

2002

The Influence of Demographic Factors on the Experience of House Arrest


Brian K. Payne

Old Dominion University, bpayne@odu.edu

Randy R. Gainey

Old Dominion University, rgainey@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_fac_pubs

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Payne, Brian K. and Gainey, Randy R., "The Influence of Demographic Factors on the Experience of House Arrest" (2002). *Sociology & Criminal Justice Faculty Publications*. 2.

https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_fac_pubs/2

Original Publication Citation

Payne, B. K., & Gainey, R. R. (2002). The influence of demographic factors on the experience of house arrest. *Federal Probation*, 66(3), 64-70.

The Influence of Demographic Factors on the Experience of House Arrest

Brian K. Payne and Randy R. Gainey

Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
Old Dominion University

A GREAT DEAL of research has focused on how various groups perceive and experience incarceration. Research into this area is justified on the grounds that understanding will yield information about appropriate strategies to effectively and efficiently supervise, protect, and treat incarcerated offenders. Groups whose incarceration experiences have been considered by criminologists include female prisoners (Enos, 2001; Kruttschnitt, Gartner, & Miller, 2000; Loucks & Zamble, 2000), older prisoners (Edwards, 1998; Fry & Frese, 1992; King & Bass, 2000), and minority prisoners (Frazier, 1995; Wright, 1989). Researchers have also considered the influence that length of sentence has on the incarceration experience. Together, research suggests that different kinds of offenders will experience incarceration differently and length of sentence will have a significant influence on the offender's adaptation (Curran, 2000; Casey & Bakken, 2001; Moyer, 1984).

While a great deal of research has considered the role of demographic factors in the adaptation to incarceration, much less research has considered how various groups adapt and respond to certain alternative sanctions. The current study examines the way that different types of offenders respond to the experience of being placed on house arrest with electronic monitoring. Four questions guide this research: 1) Do male and female offenders perceive and respond to house arrest with electronic monitoring differently? 2) Do black and white offenders perceive and respond to house arrest with electronic monitoring differently? 3) Do older

offenders perceive and respond to house arrest with electronic monitoring differently than younger offenders? And 4) How does length of sentence influence offenders' perceptions about, and experiences with, house arrest with electronic monitoring? In the review of literature, research on the incarceration experiences of different offenders will be considered to set the framework for research on the way offenders experience house arrest with electronic monitoring. The results of this study will aid in understanding strategies that would be most useful in supervising and treating different types of monitored offenders.

Review of Literature

Incarceration and Race

Minorities were incarcerated at increased rates throughout the 1980s and 1990s (Mauer, 1997). Although research suggests that race does not influence sentence length (Kramer & Steffensmeier, 1993), young black males are more likely to receive a prison sentence than young white males (Spohn & Beichner, 2000; Spohn & Holleran, 2000). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1997), blacks are about twice as likely as Hispanics and six times more likely than whites to be imprisoned at some point during their lives. In fact, 28.5 percent of black males will be imprisoned at some point in their lives, as compared to 16 percent of Hispanics and 4.4 percent of whites.

As far as the imprisonment process and race is concerned, at the most basic level, inmates define themselves by their race (Maghan, 1999). Consequently, it is believed that race has "an important effect on the interpersonal dynamics of the prison" (Leger,

1988: 167). Some research shows that black and white inmates 1) adjust to prison in similar ways, 2) have similar needs, 3) rate the prison setting in similar ways (Wright, 1989), and 4) commit the same proportion of rule infractions (Finn, 1995), while other research finds important differences regarding the prison experience for different races. As an illustration, one study found that black inmates use prison health clinics more often than white inmates (Suls, Gaes, & Philo, 1991). Another study on nearly 50,000 disciplinary actions found that black inmates had higher rates of violent misconduct than white inmates did. Black inmates' rates of drug and alcohol violations, however, were lower than white inmates' (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996).

Female Inmates

Roughly 6.5 percent of all individuals incarcerated in the United States are females (Gilliard & Beck, 1998). Many incarcerated females turned to crime because of substance abuse, sexual abuse, dysfunctional families, or partner abuse victimization (Greene, Haney, & Hurtado, 2000; Henriques & Manatu, 2001). Some research shows that women receive preferential treatment at the hands of justice professionals because they are less likely to be incarcerated than males (Spohn & Beichner, 2000). For those who are incarcerated, however, a set of needs different from the male inmates' needs exist (Coll & Duff, 1995).

