# Federal Probation





DECEMBER 1992

# Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

*Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts*

VOLUME LVI DECEMBER 1992 NUMBER 4



## This Issue in Brief

**Euphoria on the Rocks: Understanding Crack Addiction.**—A certain mystique surrounds crack cocaine and makes supervision of crack addicts a real challenge for even the most seasoned probation officer. Stressing the importance of knowing the facts about this drug, author Edward M. Read focuses on helping the officer understand the drug itself, the dynamics of addiction to it, and how to assess a person's dependence on it.

**The Costs and Effects of Intensive Supervision for Drug Offenders.**—Authors Joan Petersilia, Susan Turner, and Elizabeth Piper Deschenes report the results of a randomized field experiment testing the effects of an intensive supervision probation/parole project for drug-involved offenders. Among the findings were that intensive supervision apparently did not affect drug use, did not reduce recidivism, and cost more than routine supervision.

**A Day in the Life of a Federal Probation Officer—Revisited.**—Six United States probation officers update an article published in *Federal Probation* more than 20 years ago by describing what might come up in a typical workday. The authors—E. Jane Pierson, Thomas L. Densmore, John M. Shevlin, Omar Madruga, Jay F. Meyer, and Terry D. Childers—all of whom serve in specialist positions—offer commentaries about their work that range from philosophical to highly creative.

**Personality Types of Probation Officers.**—Are there personality characteristics common to probation officers? Authors Richard D. Sluder and Robert A. Shearer address the question, reporting findings from a study of 202 probation officers using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The authors discuss the patterns of MBTI personality characteristics among the officers studied, reviewing the strengths and potential weaknesses of the personality types.

**When Do Probation and Parole Officers Enjoy the Same Immunity as Judges?**—Authors Mark Jones and Rolando V. del Carmen examine the types of defenses a probation or parole officer enjoys in civil liability suits, focusing on the concepts of absolute, quasi-judicial, and qualified immunity. The authors



CONTENTS

# The Pride, Inc., Program: An Evaluation of 5 Years of Electronic Monitoring

By J. Robert Lilly, Richard A. Ball, G. David Curry, and Richard C. Smith*

ELECTRONICALLY MONITORED (EM) home confinement began with a tiny experiment in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1983 (Schmidt, 1986). The first continuously operating program began in Palm Beach County, Florida, in 1984, and by 1986 there were 95 monitorees in several states, with nearly 2,300 in more than a dozen states in 1987 (Schmidt & Curtis, 1987) and about 6,500 scattered across 37 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico by 1989 (Renzema & Skelton, 1990). Projections vary from suggestions that EM is a passing fad to expectations of from 500,000 to 1 million monitorees within a few years (Renzema & Skelton, 1990). This growth has been driven in part by a conviction that jail is not the best alternative for certain offenders, in part by worsening problems of overcrowding, in part by aggressive marketing, and in part by the lure of technology.

There are various types of EM devices, usually in the form of a tamperproof bracelet worn on ankle or wrist (Schmidt & Curtis, 1987). To participate, the offender must have a private, residential telephone line, with no answering machines or cordless telephones permitted. In the "passive" (Vaughn, 1987) or programmed contact formats, the offender is monitored through a central computer which dials the home telephone periodically with a recorded announcement that the offender is to state name and time of day and then insert the coded wristlet into a special base unit attached to the telephone to verify presence. In the "active" or continuous monitoring programs, the format consists of a bracelet transmitter and a small receiver placed in the home telephone. If the offender moves more than some 100-150 feet from the telephone, the signal transmission is broken, and a departure code is sent to a central computer programmed to alert the probation officer and print out the name of offender and time of violation. The first tends to be less expensive but also less efficient, and by 1989 the growth rate for programmed contact had fallen behind that for continuous monitoring (Renzema & Skelton, 1990).

*Dr. Lilly is professor, Department of Sociology, Northern Kentucky University. Dr. Ball is professor and Dr. Curry is associate professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University. Mr. Smith is program coordinator, Economic Development Clearinghouse, West Virginia University.

