

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

# Frontiers of Incarceration: An Overview of Electronic Monitoring in Cook County

Ayomikun Idowu



A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Arts  
(Geographical Sciences)

Preceptor: Nikita Jain and Professor Michael Conzen  
Advisor: Dr. Sorchá Brophy

June 2020

## **ABSTRACT**

Given the substantial cost of running carceral facilities in the United States and the overcrowding of jails and prisons, the number of individuals on electronic monitoring has dramatically risen during the last decade. Government officials have hailed electronic monitoring as the solution to mass incarceration while criminal justice activists have called electronic monitoring another form of incarceration. In particular, electronic monitoring has been criticized for violating individual's right to privacy through unnecessary surveillance and movement restrictions. The goal of this study is to determine the effectiveness of electronic monitoring as an alternative to incarceration using interviews and survey data. The study concludes that electronic monitoring still operates as a punitive, rather than a rehabilitative form of criminal justice policy. Instead of thinking of electronic monitoring as identical to prison, electronic monitoring exists as an adaptation of mass incarceration to a political system that values economic efficiency and technology. Electronic Monitoring increases the ability of the state to surveil marginalized groups, specifically young, Black men. In order to create a rehabilitative carceral system Cook County must ease the movement restrictions of electronic monitoring and invest in long term social welfare.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wish to express my utmost gratitude to Dr. Sorchá Brophy, Nikita Jain, and Professor Michael Conzen for reading this thesis and providing advice and encouragement throughout the process.

A special thanks to my best friend Fikayo Walter-Johnson for pushing me to finish when I thought I could not.

This study is dedicated to all the wonderful people I interviewed who were so kind and willing to engage with me despite the nature of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Chapter 1	
Introduction	1
Chapter 2	
Literature Review	5
Chapter 3	
Methodology	17
Chapter 4	
Data and Results	20
Societal Interactions	21
Family and Friends	31
Personal Development	35
Chapter 5	
Discussion	42
Chapter 6	
Policy Recommendations	46
Chapter 7	
Conclusion	48
Bibliography	49
Appendices	53

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

On October 14, 1982, President Ronald Reagan delivered a televised speech to the Department of Justice. He announced new federal initiatives aimed at combating drug trafficking and organized crime. Reagan declared, “The perception [in America] is growing that the crime problem stems from...a class of repeat offenders and career criminals who think they have a right to victimize their fellow citizens with virtual impunity...they're confident that once their cases enter our legal system, the charges will be dropped, postponed, plea-bargained away, or lost in a maze of legal technicalities that make a mockery of our legitimate and honorable concern with civil liberties.”<sup>1</sup> His remarks highlighted an emerging consciousness in America, one that demanded that government entities crack down on crime.

Beginning in the 1970s, many Americans believed the level of crime in the United States had risen out of control.<sup>2</sup> Wealthy, White Americans began moving out of urban areas as public hysteria grew over drug use. As a result, the 1970s through 1990s saw significant changes in U.S. sentencing and correctional policy.<sup>3</sup> The rehabilitative model of indeterminate sentencing, discretionary parole release, and offender treatment was replaced by a policy based on three strikes, mandatory minimum sentencing, and increased police surveillance. Most famously, the 1994 crime bill provided \$9.7 billion in funding for prisons and greatly expanded the federal death penalty.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reagan, “Remarks Announcing Federal Initiatives Against Drug Trafficking and Organized Crime”

<sup>2</sup> Drug Policy Alliance, “A Brief History of the Drug War”

<sup>3</sup> Cohen *et al.*, “The History of Mass Incarceration”

<sup>4</sup> Congress. [www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/3355/text](http://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/3355/text).

When Regan left office, the total prison population in the United States increased from 329,000 people to 627,000 people.<sup>5</sup> The last 30 years continued this trend with the current U.S. prison population having grown by over 500%.<sup>6</sup> Today, the United States contains the highest prison population in the world with over 2 million adults and children serving time.<sup>7</sup>

Such rapid growth in incarceration has caused modern criminal justice practices to come under intense scrutiny due to their cost and effectiveness and the severe violation of human rights. It costs \$47,057 per year to incarcerate an individual in the United States.<sup>8</sup> Yet, growth in prisons and policing have not been proven to significantly decrease crime or recidivism.<sup>9</sup> Lawmakers, as well as larger society, have begun to view incarceration as an expensive, ineffective means of fighting crime. This has led to a renewed interest in prison reform.

One of the major ways in which federal and local governments are moving to reduce the prison and jail population is through the use of electronic monitoring (E.M.).<sup>10</sup> E.M., also known as the ankle bracelet, is a GPS tracking system that records the location of pretrial defendants, parolees, and those on probation. With it, correctional systems can limit how long an offender stays outside approved places and distance traveled.

As E.M. allows defendants and the formerly-incarcerated to return home, the bracelet has been hailed by government bodies as an alternative to incarceration.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, critics claim the program is too restrictive and expands state surveillance.

---

<sup>5</sup> Cohen, "The History of Mass Incarceration."

<sup>6</sup> The Sentencing Project, "Criminal Justice Facts"

<sup>7</sup> Sawyer and Peter Wagner, "How Many People Are Locked up in the United states?"

<sup>8</sup> Henrichson *et al.*, "The Price of Jails"

<sup>9</sup> Stemen, "The Prison Paradox"

<sup>10</sup> Prison refers to a place of confinement for those that have been convicted of a crime, jails are places of confinement for those awaiting trial.

<sup>11</sup> "Electronic Monitoring Program." The Cook County Sheriff's website refers to their electronic monitoring program as "a community-based alternative incarceration"

Using Cook County as a case study, this thesis seeks to evaluate E.M. as an alternative to incarceration. It will answer two major questions: first, how does E.M. affect the individual and second, what does the use of GPS tracking in the criminal justice system indicate about society? Questions on E.M. sit within broader discussions of the carceral state and surveillance. As suggested earlier, the United States prison industrial complex emphasizes punitive punishment. It relies on the belief that if one commits a crime, they must be deprived of civil liberties as punishment. However, if we are to move towards a more rehabilitative form of criminal justice then legislators must understand how instruments of reform reinforce the prison structure. The rise of E.M. serves as a premier way to look at incarceration outside its physical setting. If the physical and psychological effects of prison can be recreated in communities and homes, then imprisonment must be a set of social conditions rather than just a location.

Although many researchers have analyzed E.M., this study differs as it attempts to understand E.M. through its personal effects. How do individuals interact with society under E.M.? How does that affect the individual? Through the use of quantitative and qualitative methods, I will attempt to investigate these questions. In the end, this study will showcase how E.M. expands the prison system by controlling the mobility of those under it in their residences, extending the bounds of prisons and jails.

I will begin my paper detailing the current literature on surveillance, mobility, and prisons. This review will give much-needed background information on previous scholarly work and the philosophical direction of the study. Next, the research methods used to conduct this study will be presented followed by an overview of the interview and survey data gathered from individuals on E.M. This will be split into three parts—the effect of E.M. on social interactions in the larger county, family and friends interactions, and person development. The interview and

survey data will be supported by a final discussion section which will further link the theories raised in the literature review to the modern use of E.M. These two sections will ultimately inform policy recommendations which calls for Cook County to ease E.M. movement restrictions and invest in social welfare.

It is hoped this study will aid policymakers in better understanding incarceration and the harm it causes. Any institution that relies on the extensive control of movement and subjugation of the individual will only reinforce incarceration. Instead of simply analyzing the outcomes and costs of interventions, this study suggests policy recommendations that radically alter the status quo and urges those in power to pursue rehabilitative carceral policy.



## CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### Surveillance and Foucault

The discourse on E.M. has occurred in conjunction with concerns regarding the punitive nature of the criminal justice system. The sense in which punishment, power, and the carceral system intersect is most famously examined by Michel Foucault in his 1975 book *Discipline and Punish*.

In the chapter titled *Panopticism*, Foucault describes the panopticon—a type of surveillance apparatus used in prisons. The panopticon is a circular building containing a tower from which it is possible to view each prisoner's cell.<sup>12</sup> In the panopticon, prisoners cannot see each other, only the tower. Yet, the tower relies on a certain invisibility— shadows obstruct the prisoner from seeing who is inside the tower and *when* someone is inside of the tower. As a result, those incarcerated must monitor their behavior, unsure if they are being watched.<sup>13</sup> To Foucault, this is the modern operation of power. The invisibility of the tower compels the individual to police their actions in response to the possibility of observation.

In causing prisoners to manage their behavior, the panopticon amplifies the power of authority through gains in knowledge.<sup>14</sup> Knowledge and power are two independent concepts that reinforce one another. Authority systems use surveillance to gain information on what identities or behaviors need monitoring, cultivation, and control. This opens up new ways of individuals acting and thinking.<sup>15</sup> Thus, power is the ability to deploy instruments of surveillance, gain knowledge, and influence internal behavior.

---

<sup>12</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 197

<sup>13</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 201

<sup>14</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 206

<sup>15</sup> Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*

Through gains in power via the panopticon, authority systems install behavioral norms without physically coming into contact with the prisoner.<sup>16</sup> The prisoner feels their permanent visibility, only being able to engage in activities deemed acceptable by the carceral system. Here, power is internalized. The observed take on the responsibility of the prison guard, disciplining themselves.

By making authority invisible and internalized, the panopticon also optimizes power. It increases the number of people able to be controlled by a single institution while decreasing the number needed to operate it. This greatly differs from past forms of control that relied on big, public spectacles such as executions and the chain gang.<sup>17</sup> The efficiency of the panoptic model has led to its emergence in other institutions like schools, hospitals, and the workplace.<sup>18</sup> The ultimate goal of these institutions is to create an economically productive individual.<sup>19</sup> In the workplace, the panopticon forges the worker who always works, aware that management could be watching. The result is increasing production, developing the economy, and raising public morality.

### **Rise of Societies of Control**

Many have written on the shortcomings of Foucault's theory of power and control. Primarily, Foucault relies on examples from the 19th and early 20th century to construct his theory on the panopticon. Gilles Deleuze modernizes Foucault's theory, introducing the concept of societies of control.

---

<sup>16</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 199

<sup>17</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 216

<sup>18</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 200-01

<sup>19</sup> Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 204

The panoptic society expresses power as a network of defined and enclosed institutions where subjects are segmented and organized to impose social norms.<sup>20</sup> Individuals move in between the school, the workplace, the hospital, etc., which all independently operate as separate panopticons. Deleuze argues that modern authority systems no longer rely on these institutions to exert control. Developments in technology have made it possible to discipline everywhere and continuously.<sup>21</sup> Technologies like CCTVs, traffic cameras, and electronic monitoring digitize and aggregate individuals into large banks of information. As opposed to the panopticon, these technologies of surveillance are interconnected and independent of institutions, making access to information faster and greater in quantity.<sup>22</sup> For example, societies of control eliminate the separation between work and home.<sup>23</sup> Individuals are given the freedom to work from home, using video conferencing to stay connected to the office. In this freedom, the demands of the workplace infiltrate the home, exposing a once private space to management control systems. Now, the in-betweens of institutions like the street, the home, and the playground are surveilled and recorded. In societies of control, there is no free time or physical boundaries. As monitoring is continuous and connected, individuals must adhere to social norms even in transitional spaces.