One need that is particularly different has to do with parenting issues that are commonly found with incarcerated females (Dodge & Pogrebrin, 2001). Estimates suggest that 80 percent of females incarcerated in the U.S.

have dependent children (Kiser, 1991; Moses, 1995). What this means is that authorities must help incarcerated mothers 1) find caregiving for their children, 2) maintain communication with caregivers, and 3) establish and maintain parental rights (Enos, 2001). Based on these differences and others, different types of programs are needed in female prisons than in male prisons (Koons et al., 1997; Morton & Williams, 1998).

Elderly Inmates

Researchers have also considered the incarceration experience of older offenders. The number of older inmates, defined as 55 years of age or older, doubled in the 1980s (King & Bass, 2000), and it is expected that older inmates will make up nearly one-third of the prison population by 2010 (Neeley, Addison, & Craig-Moreland, 1997). Reasons for an increase in older inmates include the consequences of stiff sentencing policies, changes in the demographics of society, and recidivism among chronic offenders. Citing data from a national study, King and Bass (2000) note that most older inmates are males, in fair to poor health, with prior substance abuse or depression problems, and unmarried. They also note that elderly inmates prefer to be separated from younger inmates.

Concerns about personal safety are likely at the core of this desire to be segregated from the younger population (Hemmens and Marquart, 1998). Because of their health needs, older inmates are believed to be the most expensive inmates to incarcerate. Also adding to the costs of incarcerating older offenders is the fact that they are also in need of different kinds of programs than younger inmates (Aday, 1994; Morton, 1993).

The Role of Sentence Length

Research has also considered the role of sentence length in the incarceration experience. One study finds that inmates with longer sentences have "fewer complaints, higher self-esteem, and lower anxiety and depression" (Schill and Marcus, 1998: 224). In a similar fashion, a study of 127 female inmates found that short-term inmates were more likely to be disruptive than long-term inmates, but long-term inmates committed more serious violations when they were disruptive (Casey and Bakken, 2001). These findings seem to suggest that the early stages of imprisonment require the formation of coping skills to adjust to prison life. Once the inmates adapt, they tend to be more adjusted to their experience, but occasional outbreaks may occur.

House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring

To deal with concerns about prison overcrowding, jurisdictions across the United States have begun to rely more and more on house arrest with electronic monitoring. House arrest has been used for decades (Lilly and Ball, 1987), while electronic monitoring surfaced in Florida in 1984. Since electronic monitoring was developed, the use of house arrest has expanded dramatically. House arrest with electronic monitoring entails the use of technology to monitor offenders' whereabouts. Offenders are confined to their homes, but are usually permitted to go to work, medical treatment, or religious services. These programs are similar to work release, but different in that, because the offender is not incarcerated, the state does not have to pay exorbitant incarceration costs.

Researchers have addressed the ethical issues surrounding this alternative sanction as well as its success. While house arrest with electronic monitoring is seen as an alternative sanction, research shows that it parallels the traditional sanction of incarceration (Gainey and Payne, 2000; Payne and Gainey, 1998). Just as there is variation in the way various types of offenders experience incarceration, it is plausible to suggest that different types of offenders (by gender, race, age, and sentence length) will experience house arrest with electronic monitoring differently. A few studies have indirectly addressed this possibility.

With regard to sentence length, for instance, research finds that those who have been on the sanction longer are more likely to violate their conditions of probation than are those who are on the sanction for shorter periods of time (O'Toole, 1999). As far as race is concerned, research has found that blacks prefer prison to intensive probation, while whites tend to prefer community-based sanctions (Crouch, 1993). In terms of gender, research shows a similar finding—females prefer alternative sanctions over incarceration (Wood and Grasmick, 1999). Taken together, what these findings imply is that different groups may be experiencing some aspect of this one type of alternative sanction differently. But, is it the alternative sanction that is experienced differently, or is it simply perceptions about the sanction that are different? The current research addresses whether the experience of house arrest with electronic monitoring varies among different groups and whether length of time on the sanction influences one's experiences.

