

Recent Research on Electronic Monitoring

Stina Holmberg

Brå

National Council for Crime Prevention, Sweden

Recent research on Electronic Monitoring

Topics in my presentation

- Recent development
- New effect studies
- Themes and suggestions in other new studies on EM

Recent development in the use of EM

- Used for more purposes
- More people on EM
- More use of GPS compared to RF

Many purposes

- Raising offender accountability
- Behavior change and recidivism reduction
- Reduction of jail or prison populations
- Public safety
- Safety of individual offenders
- Reducing costs

Gies et al. 2012

A wider field of use of EM

- Community sentence (with or without probation)
- Conditional prison sentence decided by court
- Alternative for those sentenced to short prison sentence
- Early release of prisoners

Taylor & Ariel 2012

A wider field of use of EM

- Temporary release from prison
- In open prisons to reduce staff
- During parole of long term prisoners (sex offenders)
- Pre-trial detention
- Restraining orders in domestic violence

Taylor & Ariel 2012

More people on EM

- A troubling lack of data!
- European overview indicated 75 000 persons on EM in 2006
- 100 000 persons are estimated to be on EM in USA
- Discussions to increase the use of EM/GPS in England and Wales to 120 000 persons

Positive aspects of increased use of GPS

- A more flexibel system that does not have to be combined with curfew
- A higher level of supervision

Negative aspects of more use of GPS

- Technical limitations
 - Does not work well indoors and underground
 - Works less well in areas with tall buildings,
 - Atmospheric disturbances and satellite shading can occur
 - 30.000 GPS-related events for 257 sex offenders in a year in California
- More stigmatizing for the offender than RF
- Easier to over-use than RF?
- More supervision might lead to more rule-breaking that might lead to net-widening of prison use

Recent effect studies

- *2005: Two meta-analysis by Renzema and Mayo-Wilson 2009 and 2010 (RF)*
 - *2009 and 2010: Two studies on effects of early release from prison with EM in Sweden (RF)*
 - *2010: Effects of EM as a community sentence in Switzerland (RF)*
 - 2010: Effects of EM in Florida (GPS)
 - 2012: Effects of EM for sex offenders under probation in California (GPS)
-
- 2012. Effects of EM for youth auto theft offenders in Winnipeg (GPS)
 - 2010. Effects of EM for heavy young offenders in England and Wales

The studies by Renzema and Mayo-Wilson

The use of EM in general

- 125 studies found with some form of “evaluation”
 - 14 included an acceptable control group
 - All but three concerned front door for low-risk offenders
 - 6 had positive results – 8 had bad or no results
-
- Renzema, M. (2003). *Electronic monitoring's impact on reoffending*. Retrieved March 1, 2007, <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org>
 - Renzema, M., & Mayo-Wilson, E. (2005). Can electronic monitoring reduce crime for moderate to high-risk offenders? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 215-237.

The studies by Renzema and Mayo-Wilson

EM for groups higher risk (reoffending rate >30 %)

- 3 studies with an acceptable control group
- One back door, two front door
- None of them showed positive results

Overall conclusions from all EM studies: No clear positive effect

Questions in my presentation of the new studies

- Under what circumstances is EM used?
- RF or GPS?
- What is EM compared to in the study?
- Conditions for EM?
- Voluntary or not?
- EM for how long?
- Other forms of help parallel to EM
- Effect measures and follow up period
- Outcome

Study EM "back door" in Sweden (1)

- Early release for inmates with sentences of 2 years or more – before parole
- Curfew with RF supervision combined with alcohol prohibition
- Compared to inmates who spent their whole time in prison
- EM for 1 to 4 months
- Voluntary choice to apply for EM at the end of the sentence

Marklund & Holmberg (2009), Journal of Experimental Criminology, 5:41-61

The EM-release program

- Access to approved residence and occupation
- Clients were helped to get an occupation
- Alcohol and drug controls
- Regular control-visits at home and at work
- Programs if needed

Material & methodology

- EM-release group: 260 inmates serving a sentence of at least 2 years
- EM for on average three months
- Historical control-group matched with propensity score
- Comparisons made from criminal records
- 3 years follow-up period from after release date

Reconviction 3 years after release

	EM-release group	Matched control group	Sig.
Proportion that were reconvicted (%)	26	38	**
Proportion that recieved a new prison or probation sentence (%)	14	26	**

Reconviction related to prior criminality and age

% reconvicted	EM-release group		Matched controls	Sig.
	No conviction	12	21	
	1-2 convictions	24	43	**
	>=3 convictions	60	66	

Better results among those with 1-2 prior convictions

% reconvicted	EM-release group		Matched controls	Sig.
	<=37 years	36	44	
	>37 years	17	32	**

Better results among older participants

Study EM "back door" in Sweden (2)

- Early release from prison for a wider group, who served prison sentences => 6 months
- Similar design –
 - – but only one year follow up
- Similar resultat

Brå 2010:8 (written in Swedish)

Reconviction one year after release

Proportion reconvicted (%) 1 year after release	EM-release group (n=867)	Matched control group (n=867)	Sig.
Group in present study (867)	11	18	**
Groups in former study (260)	11	15	
Groups in former study (260) 3 years after release	26	38	**