Societies of control build the scope of surveillance through technology. As with the panopticon, it serves the goal of increasing economic efficiency by further instilling social norms. The popularity of electronic surveillance emerged in response to shifting modes of production—from manufacturing to a “knowledge economy in which immaterial labor, digital communication, and information technologies predominate.”<sup>24</sup> The factory disappeared in favor

---

<sup>20</sup> Deleuze, “Postscript on Societies of Control,” 3

<sup>21</sup> Deleuze, “Postscript on Societies of Control,” 6

<sup>22</sup> Martinez, “Beyond Disciplinary Enclosures,” 201

<sup>23</sup> Crain, “Living in a Society of Control”

<sup>24</sup> Martinez, “Beyond Disciplinary Enclosures,” 204

of the office. Electronic surveillance ensures order and accountability for this increasingly immaterial labor force. The panopticon cannot control the worker that works from home, but technology can.

Despite the differences in societies of control and the panopticon, the effect remains the same. They create the feeling that one might be under surveillance at any given moment.

Electronic surveillance is more efficient in that it destroys the physical barriers the panopticon was beholden to.<sup>25</sup> In this way, societies of control extend and intensify the power of authority systems by reaching into the private space.

The shift from institutions as channels of power to electronic surveillance supports the accumulation and centralization of knowledge by authority. In societies of control, knowledge and power are built through spatial tactics.<sup>26</sup> Electronic surveillance both records and controls mobility. In having the capability to always watch, electronic surveillance allows authority systems to know where we go, what we do, who we meet, and by what modes. Consequently, authority systems can now build a profile using these multiple but centralized forms of surveillance. Just recently the state department denied Harvard student Ismail Ajjawai entry into the United States after being questioned about politically-oriented social media posts by his friends.<sup>27</sup> Authority systems also control movement through their power over economy and capital. Screen sharing technologies force the desk employees to limit their mobility in work.

The consequence of knowledge gained by societies of control is a loss of civil liberty and privacy.<sup>28</sup> Electronic surveillance is a contradiction—western capitalism exalts individualism

---

<sup>25</sup> Martinez, "Beyond Disciplinary Enclosures," 208

<sup>26</sup> Martin and Mitchelson, "Geographies of Detention and Imprisonment," 459

<sup>27</sup> Sabur, "Palestinian Harvard Student Denied Entry to US Because 'Friends Posted Anti-American statements'."

<sup>28</sup> Dobson and Fisher, "The Panopticon's Changing Geography," 311

which can produce chaos. Sustaining an individualist society with such a high degree of economic freedom requires sophisticated forms of state surveillance.<sup>29</sup> Individualism must serve capital accumulation. It is no surprise that the appeal of societies of control comes from their relatively cheap cost compared to the panopticon. In the school, the digitized classroom removes the need for multiple assistants, teachers, and even administrative staff.

### **Electronic Monitoring in Societies of Control**

Societies of control have altered incarceration practices namely through the use of E.M. Despite the number of those incarcerated decreasing, the number of individuals subjected to E.M. has grown.<sup>30</sup> The rise of E.M. coincides with an increase in police surveillance, gang databases, facial recognition software, wiretaps, and other surveillance software. Surveillance technologies diffuse the prison into the everyday. Cities have become carceral spaces, where potentially every corner is imposed with a type of control.<sup>31</sup> Electronic monitoring, in particular, expands the spaces in which correction agencies contain and exclude while shifting the site of punishment from the prison, a bounded space, into communities, an open space.

The appeal of E.M. as opposed to direct incarceration comes from its transient nature. GPS data can be accessed at any time by anyone, removing the need for physical guards and facilities.<sup>32</sup> From 2005 to 2015 the Pew Research Center recorded that the number of active monitoring bracelets grew by nearly 140%.<sup>33</sup> It is no coincidence that the most dramatic increase happened in 2009, just a year after the 2008 financial crisis. Like other methods of surveillance,

---

<sup>29</sup> Gill, "The Global Panopticon," 9

<sup>30</sup> The Sentencing Project and Pew Charitable Trust, "Use of Electronic Offender-Tracking Devices Expands Sharply"

<sup>31</sup> Jefferson, "Computerizing Carceral Space," 983

<sup>32</sup> Martinez, "Beyond Disciplinary Enclosures," 208

<sup>33</sup> Pew Charitable Trust, "Use of Electronic Offender-Tracking Devices Expands Sharply"

E.M. is significantly cheaper than the institutional panopticon. In Illinois, it costs \$33,507 per year to imprison someone while on E.M. it costs \$750 per year.<sup>34</sup>

The efficiency and cost-saving nature of E.M have led government officials to praise it as an alternative to incarceration.<sup>35</sup> Those on GPS tracking can serve their prison time in the comfort of their own home. Yet, high surveillance and freedom are oxymorons. The mobility experienced under E.M is a disciplined mobility—one that increases government power.<sup>36</sup> The freedom to move comes with restricted hours in pre-specified places. Ankle bracelets record the precision of movement, such that if an offender crosses into an exclusion zone or absconds even momentarily, it will immediately set off an alarm. Privacy and agency are lost. Like in prison, the carceral system controls daily movement. The only difference is that the technological advancement of E.M makes it so that control no longer needs to be facilitated through an employee (the prison guard) or a boundary (the prison).

### **Race, Surveillance, and Incarceration**

However, the carceral system carries a special consequence for those that it subjects. Unlike other institutions of control, felony convictions exclude incarcerated persons from meaningful participation in social, civic, and economic life.<sup>37</sup> The formerly incarcerated find it difficult to gain employment, enroll in school, or even vote. This particularly affects Black Americans. After the 1960s, the criminal justice system increasingly targeted Black Americans as outright discrimination became illegal.<sup>38</sup> The war on drugs, tough on crime policies, and super

---

<sup>34</sup> “Vera survey of state prison expenditures” and Roman *et al.*, “Costs and Benefits.” The Downey *et al.* study focuses on Washington D.C. but is still a good proxy for other major U.S. cities. The cost-effectiveness of E.M. is due to the state not having to pay to house inmates. This eliminates expenses for food, electricity, etc.

<sup>35</sup> See citation 11.

<sup>36</sup> Brooks, “A New Mass Incarceration,” 22

<sup>37</sup> Miller and Alexander, “The Price of Carceral Citizenship,” 302

<sup>38</sup> Alexander, *New Jim Crow*

predator/welfare queen images helped support a criminal image of Black Americans. Feeley and Simon explain these new criminal justice practices as part of the new penology in which “penal managers strive to manage populations of marginal citizens with no concomitant effort toward integration into mainstream society.”<sup>39</sup> The role of the prison was to now restrict and contain populations deemed against the White, heteronormative, and individualist structure of the United States (primarily Black Americans).

New penology policies rose in conjunction with rollbacks on the Keynesian welfare state.<sup>40</sup> Conservatism, which championed mass incarceration, eliminated policies that protected income maintenance and wealth distribution. The diminution of the welfare state and reemergence of the privatized, liberal market economically damaged low-income communities, many of them predominately Black. Crime increased in these areas which bolstered punitive criminal justice practices.

The 1970s and 1980s saw Black Americans become even more targets of a risk-based society.<sup>41</sup> Criminal justice institutions no longer required knowledge of the specific individual but of problematic populations.<sup>42</sup> Prisons, courtrooms, and police existed to monitor and manage Black Americans. The term racial profiling came to refer to the practice of law enforcement and private security targeting people of color without evidence of criminal activity based on perceived race and ethnicity. In the 1980s, popular policing theories such as stop-and-frisk and broken windows relied on police officers using their discretion to determine who was a threat to

---

<sup>39</sup> Feeley and Simon, “The New Penology,” 463

<sup>40</sup> Peck, “Geography and public policy,” 222

<sup>41</sup> “The Biopolitical Justification for Geosurveillance” by Jeremy W. Crampton details how fear of the “other” creates a risk-based society, increasing government surveillance. German sociologist Ulrich Beck defines a risk-based society as “a systematic way of dealing with hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernization itself”.

<sup>42</sup> Crampton, “The Biopolitical Justification for Geosurveillance,” 390

society.<sup>43</sup> This manifested itself in the frequent stops of Black Americans and Latinx Americans.<sup>44</sup>

The targeting of Black Americans can also be seen in the passing of the 1994 crime bill. Despite crime decreasing in the 1990s, laws like the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 still pursued punitive justice policies.<sup>45</sup> A main provision of the 1994 bill was the creation of the Community Oriented Police Services Office which provided law enforcement departments funding to hire additional community police officers. Actual crime rates did not matter in penal policy. Most famously, a main proponent of the bill, Hillary Clinton, referred to gang involved children as “super-predators”, a term used in reference to Black Americans.<sup>46</sup>

The carceral system is not the only method by which Black Americans were targeted and contained. In *Spatializing Blackness*, Rashad Shabazz uncovers public housing, the private housing market, and HIV/AIDS as methods on containing Black Americans.<sup>47</sup> These systems operated by physically removing Black Americans from larger society and branding them as biologically dangerous. Shabazz’s analysis also criticizes Foucault for his lack of attention to race.<sup>48</sup> Neighborhood segregation makes possible the policing and surveillance of Black communities, feeding individuals to the prison industrial complex. As the carceral system permanently outcasts those incarcerated, the targeting and confinement of Black Americans in

---

<sup>43</sup> The broken windows theory states that visible signs of crime, anti-social behavior, and civil disorder create an urban environment that encourages further crime and disorder. This gained popularity during the 1980s with “signs” of urban decay becoming highly criminalized.

<sup>44</sup> Blow, “Romanticizing Broken Windows”

<sup>45</sup> See citation 4.

<sup>46</sup> Clinton, “Hillary Clinton Campaign Speech.”

<sup>47</sup> Shabazz, *Spatializing Blackness*, 10

<sup>48</sup> Shabazz, *Spatializing Blackness*, 5-6



and outside of prison creates an unemployable, criminalized, racialized class.<sup>49</sup> Ultimately, the goal of a race-based carceral system is not to turn the abnormal into normal, but to ensure that the abnormal can never be part of the normal.

### **Electronic Monitoring in the Modern Age**

The development of E.M. does nothing to combat this new penology, rather it reinforces it. Legislative discourse on E.M. has primarily focused on managing costs and a growing prison population rather than on rehabilitation and reintegration.<sup>50</sup> The use of E.M. in criminal justice has also allowed for populations that would normally be free of authoritarian oversight in the pretrial and supervised released stages now to be under surveillance.<sup>51</sup> In this same vein, several jurisdictions sentence E.M. based on prior convictions without taking to account personal growth and current disciplinary status. Recently state lawmakers in Illinois passed a bill mandating that the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) and Prisoner Review Board (PRB) track and publicly report data from their electronic monitoring program.<sup>52</sup> At the Illinois house judiciary committee hearing, IDOC and PRB officials revealed they did not have any criteria for why certain formerly incarcerated persons were placed on E.M. and for how long.