In view of the promises and perils associated with the growing EM movement, it is important that careful evaluations be undertaken. Although national surveys provided some summary data for 1987, 1988, and 1989 (Renzema & Skelton, 1990), to date only a few early evaluation results have been provided, and these have involved populations of only 25-75 offenders (Lilly et al., 1987; Baumer & Mendelsohn, 1989; Charles, 1989; Rogers & Jolin, 1989; Cooprider & Kerby, 1990).

The present study will focus upon the program developed by Pride, Inc., of West Palm Beach, Florida, the nonprofit corporation which in December 1984 set up the first continuously operating EM program (Schmidt & Curtis, 1987). For 20 years, Pride, Inc., has administered misdemeanor and criminal traffic and pretrial intervention for Palm Beach County, as well as operating a DWI school and a substance abuse education program. With four offices in Florida, Pride, Inc., has about 50 employees and an annual budget of more than $2 million. Its program is the most widely publicized EM program in the United States and the principal model for others across the country (Petersilia, 1986), and it has handled hundreds of cases (Ball et al., 1988). Our data cover the first 415 cases, which comprise all cases from the beginning of the program in late 1984 through all cases closed by November 1, 1989. Most were sentenced to a probation term of 1 year, beginning with a period of "front end" EM home confinement designed to provide close control in the early stage.

Our evaluation includes an assessment of *input/effort* (cost), the *implementation process* (procedures for handling cases), *output/outcome* (proportion of successful cases to total cases and differences between success and failure), *effectiveness* (cost per successful case), *cost effectiveness* (cost proportionate to cost of alternatives), and *impact* (output proportionate to need). We will then consider the technical data within a context of sentencing goals, including not only utilitarian effectiveness but also issues of just sentencing and reintegration of offender and society.

### *Assessment of Cost and Cost Effectiveness*

Although costs of alternatives such as EM are usually compared with costs of jailing, there is always the possibility of an "add-on" effect if the offenders would

have been candidates for some less restrictive alternative. We find no evidence of this in Palm Beach County. A study of court records by the Palm Beach County chapter of MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving) shows, for example, that some 13,000 persons were arrested for DWI (Driving While Intoxicated) from 1986 through 1988, with only 200 (1.5 percent) of this total sentenced to the Pride, Inc., EM program. And rather than "creaming" the easy cases who might have been treated more leniently, the EM program was assigned some of the most difficult offenders, with 87 percent having a previous record, 60 percent having more than one prior arrest, and 34 percent having been in a prior alcohol or drug treatment program.

Many considering EM calculate only the equipment cost, ignoring the human supervision necessary to deal with all the other aspects of probation. At the maximum, the potential cost of equipment plus staff salaries, office expenses, and other costs may bring the *total* EM cost to about one-third that of jail. Much of this has to do with the heavy startup expenses associated with lease or purchase of the central computer and the fact that costs may be spread over only 10-15 clients.

Of course, offenders are frequently required to pay part of the cost themselves. By 1989 about two-thirds of all EM sites in the United States were charging such fees, which ranged from $1 to $15 per day with a mean of about $5 per day, sometimes with a sliding scale based on ability to pay (Renzema & Skelton, 1990). Florida law allows a probation supervision fee of $50 per month for felons and $40 per month for misdemeanants, with a higher fee for EM, and for the 1984-89 period, Pride, Inc., charged an EM fee of $7 per day, waiving the $40 per month probation supervision fee until the end of EM. Given its contractual relationship with Pride, Inc., EM cost the county virtually nothing.

