ELECTRONIC MONITORING OF OFFENDERS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA: COUPLES' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPACT ON THE HOME ENVIRONMENT AND THE FAMILY

by

Diana Louise Doherty

B.A. Simon Fraser University, 1987

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS (CRIMINOLOGY)

in the School

of

Criminology

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER 1994

APPROVAL

Name: Diana Louise Doherty

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: Electronic Monitoring of Offenders in British Columbia: Couples' Perception of the Impact on the Home and Family

Examining Committee:

Chairperson: Robert Menzies, Ph.D.

Brian Burtch, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Senior Supervisor

William Glackman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Stephen Mainprize, ~~Ph.D~~.
External Examiner
Instructor
Douglas College, New Westminster, B.C.

Date Approved: 7 December 1994

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/[illegible]

Electronic Monitoring of Offenders in British Columbia:

Couples' Perceptions of the Impact on the Home Environment and

the Family

Author: _____

(signature)

Diana Louise Doherty

(name)

Dec. 14/94

(date)

ABSTRACT

This study examines how the intrusion of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) into the home environment affects families in the lower mainland of British Columbia. An historical overview of EMS is provided to gain an understanding of where the B.C. system fits within this development. Key controversies over the emergence of EMS are also examined.

The social-psychological impact of EMS on the family is explored utilizing a contextual model of family stress and adaptation. Twenty-seven offenders and their spouses were interviewed. It was hypothesized that increases in stressful experiences associated with EMS and other family life events with decreasing levels of resource capability would result in lower levels of adaptation. This hypothesis was *not* supported by the current research. Overall findings suggest that EMS has both positive and negative effects on family members. The positive effects include: improved partner relationships, maintaining family relationships and family life, avoiding the dehumanizing conditions of prison, increased discipline and alcohol abstinence. The negative effects include: increasing isolation (including less social support), reducing privacy, shifting roles and responsibilities for household labour, and reducing social and physical activities. While spouses in this study may be particularly affected by increased responsibilities for household tasks and childcare outside the home, offenders were more likely to feel isolated from the community and their friends. Generally the benefits of EMS seemed to outweigh the stress associated with the program.

These findings are analyzed within a broader context to understand the social control implications that this type of state intervention has for the family and home environment. The shift toward community corrections is viewed as resulting in the expansion and intensification of social control networks (Garland, 1985). EMS is also

viewed as part of the state's net-widening effort (Mainprize, 1992). Both positive and negative sides to the exercise of state power are considered. The meaning of the home to the family is also considered. Implications for policy are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the various people who assisted me through the process of doing my thesis. I would like to thank my supervisory committee, Dr. Brian Burtch and Dr. William Glackman for their assistance, support, and guidance on this project. Their patience in working with me through the various stages is greatly appreciated.

I am indebted to the British Columbia Corrections Branch for allowing me to conduct my research in the Vancouver and Fraser Regions of the Electronic Monitoring Program. Special thanks to the Program Directors, their staff and the couples who participated in this study. Of special note are Colin Richardson, Brenda Tole, and Jim Konowalchuk for their openness about the program and facilitation of the research process.

I would like to thank Dr. John Ekstedt and Dr. Ray Corrado, with whom I have worked with and known for many years, for sharing their knowledge and providing me with encouragement and support.

My thanks is also extended to my partner and friends for their understanding and moral support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

History of Electronic Monitoring Systems

Introduction

Since the introduction of electronic monitoring systems (EMS) in 1984, house arrest programs have increased considerably in North American criminal justice systems (Petersilia, 1987; Schmidt, 1989). It is estimated that 39 states in the United States have EMS programs (Renzema and Skelton, 1990). In Canada, two provinces (British Columbia and Saskatchewan) and the Yukon have EMS programs. EMS involves the restriction of the offender to the home during specified hours. Compliance is monitored with electronic devices which provide continuous or intermittent verification that the offender is at home during specified times. When an offender is out on approved activities, such as work or attendance at an alcohol and drug program, human confirmation of these activities may occur.

Program growth has been accompanied by a considerable increase in the evaluative and critical literature pertaining to EMS. The evaluative literature on home incarceration has tended to focus on the technical, legal and administrative aspects of the program. Increasing attention is now directed to concerns over the nature of the intrusiveness, possible class and race biases in applying EMS, and social control implications for the family and home environment. Nevertheless, few articles, either evaluative or critical, have been written on the impact of EMS on family members (Mainprize, 1990, 108).

The recent adoption of EMS in North America stems from a combination of factors: overcrowding in prisons, growing cost of corrections, the development of EMS technology, and negative consequences (e.g., stigmatization, loss of income and

employment, reduced social contact with family and friends, and personal injury) associated with penal incarceration.

The dramatic increase in EMS programs and concerns about its impact on families warrant further examination. This study examines how the intrusion of EMS into the home environment affects families in the lower mainland of British Columbia. Since this research is one of the first such attempts, it is exploratory. The focus is on couples' perceptions of the impact of EMS on the family and home environment. A contextual model of family stress and adaptation provided the general framework for the interview schedule. Social psychological research of families under stress is important in understanding how family members react and adapt to the intrusion of EMS in the home environment.

Overview of Chapters

This chapter examines the roots of EMS, including home incarceration with and without electronic monitoring. This historical overview provides some background and understanding of where the B.C. system fits into the overall development of electronic monitoring systems. Chapter two traces controversies over the emergence of electronic monitoring systems. These controversies focus on the nature and implications of the intrusiveness of EMS in the context of civil liberties, social control, and the debate about community control. Key controversies include: intrusiveness, legality, and *net widening* (expansion of the social control infrastructure). Also included in this chapter is a brief examination of the theoretical and ideological implications of community corrections using Garland's (1985) *Punishment and Welfare: The History of Penal Strategies* as the focal point for this discussion. Garland focuses on political and ideological factors behind the shift towards community corrections. He views this shift as resulting in the expansion and intensification of social control networks. A review of key points of his thesis and the implications for policy will be included. Furthermore, other writers such as Stanley Cohen

(1985), and Janet Chan and Richard Ericson (1981) will be integrated into this discussion. They consider economics as a key factor in the shift and expansion of state control apparatus. Examining the emergence of EMS in this broader context is important in understanding the social control implications that this type of state intervention has for the family and the home environment.

Chapter three offers a social-psychological and sociological examination of the meaning of the home for the family, and the implications of state intrusions on this environment. This includes the evolution of the separation of public and private domains in the context of the family's role in society. Understanding the family's role in the community is important to gaining a deeper understanding of how EMS may affect families.

In chapter four a contextual model of family stress[1] is discussed. This model is used to explore the impact of EMS on the family and home environment. A discussion of the measures, method, and procedures used for data collection in this study is presented in chapter five.

In chapter six an analysis of the interview data is presented. The findings of the present study are compared with studies that have examined the impact of EMS on the offender. In the final chapter recommendations are made for policy and operational considerations, as well as future research. An examination how the intrusion of EMS into the home environment affects family members in the context of a family stress model is discussed. Also, a review of the growth of EMS and the controversy over community corrections is provided. EMS is located in the broader context of the development of community corrections.

---

[1] The model used for this study was adapted from the Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation (see for example McCubbin and Patterson (1982) and Walker's (1985) discussion of the importance of examining the context in which stress occurs in families).

Historical Overview of EMS

EMS is linked to two developments: first, Schwitzgebel's proposal for a telemetry-based system (see below) in 1964; and second, community correctional 'house arrest' or 'home confinement' programs where no telephone-computer monitoring is used (see Schmidt and Curtis, 1987; Ball and Lilly, 1988). A more ominous precusor to modern EMS measures is house arrest programs in totalitarian regimes, used to suppress political dissent (Ball and Lilly, 1985; Corbett and Fersch, 1985; Lilly and Ball, 1987). For example, Galileo, the Florentine philosopher, astronomer and physicist was subjected to a form of house arrest on the charge of heresy because he offered an unorthodox view of the universe. After a "second condemnation" trial in Rome in 1633 he returned to his home in Florence to live out the rest of his life under house arrest (Lilly and Ball, 1987, 359). In some countries, a form of house arrest referred as "banning" has been used. South Africa has a long history of the use of banning to control political dissent. Poland, South Korea, India, and the Soviet Union/Commonwealth of Independent States have also used house arrest for political dissidents.

The recent history of electronic monitoring can be divided into three phases: (i) telemetry; (ii) fallow period and (iii) program development (Lilly and Ball, 1987). The first phase began in 1964 with Schwitzgebel's proposal of behavioral electronics (a telemetry-based system[2]). This evolved out of the development of portable transceivers[3] transmitting and receiving information that could be relayed to a central recording station (Ball and Lilly, 1986, 3). Transceivers allowed the monitoring of a specified geographical

---

[2] Ingraham and Smith (1972, 966) state that his system "... consists of small electronic devices attached to a subject that transmit via radio waves information regarding the location and physiological state of the warer. A telemetry system provides a method whereby phenomena may be measured or controlled at a distance from where they occur -- i.e., remotely."

[3] Transistor technology replaced vacuum tube technology. This technological innovation became operational in the 1960's and resulted in the reduction in size of electronic parts and devices. This revolution in electronic technology resulted in consideration of electronic devices for therapy within the medical, psychiatric and the criminal justice fields (see Schwitzgebel, 1964).

location as individuals moved through monitored areas (Schwitzgebel, 1969). The operation of the system was extended from the hospital laboratory to cover two city blocks and is described as follows by Schwitzgebel (1969, 599):

> As the wearer walks through a specified monitored area, his transceiver activates various repeater stations which then re-transmit his signal with a special location that at least one is always activated by the wearer's transceiver ... The patterning of the signals from these repeater stations allows a determination of the person's geographical location.

In the mid and late 1960s the equipment worn by participants consisted " ... of a transceiver and a battery pack, each of which was approximately 6 inches by 3 inches by 1 inch in size" and " ... weighed about two pounds" (Gable, 1986, 168). Testing of the system occurred between 1964 and 1970 using civilian volunteers, parolees, and mental patients in Massachusetts (Schwitzgebel, 1968).

The academic literature in this period focused on *technical* aspects of EMS and therapeutic benefits of this system. Schwitzgebel (1969) envisioned that EMS would facilitate a therapeutic relationship with the offender. It was also viewed as a humane intervention. EMS would be less of an infringement on the rights of offenders, would allow more privacy, facilitate an early return to the community and work, and would be more effective at reducing crime since the deleterious environment of prison would be avoided (Ingraham and Smith, 1970). Some writers warned of potential infringements of civil liberties through overzealous application of the technology (Beck, 1969). The benefits of the EMS program (e.g., rehabilitation), however, were generally viewed by correctional administrators, policy-makers, and treasury boards as outweighing any negative effects. The first phase ended in the early 1970s after the system has been developed, tested and patented. This type of telemetric system, however, was not adopted as a criminal justice system program because of prohibitive costs in developing the technology, and the operational requirement of one-to-one staff/client observation and communication (Mainprize, 1990, 49).

The second phase in EMS development (1970 - 1983) is the fallow period (Lilly and Ball, 1987). Operational development of EMS programs did not occur in this period. A large-scale model, however, was designed by Meyer (1971). This model would cover all major cities in the U.S., and involve millions of offenders. This system was viewed as a revolutionary means of controlling crime in larger cities. Meyer (1971, 21) stated that:

> By increasing the probability of apprehension and conviction to a near certainty, the ... system can discourage crime without isolating the offender irrevocably from the society. Thus, *heavy surveillance and light penalties substitute for light surveillance and heavy penalties.* With a system of moderate but enforceable constraints on offenders, the problem of recidivism can be attacked, and the opportunity for repeated crime brought under control. (emphasis added)

During this fallow phase, there was a trend toward the development of house arrest programs without electronics in western societies (Ball et al, 1988). As early as 1970 France introduced the practice of 'control judicare', using *pretrial* supervision with home confinement (Gerety, 1980). A similar policy was implemented in Italy in 1975: home supervision occurred after a three month "shock period" of incarceration (Lilly and Ball, 1987, 91).

In the United States, the first use of home incarceration occurred in 1971 with juvenile offenders (see Rubin, 1985; Ball and Lilly, 1985). These programs used curfew restrictions for youths, and were similar to current intensive supervision programs (see Gettinger, 1984; Ball and Lilly, 1985). Ball and Lilly (1985, 84) describe a program for juvenile offenders implemented in New York:

> In the United States, the New York Division of Youth has established a Community Aide program with volunteers who provide informal counselling to youthful offenders, pick them up for court, attend court sessions with them, and (what is especially noteworthy here) periodically look in on them at home with the understanding that this is where they will be found.

By 1977, "home detention" programs for youths were in place in various states throughout the United States including: Washington, D.C.; Maryland; Virginia; Florida;

Michigan; California; Kentucky; and Alabama (see Lilly and Ball, 1987, 360). This type of program for youths was apparently the result of concern for the "stigmatizing" and "corrupting" effects of institutionalization (Lilly and Ball, 1987, 360-361). The inexpensiveness of this program also added to its appeal (Lilly and Ball, 1987, 360). Nonetheless, some highlighted its drawbacks. Burkhart (1986, 75) regards intensive supervision programs as a control-oriented program, which includes a punitive or retributive element. For Burkhart, cost-savings and rehabilitative efforts are secondary to these concerns.

Home detention programs for adults were developed by several states such as Georgia, Florida, and New Jersey in the early 1980's (Ball, Huff, and Lilly, 1988). Home detention programs were either developed as a separate disposition or as a component of intensive supervision. Compliance with the program's conditions and verification at place of residence were fostered through labor intensive methods. Parole and probation officers had the responsibility of monitoring the offenders on the program. Baumer and Mendelsohn (1990, 5) state that "while these early programs were thought to achieve some of the desired outcomes, their appeal and widespread application were limited by the requisite labor and uncertainty associated with trying to supervise a large number of offenders at home with manual methods." This, in part, would explain the rapid growth of house arrest programs with electronic monitoring once the equipment became commercially available. Ball, Huff, and Lilly (1988, 36) state that "the surge of interest in home incarceration of adults as an alternative to jailing or imprisonment has been closely associated with the development of this new technology."

The third phase began in 1983, with a trial of home incarceration, with electronic monitoring of offenders (Ford and Schmidt, 1985). By this time, "workable active monitors" were developed by Michael Goss in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and by Thomas Moody in Key Largo, Florida. In New Mexico, in April 1983, Judge Love placed a

probation violator on EMS, using the Goss system[4], for one month. Subsequently, he sentenced four other offenders to serve their sentences on EMS. Two of these offenders had convictions for driving while intoxicated; the other two had violated their probation that would have resulted in the remainder of their sentence being served in prison or jail. An appraisal of the program conducted by the National Institute of Justice (n.d.) concluded that:

> The equipment operated successfully.
>
> Monitored home confinement appeared to be acceptable to the local criminal justice community.
>
> The concept did not appear to pose legal problems when used as an alternative to detention.
>
> As compared to detention, monitoring resulted in "substantial savings" to the criminal justice system (Ford and Schmidt, 1985, 2).

Judge Love was inspired by a 'Spiderman' comic strip printed in 1977. In the comic, Spiderman was being tracked by a transmitter worn on his wrist. Judge Love was involved in sentencing offenders to work-release programs. At this time, there was a backlog of persons who were eligible for the program. This prompted him to get companies interested in developing a monitoring system. Timko (1986, 16) states:

> He again approached the major computer companies but no company was willing to commit a research and development project to it. He then decided to arrange for the research and development independently. Michael Goss was with one such computer company and he had pushed the concept internally with success until it reached the higher echelons. When he delivered the company's formal reply, to the judge, he stated that he would like to commit his energies to the research and development of the concept. At that point, their alliance was formed. Michael Goss then left that company and he formed Nimcos with $100,000 of investors' money and the dream of having a working model.

---

[4] Also referred to as the "Gosslink" (Timko, 1986). It consists of an electronic bracelet that is approximately the size of a large package of cigarettes and is strapped around the ankle. A signal is transmitted from this device to a telephone every 30 to 90 seconds, which is then relayed to a central computer. The offender is allowed to move within a fixed distance, usually 150 to 200 feet, and if he/she goes outside this distance, then a signal loss occurs which is recorded. This system is smaller than the one designed and tested by Schwitzgebel due to the miniaturization of electronic circuitry.

In developing a working model, many different technologies were examined, costing Nimcos $500,000 in research and development. The system supported by Judge Love resembles the intensive supervision program cited above, with the addition of electronic monitoring as a means of verifying curfew compliance.

Another barrier was encountered when Judge Love attempted to implement the model in the criminal justice system. Love and Goss had to deal with legal, ethical, and cost issues. Timko (1986, 16) explains:

> Judge Love then ran into difficulty with the legal system in new Mexico and the new technology was challenged in the state's supreme court. It was then claimed that he should have submitted the idea to his judicial peers first. Another objection was that part of the sentencing could not be based on the premise of the offender's ability to rent the control or have a phone and that the judge could not enter into a contract with Mr. Goss. Since there were only a few devices in existence and this was strictly a concept development project, the cost objection and the others were solved and the project moved on.

If Judge Love had entered into a contract with Goss, or invested in a company developing or producing the devices his commitment to the concept would have appeared as profit-motivated. However, this never occurred.

At this time, the implementation of an EMS project came from prison overcrowding and fiscal constraints which are viewed as major impetuses in the development of the technology (Friel and Vaughn, 1986, 3). The possibility for the development of such a system to monitor offenders existed prior to this time period, but the conditions for this type of experimentation did not exist. Although Schwitzgebel and colleagues had developed and tested a system for controlling offenders in the community, the costs associated with this system were steep both in terms of the purchase and operation of the technology, and the high staff-to-prisoner ratio (see Schwitzgebel, 1969).

The initial use of EMS was followed by a rapid increase in similar programs in the U.S. In late 1984, the first criminal justice programs were established in Florida. Two programs were initiated in Palm Beach County, Florida: one run by Pride, Inc., a private

agency which supervises probationers and parolees; the other involved work-release offenders from a minimum-security facility operated by the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office (Ball, Huff and Lilly, 1988, 92-98). The Florida Department of Corrections also instituted a program (ibid). By spring, 1985, 10 programs using monitoring equipment were in operation in the U.S. (Friel et al., 1987). By February 1989, the number of states operating electronically monitored house arrest programs had increased to 39 with over 5,500 individuals being monitored (Renzema, 1989). Although some states in the U.S. have both types of programs (electronic and non-electronic), house arrest with electronic monitoring is now the dominant program.