The lack of transparency in the implementation of E.M. raises questions around the legality of these programs. The Fifth Amendment states that no person shall be “deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.” All levels of American government must provide fair treatment which includes transparent procedures for sentencing. Not only does E.M.

---

<sup>49</sup> Smith and Hattery, “Incarceration: A Tool for Racial Segregation and Labor Exploitation”

<sup>50</sup> Feeley and Simon, “The New Penology,” 465

<sup>51</sup> Carney, “Correction through Omniscience: Electronic Monitoring and the Escalation of Crime Control,” 294

<sup>52</sup> Agnew, “Data Transparency around the use of Electronic Monitoring in Illinois (Policy statement in Support of HB 0386)”;

The Prison Review Board is a separate body to IDOC that imposes release conditions for offenders exiting penal facilities, revokes and restores good conduct credits from inmates, conducts hearings to determine whether parolees have violated conditions of parole, and awards certificates of Relief from Disabilities and Certificates of Good Conduct.

potentially violate due process, individuals given E.M. as a requirement of pretrial detention are essentially punished without having been convicted of a crime.<sup>53</sup> For persons on parole, who have completed their sentences, legal scholars argue that E.M. violates the fourth amendment ex post facto clause.<sup>54</sup>

Despite constitutional challenges, the use of E.M. has grown in all levels of government. Nonetheless, a growing body of literature has rejected claims of E.M. as an alternative to incarceration. Lauren Martin and Matthew Mitchelson define incarceration as “intentional practices that (i) restrict individuals’ ability to move from one place to another and (ii) impose orders of space and time so that individual mobility is highly constrained, if not eliminated.”<sup>55</sup> E.M. imposes such restrictions. Individuals cannot leave their place of residence without permission, likened to the way prisoners cannot leave their cell without permission.<sup>56</sup> In Illinois and other states, tampering with or removing the ankle bracelet can be seen as a crime of escape, causing individuals to be returned to jail or prison. As James Kilgore states, “if being on a monitor is not a form of incarceration, how can a person be escaping from it?”<sup>57</sup>

Claims to the effectiveness of E.M. in the criminal justice system commonly cite William Bales et al.’s 2010 study on E.M. in Florida. Examining 5,034 medium and high-risk offenders on E.M. and 266,991 offenders not placed on E.M., they found that E.M. reduces offenders’ risk of recidivism by 31 percent.<sup>58</sup> While a robust analysis, Bales *et al.*’s study only determines if participants can avoid being arrested, not if they are successful and integrated into their

---

<sup>53</sup> Still, the Bail Reform Act of 1984 allows judicial officers to release or detain an arrested person awaiting trial, sentence, or appeal.

<sup>54</sup> Carney, “Correction through Omniscience: Electronic Monitoring and the Escalation of Crime Control,” 297

<sup>55</sup> Martin and Mitchelson, “Geographies of Detention and Imprisonment,” 460

<sup>56</sup> Kilgore, “No More Shackles,” 5

<sup>57</sup> Kilgore, “No More Shackles,” 6

<sup>58</sup> Bales *et al.*, “A Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Electronic Monitoring,” 40,58

environments. Factors like employment, housing, and familial relationships remain overlooked. Such an oversight neglects the personal toll of E.M. When Bales did conduct a qualitative analysis, interviewing 105 people on E.M., he found that E.M. did bear negative consequences for family members and was a “serious detriment” to securing and keeping a job.<sup>59</sup>

The social impact of E.M. should not be ignored. One of the major ways in which E.M. disrupts the lives of participants is through their inability to secure employment. For most programs, securing movement is extremely difficult causing many to miss interviews and start dates.<sup>60</sup> Additionally, few jurisdictions have clear movement rights such as going to the store to buy food, visiting a dying family member in the hospital, or tending to urgent medical needs, nor is there any process of appeal or review of an officer's decision.<sup>61</sup> A person on E.M. must rely on the availability and efficiency of their parole officer or supervisor to grant movement outside their homes. In emergency situations that demand movement, the parole officer may be unavailable, which risks participants being returned to prison or jail.

E.M. has also been shown to create additional burdens on family members. Family members can be subjected to unannounced searches by parole officers or the police, often at inconvenient hours, creating tension within the household.<sup>62</sup> This overburdens households already dealing with the traumatic transition of loved ones from prison or jail. In the case of participants who are parents, the ankle bracelet restricts their ability to take part in the child's life, negatively impacting their development.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Bales *et al.*, “A Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Electronic Monitoring,” 89-91

<sup>60</sup> Kilgore, “Progress or More of the Same?,” 129

<sup>61</sup> Kilgore, “Progress or More of the Same?,” 134

<sup>62</sup> Kilgore, “Progress or More of the Same?,” 131

<sup>63</sup> Kilgore, “Progress or More of the Same?,” 132

Few studies exist on the mental health toll of E.M., although the literature on psychological effects of incarceration affirms the damage of confinement. In their study, “Dysphoria and electronically monitored home confinement,” Holman and Quinn did not find that E.M. effected participants’ mental health.<sup>64</sup> However, these results should be viewed with skepticism. Holman and Quinn conducted their study in survey format which runs the possibility of respondents misrepresenting their experience due to not being familiar with the researchers and the social stigma surrounding mental health. Conversely, Vanhaelemeesch *et. al*’s study on E.M. in Belgium found that the feeling of being watched by the government caused stress and anxiety in participants.<sup>65</sup> Being on E.M. also took away participants’ sense of autonomy and control, hurting their sense of self.

There are ways that the U.S. carceral system can begin to better understand and address these social problems within their E.M. population. While there has been strong quantitative analysis evaluating E.M.’s cost-effectiveness and influence on recidivism, very few studies have focused on the social impact E.M. This study attempts to fill that gap in knowledge by using qualitative interviews that center the day to day experiences of E.M. participants to determine the success of monitoring programs. A successful E.M. program truly serves as an alternative to incarceration by having minimal disruptive impact on participant’s lives. But as initial overviews of E.M. programs have expressed, E.M. may more or less support pre-existing punitive carceral practices. As a result, in assessing the social impact of E.M. this study will also discuss the connection between the modern application of E.M., general theories on incarceration, and the U.S. specific racial caste system.

---

<sup>64</sup> Holman and Quinn, “Dysphoria and electronically monitored home confinement”

<sup>65</sup> Vanhaelemeesch *et al.*, “Punishment at home” 282

## **CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY**

This thesis uses a mixed-methods approach to address the questions raised in the introduction. First, I interviewed twelve individuals on, or formerly on, E.M.<sup>66</sup> This was then supported by a survey analysis to quantify responses.<sup>67</sup>

### **Interviews and Survey Analysis**

Research participants for the study were recruited using a variety of methods. Ten participants were involved in a local community organization in Chicago, one was referred by another interviewee, and the last participant I found through an advocacy organization in Chicago. Despite ten participants coming from one organization, this organization is located in a neighborhood with one of the highest number of adults on E.M.<sup>68</sup> Primarily using this organization ensured my data was representative of the geography and race of E.M. participants in Cook County. To protect participants' identity, the location and names of these organizations will remain confidential. Names used throughout the study are also fictional to prevent participants identification. For the participants located through the local community organization, interviews were conducted face-to-face in the organization's headquarters. Other interviews were held on the phone. Interviews were conducted in January and February of 2020. Participants were paid \$20 in compensation for their time and in acknowledgment of potential distress of the potential distress caused by recalling their experiences on E.M. Funding for these interviews was

---

<sup>66</sup> See Appendix A for interview questions

<sup>67</sup> See Appendix B for survey questions

<sup>68</sup> This was determined by Freedom of Information Act documents received on the number of people on E.M. per zip code.

provided by the Public Policy program at The University of Chicago and the Pozen Center Human Rights Lab.

The interviews were semi-structured with an average of 14 questions asked over 30 minutes. All participants were sent a copy of the consent form and asked to verbally consent before the interview began. Interviews were recorded and transcribed by the service Temi to guarantee an exact representation of participants' responses. Responses were coded based on the subject matter: societal interaction, family and friends, and personal development.

Cook County was used as the site of analysis for its accessibility to the researcher. Considering there are several types of E.M. in Illinois, and this study is meant to be an overview, participants interviewed varied on type: Mandatory Supervised Release, Pretrial Detention, and Juvenile Probation. All interviewees were over the age of 18.

Survey results were collected in hopes of increasing the sample size. Unfortunately, responses could only be collected from those interviewed. I administered the survey right after interviewing the subject and left them alone so my presence would not influence answers. Survey participants also had the option to expand on their responses if desired (which two did). The survey gathered general information on participants: their name, age, race, and under what conditions they were placed on E.M. The survey consisted of 11 questions asked on a 7-point Likert scale. The Likert scale response options were listed as an effect (strong positive effect to strong negative effect) on the participant. Qualtrics was used to create and circulate the survey. Interviews and survey results are de-identified to protect the privacy of the individuals participating and to ensure honesty in answers.

Similar to other studies, this project does have its limitations. First, I noticed the survey results differed from the responses given during the interviews. For example, I would ask a

participant to explain how E.M. affected their daily schedule and they would detail E.M.'s negative impact. However, when taking the survey, that respondent would mark E.M. as only slightly negatively impacting their daily schedule. I believe this could be because I am interviewing individuals who have grown up in high violence neighborhoods and when considered against other life traumas, E.M. affected them somewhat less by comparison. This should be kept in mind when reading survey results layered throughout the data section. Secondly, like any researcher I do carry bias. As someone involved in prison advocacy I may have overly focused on the negative impacts of E.M.

All respondents were male and identified as Black or Hispanic/Latinx. Although I would have liked to interview a more diverse participant body, most individuals on E.M. in Cook County are Black or Latinx, and male.<sup>69</sup>

Additionally, I do recognize the sample size of my study is small. Regardless, I do believe there is benefit in having a small sample size in that I am able to better illustrate individual stories. Coupled with the fact that respondents expressed similar sentiments, I do believe this sample size provides a start to understanding E.M. in Cook County and the nation.

---

<sup>69</sup> Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council, "Research Briefing: state of Use of Electronic Monitoring"

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA AND RESULTS

Twelve people were interviewed for this study. Of the participants, 9 (75%) identified as Black and 3 (25%) identified as Hispanic/Latinx. All respondents identified as male.

In Cook County, three agencies currently operate E.M. programs: the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), the County Sheriff's Department, and the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ). The IDOC uses E.M. as part of their Mandatory Supervised Release (MSR) program, the County Sheriff uses E.M. to monitor pretrial defendants and those on probation, and the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) runs an E.M. program for youth on probation. Unlike the IDOC and ICJJ, county E.M. participants do not have a parole officer, they directly call the County Sheriff for needs.