The question of cost effectiveness asks: How much does EM *save the county?* Even if jail is the only alternative, cost comparisons using the *average* cost of offenders in the jail may be misleading in that putting a few more inmates into a jail that is under capacity will add only marginal costs. In Palm Beach County, however, the situation when EM was initiated had become desperate, with the local jail at capacity and more than 720 offenders waiting for jail space (Garcia, 1986). Jailing under those circumstances would have meant the actual construction of additional cells, so that the cost effectiveness of EM can be figured on the "low side" as the *average cost of jailing* and on the "high side" as the average cost of jailing *plus the cost of new cell construction.*

If average costs are compared, one must remember that an EM sentence is likely to be longer than the alternative jail sentence. In Kenton County, Kentucky, for example, guidelines were formalized calling for EM to be some three times the length of whatever the jail sentence would have been (Lilly et al., 1987). Using this "rule of thumb" for the Pride, Inc., program, we find that the mean EM sentence of 72.23 days equates to a mean alternative jail term of 24.08 days. With $32 as the average daily cost of jailing an offender in Palm Beach County (Garcia, 1986), the cost of jailing would have been 24.08 days x $32 per day= $770.56 per offender. For the total population of 415 cases, the cost of jailing would have been $319,782.

The comparative figure for EM is 72.23 days x $7= $505.61 per offender x 415 = $209,828. Without fees, the minimum savings would have been $109,954 over less than 5 years, but with fees the savings amounted to about $320,000. If savings resulting from avoiding construction of new cells are added, cost effectiveness appears still greater. Serving about 24 days each, the 415 offenders would have accumulated approximately 10,000 jail days, which spread over the period of approximately 1,500 days from the entry of the first until the release of the last from the EM portion of his probation in early 1988 would have required *at least* six additional cells. In 1984 expenses varied from $25,000 to $75,000 or more per bed, depending on level of security and local construction costs (Funke, 1985). Thus, using the very lowest figure of six cells at $25,000 each, the program achieved a one-time construction savings of at least $150,000.

### *Assessment of the Implementation Process*

In their general survey, Renzema and Skelton (1990) note that 47 percent of the problems reported with EM center upon equipment malfunctions, with the amount of administrative labor required listed as the second most serious problem. Some studies have described a general "technoshock" resulting from the introduction of such equipment into a program where it did not mesh well (Baumer & Mendelsohn, 1989), as with a pilot study involving 30 cases in Georgia which encountered problems with technicians manning a central computer monitoring service provided by the vendor (Erwin, 1990). It should be noted, however, that even where unusual technical problems exist, they may be handled by assigning them to a full-time technician. Such a solution was found for Tampa, characterized by meteorologists as the "lightning capital of the world," where power surges caused an unusual number of equipment problems (Papy & Nimer, 1991).

Sometimes new technology is considered a solution in itself, but as Petersilia (1990) has pointed out with respect to community-based programs in general, success is more likely if the implementing organization

has a committed and effective leader, secure administrators, low staff turnover, sufficient resources, a chain of command that shares the leader's goals, and clear lines of authority. Pride, Inc., was characterized by all of these, and it operated in an affluent community with a history of openness to new ideas. In its first year of operation, the program encountered some of the common startup problems, including equipment failure such as breaking straps or faulty transmitters, along with software problems and problems with the telephone when service was cut off without notification, but these were soon managed. Despite the fears of some (Baumer & Mendelsohn, 1989), we found no evidence of any serious gap between what EM clients were told to expect and the limited capacity of staff to actually monitor them and therefore few of the "cat-and-mouse" games where clients try to beat the system.

Although we ourselves have speculated about resistance from EM clients (Ball et al., 1988), surprisingly little was reported here. This is not because clients generally consider EM to be especially lenient. In a study of a small group of EM parolees, for example, Beck, Klein-Saffran, and Wooten (1990) found that about one-half felt that EM was more punitive than being in a halfway house. Pride, Inc., also found EM very restrictive, with the most stressful aspects having to do with time pressures such as traffic delays when heading home close to curfew time.

Some monitorees complained of boredom, but the most common objection involved some embarrassment about others noticing the bracelet, although it was concealed under clothing. When this occurred, the client sometimes explained it away as a medical device, but most reported that they simply told the truth. Only one client, a waitress who had to wear a short skirt at work, had a major objection, complaining that it was impossible to conceal the equipment and that this might cause her problems on the job. Nevertheless, she elected to remain in the program and completed it successfully.