✳ In Canada, British Columbia was the first province to institute an EMS program. The B.C. Corrections Branch implemented a pilot project in August, 1987 in the metropolitan area of Vancouver. It was implemented as an alternative to imprisonment, and to reduce capital costs (Neville, 1989). It was expected that EMP[5] could be used to manage the intermittent population. The Lower Mainland Correctional Centre (a maximum security provincial facility) was being phased out and a smaller bed facility was being built to house the more serious provincial (and some federal) offenders. Pilot testing of EMP occurred until the spring of 1989. After pilot testing, EMP achieved program status. Subsequently, the program expanded throughout the province. Currently, there are EMP programs operating in all five regions (Vancouver, Fraser, Island, North and Interior) of B.C. One other Canadian province (Saskatchewan) and the Yukon territory have EMS programs.

In B.C., due to concerns over the use of house arrest as a tool of government repression, the Attorney General took a cautious approach to its implementation (see Mainprize, 1990). Several safeguards were built into the program and its organization. Program participants are placed on the program as a classification option rather than

---

[5] Since 1991 the program in British Columbia has been called Electronic Monitoring program (EMP).

through judicial sentencing. Recommendations given by the judiciary[6], however, are given considerable weight. Another cautionary measure taken was development and application of "eligibility criteria" to potential program participants. Each inmate must meet the following criteria[6]:

1. they consent to participate in the program
2. serving a sentence of four months or less
3. there is no outstanding charges or warrants
4. they have a suitable (stable) residence and telephone
5. he/she is employed, seeking employment, registered or seeking registration in school, is involved in voluntary work, or has single parent obligations or other constructive use of time
6. their present offence is non-violent or there is no pattern of violence in their criminal history

A Citizen's Advisory Committee[7] was also formed "... to offer advice to the Corrections Branch on matters relating to the use of EMP and to complete formal reports for the Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Solicitor General" (Neville, 1989, 33).

---

6 Referrals can also be made by a lawyer, a probation officer through a pre-sentence report, and by the individual facing a jail sentence (Neville, 1989).

6 These criteria have been modified slightly from their original development. There appears to be more flexibility allowing for the admission of some offenders who would have been ineligible under the past criteria. On the positive side, the employment criteria is now more flexible. An offender does not have to be employed or enrolled in an educational program while on EMS. Those who have other "constructive obligations" may be placed on the program. This allows for certain individuals to be on the program even if they are not seeking employment, such as, individuals who have childcare responsibilities. Some criteria have been modified giving more clarity to those who are applying them. In the past offenders who would "cause public harm" and "bring the administration of justice into doubt" were not eligible for the program. Currently, persons who have outstanding charges or warrants, and/or offenders whose current or previous convictions represent a danger to the public are ineligible. On the negative side, consideration of others in the home is no longer stated in these criteria. This is an important omission since those who live in the home with the offender are likely to be the persons who are most affected by the offender's placement on the program. It is important that their approval is taken into consideration (see Ministry of Attorney General, Corrections Branch (1987) discussion paper).

7 The committee is comprised of representatives of organized community groups including: the Elizabeth Fry Society, the John Howard Society, Citizens United for Safety and Justice, the B.C. Civil Liberties Association, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, the B.C. Criminal Justice Association and the Salvation Army. Project Directors and other personnel from the ministry also attend on behalf of the Corrections Branch.

Although the Committee was formed at the beginning of the pilot stage their advisory role has continued to date.

Along with serving time at home, offenders are required, to participate in an alcohol and drug program, if their offence is alcohol or drug related. Community service is also a condition of the program. The program also allows for other activities such as work, education, laundry, and grocery shopping.

The above discussion indicates the gradual expansion of EMS programs to various jurisdictions in the U.S. and Canada. Although there are programs operating in other countries (Australia and England), so far the use of this technique is primarily a North American phenomenon. It serves to alleviate overcrowding in prisons and manage prison and probation populations in an efficient manner[8] (see Mainprize, 1990), and suits the highly technological nature of society (microelectronics and microprocessor technology) (Timko, 1986), and the extensive use of telephones in residences. As a community-based program, EMS may be widening the net of social control (see Cohen, 1985; Garland, 1985; Chan and Ericson, 1981, Scull, 1984). Expansion is visible in North America in the types of populations to which electronic monitoring programs have been attached in the criminal justice system including: probation, parole, pre-trial release, work-release and bail. EMS was initially conceived as an alternative to incarceration and has generally been assigned as a condition of probation (Friel et al., 1987). Most of those on EMS in 1988 were sentenced offenders on probation or parole (Schmidt, 1989, 2). Nevertheless, Renzema (1989) notes that parolees and unconvicted and unsentenced individuals populations are increasingly placed on EMS.

In the Canadian context, there have been concerns that this program may widen the net of social control by subjecting those who would have received less intrusive

---

[8] A more intense form of supervision was needed to satisfy public concern that probation alone was too lenient (see also Petersilia, 1986, 1987; Rush, 1987).

sentencing forms (e.g., probation) to this program type (Mainprize, 1990; Burtch, 1989; Culhane, 1989). Another form of net-widening appears to be occurring. In B.C., EMP is more labour intensive than originally conceived, resulting in more correctional personnel being added to the system than would have been the case if this 'alternative' had not been developed (Mainprize, 1992).

EMS and Its Application in B.C.

The present EM systems are of a more limited design than the telemetry system developed and tested by Schwitzgebel. In Schwitzgebel's design it was potentially possible to verify the location of the subject outside of the home and into the neighbourhood. EM systems that are available today limit observation or verification to the home environment.

There are two basic equipment types: radio frequency and programmed contact devices (Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1991). Both devices seek to verify compliance electronically at a particular location during specified hours. In the first type of technology:

> ... a transmitter with a limited range is strapped to the offender, frequently on the leg. A receiver/dialer is then connected to the telephone system. This receiver/dialer periodically dials the central computer then matches these reports with a previously entered schedule and issues a status report ... The underlying principle of the system is to provide direct, real time data about the offender's movements ... The relatively constant flow of information about offenders is designed to inform program officials immediately of unauthorized absences. (Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1991, 2-3)

The latter type of technology is also described by Baumer and Mendelsohn (1991, 3):

> Programmed contact systems monitor the presence of the offender through the use of random telephone contacts--much like a manual system. For all systems of this type a central computer, using previously entered schedules, directs a dialing system to contact the offender's place of residence. When the telephone is answered the equipment directs the offender to perform specific tasks. These tasks vary by system, but all are intended to verify that the offender is present. The underlying principle in this approach is that the unpredictability of random contacts, combined with the threat of sanctions for violations, will control offender behavior and detect all but the shortest absences.

Verification of a program participant can be achieved in several ways with programmed contact systems such as voice verification, visual verification, or a wristwatch device (see Schmidt (1989) for a discussion of these technologies). B.C. uses the former, radio-frequency type of system. More recently, due to cellular technology, receiver devices are placed in vehicles, and program personnel can drive-by locations outside the home to ensure the offender is at the place of scheduled activity.

Summary

The controversy that began in the literature in the first phase intensified in the third phase. Issues connected with technical, legal, administrative, and therapeutic aspects of EMS have dominated discourse. Discussion of the therapeutic benefits of the program was expanded to include the avoidance of the labeling effects of imprisonment. As more jurisdictions adopted EMS programs, increased concern was also expressed about the programs' impact on the offender and the offender's family (Ball and Lilly, 1988). Although advocates and policy-makers pushed for program adoption, some expressed caution about the implementation of EMS without systematic assessment of the operation and impact of such programs (Ball and Lilly, 1988; Vaughn, 1987). It was during this period that this alternative became embroiled in the community corrections controversy.

A review of the history of EMS has shown how program development has rapidly expanded. Diversification has also occurred - different populations are being subject to it. Initially, it was conceived as an alternative to imprisonment and now is being used in some jurisdictions for pre-trial detention and aftercare. It appears to be intensifying control over those who would have otherwise been subject to less intrusive alternatives. In chapter two the debate about community corrections, including EMS, will be discussed. As well, the theoretical, ideological and political implications of community corrections are examined.

CHAPTER 2

Community Corrections, EMS, and Power: The Lesser of Two Evils?

Introduction

In this chapter the debate about the intrusiveness of EMS will be explored in the context of civil liberties, social control, and the debate about community control. The key controversies include: the nature of the intrusiveness, its legality, and net-widening. Garland's thesis on the expansion of state control will then be discussed to gain an understanding of the emergence of community control and electronic monitoring. Garland's primary focus is on the political and ideological factors behind the change to the modern penal system. Other writers included in this discussion are Cohen (1985), Chan and Ericson (1981), and Scull (1977, 1984).

Controversies over Community Corrections

The debate about community-based alternatives has been ongoing since at least the early 1970s. In general, advocates have argued that these types of programmes will benefit the criminal justice system and society-at-large. These programmes are seen as more effective in rehabilitating offenders, and more humane (they impose fewer restrictions, and allow for greater individual freedom than larger-scale correctional institutions). Critics have argued that community-based alternatives compromise due process rights (for example, diversion policies have resulted in programme placement without formal adjudication) (Austin and Krisberg, 1981). Community alternatives are seen as having a net-widening effect in which they: (1) expand the state's control over the behavior and freedom of individuals who would not otherwise have been subjected to the system's reach, and (2) expose those already subject to the system's intervention to further controls and restrictions (Greenburg, 1975; Chan and Ericson, 1981; Austin and Krisberg,

1982; Hylton, 1982; Cohen, 1979, 1985). Such statist measures are seen as benefiting the state and a general context of social domination, rather than preserving individual rights or promoting social justice. Another form of net-widening is "systemic" or "organizational" net-widening (increases in budget, size, personnel, and involvement in public life) (see McMahon, 1992; Mainprize, 1992). Rather than assessing whether offenders are being diverted into less onerous sanctions (EMS over prison or probation over prison), and new persons are not being brought into the system, "a system vantage-point" is taken where an assessment of "budgetary expenditures and staffing increases" is done (Mainprize, 1992, 167). Further, it has been argued that community correctional alternatives blur the boundaries between community and institutions. This clouds who is involved with the formal control system, and where the prison begins and the community ends (Lowman et al., 1987; Cohen, 1985). On the surface, alternatives may appear less coercive or intrusive than imprisonment, but in reality, the state is becoming more entangled in the day-to-day lives of a greater number of individuals. It may be easier to detect net-widening at an organizational level as contrasted to offender net-widening because of this obscurity (McMahon, 1992; Mainprize, 1992). In discussing this issue in Ontario's Ministry of Correctional Services, McMahon (1992, 182) states:

> Where the organization, budget, personnel of the ministry are concerned, while the 'blurring' of boundaries characteristic of community corrections sometimes impedes precision, a general trend of expansion is clearly identifiable. Organizationally, the ministry has expanded its operations through its fostering of numerous community-service-order, victim-offender reconciliation, alcohol-awareness, residential, driving-while-impaired, and other community programs. Moreover, and as has been documented, for the most part these programs have not been developed as substitutes for the use of imprisonment. Rather, they have taken the form of add-ons to probation, or as additional programs to be participated in by those who are incarcerated.

While the focus has generally been on offender net-widening there is little empirical evidence to support such claims. Much of the evidence that is available is methodologically flawed. Results have been overgeneralized, incompatible data have been

compared, and only partial trends are identified (McMahon, 1992). Many critical writers assert that community-based sanctions supplement traditional methods of social control (see for example Cohen, 1985; Scull, 1984). McMahon (1992, 32) states:

> One notable characteristic of the critical literature on decarceration has been the tendency to express the empirical basis of arguments as much through metaphors and analogies as through specific statistical statements about identifiable penal populations.

In other words, rigorous statistical studies of carceral expansion have been the exception, rather than the rule, in the critical literature. Although rates of imprisonment are critical to arguments about net-widening there has been little empirical analysis of these rates. McMahon (1985, 39) states:

> The primary research objective of critical criminology has been to demystify the benign face of alternatives, and to make new discoveries about penal control beyond the prison. The ensuring paradox is that trends in imprisonment have simultaneously been central to arguments about net-widening and penal expansion, and peripheral as a focus of empirical inquiry.

Even those studies that have been represented as more empirically sound are incomplete. Two key studies done in Canada (Hylton, 1981; Chan and Ericson, 1981) have been cited in support of the net-widening explanation of penal expansion western countries (see Cohen, 1985). McMahon (1992, 74-75) states:

> ... the predominant approach of net-widening analysts has been to point to the maintenance and increase of imprisonment, and to posit alternatives as not only failing to counter, but also fostering, this trend. Yet, documentation of trends in imprisonment, and of substantive processes of net-widening, has been sketchy. Moreover, inherently problematic assertions about the quantitative occurrence of net-widening have been made and gone unnoticed.

As McMahon (1992) points out, Hylton's analysis of the prison population in Saskatchewan included provincial prison data, and ignored federal data on prison admissions. This makes his thesis questionable since increases in one area of the system (i.e., provincial) may be compensated for in another area (i.e., the federal system). In

Saskatchewan, where Hylton's data was collected, without the inclusion of all the prison admissions data we cannot be sure that the control system is necessarily expanding.

A re-analysis of Chan and Ericson's data reveals several problems. First, there is a problem with their evidence that apparently supports penal expansion. Their analysis is based on absolute numbers rather than rates per 100,000 when comparing the numbers in prison from 1952 to 1977. A re-examination of the rates reveals that the rate of imprisonment was *lower* from 1972-7 than from 1955-60. The decrease in provincial population was also greater than the increase in the federal population over this period. This also highlights the importance of a longitudinal analysis of prison rates (McMahon, 1992). Their data also purportedly supports net-widening. In support of this thesis they claim that there was a substantial increase in probation from 1972 to 1978 and that this increase is greater than the rates of imprisonment. The problem with this comparison is that they are comparing dissimilar groups. Probation supervision includes both counts (average daily number) and admissions (number admitted per year) data while prison population only includes counts. When McMahon presents the data in a consistent manner, the data suggests the opposite is true. In any event, the summation of counts and admissions does not provide an useful overview of trends. When probation is utilized as an alternative to prison, probation sentences are lengthier. If prison is being used as an alternative we would actually expect the average length of prison sentences to increase (since the shorter probation is being substituted for the shorter prison sentences) and the average daily population in the system to increase due to longer probation sentences. Chan and Ericson used count data to show that there has been an increase in people coming in the system when the use of admissions data are more appropriate. A re-analysis shows a *decrease* in the number of people coming into the system. Thus, McMahon's re-analysis of Ontario using admission data casts doubt on the net-widening thesis. The decrease is attributed to a reduction in admissions for fine defaults. Nonetheless, there has

been an increase in that those who are in the system are subjected to increased controls. This increase has been assisted by "... the ministry's strategy of privatization in the development of community corrections" (McMahon, 1992, 182). The trend towards expansion is an organizational one.

EMS and State Sanctions

This controversy over state expansion is also evident in the literature on EMS. The issue of widening the net of social control is a central concern (see Mainprize, 1990; 1992; Berry and Matthews, 1989; Fox, 1987; Berry, 1986; Petersilia, 1988; Ball and Lilly, 1988). Proponents have claimed that safeguards, such as screening devices[1], will combat this effect and protect the family from unwanted intrusion. For example, the intention has been to restrict the types of offenders placed on the programme to those who would have otherwise gone to prison and are instead given the choice to participate in the programme. Those convicted of less serious charges are thus excluded from EMS, and fines, probation and other sanctions are instead given. In addition, some programmes have restricted participation to those offenders who do not have a history of violence.

Others view net expansion as a realistic possibility. For example, Burtch (1986, 4) stated, with regard to the EMP pilot project in British Columbia, that the potential net-widening was a primary concern of the B.C. Civil Liberties Association. A cautious approach was warranted in implementing EMS projects. The intrusion that EMS represents may be acceptable in theory, but the fear is that this programme will control behavior that otherwise would have been ignored or subject to a less intrusive alternative (e.g., bail-release, and offenders on probation and parole). There is some indication that expansion may be occurring despite these gatekeeper functions (Mainprize, 1992; Ball et

[1] Many programs have developed criteria for screening offenders such as no violent offence history, do not pose a threat to the community, and have a suitable home environment (have a telephone, a stable residence and there is no expectation of domestic violence).

al. 1988; Flynn, 1987[2]). Offenders deemed to be low risk and nonviolent offenders who may not have been incarcerated are being placed on the programme. There are pressures from correctional administrators to expand these criteria. Mainprize (1992, 168) believes we should examine systemic or "correctional personnel system net-widening" and how programmes generate staff positions.

> The metaphor of the fish-net is limited to offenders and neglects the possibility that program counts may be stabilized or reduced; however, the social control apparatus may well be expanding in the process. The metaphor that takes account of this system expansion is that of social networks, meaning the organized system features like number of additional personnel, added costs and evidence of systemic expansion. Expansion can be assumed to be occurring where increases in level and intensity of regulation provided by the new punitive options are expanding the networks of social control and there is no evidence that reductions are occurring in other parts of the system as a result. *Essentially, what occurs in this type of net-widening is that more correctional personnel are necessary for the new program entities that mutate out of the punitive apparatus* (Mainprize, 1992, 168, emphasis added).

In reviewing the evidence on systemic expansion for the B.C. Electronic Monitoring Programme Mainprize (1992, 176) concluded that this programme was producing such effects.

> All of the suggestive evidence reviewed previously concerning staffing of the EMS program indicates that, whatever happens regarding the offender-side of net-widening/expansion, the correctional-side of network-widening/expansion appears to be occurring. There is no reason to believe that this trend is going to reverse directions in the future since provincial correctional policy is not informed by a 'deep-end' strategy of systematic reduction.

Thus, if the system has available space or capacity then it will be utilized (a deep-end strategy). This is contrasted to a strategy that involves the reduction of system capacity.

In contrast to the net-widening argument, a more liberative view of EMS has been espoused (see Burtch, 1989). If offenders are placed on EMS instead of prison they will

---

[2] In a house arrest video tape a correctional administrator admitted that this program was being used on some (14%) offenders who would have been placed on probation (Flynn, 1987; cited in Mainprize, 1990). Ball et al. (1988) claim that net-widening is occurring on the basis of interviews with judges over their sentencing philosophies.

avoid dehumanizing conditions (including overcrowding, restrictions on visits, the effects of institutionalization, lack of privacy and intimidation, and injury). The offender will not be isolated from his or her family, and will be able to continue working, or to seek employment.

Proponents argue that EMS is a cost-effective alternative to imprisonment. EMS is viewed as less expensive than incarceration when per diem rates are compared. Additional savings may be found in reducing the rate of capital construction costs if prison-bound offenders are placed on EMS (Friel and Vaughn, 1986). EMS may also preclude the need for new prison construction. In some U.S. jurisdictions additional savings can occur where offenders pay a per diem rate for the programme[3]. The state may save money on welfare support when the offender remains at home with his or her family (Berry and Matthews, 1989). Cost saving, however, may only accrue if overcrowding is a problem and new construction is impending.