For this study, 3 (25%) respondents were on E.M. via IDOC, 5 (42%) via the County Sheriff for pretrial detention, and 2 (17%) on juvenile probation. Additionally, 2 (17%) respondents had been on both county pretrial detention and IDOC MSR.

Table 1: Demographics characteristics of the study group	
<i>Ethnic Breakdown</i>	
Black/African American	9 (75%)
Hispanic/Latinx	3 (25%)
<i>Types of E.M.</i>	
Pretrial Detention	5 (42%)
Juvenile Probation	2 (17%)
Mandatory Supervised Release (MSR)	3 (25%)
Pretrial Detention and MSR	2 (17%)



<i>Age Distribution</i>	
18-28	8 (67%)
28-38	1 (8%)
38-48	3 (25%)

### **Societal Interactions**

Among respondents interviewed for this study, many expressed concerns around their ability to successfully participate in everyday county life while on E.M. Social interactions proved difficult as E.M. greatly affected respondents' abilities to form a positive impression, gain employment, move throughout the county, and navigate the social/geographical layouts of their environments.

#### *External Perceptions*

In response to the question, "Do you believe being on electronic monitoring affects the way others see you?" several participants noted that it did, mainly in unfavorable ways. Ryan, who recently completed his MSR period stated:

"If I'm walking down the street in the summer shorts and you see a band on my leg or if I go to adjust my shoe or cross my leg and you just see it, what are people going to think? Yeah there are open minded people that don't judge and all this other shit, but the fact is that most people do judge and most people are afraid of things like that."

Last year Ryan was released from prison where he served over 20 years for a violent crime. While incarcerated, Ryan participated in educational programs, eventually leading a trauma-informed therapy group. On paper, Ryan appears to be the model inmate. He successfully turned his life around while helping others incarcerated. This is the type of transformation that the prison system aims to produce but rarely does. Despite efforts to become a positive influence, Ryan still found himself stigmatized for having been incarcerated. Particularly, being on E.M.

led others to avoid him, interpreting the bracelet as a sign of danger. Other respondents echoed Ryan's statement and viewed being on E.M. as damaging to their ability to form meaningful relationships in their neighborhood and the larger county.

These social stigmas especially affect juvenile offenders. Adolescence is an extremely sensitive time, impacting both the psychological and physiological development of youth.

Miguel, a respondent formerly on juvenile probation, recounted that he was expelled from school and treated as an outcast for being placed on E.M.:

"I lost a lot of friendships, opportunities to go to school because I got in trouble...If someone's in trouble, [the school's administration] don't want somebody like that in their school."

Being expelled and losing his friends severely hurt Miguel's self-esteem. While his school should be reprimanded for excluding him when he needed their support the most, his experience serves as an example of the various types of discrimination those on E.M. regularly face. Wearing a physical bracelet that marks a person as having interacted with the criminal justice system significantly reduces their opportunities to develop and maintain positive relationships. To avoid this, respondents would carefully pick their clothing, hiding the ankle bracelet behind long pants. These efforts could go in vain as the bracelet is quite large:

"It's noticeable. You got this big old thing almost the size of a phone. It's noticeable, so it'll make police want to bother you. It'll probably make professional people not want to mess with you... You miss out on a lot of opportunities like that."



(Figure 1: Picture of E.M. bracelet, found through google images)

Felony convictions and arrests exclude individuals from participation in social, civic, and economic life. Normally, individuals who have been arrested or convicted can choose when to disclose such information, allowing strangers to learn their personality before reaching a judgment. This anonymity is extremely helpful, especially when applying to jobs. The ankle bracelet takes that ability away. It automatically brands a person as criminal, ultimately tarnishing social interactions through advertising the criminal justice history of those arrested and formerly incarcerated.

Table 2: Response to survey question, ““Do you believe being on electronic monitoring affects the way others see you?”” <sup>70</sup>	
Negative effect	6 (50%)
Positive effect	4 (40%)
No effect	2 (20%)

<sup>70</sup> See Methodology for information on inconsistencies in survey reporting.

### *Employer Interactions*

Furthermore, respondents cited employment as the most hampered opportunity due to being on E.M. Electronic monitoring made it difficult to find work not only because of the bracelet's social stigma but the lack of movement as well.

Respondents on MSR had initial movement on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays for around five hours each day.<sup>71</sup> In that time, they were expected to secure work. Many found this impossible as they lived far away from high employment centers and relied on public transportation for travel. One respondent on MSR recalled:

“Yes, it affected my ability [to find a job] because it got in the way of me getting opportunities. I was getting interviews but I wasn't able to proceed with going to them.”

The five hours of movement given only three times a week proved a huge barrier in securing employment. Employers would ask respondents to start immediately or interview on non-movement days. Such extended movement needed to be approved by a parole officer or county official who often took several days to respond. The lack of flexibility in movement eventually turned potential employers away. In addition, several respondents did not have access to the internet and could not apply to jobs online. This meant they had to physically enter stores to ask for work. However, movement was not solely used for job hunting but to run errands and visit family. As a result, respondents required additional time to obtain employment, more than what was offered by the County, IDOC, or ICJJ.

For pretrial defendants, locating jobs proved even more challenging as they were not given any movement on E.M.<sup>72</sup> Mundane tasks such as taking out the trash or sitting on the lawn

---

<sup>71</sup> Although requested through the Freedom of Information Act, there is no official data on the most common movement restrictions for those placed on E.M. through IDOC or Cook County. The estimation of average movement parameters was based on respondent interviews who mentioned similar guidelines.

<sup>72</sup> See Appendix C for Cook County E.M. guidelines

were considered violations. In both cases (MSR and pretrial), only the acquisition of a paid position could extend movement. This meant that pretrial defendants could only leave their home if they found a job online or a judge specially granted movement. Consequently, many ended up jobless despite seeking employment.

When work could be found, the state and county bureaucracy often prevented it from being retained:

“So when I got out I had a job that was lined up for me...The difficulty is when I go and apply for a job, I have to let the employer know that I'm on house arrest because let's say I do the interview with you, you're going to hire me...Now you're telling me, ‘Oh great, we'll love for you to start on Monday’ I have to be like, ‘Oh, um, I'm sorry, I have to call my parole office and is it okay if my parole officer calls you because they get to talk to a contact person?’...Like how off putting is that to any employer? It was hard for me just to find a job that way.”

The process of getting movement approved for work hinders E.M. participants from sustaining jobs. It requires employers to engage with the criminal justice system, breaching their own privacy and freedom. Employers must leave themselves open to frequent phone calls and visits from parole officers and county officials as stated in participant agreements.<sup>73</sup> As respondents articulated, that was extremely off-putting, further impeding efforts to better themselves. When asked about the relationship between respondents and their employers many gave anecdotes of how they or a friend were fired from their job due to parole officers calling or pulling them away from work. Frequent rejections due to this barrier even discouraged some respondents from looking for work.

---

<sup>73</sup> See citation 73. Although requested, there is no rule document for IDOC MSR. For IDOC, this claim is based off of respondents' interviews.

Likewise, the lack of movement on E.M. impacted respondents' ability to be effective employees. Marcus, a respondent who works at a non-profit that helps those incarcerated lamented:

“So I can't go to certain engagements because they happen at night and this is an engagement with organizations that deal with higher education in prison... This is a restorative justice based program, so you have a lot of restorative justice based meetings and events that take place throughout the city that I can't take part of because of the timing, which disrupts my ability to be effective in certain areas and to develop certain relationships.”

Extended movement from usual work hours can only be approved 24 hours in advance, but if engagements go on too late or are in certain parts of the city, movement can be denied. Such denial undermines respondents' ability to complete assignments and show dedication to their job. Marcus shared how he was forced to leave work early due to bad weather, fearing not being home in time for curfew. Luckily, Marcus' boss was understanding of his situation, but that relationship touches on another drawback of E.M.: participants must find employers who will tolerate such disruptions. Most were unable to.

Two respondents did mention that although work was difficult to find, being on E.M. still encouraged them to seek employment as it was their only way of receiving more movement. If not on E.M., they would have continued to remain unemployed.

Table 3: Response to survey question, “Has being on electronic monitoring affected your ability to stay employed/find employment?”	
Negative effect	7 (58%)
Positive effect	2 (17%)
No effect	3 (25%)

### *Movement and Social Segregation*

The rules for requesting movement were unclear to respondents. Parole officers and county officials denied movement not only for work engagements but social engagements as well. Charles, on MSR, was unable to attend his aunt's funeral due to his movement being denied. Another respondent likened his current movement to social segregation:

“So in prison, segregation is utilized...as a tool to punish people for breaking the rules...so all the privileges that are afforded in prison, they take you away from all that. So being here on house arrest, it's the exact same thing. So I'm actually socially taken away from all of the social privileges that I have. So being able to go out to a movie, a dinner, being able to stay at a significant other's house...all these things are being taken away from me. Spending time with my family, actually going out...So I just think that's the best way that I can describe this to someone that doesn't know, it's social segregation or isolation.”

The use of the term social segregation points to an often overlooked aspect of E.M.: the majority of people on E.M. live in low-income areas with few amenities such as places of employment, hospitals, grocery stores, and entertainment centers.<sup>74</sup> Significantly restricting these individual's movement harms their ability to access social resources and engage in the larger civic life of the county. Respondents could not frequently travel outside their immediate surroundings due to movement restrictions, obstructing the development of social relationships.

Like with employment, these restrictions specially impaired pretrial defendants. John who was put on E.M. earlier this year commented:

“Yes, [movement] had to be approved and the approval was very hard. You have to send documents in and you have to make calls. This was what happened when I was sick. They told me in order to go to the hospital I'll have to call the ambulance. And once they make it there, they would have to speak with them and they will let electronic monitoring know if I'm sick

---

<sup>74</sup> See citation 73. Zip codes with the highest number of people on E.M. are also low-income, bearing few daily resources. Respondents also talked about their neighborhoods as not having enough resources.

enough to leave the house. So the ambulance had more rights over me than I had over myself.”

Individuals on pretrial detention are placed on E.M. without being convicted of a crime. Yet, their civil liberty of free movement is stripped away. In fact, their form of E.M. is the most restrictive. Any movement outside their home must be approved by the County. But this movement is difficult to obtain. Ryan, who now works at a community center helping justice involved youth, described his experience applying for movement for his mentee:

“I think I got a movement three times and I submitted a movement for him so many times and I would keep asking. I would keep doing everything they asked me to do. I had submitted a letter, I had to get the other entity to submit a letter. I would do that and it wasn't enough. ‘Oh well, he has to call.’ I would have him call. I would still submit the letters. I would call with him. Still couldn't get the movement we're trying to start school. We're trying to get a job and they acted so ridiculous.”

Respondents on pretrial detention, more so than any other population, were socially segregated from county life. They found themselves isolated in their homes, devoid of social interaction without having been sentenced. County officials denied movement even for beneficial community programs and family engagements. For these respondents, E.M. assumed their guilt, punishing before judgement. This can be detrimental as one respondent interviewed was later found innocent of his charges despite having spent several months on E.M., unable to obtain a job and provide for his family due to movement restrictions.