The offender population in the Pride, Inc., program included 359 males and 56 females, and table 1 shows their offense pattern. Given the nature of the program, it is not surprising that most were charged with DWI or Driving Under Suspension (DUS). Fewer than 2 percent were charged with violent crimes, and most of the remainder fall into a general category of "disorderly conduct," including resisting arrest, criminal mischief, and minor alcohol/drug-related disturbances, although there were a few property offenders included. Offenders ranged in age from 17 to 71, with 45 percent aged 25-32, 24 percent aged 17-24, 17 percent aged 33-40, and 14 percent over 40. Some 39 percent were serving 30-day sentences, with 17 percent serving 60 days and 22 percent serving 90 days, but 2 percent were serving 10 days or less, 7 percent were serving 20 days, 5 percent were serving 35-50 days, and 8 percent were serving 65-80 days.

The gender pattern is characteristic of what we know of EM programs across the country, where 10 percent of the clients in 1987 and 13 percent in 1988 were women (Schmidt, 1988). Table 1 indicates that DWI charges accounted for about one-half of the males but for more than 70 percent of the females in this EM program, with the males much more likely to be charged with DUS. It should be noted, however, that many of these males had earlier DWI arrests.

Considering speculations about the effect of EM on the family of the offender (Ball et al., 1988), it is interesting to note that slightly over one-half of the clients in this program were single, with nearly one-fourth separated or divorced and a few widowed. Only a little less than one-fourth were married. More than one-half (58 percent) had no children, and of the 20 percent having one child and the 22 percent having two or more, few had their children living with them. This runs directly counter to the expectation that judges would tend to choose "family men" for EM in lieu of jail (Ball et al., 1988).

Despite some suspicion that EM might be used to keep middle-class, white offenders safely at home while their poor and working-class, black counterparts went to jail, there is no clear evidence of that sort of socioeconomic bias in this program. Only 17 percent of the 415 offenders had yearly incomes of $10,000 or less. Yet 31 percent had less than a high school education, 39 percent had a high school education only, and only 30 percent had some education beyond high school.

On the other hand, one of the common conditions for the EM option is a job, partly because it offers signals of stability and partly because it provides a justification for avoiding jail. Ninety-three percent of these offenders were employed, and the remainder were disabled, working as housewives, or searching for a job. And, of course, the EM prospect must have a residence, with 55 percent of these offenders residing in a house, 27 percent in an apartment, and 18 percent in another type of residence, most often a mobile home. Although it seems likely that an offender with access to a vehicle (which includes almost all of those in the program) could afford a residence and telephone, we have no data on offenders not included in the program simply because they could not afford the monitoring fee.

The question of racial/ethnic bias is even more complex. For example, the data show that 92 percent of the offenders sentenced to EM with Pride, Inc., were white with only 4 percent African-American and only 4 percent Hispanic, which would signal obvious racial/ethnic bias

TABLE 1. NATURE OF OFFENSE BY GENDER

| Nature of Charge | Male | | Female | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| DWI | 193 | 53.8 | 40 | 71.4 | 233 | 56.1 |
| DUS | 128 | 35.7 | 9 | 16.1 | 137 | 33.0 |
| Traffic | 8 | 2.2 | 2 | 3.6 | 10 | 2.4 |
| Violent Crime | 5 | 1.4 | 1 | 1.8 | 6 | 1.4 |
| Other | 25 | 7.0 | 4 | 7.0 | 29 | 7.0 |
| TOTAL | 359 | 100.0 | 56 | 100.0 | 415 | 100.0 |

for most programs. However, approximately 90 percent of the DWI/DUS offenders arrested in the U.S. each year are white, and DWI/DUS offenders make up nearly all of the offenders in this program. Of course, making EM especially available for DWI/DUS offenders, who also happen to be white, may represent an institutionalized racial/ethnic bias, but consideration of this possibility is beyond the present study.