> It has also been argued that direct cost comparisons between "house arrest" (EMS) and imprisonment are extremely difficult due to the effects associated with net-widening. If offenders who would have otherwise been placed on probation or less intense forms of monitoring are diverted to EMS then no cost-savings will occur (Berry, 1986; Friel and Vaughn, 1986; Berry and Matthews, 1989).

If the goal is simply reduction of the prison population, cost savings may be problematic. Friel and Vaughn (1986, 6) state:

> ... even if offenders were diverted from existing institutions, thereby making bed space available, the beds would be filled anyway. The result would not be a reduction in operating costs; on the contrary, it would simply increase overall public expenditures by the cost associated with the purchase of the technology.

Short-term expenditures for start-up costs for equipment also need to be considered (Berry and Matthews, 1989). Even if offenders who would have otherwise gone to

---

[3] The policy of charging offenders to be on the programme raises concerns about discriminating against indigenous offenders (see Friel and Vaughn, 1986). Jurisdictions with a policy of having offenders pay for EMS, usually have a sliding scale.

prison are placed on EMS cost savings may be negligible since the costs of incarceration remain roughly the same whether the prison is full or half-empty. Approximately 85% of the costs of incarceration are fixed costs, which can only be "saved" if the institution, or some part of it is closed down. Comparisons, therefore, of daily rates of incarceration per person are misleading, and the savings of removing a small number of people from prison are minimal (Berry and Matthews, 1989, 23).

Some evidence supports cost savings where EMS has been used in lieu of incarceration. Lilly and his associates (1993) examined costs in their analysis of the Pride, Inc. electronic monitoring programme in Palm Beach, Florida. The programme included individuals convicted of drunk driving. The programme was assessed at three different time periods over a seven year period. Offenders destined for prison were given a "choice" as to whether they wanted to be placed on the programme or go to prison. Lilly et al. (1993) claim to have been conservative in estimating cost savings. Their estimation of costs included equipment, staff salaries, office expenses, offenders' contribution to costs, and the savings of not having to build additional cells, and length of EMS sentences in contrast to jail.[4] The authors found that the EMS programme was a cost-effective alternative to conventional incarceration for "driving while intoxicated" offenders:

> ... for the entire 7-year period, total savings for the county amounted to slightly over $1,700,000 by the 1 to 1 rule and some $600,000 by the 3 to 1 rule. Had the county leased space [for the programme], costs would have been even greater without the EM alternative (Lilly et al., 1993, 468).

Thus, if offenders are serving an EMS sentence three times the length of a jail sentence, the savings attached to the 3 to 1 rule is applicable. This, however, would suggest that systemic expansion is occurring since more personnel are likely required to administer and supervise offenders receiving lengthier sentences, and those who may violate programme

---

[4] The EMS sentence tends to be increased in order "... to compensate for what is perceived as a less onerous quality of punishment that jail would have inflicted" (Lilly et al., 1993, 467). EMS sentences tend to be three times the length of a jail sentence.

conditions. Thus, the cost savings may be minimal. Berry and Matthews (1989, 23-24) suggest that the figures, presented in such studies, can be misleading:

> For significant savings to be made the cost of imprisonment would have to be at least five times the cost of home confinement, with or without electronic monitoring. For such cost savings would have to take into account the additional administrative cost for overseeing those agencies, and in a percentage of cases include the cost of locating, tracking and eventually reincarcerating those who break the conditions of curfew.

Clearly, much of the criminological literature on EMS has centred on the issues of net-widening, civil liberties, and reducing state expenditures. The impact of EMS measures on families, however, has rarely been examined. Social costs may also be incurred by the family in terms of the intrusiveness of this technology in the home and its effects on the family. The issue of the programme's intrusiveness is also unresolved. The state's presence in the home heightens the fear of moving closer to the Orwellian scenario of government surveillance and control (Ball and Lilly, 1985).

Proponents have contended that the intrusiveness of the programme is defensible on several grounds. First, this programme is viewed as less onerous and intrusive on an individual's privacy than imprisonment (Ingraham and Smith, 1972; Berry, 1985; Petersilia, 1986). This perspective, however, does not take into account whether it might be more intrusive and potentially more demanding and dangerous than incarceration for the *family*. Incarceration may be less intrusive on the offender's privacy, but since EMS involves the home environment, and turns the home into a quasi-prison structure -- laundry, telephone, mail, visits, are subject to the system's interference -- the family becomes further involved in the web of state control. Costs to the state may be reduced, but these costs may be borne by family members.

Second, EMS has generally been imposed on offenders after conviction[5] and consent to programme participation is obtained (Petersilia, 1986, 54). Although

[5] EMS is increasingly being used for before trial and post institutional detention (Renzema and Skelton, 1990, 10).

programme participation is subject to the informed consent of the offender (and presumably the family, although this has not been established empirically), there is some question about what informed consent means with EMS (see for e.g., Berry 1985). In most EMS programmes, after meeting programme criteria, offenders have an option of serving their sentence in an institution or on EMS. This choice is viewed by some as coercive, since most offenders will choose EMS, the lesser of two evils.

Finally, the intrusion of technology into the home environment in the U.S. has been found legally and constitutionally justifiable as long as it is rehabilitative[6] to the offender and protective of society (del Carmen and Vaughn, 1986). Others view this issue as unresolved, because legal definition fails to take into account other persons whose rights may be violated (Ball and Lilly, 1988, 162-163). The family's expectation of privacy should thus be considered.

In general, these issues have been examined primarily from concerns of proponents and critics of EMS, and only secondarily from the point of view of the offender. Its impact on the home environment, and especially on spouses and children, is critically overlooked. There is a pressing need to explore the impact of EMS from the family's perspective. The sixth chapter will examine the impact of the EMS programme in the province of British Columbia on family members.

Explaining the Emergence of Community Corrections

One of the more important works done on the emergence of community corrections is Garland's *Punishment and Welfare: The History of Penal Strategies (1985)*. While EMS was not fully explored in this framework, Garland's work will be used to gain theoretical understanding of the emergence of electronic monitoring. For Garland (1985), political and ideological forces were crucial in motivating change to community

[6] The assumption that rehabilitation is taking place has been questioned (Ball and Lilly, 1988). There are no rigorous, controlled studies of the impact of EMS on recidivism.

corrections. The period of reform from 1895 to 1914 substantially altered British "penality[7]" and laid the foundations for the proliferation of community corrections. He argues that present day techniques, discourses, and objectives differ from the late Victorian period, but are continuous with changes that began in the early 1900s. Change includes an increase in the repertoire of sanctions which shifts the prison from the centre to a back-up position. Given the increased array of sanctions the main objectives became classification and assessment. Choosing the right sanction for the offender requires "expert" knowledge. This opens up the law to qualification of its authority. The discourse becomes oriented towards benevolence rather than punishment and repression. The success of the new system "is its ability to administer and manage criminality in an efficient and extensive manner, while portraying the process in terms which make it acceptable to the public and penal agents alike" (Garland, 1985, 260).

The change to the modern penal-welfare system that occurred in this period took place within the context of a broader social transformation. In the 1890s the British penal system was experiencing serious difficulties with its administration and legitimacy which were exacerbated by a more general social crisis. Part of the solution to this crisis was to extend citizenship and security to all classes. This required a less repressive and exclusionary means of controlling the population. Garland (1985, 247) states:

> Henceforth its modalities would have to be more refined and discreet. Yet at the same time they would require to be more systematic and penetrating, more thorough in their effects. Their task was to ensure that the new and permanent threat posed to the system of class domination by the workers' vote, their mass trade unions and their collective political existence was counterbalanced by an equally extensive and thoroughgoing regulation and discipline, reducing the 'risks' that democracy entailed, ensuring the new citizens were good citizens.

---

[7] Penality refers to the assumptions, logics, objectives and organization which support the operation of the penal system including "... the sanctioning practices, policy formation and day-to-day decision-making which takes place in modern penal institutions" (Garland, 1985, 3).

The transformation that occurred resulted in an important change in the logic that underpinned the penal system. A system that was unapologetically repressive and punitive (in theory, treating all persons as equal regardless of their social position or circumstances) became reformative and benevolent, taking the circumstances and peculiarities of individuals into account. "There is thus a move *from individualism to individualisation*, which alters the penal field fundamentally" (Garland, 1985, 28, emphasis in original).

This transformation to a more subtle, and more diverse repertoire of punishments was accompanied by the creation of a number of new agencies, institutions and organizational patterns. These new resources altered the structural position of the prison. Although the prison remained an important part of the penal system, it was "decentred" and became a back-up sanction for other institutions and community-based sentences. This change entails a greater diversification and expansion in the field of penal practice. With a diversified range of sentencing options assessment and classification became the key practical objective. Garland (1985, 28) describes this as a transformation "from a *calibrated, hierarchical structure* ... to *an extended grid of non-equivalent and diverse dispositions*..." (emphasis in original) Prisoners were inserted in the former structure according to the severity of their offence, and into the latter extended grid according to the diagnosis of his/her condition and the treatment appropriate to it.

The ideology of the welfare state plays an important role in representation and legitimization of the state's role in the penal system. The offender is represented as an individual with particular deficiencies. The state is no longer viewed as punishing the offender, but is given the responsibility of reformation and normalization. What the state does with the offender takes on a more positive character - the state as benefactor, expert, and rescuer. The view of the state as benevolent depoliticised its role. Garland (1985, 250) states:

> ... a corresponding ideology of beneficial provision to help those citizens-who-lacked was achieved without reference to the political transformation

> of 'citizenship' and the extension of state control, which it undoubtedly involved. Instead, it was represented as an (apolitical) moral duty to help those whom modern science had recognized as being in need of care and control (brackets in original).

The policy elements of this new logic developed out of "a complex and fragmented process of struggle, within which the calculation of individuals and agencies play a crucial, but by no means controlling part." Through a series of manoeuvers, opposition and resistance was circumvented and the theoretical ideals of reformers were compromised. Social causation and determinants of crime became focused on the character of the individual, rather than more radical social transformation. This political compromise was necessary to fit with the ideological structures that were in place and to establish power. The power exercised by the reformers was not strong and deep enough to undermine the deeper structures of capitalism. Garland (1985, 197) states that " ... many of the positions that were discursively established, stemmed from the deep-rooted 'unconscious' ideologies of modern capitalist society."

The discursive manoeuvers were also likely motivated by the way in which they avoided resistance and gained political representation. Even if reformers did not recognize the unconscious ideologies (determinism, responsibility, and reform) they could at least "appreciate the *practical effects* that these ideologies produced" (Garland, 1985, 197, emphasis in original). Whereas the previous system had left certain individuals outside of its control, the new social network and penal complex extended its control to the home and the family. Control was extended beyond the reach of those who were serving sentences through the soft end of the system. The "normalising sector" of the extended continuum of penal sanctions allowed correctional personnel to invade the home and influence family members to participate in the normalisation process of the offender.

EMS is continuous with these reforms that brought about the modern day penal system. EMS appears to fit within the normalising sector (includes probation, after-care and licensed supervision) of the penal apparatus. EMS is a community-based sanction that

allows the offender to remain at home with his/her family and continue working. This sanction allows greater intrusion in family life as offenders must comply with certain behavioral norms and are subjected to unannounced visits by correctional personnel. If the offender fails to comply with the rules and norms in this sector, the corrective sector of the penal apparatus is used as a back-up. It provides a further refinement of classification powers by differentiating another offender group (Mainprize, 1990, 182).

Although other critical theorists see modern penal systems as being continuous with an earlier transformation that occurred with the birth of the prison, the role of the economy is given more weight in the development of community-based sanctions. Scull (1977) initially provided a more extreme position on the role of the economy in this regard. For Scull (1977), the primary motivating force in the move toward community corrections was a fiscal crisis prompted by the growth of welfare states during the post-war period. Structural pressure existed for the state to cut institutional costs.

For Scull (1977) ideology played a less significant role. Ideology was viewed as a useful tool in covering up problems in the economy and the neglect that ensued. A decline in institutional-based sanctions was said to occur as a means of curtailing expenditure. The accompanying growth in welfare services and the reduction of "problem populations" strengthened one another. It was the expansion of one system that allowed for the other to contract (Scull, 1977, 135). In a subsequent analysis of community corrections Scull (1984) conceded that the ideology of decarceration was responsible for an overall increase in the control system. As discussed above Garland (1985) and others (Chan & Ericson, 1981; Cohen, 1979, 1985; Matthews, 1979) support this argument.

One of the most notable criticisms of Scull's original thesis is that he under-estimated the role of political-ideological structures in the reform process (Chan and Ericson, 1981; Matthews, 1979; Cohen, 1979). Chan and Ericson (1981) point out that since the correctional budget is a small part of the total crime control budget,

institutionalism would not have been so problematic if it had not been such a "dismal failure". For Chan and Ericson (1981), it was politically problematic to continue a penal policy that was unsuccessful when an apparently cheaper, more humane alternative existed, that was more effective and extensive in its reach. Community control also maintained the state's legitimacy by appearing benign, if not benevolent. The ideology of the community is also less stigmatizing and deteriorating for the offender. Additionally, it is important to consider the organizational level as original intentions may be thwarted by the interests of control agents to survive and proliferate. They state:

> Appreciation of the competing demands on control organizations to reproduce order, legality and their own interests makes it possible to understand why the consequences of reform are typically different from what was originally intended (p.21).

Cohen (1985) also supports the importance of considering organizational dynamics and interests as they can impede the realization of any reformative efforts. Ideologies are useful in guiding change and rationalizing policy development (Cohen, 1985, 112). Nonetheless the political economy limits the autonomy of these forces. Cohen views political economy as responsible for creating more deviant and problem groups and expanding the size and range of the penal complex to deal with them.

The view of the penal complex as ever expanding and intensifying its control over members of society is problematic as is rules out progressive penal reform (McMahon, 1992). Critical theorists focus on the ominous effects of the power of the system. McMahon (1992) argues that this view is limited. A more balanced conception of power takes into account its liberative aspect. Power can be exercised in a positive direction - reduction of the control system may be possible and unintended consequences may also be positive. This view of power also denies the importance of human agency. The intentions and efforts of penal reformers are seen as repeatedly thwarted by more structural factors.

As discussed above, EMS seems to represent an extension and intensification of the penal control system, by its intrusion in the home and the lives of family members. This does not preclude positive effects of the programme, particularly if used and considered as an alternative to incarceration. In order to gain a broader view of the impact of the penal system its effect needs to be more fully studied. McMahon (1992, 221) states:

> We need to explore the situation of those subject to various forms of community sanctions, and to investigate not only their penalizing aspects but also any 'social and personal benefits that accrue to participants'.

In chapter 3 an examination of the meaning of the home for the family is provided to gain a better understanding of how EMS affects the family and home environment.

CHAPTER 3

The Meaning of the Family Home: Implications of Intrusion on the 'Intimate' Environment

Meaning of the Home for the Family

Understanding the *meaning* of the family home is an important aspect in understanding the impact of electronic monitoring. The family is increasingly relying on the home for intimacy and privacy (May, 1991; Skolnick, 1978; Aries, 1979; Shorter, 1975). Skolnick (1987, 127) states that one of the things that distinguishes the family today is:

> ...the psychological quality of the intimate environment of the family and the relationship between the family and the larger community. Within the home the family has become more intense emotionally, while the ties between home and the outside community have become more tenuous. (emphasis added)

The meaning of the home is examined by providing a historical overview of the changes that occurred from pre-industrial to industrial society transforming the home into a private "sanctuary" for family members.

It is often assumed that multi-generational or extended families lived together under the same household in the past. It is also assumed that the present-day nuclear family form has resulted in more privacy for families. On the contrary, the predominant structure of the family in the past in England, Western Europe, and North America was nuclear (Hanawalt, 1986; Wall, 1983; Hughes, 1975; Laslett & Wall, 1972; Demos, 1970; Greven, 1970; Laslett, 1965; Goode, 1963). Rather than having extended family members in the home environment, it was the existence of others or "strangers" that provided a more public atmosphere for family life through the economic function provided by the family (Gittins, 1985). In this sense, the household structure was perhaps more complex in comparison to present day family structures.

Prior to industrialization, the family was usually the principal unit of production in agriculture, commerce and manufacturing. Most people were involved in agriculture or in specialized trades or crafts (e.g., bakers, tailors, carpenters, smiths, brewers, weavers) up to the 18th century. The majority of people lived in rural areas and worked in agriculture (Tilly & Scott, 1987). Some agricultural peasants practiced such crafts part-time for supplemental income (Hanawalt, 1986). In both contexts the family functioned as a economic enterprise or business; work and family life were intertwined.

The economic functions provided by the family meant that the pre-industrial English and Western European households were "... the centre around which labor, resources and consumption were balanced" (Tilly & Scott, 1987, 12). Balancing the number of individuals supported by a household was achieved, in part, by reproduction. However, in the early part of the family life cycle the young had to be cared for. At this stage of the lifecycle, the balance of labor and resources was achieved by including others into the household. The number of non-kin in the household of the propertied peasant depended on the composition of the family and the size of land holdings in the rural household[1] (Tilly & Scott, 1987, 13). Wealthier landholders would have also brought others into their household regardless of the life cycle of their children. In the case of large families and few resources, or families without property, members would leave the home to obtain employment in the houses of others who required additional labour. In some cases, kin would be hired as servants (MacFarlane, 1970). It was necessary at certain times of the year (planting and harvest times) to hire additional assistance. Day laborers were hired in such cases, but lived in separate residences (Hanawalt, 1986). This contrasts with servants and apprentices who lived in the family home throughout the year.

---

[1] Morgan (1966, 77) has also pointed out that Puritan children in seventeenth century New England left home to serve in another household as "Puritan parents did not trust themselves with their own children, they were afraid of spoiling them by too great affection."

Neighbours were important in providing assistance in the family enterprise and contributed to the public atmosphere of family life. Cooperative exchanges were entered into with neighbours due to the demands of the family enterprise. For farmers, neighbours were essential for survival and the smooth functioning of the household enterprise (Hanawalt, 1986). Reciprocal relations with neighbours involved the exchange of labor, equipment, loans, and food. Networks of cooperation and reciprocity were important in assisting with many tasks (Hanawalt, 1986). Laslett (1984, 12) states:

> The necessities of rural life did require recurrent groupings of households for common economic purposes, occasionally something like a crowd of men, women and children working together for days on end.