Even for those on MSR, the lack of movement on E.M. still elicits frustration. MSR is not the equivalent of discretionary parole, which Illinois outlawed in 1978. MSR is served *in addition* to prison time. Despite already paying their “debt” to society, individuals on MSR continue to face limited freedom. Some respondents interviewed had been in prison for over 20 years. The lack of movement prevented them from forming social bonds in the workplace and new friendships/relationships. Respondents had to always be conscious of time as failing to



appear at home on time or even going to places off limits runs the risk of being returned to prison or jail. Participants noted this was a fear as complications from buses or weather could delay them on their journey home. Whether or not MSR respondents would be sent to prison was determined by their relationship with their parole officer. Some respondents had positive relationships while others had negative. All MSR respondents, though, relayed that their parole officer solely determined if their movement was extended. This made approval for movement anxiety-inducing.

### *Neighborhood Navigation*

Moreover, the lack of movement on E.M. impaired MSR participants from successfully integrating into their communities. Respondents returned to low-income and high-violence neighborhoods after several years away, forcing them to relearn the social fabric of their surroundings. Movement restrictions made the development of such knowledge significantly challenging:

“So to come out of prison after 26 and a half years...to chart this space, to navigate through this space without the stress and anxiety...you don't know where to travel, you don't know how to travel, you don't know where to look. You got to know where to look for work and if you do, you have to figure out how to get there.”

For respondents living in high violence areas, successfully navigating their neighborhoods was essential to survival. Being in the wrong place at the wrong time could turn them into a target. Respondents stressed that movement restrictions under E.M. sabotaged their safety by preventing them from relearning the social rules and boundaries of their area.

Not only do formerly incarcerated people need to relearn the social fabric of their neighborhoods, they must relearn how to navigate the county as well. When asked about returning, respondents discussed the difficulties of mastering public transportation while on E.M.

Marcus recalled getting on the wrong bus and having to walk in a foreign neighborhood, opening himself to conflict. Not being able to secure a job made bus fare expensive so he could not take additional transportation. The time restrictions given by MSR thwarts respondents from gaining spatial awareness, making them vulnerable to violence and susceptible to getting lost.

Individuals on probation and pretrial detention also found their safety compromised by being on E.M. Electronic monitoring damaged their existing social navigation knowledge. Luis, a respondent formerly on juvenile probation, remembered:

“Because I would walk to school. Being in my neighborhood and then going into a different neighborhood, I obviously would have to take different routes every day. Eventually my P.O. was like, “Why aren't you going straight to school?” I could've walked straight down, but I'm not going to sit there and walk straight down.”

Luis like many students would take different routes to school as some areas harbored gang activity. His parole officer, an outsider to his neighborhood, did not understand this dynamic, almost arresting him on several occasions. The lack of cultural awareness on the side of the parole officer in conjunction with the reality of his dangerous surroundings put Luis in an uncomfortable position. He had to choose between his safety or returning to juvenile detention. The restrictions of movement proved unrealistic in the reality of his environment. For certain communities, free movement is critical to safety.

The stagnation of home detention also worried pretrial defendants:

“You got to always think like the next person...If I'm seeing people online, I be like, okay I know he on live with dude. Dude just got out. Dude on house arrest. I'm paying attention to all of this, so now I'm looking at the background of his crib...people dying out here. People that you don't want them to know where you at, they know where you at. It ain't hard to figure it out. I know he in the crib and I know he must live in his hood, because all his homies be out there.”

Anonymity in location protects individuals in high violence neighborhoods from attacks. Always being in one place can expose individuals to clashes or intimidation by others. For respondents, movement is not just a thing needed to facilitate social interaction but to avoid certain interactions as well.

### **Family and Friends**

Family and friends were referenced as a major source of stress for those on E.M. Respondents found themselves unable to engage in family activities which led to conflicts and formed feelings of resentment. At the same time, being on E.M. emphasized the importance of family and friendship networks for success.

#### *Engagement in Family Life*

In answering questions on family life, respondents relayed that E.M. affected their ability to engage. Respondents found this particularly stressful as family and friendship connections were needed for emotional support. The movement restrictions established by the County, IDOC, and ICJJ barred respondents from visiting family members, especially those that lived far away. Respondents recalled not being able to see mothers, sisters, and cousins due to their lack of movement. For those on MSR, who had been incarcerated for several years, this was particularly painful:

“I can't really go nowhere...I ain't seen my sister since I been out. She get off work at one o'clock and she live all the way in the suburbs. A 45 minute drive...I can't even go see her, because she work so much. But if I wasn't on house arrest, I could have went out there five, six, seven, eight o'clock at night, kicking it with her, spent the night. Because family is important. You have people in your family you be wanting to see.”

John, a pretrial defendant, was arrested in Cook County and forced to stay in Cook County despite living in DuPage county. In those months, John rarely saw his wife and kids,

developing feelings of depression. His story illustrates how movement restrictions derived from E.M. can harm family bonds and structure.

During his time in Cook County, John missed family parties, holidays, and his children's birthdays as he could only receive movement for work. Other respondents with children touched on the hardships of raising kids while on E.M. Their children would express disappointment in not having their parents actively involved in their life. One respondent on pretrial detention remembered being denied movement to pick his daughter up from school. Not having access to emotional support systems while not being able to emotionally support others, negatively impacted the family dynamic of respondents. Respondents described arguing with family members:

“But, it messed some years up. I think I would have been different, maybe. Something would have been different right now. I think if I would have helped more, my family would have been together. Because I was in trouble for like three or four years because they gave me probation for five years, so I felt like I couldn't do a lot of things”.

Being on E.M. strained Miguel's already difficult home life. His inability to move sparked arguments between his parents, fights which Miguel still blames himself for. Especially as a juvenile, the familial fallout from E.M. can have lasting, damaging effects. On a broader scale, respondents agreed with Miguel's statement that E.M. increased conflict within the household. Family members were often at odds due to the financial strain of respondents not being able to work and cramped living situations.

### *Family Privacy*

E.M. not only stirred conflict in families from the lack of movement but the lack of privacy too. One stipulation of signing up for E.M. via IDOC, Cook County, or ICJJ is that

individuals must allow state officials to enter their place of residence at any time.<sup>75</sup> Family members expressed displeasure at having criminal justice officers constantly search their residences. For Luis, these searches put his aunt in danger:

“She was already dealing with DCFS (Department of Children and Family Services) with her kids and then to have me in the house.. because I was a criminal, [DCFS] had to come in.”

As Luis was a juvenile when he received probation, he had to stay at his aunt’s house to qualify for E.M. Luis’ presence and stops by his parole officer harmed Luis’ aunt’s custody of her children. As he was a “criminal,” DCFS agents believed his presence to be proof that she was an unfit mother. Luis’ story highlights the struggles of families with loved ones on E.M. They are often interacting with more than one form of state surveillance be that E.M., DCFS, or even public housing. Having family members on E.M. can jeopardize their relationship with these agencies and increase the exposure to state bodies.

Frequent stops by parole officers and police led to arguments between respondents and their families as family members were unaware of the level of privacy they would be forced to give up:

“Because it was like she didn't like how the police had to come keep checking up on me, pulling up to the house, she didn't like that.”

Not only were respondents punished but their families as well.

### *Networks*

Still, having family members underlined the importance of networks. As individuals on E.M. are restricted in their movement, many rely on family and friends to access resources. This requires a strong support network. Lucas disclosed:

---

<sup>75</sup> See citation 72 and 73.

“Yeah, if I didn't have a network it would have been impossible. It would have been impossible because right now I don't have a license. I don't have a car. I talk to guys in the [counseling] group...out of all the people I'm doing the best, because I had a network that was behind me and the ability to create resumes and all this stuff before I left prison...I think it would've been impossible and be able to actually take care of myself”.

Lucas was put on E.M. as a requirement of his sexual assault case. As a registered sex offender, his E.M. carries special restrictions—stricter than regular MSR. Due to his little movement, Lucas depended on the friendships he made in prison to secure him a place to live and a job. Without these networks, Lucas would have struggled, similar to members in his support group. Despite Lucas' special circumstances, other respondents concurred with his statements. Strong family and friendship bonds were essential for success. Family and friends helped respondents gain employment, acquire food, and even receive haircuts. Yet, not everyone has these networks. Some respondents did not have family or friends to support them upon release. Many in the jail and prison system are homeless and lack strong family and friendships bonds. Without these bonds, E.M. becomes impossible.

Nevertheless, these networks stressed respondents. Many felt like a burden on their loved ones:

“And now here I am in this home and yeah, it's beautiful and it's my family and it's wonderful connecting with [my brother], his wife, and my nephews. But at the same time I feel like I'm in the way, like I'm always stuck in the house...They're supposed to have privacy, they're supposed to be able to be intimate, they're supposed to be able to feel comfortable and you can see at moments that's not the case...that made it really, really hard”.

When on E.M., respondents lack independence. Counting on others to function evoked guilt on the side of the respondent over the added responsibility on their loved ones but also irritation if certain errands were not run correctly. Both these feelings increased tension within the family

unit. Even so, these networks were crucial for survival. Respondents who did have these networks noted it was a privilege.

### *Positive impact*

Yet, not all respondents found being on E.M. detrimental when it came to their families.

Being forced to stay at home allowed some respondents to grow closer to their loved ones:

“In a way it made [my mom] happy because I was off the streets in the house every day. That's something that she wants. Not for me to be in the house not doing nothing, but to be in the house, she was happy that I was safe and in the house. It was cool to her, she was okay with it. Yeah, [our relationship] improved. It made me want for more I guess.”

Surprisingly, in the survey results, the number of people who listed E.M. as having a positive effect equaled those who listed E.M. as having a negative effect. This could be due to error in the survey results as most respondents spoke of E.M. having a negative influence on home life.<sup>76</sup>

Table 4: Response to survey question, “Has being on electronic monitoring affected your relationship with your family?”	
Negative effect	5 (41.5%)
Positive effect	5 (41.5%)
No effect	2 (17%)

### **Personal Development**

Aside from the impact on external relationships and perceptions, respondents communicated that E.M. damaged their mental health. Respondents reported growing depressed and anxious due to the lack of privacy from the criminal justice system. Time in solitude did allow for some respondents to engage in personal reflection, resulting in the development of positive personality traits like patience.

---

<sup>76</sup> See Methodology for information on survey error.

### *Psychological Impact*

Pretrial respondents emphasized missing the outside as a major part of their E.M. journey. Many saw running, walking, and just sitting outside as crucial to clearing their heads and achieving a sense of calm. The added familial and financial pressure of E.M. made access to the outside even more important. However, with home confinement, as designated by the county and state, such movement was impossible. Sebastian, a pretrial defendant, admitted that at times he felt he was going crazy:

“I’m telling you the first two months, it was good. And then in the middle, it started getting it to me. And then because I had a lot of things going on. I had been away from my family.. and then it was like my first time ever going to county and all that. So it was like a whole lot of new things. But yeah, it just felt crazy though. I have never felt like that in my life. Just isolated from all the people I was used to socializing with.”