### *Assessment of Outcome, Effectiveness, and Impact*

During their total term of probation, 43 percent of these offenders were referred to court for one or more violations. Of these about one-half were new violations (mostly DUS with about one-fourth involving DWI or drugs/alcohol violations) and one-half were technical violations (mostly nonpayment of restitution or fines, general probation violations, or failure to continue treatment). Only 2 of the new violations and 26 of the technical violations, however, occurred during the EM period of probation.

As indicated in table 2, 97 percent of the offenders completed their EM period successfully, and nearly 80 percent of them completed their entire term of probation. Thus, *effectiveness*, defined as cost per *successful* case, is nearly the same as *cost effectiveness*, defined as the savings compared to jailing. The EM completion rate is especially impressive in view of the fact that the likelihood of probation violations is highest early in the probation period (Carter et al., 1984). When one takes into account the fact that the tighter EM control is more likely to *provoke* trouble because of the offender's resistance to authority and more likely to result in *detection* of many minor technical violations that would have escaped attention later, the low EM revocation rate is even more impressive.

TABLE 2. PROBATION OUTCOME

| Outcome | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Completion of Probation | 326 | 78.6% |
| Revocation | | |
| New Violations | 48 | 11.6% |
| Post EM | 46 | 11.1% |
| EM | 2 | .5% |
| Technical Violations | 41 | 9.9% |
| Post EM | 31 | 7.7% |
| EM | 9 | 2.0% |
| Offender Request | 1 | .2% |
| TOTAL | 415 | 100.0% |

Of the 11 EM revocations shown in table 2, only 2 involved new violations, a burglary and a battery. Given the risk factors associated with the age, gender, and prior offenses pattern of the 415 clients, one burglary arrest and one battery arrest do not suggest that the EM option significantly endangered the public. Three of the nine technical revocations involved curfew violations, two involved nonpayment of monitoring fees, and two offenders had their EM revoked because of a pattern of persistent noncooperation associated with calls complaining about nonexistent equipment problems, some attempts at tampering, and continued ignoring of warnings about "testing the limits." One offender had EM revoked for removal of the monitoring bracelet (which cannot be reattached), and another asked to be taken to jail, saying that the "pressure" for self-control was too great.

EM itself had so few failures that no success/failure comparisons are possible, but it is possible to make some comparisons in terms of those who managed to complete successfully the entire period of probation. There were too few African-Americans or Hispanics to provide racial/ethnic comparisons, and there were no differences in completion rates by gender or age. While 85 percent of the homeowners completed their probation, only 73 percent of nonhomeowners completed, a difference that is statistically significant ($p<.01$). Of the few offenders who were unemployed, only 60 percent completed their term of probation compared to a completion rate of 79 percent for the employed offenders, a difference that is also statistically significant ($p<.05$). Finally, there was a statistically significant difference ($p<.05$) between the 81 percent completion rate for clients with incomes over $10,000 and the 68 percent completion rate for those with incomes of $10,000 or less. These differences may be due, of course, to differences in risk factors such as nature of offense or prior record, but the number of offenders here remains too small to test these possibilities.

Although very *effective* in purely utilitarian terms, the Pride, Inc., EM program was still too small to have much *impact* given the size of the offender problem faced by Palm Beach County. As indicated above, even with respect to the DWI problem, which was its principal focus, the program handled less than 1.5 percent of the 13,000 DWI offenders arrested in the county from 1986 to 1989. It is true that this small number constituted some very serious problems and that EM seems to have handled them very effectively, but it remains a "drop in the bucket" in terms of overall impact.

### *Conclusion*

If these findings hold for other large-scale evaluations, the question of whether EM should be ex-

panded will depend largely on the extent to which it meets other sentencing goals such as just sentencing or reintegration of offender and community. Reviewing community-based sanctions in terms of a justice model, von Hirsch (1990) stresses criteria of *proportionality* and *intrusiveness*. In brief, this emphasizes that above all else the punishment must fit the crime (proportionality) and that the dignity of the offender must not be degraded by imposition of either humiliating conditions or invasions of privacy (intrusiveness) beyond those strictly necessary to the proportionate sanction. Here the question revolves around whether EM is a *just* sentence.