Method

Sample

To gain insight into the house arrest with electronic monitoring experience, a survey was administered to 49 electronically-monitored offenders. Initially, we intended to interview in person all of the offenders for the project. Due to time constraints, however, some offenders were unavailable for face-to-face interviews. The survey was modified so that it could be completed one of four ways. These strategies and the number of respondents who used that strategy include the following: 1. face-to-face interviews (n=12); 2. telephone interviews (n=3); 3. self-administering the survey at the sheriff's office (n=29); and 4. mail return surveys (n=5).

Respondents were virtually evenly split in terms of race—53 percent were black and the rest were white. About three-fourths were male and most had a high school degree (85 percent) and a job (91 percent). They ranged in age from a low of 21 years to a high of 63 years and their average age was 34 years. In addition, their length of time on the sanction ranged from a low of one month to a high of 18 months. Their average amount of time on the sanction was 4.16 months.

Measures

A survey instrument was developed to assess the experience of being on house arrest with electronic monitoring. The survey instrument included four sections: 1. an open-ended section asking about general aspects of the house arrest with electronic monitoring experience; 2. a close-ended section asking offenders about specific costs or consequences of being placed on house arrest with electronic monitoring; 3. a close-ended section assessing individuals' perceptions about the utility of the electronic monitoring sanction; and 4. a demographic section. The current study uses information gathered from the last three sections to gain insight into whether house arrest with electronic monitoring is experienced differently among different offenders.

Section 2 of the survey included a series of statements about the possible negative aspects of the house arrest with electronic monitoring sanction (e.g., not being able to go for a walk when you want, not being able to drink alcohol, shame, etc.). Offenders were asked to indicate whether different experiences were "no problem" (coded 1), "a minor problem" (coded 2), "a moderate problem" (coded 3), or "a major problem" (coded 4). Using the same sample as the one used in the current

study, these items have been analyzed in the form of six sub-scales (e.g., privacy issues, shaming issues, disruptiveness, social restrictions, work problems, and drug use, See Gainey and Payne, 2000). The way responses to these items relate to the open-ended questions has also been considered (See Payne and Gainey, 2002). This paper analyzes the items individually to see whether specific differences exist among various groups experiencing the sanction.

Items from the second section, 24 in all, are also combined to form a composite scale assessing the entire house arrest experience. Scores for this scale, labeled *electronic monitoring's punitiveness scale*, were developed by summing the individual responses to each item in section 2. Possible scores could range from a low of 24 (meaning that the sanction was not at all punitive) to a high of 96 (meaning the sanction was quite punitive). The scale rates high in terms of its reliability ($\alpha = .91$).

Section 3 of the survey included a number of statements about individuals' percep-

tions about the sanction. Items from this section of the survey have been scaled in the form of five sub-scales (e.g., deterrence, cost-effectiveness, effectiveness, punishment, and rehabilitation). These scales have been analyzed using a sub-sample of the sample used in this study along with a sample of students enrolled in criminal justice and sociology courses at a medium-sized urban institution (Payne and Gainey, 2000a). The current study examines whether different types of offenders from the entire sample respond differently to specific aspects of the sanction.

Factors Influencing Offenders' Experiences and Perceptions

Cross tabulations and t-tests were conducted to see whether various demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, race, and age) and length of time on electronic monitoring influenced offenders' experiences with or perceptions about electronic monitoring. For the experience questions, the categories "no problem" and "minor problem" were combined, as were the "moder-

ate problem" and "very big problem" categories. For the perceptions' questions, "disagree" and "strongly disagree" were combined as were the "agree" and "strongly agree" categories. Significant differences were found with race, gender, age, and length of sanction moderately influencing various perceptions and experiences. Tables 1 and 2 outline the gender differences uncovered.

Gender was significant in five areas. First, and in line with previous research on a sub-sample of this sample (see Payne and Gainey, 1998), females were more likely to cite having to wear a visible monitor as a problem than males. Over three-fourths of the electronically-monitored females ($n=10$) agreed that the visible monitor was a problem while 37 percent of the males ($n=13$) cited the visible monitor as a problem (Chi Square = 6.01, $\phi = .35$, $p < .01$). Second, females were slightly more likely to cite not being able to stay late at work as a problem. Over 58 percent of the females ($n=7$) cited this as a problem as compared to about a fourth of the

TABLE 1
Consequences of House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring by Gender

