I love that reframing a rejection letter as hey, that's expected and actually you should be getting multitudes of their like them all that you do. That's how this works. And for many people, if they haven't ever experienced that, I could see where that, that's a major setback. Wow, I really wanted this job. I got rejected. Now I'm just gonna fall back into my neurosis and depression. And probably not that mad, but well, it's a great way of reframing all the rejection letters we get from people that we asked to be on the podcast that say, no, I think this is going to be, this really helps me. So thank you Alex. |

| Speaker 3: | 33:26 | Or you get the better you're doing. Right. |

| Speaker 2: | 33:28 | Exactly. The one we're asking, so you and all this is it no charge, right? Every, every, everybody gets all this at no charge. Right? |

| Speaker 3: | 33:36 | So the goal is that we're, so this is, this is something that we're beginning to work out right now. Um, right now what we know is, uh, there's a huge cost in the system. So we spend about $6.6 billion a year to supervise the total population under supervision. But this population, yeah. Creates another $9 billion in costs when we incarcerate them. So the failure rates in the, in and of themselves are exceeding in total costs. The amount that we're actually putting into the, the supervisory system in the first place, which means that, you know, we obviously have a problem with that. We're putting our money. The goal here is really trying to get governance and we're seeing this begin to happen. Think about ways where they can make strategic investments that are evidence-based, that are going to produce cost savings in the system, which can then be reallocated towards other investments that could potentially continue to catalyze change. |

| Speaker 3: | 34:25 | And so what we're now seeing across the country is a number of what are called justice reinvestment initiatives. So the, the office of the Bureau of Justice Administration has been providing, uh, grants and other sorts of financial support as well as, as technical support, um, through entities such as the Council of state government, uh, Pew Urban Institute to help state governments understand where those inefficiencies might exist within their existing systems, what policy changes or other sorts of interventions might be helpful in reducing some of those costs and advice about where that cost savings should be |

reinvested to try to help improve outcomes overall. And so what we're really trying to do is capture some percentage of that reinvestment as part of what we consider to be catalyzing factors that can help to reduce the likelihood of people end up recidivating. Um, ==so the business model is really around trying to create savings for states and local government that they can then put back into the system to help continue the snowball effect of improving people's outcomes and long-term livelihoods.==

| Speaker 2: | 35:23 | Yeah. That, that, that is, that is a terrific. Um, and you mentioned the state governments, uh, are, is most of the funding that is coming for a, the supervision system for parolees, is that coming from the or is there |

| Speaker 1: | 35:38 | some that's coming from federal? |

| Speaker 3: | 35:40 | So some is coming from federal, some is coming from budgets within tax, you know, tax allocated budgets. Um, but a fair amount of probation and parole costs, you're actually being paid for by the individuals themselves. Um, and you know, we can talk about whether or not we consider that to be fair or unfair, but the reality is that a lot of revenue for probation and parole departments are coming through what we call just supervisory fees. The things that people are paying on a regular basis in order to finance either the services that they're receiving be a drug testing or something along those lines. Or, or even for those individuals that have electronic monitoring, the GPS or the RF cuffs that they wear on a regular basis. Um, what we're trying to propose, again, you know, we spend twice the amount, more than twice the amount that we're currently spending within the probation and parole system. |

| Speaker 3: | 36:28 | Just incarcerate people that we could probably cover a fair amount of those costs directly through those cost savings. Um, so that we don't actually have to have that financial burden put on individuals. And I know that you guys had a conversation a couple of episodes ago around the psychological impacts of scarcity and I think that this is actually a really important piece of why it's necessary to try to reduce some of the costs for this population. You know, there's this, again, this conversation that asking people to pay for the things that they've done make some sense, but at the same time I would consider being under this and position is pretty costly to begin with. And if you're not really receiving much support, then it's unclear what's the role of the state actually is in trying to improve some of these outcomes. But the reality is, yeah, go ahead. |