Other Results

- In both studies the persons on EM were satisfied with the sanction and preferred it to prison
- Having an occupation and being with family most appreciated

Community sentence with EM in Switzerland

- An offer to offenders who were eligible for an alternative to executing *prison sentences* up to 3 months
- EM-group compared to offenders who got Community Service
- *Curfew with RF* – but not (as in Sweden) total prohibition to drink alcohol
- *Duration* : 3 months in both groups

Killias & Gillieron & Kissling & Villettaz, Brit J. Criminology (2010) 50, 1155-1170

Community sentence with EM in Switzerland

- *Conditions*: access to approved residence with fixed net telephone
- – but having a job was no condition
- *Other forms of help*: business as usual for both groups

Design and effect measures

- A randomized study
- People eligible for both CS and EM were randomly assigned to either of them
- 115 persons in EM group, 117 i CS group.
Median age 38 years
- Follow-up period: 3 years after assignment to EM or CS
- Effects measures: Reconviction rates and number of new offences

Reconviction 3 years after assignment

	EM group (n=115)	CS group (n=117)	Sig.
Proportion that were reconvicted (%)	23	31	NS
Number of offences	0.32	0.41	NS

Results

- The EM group and the CS group were equally satisfied with their sanction.

Author's reflection:

- Important with more studies – promising results
- EM could be another out of prison alternative besides CS in Switzerland
- EM might produce better results because it, contrary to CS, isolates defendants from other offenders

Summary

	Sweden 1 and 2	Florida	California	Switzerland
Circumstance	Backdoor Curfew RF	During probation GPS	During parole for sex off. GPS	Alternative to community work Curfew RF
Equal alt., relief or on top	Relief	2/3 on top, 1/3 relief	On top	Equal alt
Time with EM	1. 3 months 2. 4 months	Varying	1 year – and potentially forever	3 months
Voluntary	Yes	No	No	Yes
Support	Help with occ + b a u	B a u	Treatment program	B a u

Summary

	Sweden 1 and 2	Florida	California	Switzerland
Design	Quasiexp. 1. 260-260 2. 867-867 historical c-group matched with ps	Quasiexp. 5034 on EM compared with ps to the whole probation group	Quasiexp. 258-258 control group matched with ps	Randomized 115-117
Follow up period	1: 3 years after EM 2. 1 year after	From two months and up	The parole year	3 years from EM start
Result recon – viction (%)	1. 26-38 ** 2. 11-18**	30 % lower relapse	5 - 11 NS Arrest 14-26** 3-5 sex crime <i>Se slide 34</i>	23 - 31 NS

Recommendations based on research

- Use EM more often than today as a tool in a whole package aiming at social and behavioral change.
- Make individual adaption, positive feedback and support to help offenders to follow the EM rules.
- Use more positive incentives for offenders on EM and less punishment

Nellis, Reaction Essay, vol 5 nr 1, Gable & Gable Sept/Oct 2007:32, Renzema, Journal of Offender monitoring, 2006, Pattavina Victims and Offenders 2009:4, Martinovic, Current Issues in Criminal Justice Vol. 21,nr 3 2010

Recommendations based on research

- Consider how EM affects the offenders family.
- Beware of the risk for net widening
- Don't use stigmatizing technology and reduce technical failures

My own view

If EM is used as a voluntary diversion from prison, it is a good alternative independent of the rehabilitation results.

stina.holmberg@bra.se

EM for sex offenders in California

- *Target group*: "High risk" sex offenders on parole
- *Circumstances*: GPS-supervision for a year, no "home arrest"
- *Compared to*: Parole without GPS
- *Voluntary choice*: No

Gies et al. (April 2012)

EM for sex offenders in California

- *Other help:* Treatment programs for both EM- and controlgroup, + traditional parole content
- *Design:* Quasi-experimental design with control group based on propensity score
- *Follow-up time:* the parole period (1 year)

Outcome during parole

Failures (%)	EM group n=258	Control group n=258	Sig.
Parole violation	64	65	
Arrest	14	26	**
Sex arrest	3	5	
Conviction	5	11	
Conviction for sex crime	2	4	
Returned to custody	58	59	
– For technical violation	56	57	

EM during probation in Florida

- EM added to probation, a decision by the judge
- Circumstances: GPS-supervision for a year, no curfew
- EM was for one third a diversion from prison
- – for the rest just a way to strengthen the supervision during probation
- *Compared to:* Probation without GPS

Bales et al. (Jan 2010)

EM during probation in Florida

- Neither an apartment or occupation was a condition
- *Other help:* traditional parole content
- *Design:* Quasi-experimental design with control group based on propensity score (E-group 5034-C-group ?)
- *Follow up time:* Varying from two months and up

Other results

- EM rarely used as a diversion to prison – 100,000 in prison – 2,400 on GPS a given day
- Most officers think GPS reduces risk for a new crime while on supervision
- Most offenders *don't* think it has that effect

Negative aspects

- 50 % felt shame and embarrassment while on GPS
- 22 % had lost their job because they were on GPS
 - Signal losses
 - Attitudes/Personal liability
 - Less possibility to be flexible in their job