Variation also existed in the types of arrangements entered into (Hanawalt, 1986). In England, the most complex relationships of reciprocity were concentrated among the "middling" peasants as compared to the upper and lower status groups, and cooperation, for the former group, was essential for profit. The higher status groups hired wage labor when they needed it. Lower status peasants' economic relationships with others "... tended to be dyadic [e.g., a contract as labourer] and involved specific transactions" (having contacts with others selling harvested goods in the market place), rather than based on reciprocity (Hanawalt, 1986, 119). Artisans engaged in reciprocal exchanges with professional associates and neighbours (see Hughes, 1975). Within this class, associates and clients were often a part of home life as business was conducted in the family home. Aries' (1962, 383) description of life among the professional class in 17th century France illustrates this:

> There were no professional premises, either for the judge or the merchant or the banker or the businessman. Everything was done in the same room where he lived with his family.

This type of dependence and involvement of the family with members of the community contributed to more interactions with neighbours and the community than today. Contact with neighbours was frequent, thereby reducing privacy and intimacy for

family members. The public atmosphere of the home acted as a form of social control. Despite the public atmosphere of pre-industrial life, it appears that violence was not uncommon towards women (Anderson and Zinsser, 1988). For example, husbands threatened and assaulted their wives if they acted inappropriately within the context of marriage. Rape was not uncommon:

> Records of towns, from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries in Italy, France, and England, tell of women being raped by all kinds of men (Anderson and Zinsser, 1988, 437).

Industrialization resulted in a split between the privacy of the home and the public place of work. When work was located in the home, as discussed above, it brought many people into the home associated with the performance of this function by the family. The shift of economic functions outside the home increased the privacy for immediate family members. As productive functions were gradually taken over by institutions outside of the family, the home environment became more private and isolated, and the focus of family life became more intimate, emotional, and sentimental.

The non-kin segment of the household population (quasi-family members) was largely removed by the growth of the factory system and machine production. According to Farber (1972, 49) and Douglas (1968), the apprentice system in America began declining at the end of the 18th century and beginning of the development of the factory system of production. Family members began to work for wages[2].

The growth of wage labour and the increasing separation of work from home did not alter the work contributions made by family members. All family members, including children, worked, but the location and organization of work changed. This resulted in more privacy for the family in the home and an accompanying isolation of the domestic

---

[2] Wage work was available prior to industrialization, but the predominant organization of work during this time was still the family unit or enterprise (Mitterauer & Sieder, 1982; Hanawalt, 1986, Gies & Gies, 1987). In wage economies, work was organized outside the home and persons entered into social and economic relations as individuals, rather than in a family group (Smith, 1980; cited in Nett, 1988).

sphere. People gravitated to urban settings. Men went to work in the factory or office. For women, domestic jobs were expanded in the home and increasing pressure was placed on women to stay at home, particularly in the 19th and 20th centuries. In practice, however, many women, particularly working class women, took on wage labour jobs outside of the home. In the earlier stages of industrialization, children's participation in the work force allowed mothers to stay at home and attend to domestic work there (Tilly & Scott, 1987). Many women who had young children stayed at home and worked there (e.g., doing "piece-work") or did part-time wage labour outside the home (Tilly & Scott, 1987, 142; Nett, 1988).

Children, rather than being employed in the homes of others, were increasingly employed in factories and lived at home. Since children could contribute wages to the family economy in the initial stages of industrialization the number of children increased in families. Children's contributions were necessary for family support and survival (Tilly & Scott, 1987). Gittins (1985, 23) states "where the number of individuals needed to run a smallholding had been limited, the number who could engage in wage labour was potentially infinite." This meant that for many children their adolescence was spent in their families of origin. Privacy and intimacy were increased for family members by having children at home. Not only did these changes result in increased privacy for immediate family members but it also increased the stability[3] of family members living together over longer periods of time (Mitterauer & Sieder, 1982, 58-59).

The idea of the breadwinner family began to take shape with the rise of the middle classes in the late eighteenth century (Nett, 1988). The idea was that husbands/fathers would procure a family wage and wives and children would stay home. Labor Unions consisting of men in skilled crafts or industries, also promoted the idea of a family wage

[3] The stability of the immediate family group was contributed to by other factors such as increased life expectancy, changes in procreative patterns (children were reared closer together in age) compulsory education, longer periods of training and better housing.

(Gittins, 1985). In reality, the majority of working class families relied on a household economy based on several wages (Tilly & Scott, 1987; Gittins, 1985, 28). Tilly and Scott (1987) point out that by the end of the 19th century due to increased productivity and greater prosperity, men's wages rose above subsistence levels and working class married women worked when necessary, such as in times of family crisis. The decline in employment opportunities for married women also contributed to the aggregate decline in their participation in the labour force. During this period children assisted with family wage earnings. After World War II there was an initial decline in married women's wage labour. However, shortly thereafter married women increasingly entered the work force. The primary motivation was their children's needs. Other factors attributed to this increase include: a demand for employment of women in white collar jobs (e.g., secretarial); couples having fewer children; and children spending a larger amount of time in school and less time as wage earners (Tilly & Scott, 1987). Until the 1970's, less that half of married women participated in the labor force (for a discussion of the changes in married women's participation in the labor force see Swerdlow et al., 1981, 34-38).

In summary, the result of the transfer of various functions (related to production) out of the home was that the family became more private and isolated from the wider community. Strangers who were a part of family life contributed to a more public atmosphere. The transfer of productive functions to the factory, shop, and office was crucial in the family becoming a more private institution. Strangers - business associates, partners, journeymen, apprentices and boarders and lodgers - gradually withdrew from the home environment with this change. The timing of these changes varied by class as well as among ethnic groups in the western world. Privacy and intimacy were thus increased by an increased continuity and stability of household membership,[4] and increasingly, the

[4] Mortality was also an important factor in decreasing solidarity and continuity of family membership (Gittins, 1985, 8-9). In contemporary society people live longer.

disconnection of the home from the community. As will be discussed in the next section, the family's control over production, not only contributed to a public atmosphere in the home, it also altered the emotional quality of relationships of family members. Privatization of the home has both positive and negative implications on family relations.

The Impact on Family Relations

The loss of various functions from the family and home environment and the accompanying separation of private and public spheres infuenced the relationships[5] that family members had with one another and the surrounding community. The informal network of social control broke down with industrialization. Under a domestic economy, the economic functions of the family were critical to family survival. Gies & Gies (1987, 297) state:

> Certainly the family environment was austere and often harsh. The economic function that ensured the family's survival tended to take precedence over other considerations. Marriage partners were chosen to help perpetuate the estate, the farm, or the business; children were an element in the enterprise.

This did not mean that medieval families led impoverished emotional lives as suggested by Aries, Stone and Shorter.[6] Although the economic function pervaded family life, emotional bonds developed as well between immediate family members. The same degree of sentiment in marriage and parenthood that exists today, however, was not present (Hanawalt, 1986; Laslett, 1973). The separation of the home and work intensified the emotional reliance on immediate family. The family's reliance on neighbours and friends is today based more on *social* needs. Social relations are more privatized. The intrusion of EMS into the home may interfere with the family's social relations if the family is too embarrassed to let others know about the offender's status on the program. Family

---

[5] The rise of individualism also occurred along with changes in family relations (see Stone, 1977 for a discussion of this).

[6] These early writers on the family argued that relationships within the family were lacking in affection and warmth.

members may maintain the same restrictions to the home that the offender is subjected to by the program (Mainprize, 1990), limiting or severing social relations for the duration of the offender's time on the EMS program.

Practical concerns and limited resources meant that parents in the past spent little time with their children. Due to the need to balance resources or to learn a trade for future survival many children saw very little of their parents from adolescence onwards. Even where children were at home in the past parents had less time to devote to childrearing. As a consequence, small children were often left without parental attendance (Hanawalt, 1986). Although older children were given the responsibility for caring for their siblings, it was not unusual for an infant to be cared for by a child of five years of age. The lack of attention given to children was imposed on the family due to the demands of the family enterprise and survival. This kind of treatment of children, however, did not mean that parents did not feel towards their children " ... the same mixture of tenderness, amusement, and wonder that they feel today" (Gies & Gies, 1987, 298). Parents were not any less capable of love for their children, but they may have expressed it differently (Pollock, 1983). According to Hanawalt (1986, 186) "coroner's inquests and literary remains show parents tending the needs of their children, providing for their future, and exhibiting love and concern for them ..." Parents also felt great sorrow at the loss of their children. Gies & Gies (1987, 206-207) state that although the " ... loss of a child involved more than emotional considerations, it involved those too."

With industrialization and the change to a wage-earning economy children remained at home rather than leaving to work in another household. By having children remain at home for longer periods of time than in the past closer relationships developed between children and their mothers. Although children were still valued for their contribution to the household economy, parents now had no material hold on their children. Nonetheless, "mothers seemed to have established strong emotional claims on

them" and this was "reinforced by a set of socially sanctioned values, which insisted that children owed their parents, and particularly their mothers, devotion and loyalty" (Tilly & Scott, 1987, 142). Anderson (1971, 77) provides evidence to support this in Preston (Lancashire, England):

> ... bonds of affection were particularly strong between mothers and their children, which seems to reflect both the greater role of the mother in the life of the child and also the fact that it was she above all who made sacrifices for her children and she who protected them from their father. She, in turn therefore, seems to have received from them affection and gratitude ....

The emotional intensity of family relationships can be attributed to the separation of home and work which "encouraged greater concentration on the affective character of the parent-child relationship within it" (Laslett, 1979, 248-249).

By the 20th century mothers spent more time nurturing children and were expected to become 'specialists' in childrearing (Tilly & Scott, 1987). After World War II there was a greater need for trained workers and parents made schooling for children a social familial priority. This was supported by compulsory school attendance and child labor laws which excluded them from the work force, at least until their teenage years. Tilly & Scott (1986, 223) state that "children's needs were a primary motive for married women's work..." Since children were more costly to raise one result was fewer children and more attention could be devoted to fewer children.

The family also became more close knit by a decrease in the gaps in children's ages. In the pre-industrial economy there was a greater age range of children living within the home and the authority structure would have been more pronounced[7] (Mitterauer &

---

[7] Laslett (1973, 483) argues that older (or adult) children in the family are more likely to be "the repositories of socially approved behavior" and act as sources of social control than are younger children. In addition, larger families are "likely to have such persons in their midst for a longer periods of the family life cycle than will smaller families, and therefore experience less privacy. Privacy is increased in smaller families by the effect which fewer children have on the age distribution of potential audience members."

Sieder, 1982, 64-65). In contrast to the modern family, siblings are closer in age to one another.

The family's relationships with the community were affected by the economic function provided by the family. In the past, the family's connection to the community was based in large part on its need for survival, but this involvement was also selective. The family did not necessarily have strong ties to kin in the community. In English peasant families extended family members appear to have played a less significant role than that of neighbors and friends on a daily basis (Hanawalt, 1986). Hughes (1975, 124-126) also found that the artisans of Genoa showed loyalties towards associates as contrasted to extended family members. For example, in some cases artisans left their estates to non-kin, such as a business partner or the parish church. This appears to be related to the reciprocal arrangements that both artisans and peasants made with community members (as previously discussed). Both of these social groups made such arrangements for survival. As Hughes (1975, 126) points out:

> Artisans, more susceptible to the vagaries of the household and obviously terrified of a poor and lonely old age, were sometimes forced to make, among other things, reciprocal arrangements with friends, fellow tradesmen, and neighbors, as the widow Agnese did in 1233 when she entrusted her small estate to a neighboring artisan, who, in turn, made her his heir.

In England by the beginning of the 15th century ties began to break down as people moved to urban centres. It is the ties with neighbours more than with kin that have disintegrated since pre-industrial times. The mutual cooperation and community ties that had been built up over several generations gradually began to break down. Hanawalt (1986, 267) states:

> While families showed resilience and regrouped into nuclear units fairly readily, the community proved less robust. If there was a major change from the medieval to the early modern period it took place less in the structure and function of family than in the community.

Although members of the community were involved with the family on a daily basis, their interest was primarily related to ensuring that the family was carrying out its functions within the community (Hanawalt, 1986). Hanawalt states that in England the community appears only to have intervened where there were problems that threatened the family's well being. Intervention generally occurred where individuals were dealt with unfairly in wardship arrangements or retirement contracts. The community might also intercede in family disputes that involved assaultive behavior (e.g., wife abuse). Pressure was put on wife abusers because they disturbed the peace of the community; family members and other community members intervened to stop wife abusers[8] (Hanawalt, 1986, 208).

One aspect of contemporary industrial society is that much interaction between family members occurs in the family's private space - the home. It has only been more recently that violence in the space of the home has been considered a public issue. The awareness of domestic violence has dramatically increased in recent years. This has led to changes in criminal justice policies that actively support the prosecution of assaultive behavior that occurs between family members. However, even today much of the violence that occurs within the home does not come to the attention of authorities. Moreover, Skolnick (1978, 135) states that "while privacy permits the family to be more loving and intimate, it also permits the expression of more negative feelings." Following Goffman's concept of *backstage interaction*, Laslett (1973) argues that the increase in family privacy in recent years may result in less social control and support on what is going on in the

---

[8] In some situations violence may have been condoned against women (within the context of marriage). Hanawalt (1986) argues that the nature of the marriage as an economic unit promoted the smooth functioning of this relationship. There is also literature that supports the husband treating his wife with affection. Evidence from court records also shows a very small percentage of cases involving maritial discord, both those involving the death of a spouse and physical abuse. She speculates that if violence towards women in the context of the marriage was more prevalent, higher percentage of cases of marital discord would show up in in both lay and ecclesiastical court records. Cruelty and abuse within the marriage were also grounds for separation.

family. No evidence, however, exists to support this hypothesis. The ideology of the private nuclear family has only become a reality in contemporary society where the effects are now becoming apparent. This ideology appears to have condoned abusive behavior that was in existence in pre-industrial society. Social-psychological literature on family stress has also found that family members' reliance on each other may also have negative ramifications if family members do not have adequate resources to deal with stress (see McCubbin et al., 1980).

The intrusion of EMS into the family home may produce considerable stress in the family since it is not only intruding on the 'intimate environment of the family,' but it may also further isolate the family from the community (Mainprize, 1990, 122-125). If so the consequences may have such devastating effects. Nonetheless, the opportunity for emotional seclusion in the home may be crucial since the elimination of opportunities for privacy are associated with the breaking down of self (Goffman, 1959). Privacy is linked with self-preservation and self-respect. Behaviors previously unacknowledged may become scrutinized and subject to control with the invasion of EMS into the home environment. Marx (1990, 524) states:

> When their privacy is invaded, people are in a sense turned inside out, and what was previously invisible and meaningless is made tangible and significant.

The EMS program may then be a double-edged sword by intruding on the family and reducing privacy on the one hand. On the other hand, it may serve to isolate the family from social relations in the community.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the withdrawal of various economic functions from the home that existed in the past and how this has altered on the home environment and relationships of family members within the family and to the community. It was the incorporation of domestic and economic functions in the home in the past gave the home

environment its more public character. Industrialization has increased privacy and intimacy of the home environment as well as intensified its emotional quality. The removal of economic functions from the home made irrelevant reciprocal community relationships and has resulted in immediate family members relying on each other more. Couples' relationships today have become more focused on emotional intimacy and support. Also, more focus is given to children's needs and individuals interests. With this change the social control function of the community was eroded. Although privacy and intimacy may have positive effects, negative consequences can also follow from this. Further isolation that may result from the EMS program and the frustrations that accompany confinement may result in more unchecked violence or other abusive behaviors. In the next chapter an examination of the methodology for the research conducted on how the intrusion of the British Columbia EMP affects the family and the home environment will be discussed.

CHAPTER 4

The Model of Family Stress and Adaptation

Family stress theory provides a useful way in which to examine the impact of EMS on the family. This chapter will discuss the Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation, along with Walker's (1985) discussion of the importance of context in stress investigations, which provide the basis for questionnaire construction in the present study.

A model of family stress referred to as the Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation is the current focus of family stress investigations. This model expands on Hill's (1949, 1958) ABCX model of family stress and crisis which focused on three variables: the event and related hardships (A), the family's resources (B), and the family's definition of the crisis (C). These variables are determinants of the severity of the crisis (X).[1] The Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation recognizes the contribution of additional stresses and strains on the impact of a major stressor event (McCubbin and Patterson, 1982, 1983a, 1983b).[2] Additional stresses occur prior to and following the crisis producing event which influence the severity of the strain associated with a crisis situation or produce "a pile-up of demands" (aA factor) for the family. A "pile-up" of demands is created both in responding to a particular stressor and related strains and in dealing other family life events.[3]

---

[1] Family crisis has been defined as " ... disruptions in the routine operation of the family social system" (Hill, 1958). Burr (1982, 7) states that the "amount of crisis" or disruption is the result of " ... variation in the amount of disruptiveness, incapacitatedness or disorganization of the family social system" which is influenced by inadequate resources.

[2] "The stressor event is an event that produces change in the family social system" (Burr, 1982, 7). Some stressor events produce large amounts of change or disruption while others result in smaller amounts of change and, therefore, smaller amounts of crisis. This change or disruption is distinguished from 'routine' changes that occur and are expected.

[3] Events that occur over time in the course of family life.

There are also factors that have a mitigating influence on the impact of a stressor event and shape adaptation. Adaptive resources (bB factor) refer to both existing resources and resources that are developed in response to the demands posed by the stressor event. These resources can either reduce the impact of demands on the family and/or help the family adapt to the changes. Although resources have been identified as crucial to understanding the family's response to a stressor event, resources vary to a great degree, depending on the type of stressful event. There appears, however, to be some resources which offset, or ease various stressful events. Three types of family adaptive resources have been identified: personal resources, family system resources (cohesion, adaptability, communication), and social support resources (Lavee et al., 1985). Personal resources are individual characteristics potentially available to family members in times of need such as self-esteem, knowledge, and skills (George, 1980; Perlin and Schooler, 1978). Various family system resources have received empirical support and appear to have general applicability to dealing with stress. These include: cohesion, adaptability, and communication (Olson & McCubbin, 1982; Olson et al., 1983; Lavee, et al., 1985). Supportive communication is a major facilitating factor of family cohesion and adaptability (Olson and McCubbin, 1982; Olson et al., 1983). Social support also buffers against the effect of stress and thereby contributes to the family's invulnerability to stress. Social support has been defined as "capabilities of people or institutions outside the family on which the family can draw or a network in which the family is cared for and loved, is esteemed and valued, and where it feels that it belongs" (see Lavee, et al., 1985, 813; Cobb, 1979; Pilisuk and Parks, 1983).