Speaker 1:	37:13	Oh, I was just going to say [inaudible], I'm not sure exactly where this research come, but I remember reading it recently where the cognitive ability for people, when they have economic pressures on them has been actually shown to be reduced. And so you're actually looking at this from the perspective of saying, Hey, you're adding a burden onto these people who are probably already in a, in a scarcity mode and you're now adding this whole other aspect that isn't necessarily we, we don't always think about that, right? We don't think about the mental anguish and the, the cognitive impact that a financial component has on people. And so I think it just reiterates what you're talking about, right? So how can we, if our ultimate end goal is to make these people better citizens that are providing, you know, that are, that are working within the communities, providing benefits to the community and not going back into the prison system, isn't it in our best interest to do everything that we can in order to help them?
Speaker 1:	38:14	Um, be that as, as, as you said, yes, there's probably a component that says, hey, you did this. You have to pay some of these costs. That's that kind of, Hey, justice, retribution component. But then if you're looking at the long-term outcome, there's a, there's another aspect of, of framing this, right? Framing it within the community of saying, but we want these people to succeed and we want these people to be successful within the community and within the larger society. And so let's make, let's, let's give them a chance at being able to do this as opposed to, you know, undercutting their feet before they even get a chance.
Speaker 4:	38:51	Yeah. Yeah. I mean,
Speaker 3:	38:53	yeah,
Speaker 4:	38:53	go ahead Alex. Go ahead.
Speaker 3:	38:55	Well, I was just going to say, I think that, you know, as a, as a behavioral scientist, again, you know, I think about how our criminal justice system and how our legal system was created to some degree. ==You know, we, we assume the rational actor model in creating laws in creating, okay. Things like deterrence mechanisms because we assume that it's just a, an economic trade off. But what we don't recognize is that, okay, putting people into this condition, we have really deleterious cognitive effects. [inaudible] it's sort of like cutting people's legs off before we give it an opportunity though to walk or run.== And so I think it's, it's really important for us as we're thinking about, you know, reforming the system or reforming aspects of the

system to not just think about the incentive structure, but also think about what are those contexts that we're putting people into? How is it affecting their ability to make good decisions for themselves? And is it from a, from a purely cost benefit analysis perspective, make sense to do that if we want to achieve better outcomes across the system.

Speaker 4:   39:53   Yeah. That is so great. I mean, it, it to go back to a, to go back to, uh, the beginnings of our, our legal system based on the rational agent model. Wow. That's, we could spend an hour on that. And as much as I would like to, I also want to talk about music.

Speaker 3:   40:16   Sure.

Speaker 4:   40:17   That's sure. Hell yes, I mean,

Speaker 3:   40:21   heck yeah. Heck yes. For sure.

Speaker 4:   40:23   You, uh, so, uh, you are a musician. You're, you, you're a songwriter. You not only write just songs, but you have written songs about behavioral biases.

Speaker 3:   40:36   I mean, what better subject matter to be able to write?

Speaker 4:   40:39   Okay.

Speaker 1:   40:40   Aren't, aren't all a song. Somehow related to some sort of human condition element that you're, that we're dealing with. I mean every love song ever written, it's all about, it's about that emotional component, you know, pretty much every country song has, you know, lost or something in it. So I lost my dog, I lost my [inaudible]. Got this. Loss aversion elements. Amen.

Speaker 3:   41:07   Solicit.

Speaker 4:   41:11   So, so, uh, I have to ask you, you do have, uh, a song called I am my own contextual feature. I'm going to bring it up. I know that it's in demo form. You haven't finalized a recording of it, but you were generous enough to share the lyrics with us. And I mean this is just spot on man. You are just, you are just, you are driving it home on the, on the behavioral side and say with this thing

Speaker 1:   41:34   I love.

Speaker 3:	41:36	So the, yeah, I mean we tried to, I tried to, so I wrote this on, we do a a a company retreat every year and I've felt like, you know, why not, right? A great behavioral, something for our company retreat because we have, we did this talent show, just be fun. But I also wanted to not just embed some really classical notions of behavioral science and some of the cool insights that we found, but also this sort of lament that the practitioner has because of course, you know, we know we're supposed to know better then everybody else about what our biases are and that we can overcome them and how to overcome them. ==But the irony is that, oh, we often even despite that knowledge, get in our own way because we don't go the extra mile to design those solutions around ourselves.== Right. So you know, we, we know how to solve the problem, but again, we are on contextual feature and it becomes a problem for us. Practitioners are often focused on solving other people's problems as opposed to our own.
Speaker 1:	42:33	Exactly. I'm going to, I'm going to read just with one of my favorite lyrics from this. All right. So I, this is not singing, that's not my forte. So true. Good. Thank you. Tim. Give me one or two jam jars of jam to pick and I'll pick them just like a pro, but give me 10 or 20 or more. And you'll see, I'll stick with my status quo. I mean, if you're taking this famous study, shout out to Sheena, ain't God. I love it. And it's so true. I mean, we know that we know that if we go into that, that supermarket that hey, it shouldn't matter. I mean actually give me more choice because I know that that ultimately economically speaking, I should, I should like that. Right? But we know that that also inhibits me actually making a choice cause it's just cognitive overload, yet we don't overcome that ourselves. So. So would you say that a behavioral scientists are more or less affected by the GI Joe Effect?
Speaker 3:	43:37	Oh, this is, this is an effect I'm not aware of. Yes. Tell me about this.
Speaker 1:	43:42	Laurie Santos, um, came up with this was where she's basing it on this idea that we, um, that at the end of the GI Joe episodes, the cartoons, GI Joe would say, Hey, now you know, and knowing is half the battle. And she says, that's bullshit. Knowing is not even close to half the battle because you'd know, doesn't help, you know.
Speaker 3:	44:07	Well, it's something, I mean, we talked about this a lot when it comes to things like financial education or education generally, right? We know that you can, you can increase someone's knowledge of something, but that doesn't necessarily mean that