Cost/Consequence	Females citing problem		Males citing problem	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Not being able to go for a walk or a run when you want to	7	53.8	19	54.3
Not being able to go to the store when you want to	10	76.9	18	51.4
Not being able to stay late at work	7	58.3	10	28.6*
Not being able to meet friends after work	3	23.1	9	25.7
Not being able to turn the ringer off on your phone	2	15.4	7	20.0
Not being able to ignore the answering machine	2	15.4	6	17.1
Not being able to call waiting	4	30.8	3	8.8*
Having to limit the length of conversations on the phone	4	30.8	15	42.9
Not being able to go out to eat when you want to	7	53.8	17	11.4
Not being able to drink alcohol	3	23.1	4	11.4
Having to provide urine for drug and alcohol testing	0	0.0	1	2.9
Having to worry about friends showing up with alcohol or drugs and getting you in trouble	1	7.7	3	13.6
Having your family or friends know where you are at every moment	1	7.7	2	5.7
The embarrassment of having to tell people that you can't go out	6	46.2	7	20.0
Having to keep your house in order in case a staff person checks in on you	0	0.0	1	2.9
Embarrassment of having to tell your friends or family members that you are constrained to the house.	5	38.5	8	22.9
Having to wear a visible monitor	10	76.9	13	37.1**
Having a strange box on your phone that people might ask about	3	23.1	6	17.1
Having your work interrupted by law enforcement calls	2	15.2	11	32.4
Having your leisure time interrupted by calls from a staff person	1	7.7	6	17.1
Having to worry about technical problems that you might get blamed for	6	46.2	16	47.1
Not having weekends free	6	46.2	18	52.9
Having your sleep interrupted by calls to check up on you	4	30.8	7	20.6
Not being able to get away from family or roommates when you want.	2	15.4	10	28.6

*One tailed test $p < .05$ level.

**One tailed test $p < .01$ level

TABLE 2

Perceptions about the Punitiveness and Fairness of the Sanction by Gender

Statement: "I think that electronic monitoring..."	Females citing problem		Males citing problem	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
As a form of punishment may be too lenient	4	30.8	9	25.7
Can be an effective method of punishment	9	69.2	31	91.2*
Ensures that the offender is punished	7	53.8	23	67.6
Really isn't a form of punishment for many people	4	33.3	9	26.5
Has too many rules and conditions	2	15.4	12	34.3
May help to rehabilitate some offenders	12	92.3	33	94.3
May punish family members as much as or more than the offender	6	46.2	13	38.2
Is an effective method of controlling offenders	11	84.6	32	94.1
Is dangerous because it's too easy for the offender to escape	4	30.8	2	5.7*
Helps in treating offenders by maintaining close supervision over them	10	76.9	33	100.0

*One tailed test $p < .05$ level. **One tailed test $p < .01$ level

males ($n=10$) (Chi Square = 3.42, $\phi = .27$, $p < .05$). Third, females were more likely to cite not being able to have call waiting as a problem. Nearly a third of females ($n=4$) cited this as a problem ($n=3$) (Chi Square = 3.56, $\phi = .28$, $p < .05$). Fourth, electronically-monitored females ($n=9$) were less likely than males to agree that the sanction can be an effective method of punishment ($n=31$) (Chi Square = 3.57, $\phi = .28$, $p < .05$). Fifth, electronically-monitored females ($n=4$) were more skeptical of the ease of escaping the monitor than were males ($n=2$) (Chi Square = 5.44, $\phi = .34$, $p < .05$).

Tables 3 and 4 outline the differences found with regard to race. As shown in the tables, racial differences were found in three areas. First, blacks were less likely to see going to the store as a problem. In all, 44 percent ($n=11$) of the black electronically-monitored offenders said not being able to go to the store when one wants was a problem as compared to nearly three-fourths of the white electronically-monitored offenders ($n=16$) (Chi Square = 3.95, $\phi = .29$, $p < .05$). Second, blacks were more likely to agree that the sanction had too many rules and conditions. Slightly under half ($n=11$) of the black electronically-monitored offenders said the sanction had too many rules and conditions while just twelve percent ($n=3$) of the white-electronically-monitored offenders saw the sanction in this light (Chi Square = 5.16, $\phi = .33$, $p < .01$). Third, whites were more likely to agree that the sanction punishes family members as much as offenders. Nearly 60 percent ($n=13$) of white electronically-monitored offenders agreed with this statement as compared to just 21 percent ($n=5$) of black electronically-monitored

offenders (Chi Square = 7.05, $\phi = .39$, $p < .01$).