The other facilitating factor to family adaptation is the family's perception of the situation (cC factor). This "refers to the family's general orientation to the overall circumstances" (Lavee, et al., 1985, 813). Perception is a critical factor in determining the severity of the stressor event and whether or not the family experiences a crisis. It can

also be part of a family's coping strategy. This includes the meaning the family attaches to a stressful situation (Venters, 1979; cited in McCubbin et al., 1980). McCubbin et al. (1980, 865) state:

> The difference between events which eventually lead to breakdown or dysfunction may depend upon the presence or absence of explanations which help the family to make sense of what happened, and how one's social environment can be rearranged in order to overcome the undesirable situations.

Montgomery (1982) suggests that for adjustment to occur, family members must share an accurate definition of the situation. If the family's definition of the situation is important to the family's response and to adapting to stress, other factors may also need to be addressed (see Walker, 1985). These include: How the family's definition was arrived at? Does this definition change over time? What happens if there is not a unified definition? Walker (1985, 833) proposes that it may be more important to examine individual's perspectives of stressful situations, and how they influence behavior and affect other members' perspectives.

Finally, this model recognizes that in response to the 'pile-up' of demands there are a "range of outcome of family processes". Adaptation is the outcome and is a continuous variable ranging from "maladaptation" to "bonadaptation" (McCubbin and Patterson, 1983). Maladaptation is where the family experiences "continued imbalance between the pile-up of demands and the family's capabilities for meeting those demands" (Lavee, et al., 1985, 813). Bonadaptation represents a more balanced state of family functioning: "... a minimal discrepancy between the pile-up of demands and the families capabilities" (Lavee, et al., 1985, 813). A family who was not adapting well to a crisis and the pile-up of demands "may be characterized by deterioration of family integrity, [and] of family members' sense of well being." (Lavee et al., 1985, 813).

Although the Double ABCX model provides a more complex understanding of family stress by the inclusion of the role that other stresses and strains play in the crisis

process, Walker (1985) finds the identification of "an initial event to begin the crisis process" problematic. Stress must instead be viewed as part of an ongoing process. Walker (1985, 828) states:

> An event-initiated stress model assumes that behavioral, familial, and social patterns are homeostatic ... An individual may use different behaviors when a greater amount of change is present, a family may intensify coping efforts, a society may take specific actions more frequently in order to deal with different amounts of change.

Stress is not viewed as inherent in the event but is a function of the family's response to the stressor event. Knowing the characteristics of the event does not enable us to predict how stressful it will be to a particular family (McCubbin et al., 1980, 857; Walker, 1985, 829). For Walker, only in some cases, is it reasonable to identify events or situations. "Resources and coping repertoires of individuals, families, and communities will predict more about family process than will information on the contours of a particular event" (Walker, 1985, 829). Events must be placed in their appropriate context.[4] Events are viewed as a consequence of the "systemic interdependence of the elements of the social milieu." From this view, it is important to understand the following: what preceded a particular stressor; how was it responded to by the family (as a group), individuals in the family, their social network, the community, and the state; what other stressful events precipitated or occurred with the crisis; and how family members interpreted the outcome. The Double ABCX model takes into account the process involved in dealing with stress by considering stress related to the stressor event that occurs prior to and following the event. This model also includes other family life events (both normative and non-normative) that influence the severity of the strain and also influence adaptation. Moreover, it acknowledges that the availability of certain resources and how the family defines or gives meaning to the overall situation may influence adaptation. Walker (1985),

---

[4] For Walker a contextual approach is important in stress investigations since we do not yet have a "complete understanding of the process of families under stress" (Walker, 1985, 827).

however, places more emphasis on the surrounding context in her model by drawing attention to the responses at various levels of the social system.

From the Double ABCX model a number of propositions can be derived: (1) increases in other family life events are positively associated with strain associated with EMP (EMP strain); (2) adaptation has a negative association with the pile-up of stressors and strain (includes family life events and EMP strain); (3) higher levels of adaptive resources (personal, family system and social support) diminish the severity of the strain created by the pile-up of demands; (4) coherence or perception influences adaptation positively (see Lavee et al., 1985).

For the present study, it was hypothesized that the level of adaptation is positively influenced by family system resources, perception and meaning and coherence, and negatively influenced by the stress experiences. It follows that buffering variables would negatively affect strain and positively affect adaptation. Family system resources and meaning buffer (i.e., reduce) against severity of the strain experienced by families. Respondents with higher amounts of stress, when family system resources (cohesion, adaptability, communication), perception, and meaning are controlled for, will have lower levels of adaptation.

In addition, as the above discussion indicates the importance of examining the context in which the intrusiveness of electronic monitoring is imposed on the family is crucial. Since this study is exploratory there will also be a descriptive focus on the various changes accompanying the intrusion of EMP into the home environment. It is important to explore how the family (or individual family members) defines the situation (or what meaning is attached to the situation in coping with it), how others responded to this situation, what additional stresses and changes occurred prior to and after placement on EMP, what resources are useful for the family, how the family adapted to this situation, and how these factors may change over time.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the family model of stress and adaptation used as a guide to questionnaire construction in this study. This model assesses how family members adapt to stressful situations in the context of other stressful life events and resources that are available to them during this process. This study attempts to explore the relationship between stress experiences, adaptive resources, perception and meaning, and adaptation in the context of EMP. In the next chapter the methodology used in the present study and the administration of the interview schedule are discussed.

CHAPTER 5

Method and Data Collection

Setting

The research site was the British Columbia Electronic Monitoring program (staffed by the B.C. Corrections Branch). In British Columbia, the EMP is currently operating in all 5 regions (Vancouver, Fraser, Island, North, and Interior) of the province. When the study was undertaken the EMP was operating in only two regions (Fraser Region and Vancouver Region). In the Vancouver Region the program began as a pilot project[1] in August 1987. It was expanded to the Fraser Region in 1989. The Island Region began operation in 1991. By 1993 the North and Interior regions were also operational. Subjects were interviewed in both the Vancouver and Fraser regions.

Sample and Selection

The central problem of this study is the impact of the EMS program on the family. To address this problem, offenders and their spouses/partners were interviewed. Interviews were conducted with 27 offenders who were on the program and their spouses. Thus, a total of 54 separate interviews were undertaken. An almost equal number (Fraser Region, n=30; Vancouver Region, n=24) of subjects were interviewed from each region. The average length of time that offenders interviewed were on the program was about two months. Presently, those offenders serving a sentence of four months or less can be classified to the EMP in B.C. EMP is a classification option[2] and offenders are placed on the program if they meet specified criteria. Exceptions to this general rule are sometimes

---

[1] The pilot-phase in this region ended in the spring of 1989 when the project achieved program status.

[2] Although offenders were classified to the EMP, recommendations from the courts are strongly considered.

made with the approval of a Regional Director.[3] Initially, this program was directed at an intermittent population who were serving their sentence on weekends in jail and where the offender's sentence did not exceed 90 days (Neville, 1989). At the time of the study there were on average between 20-30 offenders on the EMP in the Vancouver Region and between 70-80 in the Fraser region. All offenders interviewed were male. 85% of the couples interviewed had children. Children were not interviewed due to the more complicated procedural requirements needed to obtain consent and ethical approval.

Access

To obtain access to the program for purposes of interviewing the offender and spouse a proposal was submitted to the Regional Director, Vancouver Region, and a copy was sent to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Attorney General's Ministry. Subsequently, a meeting was scheduled with the Local Director and the program Director in Vancouver region. After a discussion of the proposal and the resources (desk, telephone, files) the researcher would need to carry out the research, access was granted to the electronic monitoring program in the Vancouver region. A proposal was then sent to the program Director and, Local and Regional Directors in the Fraser Region. Shortly thereafter, a meeting was scheduled with the program Director in the Fraser region and access was granted to the program. The program Director in Vancouver region was helpful in expediting access to the program in the Fraser region. Staff in both regions cooperated fully with the research. No restrictions were imposed on the data collection process. The only condition in terms of accessibility of the research site was that a copy of the research findings be given to the Corrections Branch. Under Simon Fraser University Guidelines ethical clearance was obtained. A crucial consideration was that offenders and family

---

[3] One offender in the present study was interviewed after spending four months on the program, and at the time of interview it was unclear how much longer he would be on the program. Since he was sentenced to 1 year he could potentially be on the program for up to 8 months.

members be assured of confidentiality. Since this research dealt with a captive population, the voluntary nature of participation in the study was stressed.

Interview Procedure

After access and ethical clearance were obtained, offender case files were reviewed to obtain subjects for this study. Subjects were selected on the basis of the following criteria: the offender had to be married or living in a common law relationship (1 year or longer) with or without children, and on the program for two months or longer. All offenders who fit these criteria were considered potential interviewees.

Prospective interviewees were contacted by an information letter delivered by corrections staff. The letter explained the nature of the study and asked potential subjects to be interviewed by a university-based researcher. It was explained that the research was important in terms of understanding how families are affected by the intrusion of EMS into the home environment. It was also important in tracing the benefits and/or problems that may result with this type of correctional program. Moreover, it was stated that this type of research may have an impact on corrections policy and sentence management.

Due to initial difficulties with a low response rate, it was decided to follow up with a second contact by telephone. Some of the couples who responded positively stated that they had forgot about the information letter or had "not given it much thought". Another reason for a low response rate was that it was necessary to obtain the consent of both the offender and spouse. In some cases where the couple did not agree to be interviewed, privacy concerns appeared to be the issue, particularly for the partner of the offender. In this respect, a couple of offenders said that did not want to "make a big deal of it" and "just wanted to get it over with". Consequently, although some individuals refused, there was a higher response rate (58% as compared to 17%) once the follow-up phone call procedure was implemented.

No interviews were terminated by a spouse or offender once the interview had begun. However, there were three incomplete interviews as subjects had some English language difficulties and were, therefore, unable to comprehend some of the questions with structured response sets. Several interviews were not done: a few offenders committed program infractions which resulted in them serving the remaining part of their sentence in a correctional institution; one offender who had agreed to be interviewed declined after his time on the program ended;[4] and one offender's partner had to go out of town for a lengthy period of time.

Once the consent of both the offender and offender's spouse was obtained (either by response form or by phone) interviews were scheduled. Before commencement of the interview subjects read and signed a "Consent" form (see Appendix A). This form elaborated on the study's purpose and procedures. It also explained who the researcher was and gave further assurance that participation would not have any impact on the offender's program status. Confidentiality of individual responses was again assured.

The data were collected over about a 1 year period (August 1991 - September 1992). All but four interviews were conducted in family residences. Three were carried out in restaurants, due to the constraints of living space in the home environment. One was carried out at the respondent's workplace. All interviews were conducted while the offender was still on the program. On average these interviews took about two hours. Most were tape-recorded, with the consent of interviewees. Hand-written notes were also taken.

Formal and informal meetings/discussions were also held with the Program Directors and staff to discuss the study and to familiarize the researcher with the operation of the program. As well, an information letter was given to officers supervising offenders

---

[4] Interviews are generally scheduled at the end of the offender's sentence (in the last week) on the program and in this time period the offender was busy with work.

on the program explaining the nature of the study and asking them to drop off an envelope with an introductory letter and a response form in it to offenders and their spouses.

Measures

Couples' perceptions of the impact of the EMS program on the family and home environment were examined through a combination of semi-structured and structured questions (see Appendix B). In order to gain an understanding of the impact of EMS on families a contextual approach is utilized, within the general framework of the Double ABCX model (see chapter 4). The interview schedule is divided into eight sections: (1) Family Background; (2) Perception of the Situation; (3) FACES (family adaptability and cohesion scales) and Communication; (4) Family Inventory of Life Events; (5) EMS Strains; (6) Life Satisfaction Survey; (7) Evaluation and Future Expectations; and (8) Background Characteristics. The first and last sections provide background information on how families are structured (e.g., number of children, children from current marriage) and personal information (e.g., age, income, education).

In the present study the placement of the offender on the EMS programme is the stressor event. The pile-up of stress created by responding to a stressor event (placement on EMS) includes stresses related to the event and other family life events. Changes and disruptions may occur in a number of areas for families with a member on the electronic monitoring program: family activities, work, privacy, contact with family, friends, and the community, relationship roles and decision-making. On this measure questions are divided into seven categories: (1) spousal involvement, (2) respondent's involvement with children, (3) familial involvement, (4) other (daycare, etc.) involvement with children, (5) power/decision-making and role changes, (6) relatives, and (7) other networks. The first four categories focus on changes in the respondent's time and activities spent with family members. Both qualitative and quantitative measures of these categories were made. The fifth category deals with change in the children's time and activities with others (e.g.,

daycare, etc.). The power/decision-making and role changes category had questions which focused on whether changes had occurred in dealing with problem/conflict situations, control over home life, and roles and responsibilities. These categories focus on stress associated with change in family activities, decision-making, power and family relationship roles. The final two categories examine changes in involvement with relatives, friends, work and neighbors. For this study social support was included as a source of stress associated with EMS, rather than as a facilitative variable. Previous research has found that EMS may interfere with social support (Mainprize, 1990). Thus an examination of the changes in family members' involvement with relatives, friends, work and the community as a consequence of placement on EMS was examined. Both objective and subjective measures of social support were made (Pittman and Lloyd, 1988, 65). The objective measures focus on the amount of interaction respondents had with family, extended family, friends, neighbours, and community organizations in a typical week. The subjective measures focus on whether the respondent received the support he/she needed from extended family, friends, and other community groups and organizations. Questions also addressed to what extent family members felt more isolated and whether their privacy had been affected by EMS.

The **Family Inventory of Life Events and Change** scale was used to assess strain prior to and after the charge (not specifically related to the EMS programme). This self-report instrument (McCubbin et al., 1981; cited in Olson and McCubbin, 1983) was designed to assess the occurrence and perceived severity of major events in family life. In the context of the electronic monitoring program, how a family responds to the placement of a family member on the program depends on other events in their life that are disruptive.

Family system resources also influence how a person will respond to stressful situations. Three scales were used to assess the availability of family system resources

(cohesion, adaptability and communication). **FACES III** was used to measure two resources dimensions: **family cohesion** and **family adaptability**. Faces III is a 20-item scale which contains 10 cohesion items and 10 adaptability items (Olson et al., 1982; Olson et al., 1985). The cohesion assesses dimension is a compilation of five concepts: emotional bonding, supportiveness, family boundaries, time spent with friends, and interest in recreation. The adaptability dimension assesses the ability of the family system to change its power structure, role relationships and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress. The following concepts are related to the adaptability dimension: leadership, control, discipline and role and rules. A **communication** scale was used to measure the communication resource. This scale consists of ten items which assess the respondent's "... feelings, beliefs, and attitudes about the communication in his/her relationship" (Olson, Fournier, and Druckman, 1982).

According to the Double ABCX model the **Perception of the Situation** is an important factor which influences how a person will respond to a stress event. Following Walker's (1985) perspective, an examination of the perception of placement of the offender on the program was examined in the context in which it occurred. Respondents were asked their perceptions of various reactions to the placement of the offender on the EMP including: individual, family, friends and the community (Walker, 1985). A differentiation was made between reactions to the offence/charge and to placement on the EMS progrmme since both situations are potentially disruptive and reactions to the charge will influence family members perception of the program. Respondents were asked if this situation holds any meaning for the family, if there was a shared view of the situation, and if so, how it was arrived at. Did this view change over time, what different views were held by family members and whether this resulted in any disruption or difficulties for the family (Walker, 1985)? If a family member held a positive meaning toward the program this was viewed as facilitating adaptation and response to stress.

Two measures were used to assess adaptation with the intrusion of the program into home life. To assess the overall well being of families, an 11-item **Life Satisfaction Survey** was used. This measure assesses family members' satisfaction with their life as a whole. Respondents used a "delighted-terrible scale" to indicate how they felt about their life. The second measure that was employed (**Evaluation and Future Expectations**) is less structured and asked respondents about their general view of the program and future expectations regarding the program and family life. The latter measure is for descriptive purposes and is not used for analysis of the family stress model. Only the life satisfaction is used to assess adaptation. Family integrity was not used as a measure of adaptation in the present study.

Administration of Intensity and Frequency Scales

For some items in various sections in the interview schedule an intensity scale was given: not at all, a little, moderate, very, extremely. "Responses for FACES" items were given on a frequency scale: almost never, once in a while, sometimes, frequently, and almost always. The communication scale items response choices were on an intensity scale: strongly agree, moderately disagree, neither agree nor disagree, moderately agree, strongly agree. For the Family Inventory of Life Events, respondents were asked to indicate (by circling their response) whether the event had occurred (Yes) or not (No). As well, open-ended questions were used for some items throughout the interview schedule. With the exception of four standardized scales (FACES, Communication, Family Inventory of Life Events, Life Satisfaction) items were verbally presented to each subject. For other items which involved the intensity scales, the respondents were presented with the response options on cards.

Organization of Data for Analysis

For purposes of data analysis a 32-page coding manual was developed (see Appendix II). Open-ended items were coded into YES/NO categorizations. In order to capture the richness of the YES/NO data, categories of responses are fairly detailed. For example, some open-ended questions evoked a variety of reponses. Some respondents had multiple responses. Each response was itemized. Coding indicated whether the subject gave this type of response (Yes) or not (No). In chapter six where the data analysis is presented, various tables show the variety of reponses given by respondents. Once coded data were entered into the computer. SPSS was utilized for data analysis. Some categories were collapsed into positive, negative and neutral categories. A composite measure of stress associated with the EMP also resulted in various (negative stress) categories being added together to produce a total amount of stress associated with the EMP. The measurement of stress does not include the level of stress experienced by respondents in each category.

Two scores were calculated from FILE. For the first score, events that were coded as Yes in the year prior to the charge (total past family life changes) were totaled. These events take longer to adjust due to their chronic nature. The second score includes a total of Yes reponses to events that took place after the charge (total recent family life changes). In both cases higher scores imply higher stress. Norms have been developed for scoring FILE. The normal range for total past changes is a score of 1 to 7. For total recent family life changes the normal range is 5 to 17. Those who fall outside the normal range may need some assistance in dealing with the changes "... to facilitate adaptation to their situation (McCubbin et al., 1981; cited in Olson et al., 1985). The scale does not include the level of stress that these events produced for each respondent.

FACES III was scored by first calculating Cohesion and Adaptability scores by adding the responses from the frequency scale for each respondent. The ten odd items are

added together for Cohesion. The ten even items are added together for adaptability. These scores are combined for a **Family Type** score (Olson, 1991). Higher scores (7-8) represent a "balanced" Family Type. A low score (1-2) represents an extreme Family Type. Mid-range (3-4) and moderately balanced (5-6) scores are also found on this scale. Families that have difficulty functioning[5] are generally found in the extreme range. The communication scale was scored by adding responses given on the frequency scale. "High scores reflect the couple's awareness and satisfaction with the level and type of communication in their relationship. Low scores reflect a deficiency in the level of communication essential to satisfactorily maintain a relationship and focus on the need to work on improving their communication skills" (Olson et al., 1985).