it's going to affect [inaudible] behavior. And again, it comes back to the same thing. If you don't change the context that they're in, you're probably not going to motivate them to have a change in their behavior either. But they will be much more about their own biases

Speaker 1:   44:34   and, and there'll be able to talk them around their biases. Right? Oh, exactly how it works for me because I know it. So getting back to music, what's on your playlist these days?

Speaker 3:   44:49   Oh, I mean it's been, unfortunately, it's mostly been really chill music, uh, through like Apple's chill playlist or something like that, if I need to listen to basically ambient noise when I'm, when I'm doing work. Um, but outside of that I listened to a lot of like chocolate calea music and I grew up, uh, my mother's a Jamaican, so I grew up listening to a lot of reggae and I love that stuff. Um, yeah, it's mostly kind of world Afro Diaspora, jazz pop kind of stuff.

Speaker 1:   45:24   All right. We have to ask, because we actually have an episode that we recorded but it hasn't been published yet where we're talking about using music as is, does it detract from you working or does it enhance your working? So do you, when you are working, do you, you said you have the ambient kind of chill music in the background. Do you find that that helps in your creative and in your, your, your, your work process or Tim can't have music going on? I am similar to you. I like to have some background. Again, I just can't have lyrics that I start to sing along with. I need kind of just um, EDM or some, you know, just music that doesn't have lyrics or at least lyrics. I don't know.

Speaker 3:   46:08   I'm going to do that gross researcher thing where I say it depends.

Speaker 1:   46:14   Okay.

Speaker 3:   46:16   Um, so yeah, I believe, at least for me, um, it depends on what I'm doing, right? So if I'm sitting there and I'm doing research or writing or need to just think really concretely about something, I need to listen to something that's not going to be intrusive and that's also going to drown out all the other stuff. It might be going on around the, I try to create that cognitive Kendall cause I got super important for doing the focus work. If I'm doing design or creative or some sort of ideation type stuff, I try to find music that's up neat and interesting and fun and motivating. And if I'm trying to work out then I'm probably going to do something that's a little bit harder. Maybe that's when the metal comes out or, or you know, some dance music

or something along those lines. But really, you know, it really depends on the context.

Speaker 1:	46:59	Oh, context matters. Okay. Context matters. But I love this. I, I didn't really didn't know that you come from that you're half Jamaica and that is just so cool. Uh, so for those listeners who think of reggae as Bob Marley and that, that's the beginning and end of their reggae lexicon, help us, you know, give us some recommendations on artists that you think would be really good to check out.
Speaker 3:	47:22	Ooh. So, uh, I'm a huge Desmond Decker fan if you're down for some ska stuff. So I don't know if people know the, where reggae comes from and how it sits in this whole sort of, you know, a history of Jamaican music.
Speaker 2:	47:35	Be Good. This is, yeah, we can go through it.
Speaker 3:	47:38	So, so back in the 90s, teen, let's say forties and 50s, in Jamaica there was music called Minto music, which is a, it's, it's folky as it gets. You'd have like maybe a banjo player in someone with just a, it's something similar to a, um, a cuff on. Uh, maybe you would have a guitar player as well, right. So very, very sort of basic folky stuff. Um, and it sounded kind of like, um, this mix between what, what we would sort of think about is ska with the same kind of lyricism as early blues music in the United States. So it's this very kind of salt of the earth sort of stuff. Um, and then what happened was mental music turned into what we call rock steady, uh, which is a more upbeat version, a little bit more electric. And then rock steady evolved into what we consider to be ska, which then became reggae.
Speaker 3:	48:29	So reggae is a sort of slowed down, much more routine version of ska. Ska was very upbeat, um, but, uh, Desmond Decker was one of the sort of foremost influencers within the genre. And it's just, it's great music. And I think that if you, if you're familiar with stuff like from the Toots and the Maytals as well, that's, that's sort of very traditional Ska music. Um, but the reggae stuffs, you know, uh, Bob I would consider to be probably frankly I think about them as more of a pop musician than anything else, but he does very much embody, uh, what we would consider to be kind of roots reggae. Um, and if we're thinking about more modern stuff, I mean like again, Japan generally skip over dance hall because there's a lot of both really great music but also like very toxic stuff. It goes on and downfall.