Age differences were found in two areas. First, offenders 40 years of age or older were more likely to cite not being able to go for a walk or run when one wants as a problem than those under forty were. Over 80 percent of older monitored offenders ($n=9$) cited this as a problem as compared to about 44 percent of younger monitored offenders (Chi Square = 4.73, $\phi = .32$, $p < .05$). Second, older offenders were also more likely to cite wearing a visible monitor as a problem than younger offenders were. Nearly three-fourths of older offenders ($n=8$) cited the visibility of the monitor as a problem as compared to about 40 percent of younger offenders ($n=15$) (Chi Square = 3.24, $\phi = .26$, $p < .05$).

T-tests were conducted to see how length of time on electronic monitoring influenced the way offenders experienced the sanction. Length of time on the sanction was significant in three areas. First, those who said that the number of rules and conditions was problematic tended to be on the sanction for shorter periods of time. Specifically, those who saw the number of rules and conditions as a problem were monitored for 2.45 months ($s = 1.13$) when they completed the survey. Alternatively, those who did not cite the rules and conditions as a problem were monitored on average for 4.85 months when they completed the survey ($s = 4.02$) $t(33.75) = 2.84$, $p < .01$).

Second, those who reported problems not being able to stay late at work tended to be on the sanction for shorter periods of time than those who did not cite this problem. Those who cited not being able to stay late as a problem were monitored for an average of

2.85 months ($s=1.34$) when they completed the survey. Those who did not report problems with not being able to stay late at work were monitored for an average of 4.63 months ($s = 4.14$) $t(30.61) = 1.93$.

Third, those who cited having to limit the length of phone conversations as problematic tended to be monitored for a longer period of time than those who did not cite this as a problem. Those who had problems with the length of phone conversations were monitored for an average of 5.81 months ($s=4.40$) when they completed the survey. In contrast, those who did not cite this aspect of the sanction were monitored for an average of 2.95 months ($s=2.30$) $t(20.95) = -2.37$.

To see whether race, gender, or age differences existed with regard to the entire electronic monitoring experience, t-tests were conducted comparing the groups' means on the *electronic monitoring punitiveness scales*. Results showed that the groups did not vary in terms of their overall experiences with the sanction. The average score for females on the electronic monitoring punitiveness scale was 46.8, while the average score for males was 44.8. For blacks, the average score was 43.4 and for whites the average score was 46.5. For older offenders, their average score was 47.9, while the average score for younger offenders was 42.6.

Discussion

Criminologists have long considered the way that offenders adapt to various sanctions including classic prison studies (Clemmer, 1940/1958; Sykes, 1957) and more recent examinations of adaptations to alternative sanctions (Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000; Payne

TABLE 3*Consequences of House Arrest with Electronic Monitoring by Race*

Cost/Consequence	Whites citing problem		Blacks citing problem	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Not being able to go for a walk or a run when you want to	12	54.5	13	52.0
Not being able to go to the store when you want to	16	72.7	11	44.0*
Not being able to stay late at work	9	42.9	7	28.0
Not being able to meet friends after work	5	22.7	6	24.0
Not being able to turn the ringer off on your phone	3	13.6	5	20.0
Not being able to ignore the answering machine	4	18.2	3	12.0
Not being able to use call waiting	3	14.3	3	12.0
Having to limit the length of conversations on the phone	11	50.0	7	28.0
Not being able to go out to eat when you want to	13	59.1	10	40.0
Not being able to drink alcohol	4	18.2	3	12.0
Having to provide urine for drug and alcohol testing	0	0.0	1	4.2
Having to worry about friends showing up with alcohol or drugs and getting you in trouble	3	13.6	1	4.0
Having your family or friends know where you are at every moment	2	9.1	1	4.0
The embarrassment of having to tell people that you can't go out	8	36.4	5	20.0
Having to keep your house in order in case a staff person checks in on you	1	4.5	0	0.0
Embarrassment of having to tell your friends or family members that you are constrained to the house.	8	36.4	4	16.0
Having to wear a visible monitor	13	59.1	9	36.0
Having a strange box on your phone that people might ask about	5	22.7	3	12.0
Having your work interrupted by law enforcement calls	5	22.7	7	29.2
Having your leisure time interrupted by calls from a staff person	3	13.6	3	12.0
Having to worry about technical problems that you might get blamed for	10	45.5	11	45.8
Not having weekends free	10	45.5	13	54.2
Having your sleep interrupted by calls to check up on you	6	27.3	5	20.0
Not being able to get away from family or roommates when you want.	10	28.6	2	15.4