Sebastian is a self-described extrovert. On E.M., he couldn’t breathe. There was no fresh air, no outside. E.M. also prevented Sebastian from seeing the people he normally socialized with. His friends and family did not like being forced to stay indoors with Sebastian, even though they cared deeply for him. The stress of not being able to go outside coupled with not regularly seeing his friends and family isolated Sebastian from the rest of the world. This manifested in him developing depression.

Interviews showed that other respondents experienced depression as well while on E.M. Like Sebastian, being cut off from important social networks caused significant mental strain. Some respondents still had access to social media and would see their friends and family enjoying life without them. This led to respondents feeling as though the world left them behind. They could not interact with society in the way that they wanted to. Specifically, respondents described E.M. their life being on hold.



When asked about depression on E.M., respondents also highlighted that feelings of isolation were not just physical but emotional as well. Respondents rarely saw their friends and family and when these networks were present they could not understand respondents' emotional distress. This would cause some respondents to withdraw from home life, further increasing their depression:

"I'm boxed in and I got this on my leg, so I was like, I can't do too much if you. I'm confined, you.. so not quite sure a person want to come to me and catch my energy. Like I ain't finna be down. He can't go nowhere. So it just makes you not even want to call a person over there, you know, you're like, I'm a ride by myself."

But respondents not only felt left behind by their family and friends but the system as well:

"Some people felt sorry for me...Mostly everybody probably just viewed me as another statistic...you know another Black male on house arrest, in jail."

The vast majority of people that who are on E.M. in Cook County are Black and male.<sup>77</sup> As a result, respondents (who were Black and male) disconnected from their experience on E.M. To them, this was just another part of growing up Black in Chicago. From a very young age mass incarceration and policing serve as the developmental backdrop for youth in Chicago. These institutions position Black men as aggressive, physically strong, and unemotional.<sup>78</sup> This sentiment gets extended in schools, in the streets, and even in their homes. As youth lose value in their environment, they lose value in themselves as well. Being put on E.M. only encouraged Black respondents' negative perceptions of themselves and their community. It reminded them that they were criminal.

---

<sup>77</sup> See citation 68.

<sup>78</sup> Cassidy, "They Wear the Mask"

Table 5: Response to survey question, “Has being on electronic monitoring affected your relationship self-esteem?”	
Negative effect	6 (50%)
Positive effect	1 (8%)
No effect	5 (42%)

These negative feelings increased tension within the households. Respondents mentioned becoming more aggressive with their families—a consequence of their depression.

### *Comparisons to Incarceration*

The depression spurred by E.M. reminded respondents of their experiences in jail and prison:

“Overall it was horrible. It was just like being incarcerated. I initially thought, okay, yes, I'm home with my family. That's great. I've come to realize it was just like being incarcerated. I could not leave out my front door. I could not take the kids off the bus. I couldn't take the garbage out. I couldn't do nothing. I couldn't even get a job.”

While respondents found being home with their families soothing, the lack of ability to travel freely awakened memories of incarceration. Respondents described their bedrooms as larger cells to which they were restricted. Even though they had moved out of the physical place that was incarceration respondents still felt trapped. This was especially difficult for low-income participants who had no TV or internet to distract themselves.

Furthermore, on E.M., there is very little independence in movement. As per participant agreement, respondents had to inform parole officers and county officials where they were at all times. Sometimes, parole officers would call at night asking respondents random questions or demanding respondents move to confirm their bracelet worked. Participants had to comply. But, for many, the harassment extended to everyday police as well. Respondents recalled being

stopped by police on the street because they were wearing a monitor. This hypervisibility to criminal justice officials and lack of privacy made participants anxious. Parole officers, county officials, and police were similar to prison guards in that they had complete control over respondents. Many feared being returned to prison or jail for conflict with these authority figures:

“And that's the thing that sucks about Mandatory Supervised Release is that you can be violated for not doing anything wrong. You don't have to break a law to be violated. You get into an argument with your parole officer, you get violated. They could write that up however they see fit and you're in the wrong, there's nothing to talk about”.

Table 6: Response to survey question, “Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of privacy?”	
Negative effect	8 (67%)
Positive effect	2 (16.5%)
No effect	2 (16.5%)

The band itself served as a reminder to respondents’ of their confinement:

“Cause you can't relax. Like right now I'm crossing my legs and I couldn't do that when I was on E.M. because the box is right there it'll start scratching into me and stuff. I had to put a pillow between my legs when I went to sleep. You know it's the simple things that we take for granted sometimes.”

Charles is a respondent that severely hurt his leg while wearing the ankle bracelet. The monitor was on too tight, leaving marks on his ankles. Respondents reiterated that wearing the band prevented them from being able to truly relax. The band could not be submerged in water (respondents could not take baths, only showers) nor could it be taken off. With it, respondents felt that the county, IDOC, and ICJJ were always watching. While this should have a positive effect on preventing people from engaging in criminal activity, it also made respondents afraid of

doing everyday activities. For example, one respondent hesitated when leaving his house to chase his dog due to fear of being sent back to jail. When he called his parole officer to explain his movement, it turned out that his band had never been turned on. It did not matter, the band served its purpose. It caused the respondent to police himself, paralleling Deleuze and Foucault's theories on power and institutions.

Negative experiences on E.M. amounted to respondents describing the program as a "set up." By this, they meant that E.M. promises freedom but still denies it. Some respondents alluded that they would have rather stayed in jail than be out. Miguel stated:

"I don't know. I feel like in E.M. it's like they're poking at you. If your friends call you, "Oh, hey. You want to go out? You know, just come," it's like peer pressure. So, I'm saying no, whatever and I even want to do that. Sometimes they give you more time when you're in E.M. So, they said they'll give you two months on E.M. I'd rather do one month locked up in jail."

For Miguel, being put on E.M. extended the time he was under IDJJ's watch. E.M. had the effect of allowing IDJJ officials to lengthen his incarceration.

Consequently, E.M. gave some respondents more opportunities to get in trouble. Simply going outside as a pretrial defendant or coming home 30 minutes late on MSR could land people back in jail and prison. One respondent was initially on E.M. for only 3 months but stayed on it for a year after getting into several arguments with his parole officer. He did not undertake any illegal activity, just violated his movement. For him, staying in jail would have been preferable as it would have resulted in less time confined. Yet, not all respondents felt this way. The majority still preferred being home but expressed confusion as to why they were given such little movement.

Table 7: Response to survey question, “Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of freedom?”	
Negative effect	7 (58%)
Positive effect	3 (25%)
No effect	2 (17%)

### *Positive Impact*

Similar to family dynamics, being on E.M. did allow some respondents to develop positive traits. Two respondents developed patience and reflected on their actions:

“I mean, it gave me more time to think about myself, and to think about the decisions I was making and stuff like that. It kind of affected me but it didn't because I expected it coming from where I come from. I mean like I said, it just gave me more time to build more of a connection with myself.”

Older respondents believed E.M. could be beneficial to younger participants as E.M. had the potential to help individuals slow down and gradually re-enter society. However, in its current state, for the majority, E.M. prevented growth due to the overly restrictive nature of the band.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

Responses to interview and survey questions introduced a variety of themes regarding respondents' experiences on E.M. It revealed that despite E.M. being marked as a “community-based alternative to incarceration” in Cook County, respondents still faced significant challenges throughout their time on the bracelet. E.M. harmed respondents’ social life, family life, and mental health. Although there were some positive elements to being on E.M., these did not outweigh the negative. Respondents could not freely work, visit family, or generally move around. Moreover, respondents’ did not view themselves as wholly outside the bounds of incarceration. While this study does not attempt to equate E.M. and physical incarceration (respondents did list several benefits of being home), it does dispel the myth that E.M. is an *alternative* to incarceration. Rather, as an advancement in surveillance technology, E.M. represents an *evolution* of the current carceral system.

E.M. like physical incarceration uses confinement to punish individuals accused of a crime. While it could be argued that E.M. differs as it allows some movement, interview data exposes the adversity many participants face when attempting to extend their movement. Respondents must call their parole officer or the Sheriff’s office to be allowed movement. This removes their bodily autonomy and independence, similar to being jail and prison. Returning home did allow for some respondents to reconnect with family members but the responsibility of caring for an incarcerated person now fell on them instead of the state. Families had to provide food, shelter, and entertainment in already financially strained households. But that is the appeal of E.M.—it allows for states to pass the monetary burden of incarceration onto the community. Interviews demonstrated the pressure being on E.M. placed on the family members.

Additionally, E.M. carries a racial dimension. In Cook County, Black men and women still constitute the largest percentage of those under E.M. The county Sheriff reported that 63% of those on E.M. in 2019 identified as Black despite Illinois only having a 13.8% Black population.<sup>79</sup> Even though Black Illinoisans represent just over a tenth of the state population they comprise the majority on E.M. Nationally, there are more people on parole, probation, and awaiting trial than incarcerated many of whom wear ankle bracelets.<sup>80</sup> If all those on probation, parole, and awaiting trial wore ankle bracelets, it would allow states an unparalleled level of surveillance in Black communities. While it may seem alarmist, the use of E.M. is on the rise. This principally harms Black people as Black people represent 12% of the U.S. adult population but 33% of the sentenced prison population.<sup>81</sup> Whites account for 64% of adults but 30% of prisoners.

Another adverse element of E.M. is that it does nothing to rehabilitate and empower those under its care. Respondents stated that they received no financial, educational, medical, or housing support while on E.M. Improvement in these fields has been proven to decrease crime and drastically reduce recidivism.<sup>82</sup> This is evidenced by the fact that several respondents interviewed were arrested for committing crimes of survival. The lack of state attention to increasing resources bodes poorly for the future of crime reduction. In actuality, E.M. exacerbated welfare issues for respondents as many could not find work due to movement restrictions.

---

<sup>79</sup>See citation 68

<sup>80</sup> Jones, "Correctional Control 2018: Incarceration and supervision by state"

<sup>81</sup> Gramlich, "The gap between the number of blacks and whites in prison is shrinking"

<sup>82</sup> Yang, "Does Public Assistance Reduce Recidivism," 552-3

E.M.'s movement restrictions combined with the lack of rehabilitative initiatives serve the ultimate goal of controlling marginalized populations. Before E.M., individuals on parole would be free without restrictions, now they must wear a monitor that tracks their movement.<sup>83</sup> Families also give up their right to privacy as participant agreements allow state officials to enter their homes at any time. In this case, justice-involved persons and their loved ones become subject to surveillance. The use of E.M. to control populations is also supported by the lack of care given in who is placed on E.M. Recently, the IDOC and PRB revealed that they had no criteria to determine why certain formerly incarcerated persons were placed on E.M. and for how long.<sup>84</sup> When interviewing respondents on MSR, many referred to their positive work done in prison to better themselves. Yet, respondents were still met with severe movement restrictions. For pretrial defendants, all get put on home detention regardless of actual risk. The goal of E.M. is not to ensure a smooth transition to society or prevent flight risks in the pretrial case, but to surveil and punish. The hypervisibility of the bracelet also makes it easier for police officers and everyday people to discriminate and target justice-involved individuals.