Speaker 3:	49:15	Um, and, and now there's this new revolution called roots revival music, which is irregular revival, which is being basically brought forward by a younger, much more liberal, much more forward thinking group of, of musicians in Jamaica. And, um, one who I'm really excited about is this, this young woman named coffee, a k o, f, f, e, e, and she is, I think she's like 17 or something like that, but she is one of the most impressive artists on the scene right now. She was mentored by another, a great artist protege who's another one of these, you know, sort of eminent individuals within this new genre, um, and is also affiliated with another musician. I highly recommend this guy chronic, um, who is doing just great. Yeah. Sort of regular revival music and bringing back, um, not just roots music, but this sort of long heritage of, of music in Jamaica and infusing it into something that feels much more modern and much more of the moment.
Speaker 2:	50:17	Yeah.
Speaker 3:	50:18	Okay.
Speaker 2:	50:19	Wow. I love talking new music and this is one of the things that sometimes Kurt and I will, uh, we'll be in discussion and curveballs be saying all, you don't listen to any new music or you don't buy any new music. I was like, oh, I don't buy new new music because I'm constantly talking to musicians, getting infused with new ideas about who you should listen to and, and going to shows. And here we'll trade cds and, and uh, all those kinds of things. It's just, I love having these conversations, Alex, and yet you still listen to music pre 1978 your time.
Speaker 3:	50:54	The music was great back then.
Speaker 2:	50:58	Oh, he's just, he's buttering you up, Tim. There you go. I think you could not just take the 1970s. You could actually look at the 1770s and look at all the great music that was written then in the sixties and seventies. Lots of, there's a big library music stacked up waiting for us every day. Right. There we go. That's very true.
Speaker 3:	51:18	We're going to start soon. I'm stoked about that.
Speaker 2:	51:23	Yeah, we could have it. We have a few groove arrival. Woo. I love it. I am going to have to put that in the show notes. Let's see if we get anybody to bite on that. Uh, well Alex, this has been fantastic. Thank you so much for talking with us. We really do appreciate it. And uh, um, thank you.

Speaker 3:	51:46	Thank you guys for having me honest. It's been a ton of fun. You know, I was, I was happy to get waylaid by you guys that are our summit back when in fact when we saw each other. But, uh, this is, this is such a great way to get reintroduced. You too. So thank you so much. It's been a great time.
Speaker 2:	52:00	I was just talking to John Harris this morning and he says to say hello by the way.
Speaker 3:	52:06	Excellent. Oh, a note for you too. My sister is in Minneapolis for the summer doing an internship and I have to come out to visit her at some point, so I'd love to meet up when I'm, when I'm in town.
Speaker 2:	52:18	We would love that. Yes. Yeah. Do you have any idea when that's going to be?
Speaker 3:	52:23	Uh, no, but I'll let you know as soon as I have plan in place. It probably won't happen until August, but probably if it does at the very beginning of August.
Speaker 2:	52:30	No. Perfect. Good. That's awesome. We'd love that. Yes. We count us in for, well maybe we should do a lives, you know, do something live too. Maybe we'll do another, another thing. Maybe we should just go out for drinks and have fun. Well, we could do that too.
Speaker 3:	52:46	Yeah. Or or jam. I'm good with all the above.
Speaker 2:	52:49	Oh, they're making music. That's a good thing. Alright. Thanks so much Alex.
Speaker 3:	52:55	Thank you guys very much. Have a good rest of your day.
Speaker 2:	52:57	You too. Take care.
Speaker 3:	52:59	All right, cheers.