*One tailed test $p < .05$ level. **One tailed test $p < .01$ level

& Gainey, 1998). The current study assesses how various offenders adapt to the house arrest with electronic monitoring sanction. With the exception of a few subtle differences based on offender demographics and sentence length, house arrest with electronic monitoring appears to be experienced relatively equally among various groups. These subtle differences, however, cannot be ignored as they may be very telling insofar as appropriate supervision strategies are concerned.

Indeed, based on the finding that gender, race, age, and length of time on electronic monitoring moderately influence various perceptions and experiences, practitioners must recognize that different offenders may react

different ways to electronic monitoring. Practitioners who are aware of these possible differences can place themselves in positions to offset any negative consequences that may arise as a result of these problems. Being in a position to prevent problems will increase the possibility that the sanction will succeed for the offender and for society in general.

With regard to gender, for instance, the results of this research, consistent with other research (see Payne and Gainey, 1998), suggest that female offenders may experience more shame from wearing the bracelet than male offenders do. Probation officers must be prepared to help monitored females deal with this shame. Also, probation officers should be

prepared to confront offenders' concerns about the way that monitoring interferes with their work schedules. The evidence provided in this study suggests that monitoring is more of a problem for females' work schedules than males'. While house arrest with electronic monitoring is advantageous in that it allows offenders to maintain work and family ties, conflicts may arise making it necessary for program officials to minimize the possibility that the work conflicts will result in offenders violating their conditions of probation.

In terms of race, it is important that probation officers recognize that black offenders may see the sanction as more restrictive than white offenders do. In part, this may explain

TABLE 4

Perceptions about the Punitiveness and Fairness of the Sanction by Race

Statement: "I think that electronic monitoring..."	Whites citing problem		Blacks citing problem	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
As a form of punishment may be too lenient. (5)	6	27.3	7	28.0
Can be an effective method of punishment (6)	19	86.4	21	84.0
Ensures that the offender is punished (8)	29	82.9	10	76.9
Really isn't a form of punishment for many people (9)	6	28.6	7	29.2
Has too many rules and conditions (10)	3	13.6	11	44.0*
May help to rehabilitate some offenders (24)	21	95.5	23	92.0
May punish family members as much as or more than the offender (37)	13	59.1	5	20.8**
Is an effective method of controlling offenders (11)	19	86.4	23	95.8
Is dangerous because it's too easy for the offender to escape (12)	2	9.1	4	16.0
Helps in treating offenders by maintaining close supervision over them (27)	22	100.0	20	87.0

*One tailed test $p < .05$ level. **One tailed test $p < .01$ level

why black offenders have been found to prefer incarceration over probation (Crouch, 1993). As far as practical implications are concerned, probation officers supervising monitored offenders should make offenders aware of the restrictions prior to placing them on the sanction so that they are better prepared to deal with the restrictions. On a related matter, offenders and their family members should be told beforehand about the way that the sanction could influence family relations.

As far as age is concerned, older offenders were more likely to have problems with the visibility of the monitor as well as the inability to leave when they want. This group of offenders should, like other groups, be made aware of the drawbacks before beginning the sanction. Interestingly, like black offenders, older offenders have been found to prefer prison over intensive probation (Crouch, 1993). For the sanction to work effectively with older offenders, they must be able to adapt to the problems they confront. Adaptation will be easier if offenders are adequately prepared for the dynamics of the sanction.

Length of sentence had mixed effects on the monitoring experience. On the one hand, those on the sanction for a longer period of time had problems limiting their phone conversations (suggesting that the sanction becomes more unbearable over time). On the other hand, those on the sanction for a shorter period of time were more likely to 1. see the sanction as having too many rules and 2. cite the inability to stay late at work as a problem. That individuals who are on the sanction for a longer period of time did not cite these problems suggests that over time, monitored offenders may adapt or adjust to the problems

that arise on the sanction. This is important information for probation officers who supervise monitored offenders. If nothing else, when offenders express concerns about their conditions of monitoring early on, they can be told by their probation officer that these conditions will eventually become less burdensome.