Summary

The B.C. Corrections EMP was used as the site for this exploratory study due to its accessibility and proximity to the researcher's university. A contextual model of family stress was utilized as a guide to questionnaire construction as it provides insightful information on how families adapt to change and disruption in their lives and what resources they draw upon to deal with disruption over time. Both descriptive and correlational analyses are done. There are several limitations of this research. In order to assess how EMS affects families, it is important to interview all the family, as each member experiences an event or stressful situation in a slightly different way. This study examines how EMS affects adult couples. Forty respondents in this study had children. The generalizability of the findings has some limitations. Those subjects who agree to be interviewed are likely to be a more cooperative group in general (Mainprize, 1990). A self-selection bias is inherent in this sample. Those who agreed to interviewed may view the program more favorably than those who refused an interview. This study does not

---

[5] Families in the extreme range "... tend to have more difficulties coping with situational and developmental stress" (Olson, et al., 1985, 5).

address the long term impact of the program on family members. Subjects are only interviewed at one point in time. The data source for the present study was interviews. Therefore, the data in this study are based on the perceptions of couples that were interviewed. In the next chapter the findings of the present study are presented.

CHAPTER 6

Impressions of the Impact of the Electronic Monitoring Program on the Family

Introduction

Three studies (Jolin, 1987; Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1988; Mainprize, 1990) have studied the effects of EMS on offenders. Family members' perceptions have *not* been consistently explored. This chapter is one of the first systematic attempts to explore the effects of home confinement on adult family members. A contextual model of family stress is used to explore the social-psychological effects of the EMS program on family members. Couples' perceptions of the impact of the program on their children are also reported. This chapter begins with an overview of findings from other studies. This is followed by an analysis of research findings from the B.C. sample (n=54). This research is compared with previous findings.

Evidence of the Impact of EMS: The Available Literature

Only one study consistently interviewed family members. Jolin (1987) completed brief entry and exit surveys in Clackamas County, Oregon reporting family members' perceptions of electronic monitored house arrest. Members were given a brief questionnaire which asked them to respond to whether they viewed the program as positive or negative. There was no thorough examination of their situation or follow up. Only seven spouses were surveyed. The rest of the sample (n=17) consisted of parents, other relatives, and roommates. Overall, respondents did not report negative effects in their relationship with the offender while on the electronic monitoring program. Social and work activities were not adversely affected by the program. Where changes did occur, they were most likely to occur in social and daily activities. Eighty-three percent also saw the program as having a positive effect on the offender (Jolin, 1987). Due to the

shortness of the interviews, it is unclear what types of positive impacts were experienced. It is also unclear how daily activities were altered by the program.

Two more detailed studies of EMS reported offenders' perceptions of familial impact. Baumer and Mendelsohn (1988) conducted a field experiment in Marion County, Indiana (random assignment to either home detention with electronic monitoring, or home detention without electronic monitoring). Offenders were interviewed in entry and exit survey formats. Overall, the findings suggest there were *positive* benefits toward family relationships: for example, housework was more likely to get done, and some offenders developed new hobbies and became more involved with their children. Offenders' attendance at their jobs improved. Some negative impacts were found. In some cases family relationships were almost disrupted. Baumer and Mendelsohn (1988) found that the "embarrassment" of wearing the bracelet was directly related to socioeconomic status: offenders of higher socioeconomic status were more likely to conceal it. Their findings are generally consistent with the Canadian study by Steve Mainprize (1990, 1992, 1994).

Mainprize's intensive interviews were with a (non-random) sample of 60 participants in the B.C. EMP. In his sample most offenders (60%) were on the program between 5 and 14 days. Mainprize concluded that offenders and their families generally adapted to the program. Some experienced a motivation to conceal program status, and a lack of social support. Other factors related to the offender's psychological and emotional stability also affected how offenders adapted to the EMP sentence. Positive and negative effects on social relations were found. Mainprize (1990, 152) states that longer sentences could either "solidify the bonds of closeness and cohesiveness or ... produce frustration and conflict with cohabitants." Not surprisingly, shorter sentences were more readily adapted to.

There appeared to be a minimal effect on the work environment. Offenders were generally able to deal with the consequences of concealment. Middle and upper class offenders were more embarrassed about being on the program and had a higher motivation

to hide the device from others. Social disapproval was potentially mitigated because the monitoring status could be hidden. Offenders unanimously perceived this sanction as "more just" and "humane" than prison (Mainprize, 1990, 153). Mainprize concluded that the EMP reduces or minimizes negative consequences of incarceration. It had rehabilitation potential since offenders had a greater level of alcohol abstinence. It seemed to enhance rehabilitation and/or social discipline (i.e., alcohol abstinence and work punctuality).

Mainprize (1990, 114) cautions that care should be used in interpreting these findings due to "demand characteristics". There was a tendency for offenders who were interviewed to put the program in favorable light. As Mainprize (1990, 114) states:

> The 10 month experience of interviewing offender-respondents leads this researcher to conclude that offenders' EMS program participation and relationship with corrections' personnel is ordered by the existence of a tacit (and in some cases quite explicit) bargain. The content of this bargain is essentially as follows: offenders avoid prison and in exchange for being given this 'break' will co-operate in 'helping to make the program a success' (emphasis in original).

RESULTS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

Background Characteristics of Subjects

Twenty-seven male offenders and their partners were interviewed in order to assess the effects of the EMP on the family. Thus 54 subjects were interviewed. Offenders' ages ranged from 25 to 49 years (Mean=36.00; SD=7.81). Their spouses were aged 23 to 50 years (Mean=33.48; SD=7.52). Participants were mainly white (n=44) (see Table 1). All but one male subject achieved at least some high school education. Over one quarter (27.8%) had some high school education. The same percentage (27.8%) completed high school. While 17 had some college, university or technical school, a small number completed university (n=5) or held a graduate degree (n=1).

Table 1

Background Characteristics of Subjects (N=54)

		n	Percent
Age	20 to 25	4	5.5
	26 to 30	17	31.5
	31 to 35	13	24.1
	36 to 40	5	9.4
	41 to 45	8	15.0
	46 to 50	7	13.0
Race	Caucasian	44	81.5
	East Indian	4	7.4
	Filipino	2	3.7
	Black	2	3.7
	Native Indian	1	1.9
	Other	1	1.9
Education	Elementary	1	1.9
	Some High School	15	27.8
	Completed High School	15	27.8
	Technical School	5	9.3
	Some College	9	16.7
	Completed College	1	1.9
	Some University	2	3.7
	Completed University	5	9.3
	Graduate Degree	1	1.9

Table 1 (continued)

Charge under Current Sentence (for the 27 offenders)	Driving While Disqualified.	4	11.1
	Impaired (over .08)	11	30.6
	Dangerous Driving	3	8.3
	Failure to Blow	2	5.6
	Fraud	3	8.3
	Theft over $1000	2	5.6
	Possession of Stolen Property	1	2.8
	B & E	1	2.8
	Robbery	1	2.8
	Breach of Trust	1	2.8
	Living off the Avails	1	2.8
	Trafficking (PPT)	3	8.3
	Conspiracy to Traffic	1	2.8
	Sexual Assault	2	5.6
Individual Income	none	9	16.7
	$1-$9,999	2	3.8
	$10,000-$19,999	4	7.5
	$20,000-$29,999	11	20.4
	$30,000-$39,999	14	26.0
	$40,000-$49,999	9	16.7
	$50,000-$59,999	1	1.9
	$60,000-$69,999	0	0.0
	$70,000-$79,999	3	5.6

The length of time offenders were on the program ranged from 60 to 151 days (mean=84.85). Only one offender had previously been on the EMP. Over one third (37%) had a previous prison sentence. Almost one third (29.6%) had spent part of their *current* sentence in prison. There were 36 charges for the (27) offenders. Almost two thirds (63.9%) of the charges were related to "drinking while driving": driving while disqualified (n=4), impaired (blood alcohol level over .08) (n=11), dangerous driving

(n=3), and failure to blow (n=2). Three charges were drug-related (trafficking; n=3). Other charges were property-related: fraud (n=3), theft over $1000 (n=2), possession of stolen property (n=1), Break & Enter (n=1), breach of trust (n=1), and living off the avails of prostitution (n=1). Only three charges were violent offences[1]: sexual assault (n=2) and robbery (n=1).

Family Structure and Perceptions of Responsibilities for Household Labour

Couples were asked who had primary responsibility for childcare, housework and home repairs. Previous research found that women are primarily responsible for household chores and childcare, and men for wage labour (Oakley, 1976, 1985; Luxton, 1980). The nuclear or blended family which consists of a woman, man and dependent children is a common household form. The man earns money outside the home and the women may or may not have a paid job but she is primarily responsible for housework and childcare.

There was some variance in family structure and composition (see Table 2). The couples had been together from 1 to 23 years (MEAN=6.96, SD=6.15). Seventeen of the couples were married; ten were common law. Almost half (n=23) of the respondents had been married previously. Among the 27 couples, 40 respondents had children. There were a total of 20 children, ranging in ages from 1 to 27 years. Thirty-two of the 40 respondents had their children living at home with them. The norm was to live in a nuclear or blended family. Only two couples had co-residents (a friend or relative) living with them. Of those respondents with children living at home, 11 female respondents said that they were responsible primarily for childcare. Male respondents tended to agree (n=12) that their partners were primarily responsible for childcare. Few (females=2;

[1] Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD) regard impaired driving as a violent offence. However, there is public ambivalence around this issue. This stems from a general view that driving after drinking is "... essentially non-criminal, even normative behaviour. In other words, the drinking-driving problem does not arise because of a 'few socially reprehensible drunks', but because many people 'like ourselves' engage in this practice unaware or unaccepting of being part of the problem" (Boyd, 1986, 140).

males=1) reported that the husband was primarily responsible for childcare. Twelve respondents (5 females and 7 males) said that responsibility was shared. Thus, the highest category was that with women having primary responsibility for childcare. This also occurred with housework. Twenty spouses reported that they were primarily responsible for housework; five said that the responsibility was shared; and only two said that their partners were primarily responsible. Interestingly, offenders' responses were significantly different ($t=2.28$; $p< .05$) from their spouses in terms of who was primarily responsible for household chores. Although offenders perceived their spouses in most (n=14) cases to be responsible for housework, eleven claimed that they shared this responsibility. Only two males reported that they were primarily responsible for household chores. Nineteen male respondents reported having responsibility for home maintenance, two males reported sharing responsibility with their partner and six said the landlord had responsibility for home maintenance. Twelve spouses claimed that males were responsible for maintenance, 4 claimed responsibility themselves, 4 said the responsibility was shared, and 7 said the landlord was responsible.

Table 2

Responsibility for Household Labour

Responsibility for Childcare (N=38)	n	percent
Offenders' perception		
her responsibility	12	60.0
his responsibility	1	5.0
shared	7	35.0
Spouses' perception		
her responsibility	11	61.1
his responsibility	2	11.1
shared	5	27.8
Responsibility for Housework (N=54)		
Offenders' perception		
her responsibility	14	51.9
his responsibility	2	7.4
shared	11	40.7

Table 2 (continued)

Spouses' perception		
her responsibility	20	74.1
his responsibility	2	7.4
shared	5	18.5
Responsibility for Home Repairs (N=54)		
Offenders' perception		
her responsibility	0	0.0
his responsibility	19	70.4
shared	2	7.4
landlord	6	22.2
Spouses' perception		
her responsibility	4	14.8
his responsibility	12	44.4
shared	4	14.8
landlord	7	25.9

In the sample, 8 out of 27 offenders were unemployed at the time of the interview. One offender attended school. The others were unemployed due to particular circumstances at the time of the interview (discussed later on). Most (n=17) spouses in this sample were employed outside the home. One worked part-time; sixteen were full-time.

Perceptions of Charges

Respondents were asked about their reactions to the offence. Respondents generally expressed some upset when hearing about the charge. A small number (n=10) said that they were not surprised and one respondent had a delayed response. Three respondents were relieved. Otherwise responses were negative; 17 were angry, 20 were fearful, 9 expressed apprehension, 17 were disgusted, and 10 were worried (see Table 3). Reasons given for the responses varied are shown in Table 4. Most commonly, respondents were worried about the potential or anticipated consequences to the charge (n=39), were concerned due to the nature of the incident (n=19) and the effect it would have on family members. Almost one quarter (n=7) of spouses had concerns about the offenders' behavior. One spouse stated:

> My mother is a recovering alcoholic. I was scared. I didn't know until the charge that he had been charged before. He came and told me at work. My previous relationship I left because there was an alcohol problem ... I thought I would see how things went. I watched how he was dealing with the situation. Was he responsible enough to handle it properly or was he just going to slough it off and not treat it responsibly?

Over one third (n=10) of the males were concerned about the effect the charge would have on family members. One offender described his response to the charge as mixed.

> When it first came to light that I was going to be charged, there was on the one hand, a great deal of apprehension, the shame of it causing loss of family and friends, and possibly my job. On the other hand, there was a sense of relief that it was finally coming to light. I wouldn't have this dark secret on my mind. (53)

Table 3

Emotional Responses to the Charges (N=54)

Items	n	percent
fearful	20	37.0
angry	17	31.5
surprised/ shocked	17	31.5
apprehensive/ nervous / anxious	15	27.9
worried	13	24.1
not surprised	10	18.5
disbelief	7	13.0
embarrassed/ ashamed	6	11.1
guilty	5	9.3
confused	5	9.3
devastated	4	7.4
unhappy	4	7.4
relieved	3	5.6
depressed	3	5.6
disgusted	2	3.7
better	1	1.9
no response	1	1.9

Table 4

Respondents' Reasons for Emotional Responses to the Charge

Items	n	percent
potential/anticipated consequences associated with the charge	39	72.2
nature of the incident	19	35.2
the effect it will have on family members	12	22.2
it was a stupid thing to do	7	13.0
unsure of what to do	7	13.0
had concerns about his behavior	7	13.0
anticipation of family members or others response	6	11.1
it was not the first incident	5	9.3
it was his first offence	4	7.4
spouse or other family member is an alcoholic	4	7.4
he was inconsiderate of how this would affect her life	3	5.6
she was unaware of what her husband had done	3	5.6
her husband was capable of such a thing	2	3.7
no control over the situation	2	3.7
police officer fabricated the charge	2	3.7
it doesn't fit with his family upbringing	2	3.7
didn't think he was driving	1	1.9
I asked him to drive because of my medical condition	1	1.9
it was advertised in the paper	1	1.9
she was pregnant	1	1.9
had no idea that he had a drug problem	1	1.9
he is my "meal ticket" (economic hardship)	1	1.9

Almost all respondents felt that the court process was stressful (n=36), a nervous experience (35), upsetting (4) and disappointing (1). For one male respondent it caused resentment. Two male respondents felt that they were treated well. What made this so stressful for family members was not knowing the outcome (n=22) and/or waiting for the outcome (n=33). A small number (n=9) could not "get on with their lives" (make plans).

Asked what their attitude was towards the sentence imposed by the court as shown in Table 5 many respondents (n=26) expected a harsher sentence. Some (n=14) expected the sentence received. A small number (n=7) expected a lighter sentence than was received. A smaller number (n=5) felt mixed about the sentence received.

Table 5

Respondents' Attitudes Towards View of Charge (N=54)

Items	n	percent
worried about how it would affect his or their future	28	51.9
accepted responsibility for charge	21	38.9
viewed charge as unfair	8	14.8
it was a big mistake	8	14.8
felt it was his responsibility to deal with it	5	9.3
another hurdle to get through	2	3.7
last chance to turn my life around	2	3.7
felt part of it was her fault	2	3.7
fatalistic about charge	1	1.9

Perceptions of the Program

Reactions to the EMP were generally positive. Respondents were asked how they *initially* responded to their placement or their partner's placement on the EMP. Most (n=45) participants responded positively to the program. Some (n=9) responded in a more neutral fashion in that they expressed relief or preference for the program over serving time or their partner's serving time in a correctional institution. *No one responded negatively*. Reasons for feeling positive about the initial placement on the program were: the program was better than jail (n=47), the offender could maintain his employment and contribute to the family (n=43), it kept the family/marriage together (n=31), concerns over relationship with partner (n=29), concerns for children (n=26), and the family could

continue on with their lives (n=15) (see Table 6). One woman was concerned about her partner's relationship with their one year old daughter:

> I was desperate that he get on this program. I couldn't imagine him being away from us, especially for [her daughter]. You can imagine how much at this age she changes. If he wasn't there at this age he would miss a lot. (02)

Her husband had spent a short time in jail before being placed on the program. She stated that her daughter "would be calling for daddy constantly" and was not as happy with her father away. Another spouse, whose children were "grown-up", was more concerned about her (financial) survival:

> My first response was good. You damn well deserve what you get. My second response was that this was my "meal ticket". I haven't worked in thirty years. I'm out on my butt because I have no money. I can't look after myself. (18)

Table 6

Respondents' Initial Response to Placement on the EMP (N=54)

Responses	Number of cases	Percentage of cases
home is better than jail	47	87.1
financial/business/employment concerns	43	79.6
kept family/marriage together	31	57.4
relationship concerns	29	53.7
concern for children	26	48.1
life continuity	15	27.8
good for taxpayers	7	13.0
good candidate since he is not violent	5	9.3
jail does not deal with the problem associated with the offence	4	7.4
could conceal status	3	5.6
could monitor his progress	1	1.9
more beneficial for him to stay in jail	1	1.9
good candidate since he had already been punished	1	1.9

Asked if their initial view of the program had changed, almost half (n=24) of the respondents said that their view of the program had *not* changed (see Table 4). One spouse stated:

> I couldn't wait for it to be over but I wouldn't change it ... If I wanted him at home on EMP I would have to accept it and do what I could to make it comfortable for both of us. (04)

Many (n=30) respondents said that their view of the program had changed. Eight found the program *more* restrictive; five stated that the EMP required more discipline (complying with program rules) than they had anticipated. One offender who had prior time in prison stated:

> I have done lots of jail time before. I wouldn't do this [EMP] again. It is very restrictive. When they let you out of jail you can go where you want when you want. Here I can't do that. It's like being severely grounded.