Fortunately, data are available with respect to perceptions of proportionality. States such as Minnesota, Washington, and Pennsylvania have ranked offenses by seriousness, and penalties have also been ranked in terms of severity of sanction, with home confinement in general ranked as "quite severe" (von Hirsch, 1990). By these standards home confinement augmented by EM meets the proportionality criterion for the cases handled by Pride, Inc.

Much of the intrusion issue centers on whether EM is seen as inherently more intrusive than human supervision simply because it substitutes electronics for personal contact. Von Hirsch (1990) argues against the idea that intrusion by technology is *ipso facto* more problematic than intrusion by human supervision, insisting that unannounced home visits by a probation officer, for example, may be more humiliating and violative of privacy than the wearing of a concealed ankle bracelet. And it must be remembered that the alternative to EM in this program was not ordinary probation supervision but jail, which hardly seems less intrusive in terms of humiliation and deprivation of privacy.

As to the goals of rehabilitation or reintegration, Ball and Lilly (1986) have developed a theory of home confinement based on a reintegrative model, noting that EM is more community-based than is jail, that it avoids the labeling and "crime school" effects, and that it may provide prospective employers and others with some evidence of the client's responsibility which would not be provided by jail time. It is clear that jail is largely ineffective with DWI/DUS offenders who have the sorts of prior records of those in the Pride, Inc., program (Jacobs, 1989; Turrisi & Jaccard, 1991). The very fact of being restricted to home and job by EM, with only a few hours each week for shopping and other errands, may actually force clients to plan more carefully, thereby imposing some order on their lives (Maxfield & Baumer, 1990). Furthermore, offenders in the Pride, Inc., program were required to make restitution and/or to participate in alcohol/drug treatment programs if appropriate, both of which seem more integrative and rehabilitative than jail (Ball & Lilly, 1986).

It must also be admitted that EM may actually contribute to the replacement of the reintegration model by an adversarial posture if it is overused. Harris (1987, p. 21) questions EM as another example of an ongoing role shift in which probation officers are moving from client advocates to "urine takers, money collectors, compliance monitors, electronic surveillance gadget readers, and law enforcers." There is room for argument here, but the Pride, Inc., staff reports that the approach did not interfere with the more reintegrative aspects of supervision. Unfortunately, we have as yet no data on recidivism for the program.

Even some of its critics have acknowledged that EM offers an option for a variety of offenders with special needs, such as pregnant women, the disabled, the mentally retarded, the elderly, and the terminally ill (Ball et al., 1988). Growth of the AIDS population may make EM even more appealing, not only to offenders and their attorneys but also to jail inmates and staff, who face not only real problems but the threat of hysteria. EM provides a way out of the political dilemma produced by the demand that the criminal justice system "get tough" at the very time when local governments face a series of fiscal crises. The technology reassures the public and adds credibility to probation, partly by the "high-tech" machinery and willingness to experiment.

It is precisely because of its apparent advantages that EM programs are expanding to a variety of offender populations (Maxfield & Baumer, 1990). During the period of study, the modal monitoree in the United States was a male convicted of DWI, much like the typical offender in the Pride, Inc., program (Renzema & Skelton, 1990). By 1989, however, DWI offenders made up only 18 percent of monitorees in the United States, with 22 percent consisting of drug offenders and the proportion charged with property offenses and violent crimes having risen to 20 percent and 12 percent respectively (Renzema & Skelton, 1990). The 97 percent success rate of the Pride, Inc., program probably cannot be expected as EM is expanded, but our evaluation suggests that it can be implemented fairly and consistently, that it is both effective and cost effective in terms of outcome, and that it has an unrealized potential for much greater impact. At this point, there is reason for guarded optimism, but further research must investigate issues of discrimination, social-psychological effects, and likelihood of success with more difficult offender populations.