Societies of control increase the power of the state by using technology to expand its surveillance capability, serving the purpose of creating an economically efficient individual. But what new penology literature reveals is that state institutions never intended to normalize minority individuals, but rather to permanently keep them as an underclass in White America. E.M. represents the convergence of these two theories. While this project initially had a loose goal of recording the journey of people on E.M., it revealed the importance of race and class in respondents' experiences. E.M. does nothing to combat the punishment of prisons. It only

---

<sup>83</sup> See citation 49

<sup>84</sup> See citation 50



extends the carceral system, using surveillance technology to target and control Black and other marginalized communities. County and state governments should remedy the harm of E.M. by drastically reforming its current confinement practices.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Short Term solutions**

Currently, state and county agencies have no clear guidelines on who gets put on E.M., for how long, what their movement is, and how movement can be extended. This lack of regulation creates a system without goals and accountability. The implementation of the proposed guidelines will have an immediate impact on individuals on E.M. as it gives participants a clear understanding of their rights on the program and recourse if these rights are violated.

#### *Standards for Movement.*

All Illinois bodies that operate E.M. programs should allow for at least 8 hours of unrestricted movement per day, including pretrial defendants. Time outside is necessary for participants to visit family, run errands, and find work. However, in Illinois, when participants locate work, the movement extended only allows for travel to and from their job. This, in effect, punishes people for gaining employment as they are now unable to engage in other activities. When participants do receive full-time work an additional 4 hours of movement should be granted.

#### *Awarding Movement.*

All requests to extend movement should be responded to within 24 hours. If a parole officer or county official fails to respond within that time frame, movement should automatically be granted. Doing so will ensure parole officers respond to movement extensions promptly, an issue that has prevented respondents from obtaining employment and attending important events

like funerals. Only a phone call from a sponsor and proof of event/employment should be needed to extend movement.

No movement should be denied or revoked unless a parole officer or county official presents a substantial reason for doing so. For example, if officials suspect a certain event is fake, evidence should be presented to prove so. All movement denials should be reviewed by a regulatory body, be that other officials or an outside accountability agency.

Instituting these reforms may require a reconfiguration of Illinois' parole agency but the current discretionary system promotes baseless movement denials. Forgoing accountability for convenience only protects corruption and negligence.

### **Long Term Solutions**

These short term solutions will temporarily improve the experiences of E.M. participants but they do not address larger issues such as the constitutionality of E.M., the psychological effects of confinement, and the lack of care in who gets put on E.M. and for how long. While promoted as an alternative to incarceration E.M. does not alleviate the social inequality that marginalized communities face. To solve these issues lawmakers should move from a punitive form of punishment to one of rehabilitation. This means the elimination of E.M. entirely. While some may fear E.M. participants committing crimes, the reality is that if a person on E.M. wants to engage in illegal activity they could. All they would need to do is take the bracelet off. Long term policy solutions that will effectively decrease mass incarceration are permanent housing, job stability, investment in education, and access to healthcare. Only when these basic needs are incorporated into the criminal justice system can there truly be an alternative to incarceration.

## **CHAPTER 7**

### **CONCLUSION**

If you go on the internet and google “Cook County Electronic Monitoring” you will be taken to a nicely designed website on Cook County’s E.M. program. When reading the website, the program appears innovative, a “community-based alternative incarceration concept that allows pre-trial, and short-time sentenced inmates to remain in the community instead of being incarcerated in jail.” On closer reflection, E.M. is anything but an alternative. The survey and interview data gathered for this project prove the psychological and social impacts that home confinement has on participants. It isolates, depresses, and restricts. The prevalence and rise of E.M. only adapt the current criminal justice system to society that prizes technology and cost-effectiveness. Prioritizing these two fields results in criminal justice innovations that continue to punish while failing to address the root cause of mass incarceration. A solution to mass incarceration will not come from reforming E.M. but eliminating all systems of confinement. Only then can we work toward a truly equitable society.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agnew, Stephanie. "Data Transparency around the Use of Electronic Monitoring in Illinois: Policy Statement in Support of HB 0386." Chicago Appleseed Fund for Justice. September 11, 2019. <http://www.chicagoappleseed.org/our-blog/hb0386/>.
- Alexander, Michelle. *New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration In The Age Of Colorblindness*. New York: New Press, 2020.
- Bales, William, Karen Mann, Thomas Blomberg, Gerry Gaes, Kelle Barrick, Karla Dhungana, and Brian McManus. "A Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Electronic Monitoring" (2010). <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/230530.pdf>.
- Blow, Charles M. "Romanticizing Broken Windows." *The New York Times*. June 4, 2015. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/04/opinion/charles-m-blow-romanticizing-broken-windows-policing.html>.
- Brooks, Iolanthe. "A New Mass Incarceration: Community Corrections, Carceral Geography, and Spatial Power." *Scholarly Undergraduate Research Journal at Clark* 4 (2018): 19–29. <https://commons.clarku.edu/surj/vol4/iss1/2>.
- Cassidy, Elaine F., and Howard C. Stevenson. "They Wear the Mask." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 11, no. 4 (2005): 53–74. [https://doi.org/10.1300/j146v11n04\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/j146v11n04_03).
- Carney, Molly. "Correction through Omniscience: Electronic Monitoring and the Escalation of Crime Control ." *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy* 40 (2012): 279–305. [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law\\_journal\\_law\\_policy/vol40/iss1/8](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_journal_law_policy/vol40/iss1/8).
- Cohen, Andrew, Lauren-Brooke Eisen, and Cameron Kimble. "The History of Mass Incarceration." Brennan Center for Justice. September 17, 2019. [www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/history-mass-incarceration](http://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/history-mass-incarceration).
- Clinton, Hilary. "Hillary Clinton Campaign Speech." 28 Jan 1996, Keene State College, Keen New Hampshire. Speech.
- Congress. [www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/3355/text](http://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/3355/text).
- Crain, Cæmeron. "Living in a Society of Control." *The Mantle*. <https://www.themantle.com/philosophy/living-society-control>.
- Crampton, Jeremy W. "The Biopolitical Justification for Geosurveillance." *Geographical Review* 97, no. 3 (2007): 389–403. [www.jstor.org/stable/30034178](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30034178).
- Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October* 59 (1992): 3–7. [www.jstor.org/stable/778828](http://www.jstor.org/stable/778828).

- Dobson, Jerome E., and Peter F. Fisher. "The Panopticon's Changing Geography." *Geographical Review* 97, no. 3 (2007): 307-23. [www.jstor.org/stable/30034174](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30034174).
- Drug Policy Alliance, "A Brief History of the Drug War." 2016. [www.drugpolicy.org/issues/brief-history-drug-war](http://www.drugpolicy.org/issues/brief-history-drug-war).
- Cook County Sheriff's Office, "Electronic Monitoring Program." <https://www.cookcountysheriff.org/cook-county-department-of-corrections/electronic-monitoring-program-placement/>.
- Feeley, Malcolm M., and Jonathan Simon. "The New Penology: Notes On The Emerging Strategy Of Corrections And Its Implications." *Criminology* 30, no. 4 (1992): 449–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01112.x>.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Gramlich, John. "The Gap between the Number of Blacks and Whites in Prison Is Shrinking." Pew Research Center. April 30, 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/30/shrinking-gap-between-number-of-blacks-and-whites-in-prison/>.
- Gill, Stephen. "The Global Panopticon? The Neoliberal State, Economic Life, and Democratic Surveillance." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 20, no. 1 (1995): 1-49. [www.jstor.org/stable/40644823](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40644823).
- Henrichson, Christian, Joshua Rinald , and Ruth Delaney. "The Price of Jails: Measuring the Taxpayer Cost of Local Incarceration." Vera Institute of Justice. May 2015. <https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/price-of-jails.pdf>.
- Holman, John E., and James F. Quinn. "Dysphoria and Electronically Monitored Home Confinement." *Dysphoria and Electronically Monitored Home Confinement, Deviant Behavior* 13, no. 1 (1992): 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.1992.9967896>.
- Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council, "Research Briefing: State of Use of Electronic Monitoring." April 2019. [https://spac.icjia-api.cloud/uploads/Research\\_Briefing\\_-\\_State\\_Use\\_of\\_EM\\_2019\\_FINAL-20191211T23034528.pdf](https://spac.icjia-api.cloud/uploads/Research_Briefing_-_State_Use_of_EM_2019_FINAL-20191211T23034528.pdf).
- Jefferson, Brian Jordan. "Computerizing Carceral Space: Coded Geographies of Criminalization and Capture in New York City." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50, no. 5 (2018): 969–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X18767427>.
- Jones, Alexi. "Correctional Control 2018: Tweet This Incarceration and Supervision by State." Prison Policy Initiative , December 2018. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/correctionalcontrol2018.html>.

- Kilgore, James. "Progress or More of the Same? Electronic Monitoring and Parole in the Age of Mass Incarceration." *Critical Criminology* 21 (2013): 123–39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-012-9165-0>.
- Kilgore, James, Emmett Sanders, and Myaisha Hayes. "No More Shackles: Ten Arguments Against Pretrial Electronic Monitoring." Center for Media Justice. October 30, 2019.  
<https://mediajustice.org/resource/no-more-shackles-ten-arguments-against-pretrial-electronic-monitoring-2019/>.
- Martin, Lauren L., and Matthew L. Mitchelson. "Geographies of Detention and Imprisonment: Interrogating Spatial Practices of Confinement, Discipline, Law, and State Power." *Geography Compass* 3, no. 1 (2009): 459–77.  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00196.x>.
- Martinez, Daniel E. "Beyond Disciplinary Enclosures: Management Control in the Society of Control." *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 22, no. 2 (2011): 200–211.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1045235410001346>.
- Miller, Reuben Jonathan, and Amanda Alexander. "The Price of Carceral Citizenship: Punishment, Surveillance, and Social Welfare Policy in an Age of Carceral Expansion." *Michigan Journal of Race & Law* 21, no. 2 (2016): 291–315.  
<https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjrl/vol21/iss2/6/>.
- Peck, Jamie. "Geography and public policy: Mapping the Penal State." *Progress in Human Geography* 27, no. 2 (2003): 222–232.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1191/0309132503ph424pr>.
- Pew Charitable Trusts, "Use of Electronic Offender-Tracking Devices Expands Sharply." 2016.  
<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2016/09/use-of-electronic-offender-tracking-devices-expands-sharply>.
- Regan, Ronald. "Remarks Announcing Federal Initiatives Against Drug Trafficking and Organized Crime." 14 Oct 1982, Great Hall at the Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Address.
- Roman, John K, Akvia M Liberman, Samuel Taxy, and P Mitchell Downey. "The Costs and Benefits of Electronic Monitoring for Washington, D.C." The Urban Institute. September 2012. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/412678-The-Costs-and-Benefits-of-Electronic-Monitoring-for-Washington-D-C-.PDF>.
- Sabur, Rozina. "Palestinian Harvard Student Denied Entry to US Because 'Friends Posted Anti-American Statements' ." *The Telegraph*. August 27, 2019.  
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/08/27/palestinian-harvard-student-denied-entry-us-friends-posted-anti/>.