An almost equal number (n=14) viewed the program as *less* restrictive than they anticipated. One spouse stated:

> It is easier that what we perceived. We are not bothered by the guys [EMP staff]. They don't come around at odd hours and they are always very brief when they do come around. (22)

A small number (n=4) of respondents whose view did not change noted that there were certain program conditions that were unclear. In a couple of cases these uncertainties resulted in violations of the program conditions. One offender stated:

> There were a few things that they didn't tell me about. I got into trouble once for coming home from work and then going out again before my working time was over -- going out and renting a movie at a video store. They gave me 5 days as a penalty. (27)

Table 7

Types of Changes in Views of the EMP (N=34)

Change	n	percent
program was less restrictive	14	41.2
view program as more restrictive/ discipline	13	38.2
lack information about program boundaries, rules, limits	4	11.8
staff member had a poor attitude	2	5.9
more respect for the program	2	5.9
inconvenience to family time out	2	5.9
checks were exercised with discretion	2	5.9
difficult to follow through on childcare responsibilities	1	2.9
thought he handled it better than anticipated	1	2.9
didn't expect distancing from partner	1	2.9
put a lot of responsibility on the family	1	2.9
pre-program administration problem	1	2.9
He's miserable if she goes out and has a good time	1	2.9
staff were slow with request for assistance	1	2.9

Subjects were asked what meaning the program had for them. The most common meanings shown in Table 8 included: provided a lesson (n=15), better than jail (n=13), punishment (n=8), and provided life continuity (n=6). Thirteen did not feel that the program had any meaning. Thirty respondents said that the meaning they attached to the program helped them to cope. Ten respondents said that the meaning they attached was not helpful in coping with the program. The most common meaning that was unhelpful in coping with the program was viewing it as punishment (n=6).

Table 8

Types of Meaning Subjects Attached to the EMP (N=54)

Program Meaning	Number of Cases	Percentage of Cases
learning experience/ lesson/ gave him a chance to reflect on life or behavior/ given a second chance or turning point in life	15	27.9
better than jail	13	24.1
no meaning	13	24.1
punishment	8	14.8
life continuity/ easier to maintain family life	6	11.2
community/ judicial system views him as not so dangerous	5	9.3
has a disciplining effect	4	7.4
appreciate/respect freedom more	3	5.6
paying debt to society	3	5.6
more routine life	2	3.7
feels he has lost freedom	2	3.7
he is being unjustly punished	2	3.7
changed roles in doing household chores	1	1.9
feels responsible for future EMP candidates	1	1.9
represents a humane image of the CJS	1	1.9
more controlling than intermittent sentence	1	1.9
feels more responsible for rehabilitation aspect of sentence	1	1.9

Respondents were also asked about others' reactions to the program, including their children, extended family members, friends, and neighbours. Approximately one-half of respondents with children (n=17) did not tell their children about the program. An almost equal number (n=18) informed all of their children (see Table 9). A key reason respondents gave for not telling their children was that they were too young to understand

the situation (n=17). In five cases, children were not told because their relationship with a parent was not close. One parent was concerned about his children's reactions, if they knew he was on the EMP.

Table 9

Disclosure of Program

To Children (N=40)	n	percent
all	18	45.0
none	17	42.5
most	3	7.5
some	2	5.0
To Extended Family (N=54)		
all	19	35.2
most	17	31.5
some	13	24.1
none	5	9.3
To Others (N=54)		
close friends	50	92.6
employer/boss	24	44.4
co-workers	20	37.0
neighbours	15	27.8
everyone else	13	24.1

Although most (n=18) children responded in a positive manner or were happy to have their father at home, young children were often affected by the confined parent's participation outside the home. Several younger children did not understand why their father could not participate in outside activities. One boy had difficulty explaining the program to his friends at school. Another younger boy was caught lying[2]. One offender speculated that it might be strange for his sons to have their father like a "troll" in their house (19). A spouse said that her teenage daughter found the phone interruptions

---

[2] The father was not honest with his son about his inability to participate in activities outside the home due to his program status. Prior to the father's participation in the program his son had never (knowingly) lied to him. He felt that his son had lied to him because he was not honest with his son about his program status.

inconvenient. One spouse, with a four year old son, expressed concerns about the program interfering with her husband's responsibilities for childcare.

> He is affected by it physically because his dad cannot take him to the park. His dad cannot go here and there with him at night, or even walk to the store with him. Maybe he doesn't realize it. My son doesn't even realize he has been affected ... If you have responsibility of childcare and they say no you can't go out, I think if your kid fell down or something they should say go and attend to him, but they say you can't go out. That's a little hard. It's hard for me to take because I think -- is my son being properly cared for? (40)

A father claimed it interfered with his childcare responsibilities. He stated:

> ... the reason I came home was to take care of my kids. I thought that this is typical of the system. It doesn't see taking care of your kids as a job. Normally, I don't even think about that, but it made me think about that. (19)

Asked whether others outside the immediate family knew about the program, *almost all (n=50) participants had disclosed its existence to somebody*: primarily, extended family members, friends and/or work associates. Of respondents who had disclosed the program, 35% told all (extended) family members, 31.5% told most family members, and 24% told some family members. For 19 respondents, whether or not they told others about the charge(s)[3] and the program depended on how close they felt to the individual. For some, geographical distance was a consideration in disclosure. If close friends or relatives lived in another province, disclosure was less likely. An offender stated:

> We are not close to her parents. My family is far away and they don't know. I wouldn't want to tell them what I did ... I don't want to be lectured. (11)

The anticipation of a negative response was thus a reason for non-disclosure (n=24). One third (33.4%) concealed the program due to embarrassment. One spouse did not tell extended family members as she did not want to violate her partner's trust. Another spouse did not tell her "two best friends" because they would be "ashamed and

---

[3] In some cases respondents did not want others to know they or their partners had been charged with a criminal offence.

embarrassed" and "they would question what I was doing and I didn't need to hear that from anybody." (43). Most (n=43) extended family members who knew about the program were perceived as supportive. One spouse said that the support she received "makes things a lot easier." (22) Another spouse stated:

> I was worried about telling everybody ... It makes it a lot easier on us that everyone is so supportive. (12)

Of those who told others outside of the family, approximately one quarter (24.1%) disclosed the program to everyone they knew. Almost all (n=50) disclosed the program to close friends. About half (n=24) told their boss or employer. Many (n=20) also told co-workers. A smaller number (n=15) let their neighbors know about the program. Similar to extended family members, responses were generally supportive (n=42). A very small portion (5.6%) responded negatively. The reasons for not telling others included: not being close (n=27), embarrassment/humiliation (n=20), anticipation of a nonsupportive response (n=17), husband did not want her to tell anyone (n=1), and distrust of others (n=1).

Changes in Home Life Associated with the EMP

Overall, it appears that the offender's placement on the program has a *constricting* effect on the activities done by other household members. The restrictions affect the activities of the offender, as well as activities of other members of the household. This is particularly true for the offender's spouse. Negative aspects of this may be offset by improved relations with their partner, and having their partner at home.

Most participants (n=32) said their lives were less active with their partners and there was a loss of outdoor activities together (n=50). Ten spouses said that they were engaging in solo activities. Social activities outside the home while their partners were at home were often curtailed. Two spouses reported doing more things together as a couple. Some of the participants said that the change was restrictive (n=28), disruptive (n=14),

frustrating (n=18), annoying (n=3), and/or disappointing (n=2) (see Table 10). Others, however, felt that the program was less disruptive (n=1) and had a *positive* impact (n=8) on their relationship with their partner. Many (n=19) respondents accepted the change caused by the restrictions on activities together because it was only for a short time (n=9), at least they were together[4] (n=14), it was good for us as a couple (n=5), and better communication had resulted (n=8). A small number (n=8) of spouses said they felt guilty about going out alone. An almost equal number (n=7) of respondents had difficulty with the program's discipline. One reported having difficulty "thinking up things to occupy him with." Another said it made more demands on her time. Most (n=39) reported that their negative view stemmed from them missing the activities normally done together *outside* the home as shown in Table 11.

Table 10

View of Changes in Activities with Partners (n=54)

View	n	percent
Restrictive	28	51.9
Frustrating/ Annoying	21	38.9
Acceptable	19	35.2
Disruptive	14	25.9
It has helped	8	14.8
Disappointing	2	3.7
Less Disruptive	1	1.9

[4] Many respondents contextualize their responses in light of the fact that their spouse may have gone to jail.

Table 11

Reasons for View of Changes in Activities

Reasons	n	percent
Missed doing activities	39	72.2
At least we are together	14	25.9
Short duration	9	16.7
Felt guilty about going out / leaving him alone	8	14.8
Better communication	8	14.8
Had difficulty with program discipline	7	13.0
Has been good for us as a couple	5	9.3
Helped / learning experience	4	7.4
Didn't feel there was a big change	4	7.4
Slowed down his life	2	3.7
Makes more demands on her time	1	1.9
Felt guilty because he was depriving his partner of doing things together	1	1.9
Had difficulty thinking up things to occupy him	1	1.9

Sixty-one percent of participants reported that the EMP improved their relationships. This included: feeling closer (n=17), being more affectionate (n=6), got to know each other better (n=4), and their relationship was strengthened (n=6). Some (n=22) reported no change. In contrast, 18 respondents reported that the impact had been negative. They argued more, felt more distance, more strain, and became less affectionate in their relationship with their partner.

Children

Respondents who had children (40 of 54) were asked about the quality and quantity of time spent with their children. Many offenders said there was no change in the amount of time spent with children. This was often in families where children did not spend much time with their parents outside the home. A few, however, spent *less time* with their children (as they could not participate in normal outdoor activities).

The change in the amount of time spent with children was also accompanied by a change in the *types* of activities that they did together. Most (n=32) respondents with

children reported changes. Significantly, more males than females said there were changes in activities with their children (t=2.00; p=.056). The types of changes included: spouses took on more responsibility for outdoor activities (n=7), offenders were restricted in the types of activities (n=18), and offenders spent more time playing in the home with their children (n=15). Those who spent the same amount of time or more with their children focused on different types of activities. Less than half (n=12) viewed the changes as negative. One offender, who had a young daughter, viewed the change as disappointing:

> It bothers me to no end. That is one of the stresses. I can't maximize my time with her. I am restricted to what I can do with her ... (01)

Most respondents felt that the impact of the changes in activities and time spent together were acceptable (n=14) and positive (n=8).

Asked whether the quality of their relationship had changed with their children, most (n=27) said that their had been no change. Some (n=11) reported that there had been a positive change in their relationship with their children. One spouse reported more strain in her relationship with her son. She claimed that her husband made more demands on her and she experienced some conflict over choosing whether to engage in activities with her partner or with her son outside the home. Thus the negative view of the changes was generally viewed as situational and was not generalized to the quality of the parent-child relationship.

Power and Decision-making

Changes in handling conflict situations were also discussed (see Table 12). Nineteen respondents reported changes had occurred. Most commonly, respondents reported there was more discussion (n=11) or they confronted more issues (n=10). One female respondent noted:

> The fact that you can't leave the situation, you're forced to deal with a problem in the home right away in order to keep it a happy environment. You can't ignore a bad situation ... He has learned that he can't just get mad or blow up at the kids and leave the situation. He has to interact with

them, deal with the problem, and deal with it properly to its conclusion or resolution. (12)

Table 12

Changes in Handling Conflict / Problem Situations (N=19)

Type of Change	n	percent
more discussion	11	57.9
confront more issues	10	52.6
resolved more issues	3	15.8
less conflict/arguments	3	15.8
more stress since no outlet for stress	2	10.5
less discussion	2	10.5
husband cannot actively participate if intervention outside the home is required (e.g. where extended family members are involved).	2	3.7

Some respondents (n=16) felt they had lost some control over home life. About half (n=9) of these respondents felt it was negative. For the other half, the effect was either positive (n=4) or neutral (n=3). One spouse who seemed resentful stated:

> I feel more in control because basically he can't really do anything. I'm the one who is playing the father and mother role. Anything that has got to be done has got to be by me. Basically, he can't even take the garbage out. (48)

Respondents were also asked if there had been any changes in the way that decisions were made. Some (n=16) reported that they had more control in the way decisions were made. A smaller (n=9) number felt they had less control. *Significantly more spouses than offenders said they had more control in decision-making as a result of the EMP* ($t=4.05$; $p< .001$). One spouse explained the control she had gained in this way:

> I think I have the last word basically on how things will get handled. No matter what we agreed on I could still probably go ahead on whatever I wanted to, but that's not the right way to do it. Basically, when he is there [at home] I could probably go out and do whatever I wanted to. I've got childcare there [at home]. As far as that goes the responsibility is taken away from me. It could really cause a lot of problems between us so I haven't really done that. (24)

Another spouse felt her partner had gained more control:

> He has more power in bossing me around because he can't do a lot of things. I have to do all the shopping. I don't have a choice whereas before I could say no you go do it. We argue a lot about those kind of things ... It gives him the power because he has to tell me to do it ... So there is a lot of things around here that I have to do now which would be 50-50, but aren't because he can't do them. He uses it as an excuse. I have a lot more duties and he's a lot more bossy that way because he thinks he has a reason. (30)

An interesting response came from an Indo-Canadian woman about the lack of control she felt over her life:

> Sometimes my husband was two minutes late. We would keep watching the time. They [corrections staff] are going to come and check him and he is not home. We were very scared. Every time we were telling him to be quick. (32)

Household Tasks and Responsibilities

A number of areas of home life were affected by restrictions on the offender (Table 13). These included: household chores (n=38), home maintenance (n=25), household management (n=25), child-care (n=17), finances (n=23), and development of hobbies or projects (n=10). The majority of respondents reported that at least one of the above areas had been affected by the program. In one third of the families the offender reported helping out more with household chores. In two thirds of the families this did not occur. In 5 families, offenders reported *more* involvement in child-care. In a few cases where offenders quit their job, this was particularly notable.

Table 13

Areas of Home Life Affected by the EMP (N=54)

Items	n	percent
household chores	38	70.4
home maintenance	25	46.3
household management	25	46.3
finance	23	42.6
childcare responsibilities	17	31.5
development of projects/hobbies	10	18.5
has better time management	2	3.7

Spouses often took on additional tasks and responsibilities. In almost half (n=13) of the families, spouses reported taking on more responsibility for household management tasks (i.e., shopping, paying bills, and running errands). Five spouses took extra responsibilities for orchestrating children's activities outside of the home. Two spouses assumed more responsibility for yard maintenance. Thus although men helped out more in some cases with housework and childcare, women took on additional responsibilities in a greater number of families for management tasks and childcare activities outside of the home.

In 26 cases, difficulties were created by shifts in responsibility: more arguments between the couple (n=2), handling chores and child-care alone was more arduous (n=3), and feeling more pressure (n=17). For mothers working outside the home, the EMP may exacerbate the tension of home-related and employment-related work.

> Sometimes it gets really frustrating. It is because I do have a full-time job and it is sometimes quite a stressful job. I go from that to taking on the children almost single-handedly ... I am running around and [he] is sitting at home reading. (50)

Another spouse stated:

> There were a lot of little things that I would have to do because he was on the program and could not go out. I would sometimes get stressed about it because I work 11-hour days and I would come home and have to run errands for him. (04)

A small number (n=5) of offenders were frustrated over not participating more. Fifteen respondents said that the changes were no problem, but only two respondents found the change to be beneficial to their relationship. One offender was pleased that spousal responsibilities were "better balanced than before" (01). Almost all (n=41) respondents who experienced changes said they were working together to deal with the changes.

Work

Most offenders and spouses reported that their work was generally not affected by the program. A couple of offenders said that work helped them to cope with their time on the program. One offender stated he had "extended work hours" which gave him "a lot of time outside of the apartment so it wasn't that much pressure that I started getting frustrated" (03). Another offender found that the program staff were very accommodating to his work situation:

> I find them [corrections staff] quite flexible because there is overtime in my particular work and it's a last minute kind of thing. All I have to do is phone them. If I have to work an extra two or three hours it's no problem. It hasn't affected my business one bit which means a lot to me and to the business. (35)

A small number (n=4) of offenders quit their jobs due to program restrictions. These offenders quit their job (worked in sales, transportation (n=2) and janitorial) as it required frequent location changes. One offender quit his job because he did not want his employer to know of his program status. His spouse felt that this revelation by staff was inappropriate.

> He quit his job because he didn't want them [the employer] to know that he was on the program. The monitoring people said they would tell his work. Why bother? You give them the times when they are allowed out and that should be enough (40).

A couple of offenders found the EMP restricted overtime. Most offenders, however, said that staff were flexible with work schedules provided that adequate advance notice was given. Only one spouse reported a negative impact of the program for her at work.

The Impact of Staff, Equipment, and Periodic Checks

Respondents were asked how they were affected by staff, equipment and periodic checks by corrections officers. Over half (n=31) of the respondents had requested assistance from program staff. Not unexpectedly, significantly more offenders (n=27) than spouses (n=4) asked for assistance ($t=12.23$; $p< .001$). As shown in Table 14 the types of assistance included: change in work scheduling (n=7), overtime (n=7), program information (n=5), shopping and banking (n=2), medical reasons (n=5), job search (n=4), recreation or change in recreation time (n=8), holiday festivities (n=5), assistance with parole paper work (n=3), and referral for counselling (n=1). Almost all (n=28) respondents who asked for assistance said that staff had responded helpfully.

Table 14

Types of Program Assistance Requested by Subjects (N=31)

Type of Assistance	n	Percent
time out for recreation or change in recreation time	8	25.8
change in work scheduling	7	22.6
requested overtime at work	7	22.6
information about the program	5	16.1
time out for medical reasons	5	16.1
time out for holiday festivities	5	16.1
job search time	4	12.9
assistance with parole paperwork	3	9.7
time out for shopping/banking	2	6.5
referral for counselling	1	3.2

Most (n=34) respondents either accepted, or were not inconvenienced by the "periodic checks" done by correctional personnel to insure compliance to the program conditions. A variety of impacts were noted as shown in Table 15 including: feeling embarrassed (n=5), keeping their house tidier (n=3), worrying about discovery of program status (n=5), feeling annoyed about the time of the checks (n=5), intimacy/sex life was disturbed (n=4), and dinner scheduling was disturbed (n=1). One woman who was worried about discovery stated:

> There was a couple times they came with the corrections vehicle. I wasn't home but I was embarrassed. I wondered what the neighbors might think. (46)

A small number (n=9) said that the checks by staff had no impact or that they were not disruptive. A spouse thought the corrections officers were being very considerate in concealing their identity from potential visitors to the home:

> They would pass themselves off as salesmen so that if others were at our home that we did not want to know about EMP the staff would not identify that [my spouse] was on the program. (50)

Table 15

Impact of Periodic Checks on Subjects (N=54)

	n	percent
not inconvenient/accepted it	34	63.0
no effect	9	16.7
embarrassing	5	9.3
worried about discovery of program	5	9.3
annoyance associated with time of checks	5	9.3
disturbed sex life/intimacy	4	7.4
resulted in keeping house tidier	3	5.6
affected dinner scheduling	1	1.9

The program equipment (bracelet worn by offender, and receiver-dialer component attached to the telephone) affected family members. A number (n=14) of respondents said the equipment was associated with apprehension about discovery. Many respondents concealed the program from some people in their lives. Eleven made excuses to explain the phone interruptions resulting from the receiver-dialer component to the phone. The device (receiver-dialer component) in the home made a small number of respondents uncomfortable (n=6). Concerns were also expressed about concealing the bracelet (n=13), and the bracelet being physically uncomfortable (n=13). A small number (n=10) felt nervous about the time restrictions imposed on the offender. One spouse said:

> ... it gave him discipline to plan his time better ... and he has been very good at it the last few weeks. I haven't had to worry as much. The first week I couldn't even be here when he came home because I would be a wreck by ... 6 o'clock. If he wasn't here and it was 1 minute to six my stomach would be in a knot. (46)

Another spouse also felt some responsibility in ensuring her husband was home on time.