That those who were on the sanction for a longer period of time did not complain about the number of rules and conditions is also a testament to the success of the sanction. Among other things, the goals of electronic monitoring are to control offenders and help them gain some sense of control over their own lives (Payne and Gainey, 2000b). If those who are on the sanction for a longer period of time have grown accustomed to having controls guide their daily activities, then monitoring has succeeded. The hope is that once the monitoring stops, offenders will continue to control their behavior on their own.

A final policy implication has to do with the versatility of the electronic monitoring sanction. House arrest with electronic monitoring is an especially viable sanction that will help to offset negative consequences of incarceration. Based on the fact that only minor differences were found between the various groups, it appears safe to suggest that this sanction is useful for all groups. Consider the negative consequences of incarceration for women: "Women's prisons increase women's dependency, stress women's domestic rather than employment role, aggravate women's emotional and physical isolation, jeopardize family and other relationships, engender the a sense of injustice—and may indirectly intensify the pains of imprisonment" (Zaitzow, 2000: 148). House arrest with electronic

monitoring offsets these consequences and allows women convicted of less serious offenses to maintain their family relationships, jobs, and independence.

For blacks, it is significant to note that house arrest with electronic monitoring offers similar benefits. A recent review by Rose and Clear (1998) suggests that the high incarceration rate of black offenders contributes to disorganization in minority communities, thereby increasing crime in those communities. Allowing blacks convicted of less serious offenses to remain in the community is advantageous in that they too can keep their jobs, family relations, and independence, but it also has the possibility of maintaining stronger communities and subsequently reducing the crime rate.

For older offenders, house arrest with electronic monitoring is an appealing sanction because it allows offenders to stay clear of the perceived dangerous prison environment and keep their family relations intact. For older offenders with health problems, better access to health care is likely afforded, and the state is relieved of the economic burden of paying for the inmate's health care needs when they are on a community-based sanction as opposed to incarcerated (Gainey, Payne, & O'Toole, 2000).

These findings should be approached with a degree of caution. The sample came from just one electronic monitoring program and was not large. Nonetheless, the differences uncovered, albeit subtle, are intriguing and warrant future research. Future research should consider whether these findings exist among other monitored offenders as well. In addition, researchers and policy makers should consider whether alternative sanctions

are experienced differently among different groups. Examining the punishment experience with an eye towards the demographic dynamics guiding the punishment experience will provide useful information about the most appropriate use of various sanctions.