## References

Baer, B.F., & Klein-Saffran, J. (1990). Home confinement program: Keeping parole under lock and key. *Corrections Today, 52*(1), 17-30.

Ball, R.A., & Lilly, J.R. (1986). The potential use of home incarceration with drunken drivers. *Crime and Delinquency, 32*(2), 224-245.

Ball, R.A., & Lilly, J.R. (1986). A theoretical examination of home incarceration. *Federal Probation. 50*(1), 17-24.

Ball, R.A., & Lilly, J.R. (1988). Home incarceration with electronic monitoring. In J.E. Scott and T. Hirschi (Eds.), *Controversial issues in crime and justice.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ball, R.A., Lilly, J.R., & Huff, C.R. (1988). *House arrest and correctional policy: Doing time at home.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Baumer, T.L., & Mendelsohn, R.I. (1989). *Final draft report for the electronic monitoring of non-violent convicted felons.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Beck, J., Klein-Saffran, J., & Wooten, H.B. (1990). Home confinement and the use of electronic monitoring with federal parolees. *Federal Probation, 54*(4), 22-31.

Carter, R.M., Glaser, D., & Wilkins, L.T. (1984). *Probation, parole and community corrections* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Charles, M.T. (1989). Electronic monitoring for juveniles. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 12*(2), 147-169.

Cooprider, K.W., & Kerby, J. (1990). Practical application of electronic monitoring at the pretrial stage. *Federal Probation, 54*(1), 28-35.

Erwin, B.S. (1990). Old and new tools for the modern probation officer. *Crime and Delinquency, 36*(1), 61-74.

Funke, G.S. (1985). Economics of prison crowding. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 478,* 86-99.

Garcia, E.D. (1986). *Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office Stockade Division In-house Arrest Work Release Program.* West Palm Beach, FL: Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office, Stockade Division.

Harris, M.K. (1987). Observations of a "Friend of the Court" on the future of probation and parole. *Federal Probation, 51*(1), 12-21.

Jacobs, J.B. (1989). *Drunk driving: An American dilemma.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lilly, J.R., Ball, R.A., & Wright, J. (1987). Home incarceration with electronic monitoring in Kenton County Kentucky: An evaluation. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments.* Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press, 189-203.

Maxfield, M.G., & Baumer, T. (1990). Home detention with electronic monitoring. *Crime and Delinquency, 36*(4), 521-536.

Papy, J.E., & Nimer, R. (1991). Electronic monitoring in Florida. *Federal Probation, 55,*(1), 31-33.

Petersilia, J. (1986). Exploring the option of house arrest. *Federal Probation, 50*(1), 50-55.

Petersilia, J. (1990). Conditions that permit intensive probation programs to survive. *Crime and Delinquency, 36*(1), 126-145.

Renzema, M., & Skelton, D.T. (1990). *The use of electronic monitoring by criminal justice agencies 1989.* Kutztown, PA: Kutztown University Foundation.

Rogers, R., & Jolin, A. (1989). Electronic monitoring: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 5,*(3), 141-152.

Schmidt, A. (1986). Electronic monitoring. *Federal Probation, 50*(1), 55-59.

Schmidt, A. (1988). The use of electronic monitoring by criminal justice agencies in the United States 1988. In K. Russell & J.R. Lilly (Eds.), *The electronic monitoring of offenders.* Leicester, U.K.: Leicester Polytechnic University, 9-14.

Schmidt, A., & Curtis, C. (1987). Electronic monitors. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments.* Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press, 137-152.

Turrisi, R., & Jaccard, J. (1991). Judgment processes relevant to drunk driving. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*(2), 89-118.

Vaughn, J.B. (1987). Planning for change: The use of electronic monitoring as a correctional alternative. In B.R. McCarthy (Ed.), *Intermediate punishments.* Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press, 153-187.

von Hirsch, A. (1990). The ethics of community-based sanctions. *Crime and Delinquency, 36*(1), 162-173.