Sawyer, Wendy, and Peter Wagner. "How Many People Are Locked up in the United States?"

Shabazz, Rashad. *Spatializing Blackness : Architectures of Confinement and Black Masculinity in Chicago*. New Black Studies Series. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 2015.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xna&AN=1091863&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

Smith, Earl, and Angela J. Hattery. "Incarceration: A Tool for Racial Segregation and Labor Exploitation." *Race, Gender & Class* 15, no. 1/2 (2008): 79-97.  
[www.jstor.org/stable/41675359](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41675359).

Stemen, Don. "The Prison Paradox: More Incarceration Will Not Make Us Safer." Vera Institute of Justice. 2017. [www.vera.org/publications/the-price-of-jails-measuring-the-taxpayer-cost-of-local-incarceration](http://www.vera.org/publications/the-price-of-jails-measuring-the-taxpayer-cost-of-local-incarceration).

The Sentencing Project. "Criminal Justice Facts." 2018. [www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/](http://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/).

Yang, Crystal S. "Does Public Assistance Reduce Recidivism?" *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 107, no. 5 (June 2017): 551–55.  
[http://www.law.harvard.edu/programs/olin\\_center/papers/pdf/Yang\\_920.pdf](http://www.law.harvard.edu/programs/olin_center/papers/pdf/Yang_920.pdf).

Vanhaelemeesch, Delphine, Tom Vander Beken, and Stijn Vandeveld. "Punishment at Home: Offenders' Experiences with Electronic Monitoring." *European Journal of Criminology* 11, no. 3 (2013): 273–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370813493846>.



## **APPENDIX A: Interview Questions**

- How would you describe your overall experience on EM?
- Can you describe your daily schedule on EM?
- What is it like trying to move around in the city or in your community under EM?
- In terms of accessing resources like food or medical care, how has being under electronic monitoring affected that?
- Has being on electronic monitoring affected your ability to stay employed/find employment?
- What was the relationship like with your family under electronic monitoring?
  - What was your relationship like beforehand?
- Before going on electronic monitoring how involved were you in your community?
  - How did being on EM change that?
  - Was there any sense of connection?
- Do you feel EM changed the way others see you?
  - Does that affect the way you see yourself?
- Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of freedom?
- Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of privacy?
- Do you feel being on electronic monitoring is isolating?
- What is the relationship between you and your supervisor?
  - How has that affected your experience on EM?
- Are the guidelines of electronic monitoring difficult to follow?
  - Was there a fear that you will be sent back to jail or prison?
- Has being on electronic monitoring affected the financial stability of you and/or your family?

**APPENDIX B: SURVEY****Electronic Monitoring Questionnaire**

---

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q1 Thank you for participating in this study on electronic monitoring. By completing this survey, you agree to have your responses included in the final report. Your name and any other identifying information will not be included.

-----

Page Break

Q2 Please answer all the questions honestly. There is no right answer.

-----

Page Break

Q3  
**Logistical and Demographic Information**

-----

Q4 Name

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

Q5 Age

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

## Q47 Race and ethnicity

- ☐ White (1)
  - ☐ Black or African American (2)
  - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
  - ☐ Asian (4)
  - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
  - ☐ No-White Hispanic/Latino (6)
  - ☐ Other (7)
- 

## Q6 Electronic Monitoring is a requirement of my:

- ☐ Probation (1)
  - ☐ Pre-trial detention (2)
  - ☐ Parole (Mandatory Supervised Release) (3)
- 

Page Break

---

Q7  
Survey Questions

\*If you are no longer on electronic monitoring answer these questions based on your past experience.

---

Q45 Has being on electronic monitoring affected how often you leave your place of residence?

Strong positive effect   Positive effect   Slight positive effect   No effect   Slight negative effect   Negative effect   Strong negative effect

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q8 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your normal, daily schedule?

Strong positive effect   Positive effect   Slight positive effect   No effect   Slight negative effect   Negative effect   Strong negative effect

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q10 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your relationship with your family?

Strong positive effect   Positive effect   Slight positive effect   No effect   Slight negative effect   Negative effect   Strong negative effect

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q11 Has being on electronic monitoring affected how connected you feel to your community?

Strong positive effect   Positive effect   Slight positive effect   No effect   Slight negative effect   Negative effect   Strong negative effect

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q12 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your participation in community/family activities?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q14 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your ability to stay employed/find employment?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q46 Has being on electronic monitoring affected the financial stability of you and/or your family?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q13 Do you believe being on electronic monitoring affected the way others see you?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q9 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of freedom?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q15 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your sense of privacy?

Strong positive effect    Positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q16 Has being on electronic monitoring affected your self-esteem?

Strong positive effect    Slight positive effect    No effect    Slight negative effect    Negative effect    Strong negative effect

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

Slide to the value that best reflects your experience ()



Q48 If you would like to expand on any of your responses please do so here.

\_\_\_\_\_

Page Break

End of Block: Default Question Block

## APPENDIX C: COUNTY GUIDELINES

### **RULES & REGULATIONS**

You must remain inside your home twenty-four hours a day unless prior permission for movement has been granted by the Sheriff's Office or court.

You must allow Sheriff's Office personnel entry into your home at all times during your stay on the program.

You must make arrangements, which will allow Sheriff's Office personnel to visit you at your place of employment or school to verify your attendance.

If you are a registered sex offender or registered violent offender against youth you must register at 3501 S. Michigan if you placed on EM at a Chicago address. If it is a suburban address you must register at the local police department. Registration must be done within three days of being placed on EM.

You must obtain approval from the Sheriff's Office prior to changing your address or scheduling movement outside of your home.

You cannot commit another crime while on the program. The consumption, possession or, being in the presence of person(s) consuming excessive alcohol, unlawful drugs, firearms or weapons is prohibited. Medication(s) prescribed by a physician for you is allowed. Any alcohol consumption or possession by a participant under 21 is prohibited.

You must return all monitoring equipment issued to you upon being notified of your discharge from the program or reimburse the monitoring company for any missing or

damaged equipment. **Failure to return issued monitoring equipment may subject you to prosecution for violating conditions of the program and or felony theft.**

You must reside at a house, apartment or condominium within Cook County.

When you are delivered to your residence you must have a legal resident present at the residence who has a valid picture ID or Driver License with the EM address listed on it. They must also sign a consent form allowing you to reside at the residence.

The device on your ankle is in constant contact with the home monitoring receiving device (black box). These devices notify the Sheriff's Office whenever you leave your home.

Any attempt to tamper or remove the ankle bracelet or telephone device is a violation of the program rules and may subject you to prosecution for the crime of escape.

The home monitoring receiving device must be plugged into an active electrical outlet at all times.

You will be receiving telephone calls from the Sheriff's Office Electronic Monitoring Center. These calls will be to your home, place of employment, or school and may occur at any time. You will respond to these calls as explained to you in the Electronic Monitoring Orientation Video.

You understand and agree that you must keep your phone in-service and the line open so that you can be monitored.

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR MOVEMENT**

Participants on the Electronic Monitoring Program seeking permission for movement must call the Electronic Monitoring office seventy-two hours in advance. If you require movement on Mondays you must call prior to 3 p.m. on the preceding Friday.

**Movement to attend your first court date after being placed on the program has been pre-approved. If movement is granted for any reason you must call our office when you leave and when you return home.**

The date and time of your court date is on your copy of your participant contract, the paper that you signed and received before being released on E/M. It is your responsibility to arrive at court on time and to return home immediately after completing your appearance. Monitoring equipment at the court records your appearance times.

If you have any continuances or have other cases pending in any jurisdictions, you must call to obtain movement permission for the court attendance seventy-two hours in advance. **If you have court on Monday, you must call on Friday.**

**ELECTRONIC MONITORING  
(877) 326-9198**

[Cookcountysheriff@BL.com](mailto:Cookcountysheriff@BL.com)

E.M.U. 711G (07-18)



### **PROPERTY**

You will be allowed to pick up your property from the Chicago Police on Tuesday's and Thursday's **only**.

### **RELOCATIONS**

You can request to relocate to another residence **after 30 days** by calling the Electronic Monitoring telephone number in the event the owner of the home or apartment no longer wishes to house you. Participants are only allowed to relocate **once** while on the program.

### **BONDING**

You may bond off of Electronic Monitoring by calling the telephone number.

### **WORK OR SCHOOL**

You may request to work on a legitimate job, in a single location, or attend school by calling the telephone number at least three business days prior to starting. You must submit a weekly schedule and copies of your pay stubs each month to the EM email.

### **EMERGENCY**

If an emergency situation occurs that requires you to seek medical treatment you should call the phone number listed in addition to 91.

### **PROGRAM FEE**

If you were ordered to pay a daily fee to participate in electronic monitoring, you must have paid the fee in full to the Clerk of the Circuit Court prior to being discharged from the program.

Any violation of the rules and regulations of the Electronic Monitoring Program will result in immediate reincarceration.

### **PROGRAM RELEASE**

If you have satisfied your obligation to the court, such as found not guilty, sentenced to time considered served, probation, etc., it is your responsibility to notify the Electronic Monitoring Unit by calling (877) 326-9198, within five (5) hours of your court appearance. You will be asked to provide your name, Jail ID number, court location and case disposition. You must have this information available when you call. Following confirmation, you will receive a return phone call from the Electronic Monitoring Center advising you if you are entitled to be discharged. If discharged, you will again be given instructions regarding what times you can return your Electronic Monitoring equipment.

If you have been issued a cellular monitoring unit, you will use the system's attached cell phone to contact the Monitoring Center for making movement requests and other matters. If regular phone service is restored to your home, you must contact the Monitoring Center within 24 hours.

### **EQUIPMENT RETURNS**

All Electronic monitoring Equipment must be returned to:

**2538 S. California**

**Chicago, Illinois**

***Between the hours of***

***9:00 a.m-4:00 p.m. Monday-Friday***

***Equipment Calls Only 773-696-9448***

## **Cook County Sheriff's Office**



### ***Electronic Monitoring Unit***

#### **Participant Information Brochure**

You have been court ordered to participate in The Cook County Sheriff's Electronic Monitoring Program in lieu of being detained in the Cook County Department of Corrections. You have agreed to abide by the conditions of the Monitoring Program by signing the participant contract. This brochure will explain the program rules and regulations that you must follow to successfully complete the program.

Your success on this program is dependent on your strict compliance of program rules and regulations. If you have any questions, inform Electronic Monitoring personnel prior to your release or call the telephone number below, following your release.

**Electronic Monitoring  
(877) 326-9198**

**Cookcountysheriff@BI.com**