References

- Aday, R.H. (1994). Golden years behind bars: Special programs and facilities for elderly inmates. *Federal Probation*, 58(2), 47-54.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997). *Lifetime likelihood of going to state or federal prison*. U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ-160092. Washington, D.C.:USGPO.
- Casey, A., & Bakken, T. (2001). The effect of time on the disciplinary adjustment of women. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45, 489-497.
- Clemmer, D. (1940/1958). *The prison community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Coll, C., & Duff, K. (1995). *Reframing the needs of women in prison*. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center for Development Services and Studies.
- Crouch, B. (1993). Is incarceration really worse? Analysis of offenders' preferences for prison over probation. (*Justice Quarterly* 10), 67-88.
- Curran, N. (2000). Blue hairs in the bighouse. *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement*, 26, 225-264.
- Dodge, M., & Pogrebin, M. (2001). Collateral costs of imprisonment for women. *Prison Journal*, 81, 42-54.
- Edwards, T. (1998). *The aging inmate population*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Legislative Conference, Council of State Governments.
- Enos, S. (2001). *Mothering from the inside*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Finn, M. (1995). Disciplinary incidents in prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 22, 143-166.
- Frazier, M. (1995). *From behind the wall*. New York: Paragon House.
- Fry, L.J., & Frese, W. (1992). Bringing the convict back in: An ecological approach to inmate adaptations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 355-365.
- Gainey, R.R., & Payne, B.K. (2000). Understanding the experience of house arrest with electronic monitoring: An analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44, 84-96.
- Gainey, R.R., Payne, B.K., & O'Toole, M. (2000). Time in jail, time on electronic monitoring, and recidivism: An event history analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 733-752.
- Gilliard, D.K., & Beck, A.J. (1998). *Prisoners in 1997*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics, USGPO.
- Gover, A.R., MacKenzie, D., & Armstrong, G. (2000). Importation and deprivation explanations of juveniles' adjustment to correctional facilities. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 44:450-467.
- Greene, S., Haney, C., & Hurtado, A. (2000). Cycles of pain. *Prison Journal*, 80, 2-23.
- Harer, M., & Steffensmeier, D. (1996). Race and prison violence. *Criminology*, 34, 323-355.
- Hemmens, C., & Marquart, J.W. (1998). Fear and loathing in the joint. *Prison Journal*, 78, 133-151.
- Henriques, Z., & Manatu, R. (2001). Living on the outside. *Prison Journal*, 81, 6-19.
- King, K., & Bass, P. (2000). Southern prisons and elderly inmates. In *Corrections: Perspectives*, D.D.J. Stevens (ed.) Madison, WI: Coursewise.
- Kiser, G.C. (1991). Female inmates and their families. *Federal Probation*, 55, 56-63.
- Koons, B.A., Burrow, J.D., Morash, M., & Bynum, T. (1997). Expert and offender perceptions of program elements linked to successful outcomes for incarcerated women. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 512-532.
- Kramer, J., & Steffensmeier, D. (1993). Race and imprisonment decisions. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 357-376.
- Kruttschnitt, C., Gartner, R., & Miller, A. (2000). Doing her own time. *Criminology*, 38, 681-717.
- Leger, R.G. (1988). Perception of crowding, racial antagonism, and aggression in a custodial prison. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 167-181.
- Lilly, J.R., & R. Ball (1987). A brief history of house arrest. *Northern Kentucky Law Review*, 20, 505-530.
- Loucks, A., & Zamble, E. (2000). Predictors of criminal behavior and prison misconduct in serious female offenders. *Empirical and Applied Criminal Justice Research Journal*, 1, 37-47.
- Maghan, J. (1999). Dangerous inmates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4, 1-12.
- Mauer, M. (1997). *Intended and unintended consequences: State racial disparities in imprisonment*. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.
- Morton, J. (1993). In South Carolina: Training staff to work with elderly and disabled inmates. *Corrections Today*, 55, 42-46.
- Morton, J., & Williams, D.M. (1998). Mother/child bonding: Incarcerated women struggle to maintain meaningful relationships with their children. *Corrections Today*, 60(7), 98-105.
- Moses, M. (1995). Girl scouts behind bars. *Corrections Today*, 57, 124-126.
- Moyer, I.L. (1984). Deceptions and realities of life in women's prisons. *Prison Journal*, 64, 45-56.
- Neeley, C.L., Addison, L., Craig-Moreland, D. (1997). Addressing the needs of elderly offenders. *Corrections Today*, 59(5), 120-123.
- O'Toole, M. (1999). *Predictors of recidivism in an electronic monitoring program*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Old Dominion University.
- Payne, B.K., & Gainey, R.R. (1998). A qualitative assessment of the pains experienced on electronic monitoring. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 42, 149-163.
- Payne, B.K., & Gainey, R.R. (2000a). Attitudes toward electronic monitoring among criminal justice students and monitored offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 29, 195-208.
- Payne, B.K., & Gainey, R.R. (2000b). Electronic monitoring: Philosophical, Systemic, and Political Issues. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 31, 93-111.
- Payne, B.K., & Gainey, R.R. (2002). The electronic monitoring of offenders released from jail. *Prison Journal*, (in press).
- Rose, D., & Clear, T. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime. *Criminology*, 36, 441-480.
- Schill, R., & Marcus, D. (1998). Incarceration and learned helplessness. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 42, 224-232.
- Spohn, C., & Beichner, D. (2000). Is preferential treatment of female offenders a thing of the past? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 11, 149-184.
- Spohn, C., & Holleran, D. (2000). The imprisonment penalty paid by young, unemployed black and Hispanic male offenders. *Criminology*, 38, 281-306.
- Suls, J., Gaes, G., & Philo, V. (1991). Stress and illness behavior in prison. *Journal of Prison and Jail Health*, 10, 117-132.
- Sykes, G. (1958). *A Society of Captives*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Wood, P., & Grasmick, H.G. (1999). Toward the development of punishment equivalencies. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 19-50.
- Wright, K. (1989). Race and economic marginality in explaining prison adjustment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 26, 67-89.
- Zaitzow, B. (2000). Treatment needs of women in prison. Pp. 148-154 in *Corrections: Perspectives* by D.J. Stevens (ed.) Madison, WI: Coursewise.