> If for example we are sitting at mass and it is going over the time it normally runs then I start looking at my watch and I'm feeling really responsible. I start feeling like a time keeper ... It is [my husband's] responsibility to be where he is supposed to be at particular times, but I take it on. (50)

Family Life Events

The Family Life Events scale was utilized in order to capture additional stress (not related to the program) on the family during the offender's time on the program (McCubbin et al., 1981; cited in Olson et al., 1985). A family dealing with several life changes at once often leads to a decline in family functioning. Most (n=41) respondents fell within the normal range[6] (total score = 1-7) for total past family changes. A small number (n=9) were in the high stress end of this scale. For total recent family life changes the average value is 11. A few (n=4) individuals fell outside the normal range at the high end of the stress scale. Thus some individuals in this study, in addition to dealing with the

---

[6] Norms have been developed for scoring FILE.

EMP, are adapting to high levels of stress associated with other changes in their lives, including recent and past family life changes.

Social Support Networks

Social support is an important resource in dealing with stress and other types of crisis situations (Olson and McCubbin, 1982; Olson et al., 1983; Lavee et al., 1985). Having a good support network may offset crisis. Most (n=44) respondents felt that their support network was available to them on the EMP, that the program had not interfered with their support network. Nevertheless, some changes occurred in the types of contacts that respondents had with other people in their lives. The eight cases where the EMP interfered with a respondent's support network is of great concern. These individuals may have an even greater difficulty in adapting to the restrictions imposed by the program.

The EMP appears to have had both positive and negative effects, at least in the short term, on family members' relationships. Some respondents were reluctant to tell others, but many told close friends and family members about the program. Nevertheless, respondents had *less* contact with extended family members (n=30) and friends (n=43), even though family and friends knew about the program. Only a small number (n=5) reported an increase in time spent with relatives. A large number (n=19) reported no change.

In some (n=29) cases there was an attempt to compensate for not being able to socialize outside of the home, by entertaining people at home. A few (n=3) of the couples who entertained in the home, however, felt apprehensive about having visitors in their home. This occurred with respondents who concealed the program from their friends. One female respondent stated:

> We had some friends here from Winnipeg. It was tough because we are not that close to them and we didn't want to tell them about the program. They wanted to take us out for dinner and we talked them into having dinner here. It was extremely tough. You have to lie. You don't want people to know about it. It is hard to hide. (02)

Another spouse described how concealing the program and the program's restrictiveness altered their social life:

> We had a couple over once but it was an uncomfortable situation for two reasons. We didn't want to have any liquor around and being on this program you are not suppose to have fun, at least this is the impression that one fellow gave us. I was afraid that if we had more than one or two people in they might think it was a party and we were having too much fun, and, therefore, [his sentence on the EMP] would be taken away.
>
> There was one time I was on a hike and we used to have people back over here for a barbecue afterward and everybody was hinting about doing this. I was hedging. Luckily, my one girlfriend who knew about the program was there. [My husband] could not go out in the backyard to light the barbecue. If there were a dozen people here we could get into trouble. (54)

Nine spouses reported *restricted* social contacts since they generally engaged in social activities outside the home with their partner. Ten spouses reported feeling guilty about going out on their own and leaving their spouse at home. In a few of these cases, the spouses said that their partner would get upset when they went out alone.

Interestingly, for many participants the lack of contact with friends did not result in them feeling isolated from their friends. Nevertheless, half (n=27) of the respondents felt isolated from their friends. Males were significantly more likely to feel isolated than their spouses ($t=4.37$; $p<.001$). This finding is interesting since many reported that their social support network had not been interfered with by the EMP. Perhaps the most extreme effect of feeling isolated was one spouse who became depressed[7] (54). Most respondents reported less extreme effects (see Table 16): missing their friends (n=9), feeling bothered by it (n=7), wishing he could get out more (n=11), and the program interfering with the development of friendships (n=4). Only one of the participants who felt isolated from his

---

[7] This respondent had only told one friend about the situation. Not having all her friends to talk to and feeling she had to hold back some of her feelings from her husband she became depressed. In order to combat the depression she pushed herself to go out and involve herself in activities that she normally did together with her partner. She felt that her husband needed her support and she could not provide it if she was depressed.

friends said it had no effect. Others accepted it (n=5) as it was only for a short duration or felt it was "better than jail" (n=3). Two offenders felt it was a good time to reflect on life.

Table 16

Impact of Isolation from Friends (N=27)

Impact	n	percent
missed friends/ hindered development of friendships	13	48.2
wished he could get out more	11	40.7
felt bothered by isolation	7	26.0
accepted it	5	18.5
it was better than jail	3	11.1
good time for reflection on life	2	7.4
put strain on their relationship	1	3.7
depression	1	3.7
no effect	1	3.7

Over one third (n=19) of respondents felt isolated from extended family members. In nine of these cases, the effect was feeling distance from certain family members; in two cases, a spouse felt there was a lack of closeness due to holding back things that were on her mind related to the EMP (54). A few (n=3) also found it frustrating.

Although many (n=17) respondents said that their community involvement (primarily recreation) had been reduced, over half (n=11) of them reported feeling isolated from the community. Significantly more males than females felt isolated from the community (t=3.31; p=.003). The effects of isolation included: missing activities they were usually involved in (n=6), feeling guilty about lack of involvement (n=2), unsure about how the community views them (n=2), and not being as involved (n=6).

Since social support is such a crucial variable in dealing with stress respondents were also asked about the type of support that they had received. Most respondents had

received support from family (n=43) and friends (n=37). Other agencies of support included: social service agencies (n=10), church or religion (n=9), an Alcoholics Anonymous sponsor (n=1), work associates (n=2), and a community program (n=18) (see Table 17). Four respondents said they received no support. As listed in Table 18, the types of support received included: moral/emotional (n=48), financial (n=16), professional counselling (n=10), practical (n=8), and educational (n=7).

Table 17

Family Members Received Support From (N=54)

	n	percent
family	43	79.6
friends	37	68.5
community organization	18	33.3
social service agency	10	18.5
professional counselling	10	18.5
church/religious organization	9	16.7
received no support	4	7.4
work associates	2	3.7
AA sponsor	1	1.9

Table 18

Assistance Received While on the EMP (N=54)

Types of Assistance	n	percent
emotional/moral	48	88.9
financial	16	29.6
professional counselling	10	18.5
practical	8	14.8
educational	7	13.0

The most support was received from family (n=37), followed by friends (n=12), religious organizations (n=3), professional counselling (n=3), an alcohol and drug program worker (n=2), AA sponsor (n=1), and a community organization (n=1). The majority (n=42) of respondents said that they had received the support that they needed, although some (n=10) said that they could have had more support through some kind of counselling. Subjects were also asked if there was a change in the level of support that they needed over time, and if there were times when they needed more support. The most common (n=15) response was that support was most needed at the initial part of the program. This appears related to the initial adjustment to being placed on the program. Others felt that the strain of confinement was difficult in the middle of the program (n=1), at the end (n=2), throughout the program (n=4) and, for some (n=10), it was related to a specific event.

Respondents were asked whether their privacy had been invaded. Almost half (n=24) felt it had: fifteen were bothered by the disruption of the visits from correctional staff; four felt that the program interfered with intimate time with their partners; four said they were not as relaxed at home; two felt that they were being watched; one respondent said that his life was structured around the visits by corrections officers[8]; one spouse felt different from the family next door; and two respondents felt their privacy was compromised by the conspicuousness of the government vehicle in their neighborhood (see Table 19).

---

[8] This offender claimed that he could generally anticipate when corrections officers would drop by on their twice weekly visits.

Table 19

Impact on Respondent's Privacy (N=24)

Impact	n	percent
felt bothered	15	62.5
intimacy was disturbed	4	16.7
not as relaxed at home	4	16.7
felt watched	2	8.3
felt compromised by conspicuousness of government vehicle	2	8.3
restructured life around the visits	1	4.2
felt different from family next door	1	4.2

Cohesion and Adaptability Resources

Cohesion and adaptability resources are important in dealing with or offsetting stress (Olson, 1991). The cohesion scale measures how connected families are. Adaptability measures the flexibility in the family's structure in dealing with change. These resource dimensions were analyzed by combining the two scores. A combined score provides a measure of family type. For FACES III high scores represent "balanced" family types and low scores represent "extreme" types (Olson, 1991). Extreme family types are more characteristic of families who have difficulty functioning, particularly under stressful conditions. Balanced families tend to function more effectively.

As shown in Table 20, when these scores were combined the average score was 4.18. About one quarter of the respondents fell in the extreme functioning range of the scale. This may indicate that these families may have more difficulties on the program.

Table 20

FACES III: Family Types (N=54)

Family Type:	n
Balanced	3
Moderately Balanced	16
Mid-Range	22
Extreme	13

Mean = 4.18
SD = 1.54

Life Satisfaction

Participants were given a "Life Satisfaction Survey" to assess how they felt about various aspects of their life while they were on the program. A "delighted-terrible scale" was used to indicate how they felt about their situation on 11 items (see Table 21). In response to how they felt about the lower mainland of British Columbia as a place to live most (n=23) respondents felt pleased. Almost one quarter (24.1%) felt delighted. Very few respondents felt unhappy (n=1) or terrible (2). Many respondents were pleased about the particular neighborhood they lived in (n=23) and their house or apartment (n=21). Over one quarter (27.8%), however felt mixed about their home. Over one third (40.7%) were pleased with their work. Feeling mixed was another common response to work (22.2%). In terms of the fun and enjoyment respondents had, a good portion (38.9%) were mostly satisfied. Some also felt mixed (n=10) or mostly dissatisfied (n=11). Most respondents felt pleased (n=17) or delighted (n=17) about their relationship or marriage. Almost one quarter (22.2%) were mostly satisfied. Almost half (46.3%) felt pleased about their health. The majority (64.8%) of respondents were pleased or mostly satisfied with

the time spent and the things done with family members. Nonetheless, one fifth (20.4%) were unhappy or felt terrible about family life. In terms of life as a whole the majority (68.5%) felt pleased or mostly satisfied. One fifth (20.4%) felt mixed.

Table 21

Mean Ratings on Life Satisfaction Survey (N = 54)

Item	Mean	SD
lower mainland as place to live	2.41	1.39
neighborhood as a place to live	2.54	1.06
house or apartment	2.87	1.30
amount of education	3.32	1.20
work	3.02	1.38
fun and enjoyment	3.61	1.28
own health	2.57	1.13
own and family's income	3.72	1.43
marriage or relationship	2.24	1.15
family life	2.67	1.08
life as a whole	2.63	.94

Response scale for items:
1=delighted; 2=pleased; 3=mostly satisfied; 4=mixed; 5=mostly dissatisfied; 6=unhappy; 7=terrible

In general the results on this scale indicate that respondents feel positive about their lives. Some, however, felt mixed or mostly dissatisfied about their home or the fun and enjoyment in their lives. Given their situation, it is somewhat surprising that more respondents did not feel worse about their lives. It should be noted that this measure may be limited by the situation under which it was administered. Almost all respondents were interviewed a couple days before the offender was off the program. This may have evoked a more positive response to their life situation. It is unclear from this measure

whether their response would have been different if interviewed in the midst of their time on the program or if subsequent to the program their response may have changed.

Respondents' Program Evaluation

The last area in the interview schedule asked participants to provide a general evaluation of the program. This was the second measure used to assess how participants coped with changes associated with the program. S*ocial support* is an important variable in dealing with the intrusion of the electronic monitoring program into the home environment.

When respondents were asked if they felt that the program would have any long term impact on their lives, most participants felt that there would be *no* long term impact (n=24), or that the impact would be positive (n=9). The types of positive, long-term effects anticipated are listed in Table 22. These include: learning a lesson (n=16), it was a deterrent (n=9), an improved relationship with their partner (n=3), assisted with life continuity (n=3), felt he got a break (n=3), becoming more disciplined (n=2), the offender became more patient (n=1), and learned to do things and feel more comfortable in the home unit (n=1). *No one anticipated that the long-term impact would be negative.* Nonetheless, a couple of respondents said that there would be negative consequences in their "life after the program". One spouse who found the situation to be hard on her was in the midst of planning her wedding.

> I hope I will never hold this against him, but I will always remember the time before my wedding [and] what I had to go through. I'm not going to try and use it against him but it will always be there, especially because ... this was supposed to be the most exciting time of my life and it was any bride's nightmare ... It was really hard for me. (44)

Thus, most thought that their life after the program would be either positive (n=30) or that there would not be an appreciable impact (n=26).

Table 22

Anticipated Long-term Impacts of Program (N=54)

	n	percent
none	24	44.4
learned a lesson/ thought about/re-evaluated life situation/his behavior / learned more about self	16	29.7
memory of situation	9	16.7
deterrent	9	16.7
helped relationship-closeness	3	5.6
life continuity	3	5.6
got a break	3	5.6
discipline	2	3.7
spouse has more patience	1	1.9
more comfortable being at home	1	1.9
more assertive	1	1.9
learned to do things in the home unit	1	1.9

Many respondents contended that the most helpful thing for them on the program was having the support of others such as spouse (n=4), extended family (n=1), friends (n=2) and program staff (n=12). Being able to work (n=5), having some time out or exercise time (n=4), having their partner at home with them (n=8), and having some stability associated with their spouse not drinking (n=6) was also helpful in coping with the program. Others found certain types of activities helpful: studying (n=1), computer games (n=2), and contract work with corrections (n=1). Only three respondents said that nothing was particularly helpful to them on the program.

Many respondents felt that there was a need to improve the program. When asked about changes which would make the program easier to cope with, approximately 39% of the respondents said that nothing would make the program easier to cope with. Others felt that there were changes that would make the program easier to cope with (see Table

23). A few (n=3) spouses felt that the availability of counselling for family members or someone to assess how the family was doing at different points in the program would help. A small number (n=4) of female respondents stated that more information about the program and an orientation for family members could have been provided. Some (n=11) respondents felt that more "*time out*" was considered important. Also, allowing the offender into his yard and garage would be helpful (n=7). A small number (n=5) felt that a smaller bracelet would be more comfortable. Three spouses felt that more counselling could have been provided. More of a rehabilitative component for alcoholics was also suggested by a few (n=3) respondents. Therefore, rehabilitation was not a prominent concern. One unemployed offender claimed that it would be easier if a person was working. Another unemployed offender said that community hours were not necessary for every case. His time could have been better spent with his children. He stated:

> The reason I came home [from prison] was to take care of my kids. I thought that this is typical of the system. It doesn't see taking care of your kids as a job. Normally I don't even think about that, but it made me think about that. They [corrections staff] know why I came home. (19)

Table 23

Changes that Would Make the Program Easier to Cope With (N=54)

Types of Changes	n	percent
nothing	21	38.9
time out	11	20.4
be allowed to work in garage/yard	7	13.0
smaller bracelet	5	9.3
orientation for family members and/or more infomation about the program	4	7.4
more counselling	3	5.6
needs more of a rehabilitation component for alcoholics	3	5.6
didn't need community hours	1	1.9
easier if person is working	1	1.9

Respondents were asked if they had the power what changes they would make to the program. Only 11 respondents said that there were no changes they would make to the program. The most common response (n=17) was that more time out (for leisure time, family activities, exercise, and participation in childcare responsibilities) should be allowed. Nine respondents also felt that the boundaries of the program should be extended to include the yard and garage. The availability of counselling for families and individuals was considered important by three spouses. Three spouses felt that more information on program guidelines could have been provided to them. The gradual extension of privileges to the offender was considered important by three spouses.

A variety of advice was given to other families subjected to the program in the future (see Table 24). The most common (35.2%) form of advice was to follow the program rules. Respondents also suggested that it helped to think of the positive aspects of the program (9.3%) and that it was better than jail (16.7%). Another important consideration was to get more information about the program prior to placement on the program (13%). Almost one third of the spouses gave advice related to support of their partners or themselves. Five respondents had no advice to offer.

Table 24

Types of Advice that Subjects Would Give to Others About the Program (N=54)

Advice	n	Percent
follow the rules	19	35.2
it's better than going to jail	9	16.7
know all your options / info about the program before placement on the program	7	13.0
no advice	5	9.3
think of the positive aspects	5	9.3
provide support to partner	4	7.4
good program for families	4	7.4

Table 24 (continued)

have someone to talk to other than your partner / good to have a support network	4	7.5
deal with your problems at the start	2	3.7
go for counselling as partner is sober	2	3.7
engage in hobbies	2	3.7
one day at a time	2	3.7
be patient	2	3.7
set ground rules with partner	2	3.7
keep working	2	3.7
entertain more at home	1	1.9
not as easy/less freedom than you think	1	1.9
thinking about his family helps keep him within the rules	1	1.9
good program as partner cannot go out drinking	1	1.9
when asking for time out be liberal	1	1.9
a lot of restrictions like jail	1	1.9

Another measure of adaptation on the program included asking respondents how they would react if the offender's sentence was longer. The majority (57%) of respondents said they would have difficulty. Some (n=20) said it would be acceptable. Only a small number (n=6) said it would not be acceptable to be on the program any longer than their current sentence. The most commonly cited reason for a longer sentence being acceptable was that being on the program was better than going to jail (n=11). The difficulties that respondents would experience included: frustrations would grow (n=11), more stress would result related to the program discipline (n=8), and it would be difficult with the type of job the offender had (n=7). The reasons given for a longer sentence being unacceptable included: frustrations would grow (n=2), may cause you to break the rules (n=1), would destroy the family, (n=1), it would put more stress on their relationship (n=1), and more stress would result (n=1). One 25 year old offender who was on the program for two months stated that a longer sentence

> ... would get to me. Two months is the limit for me. Around the end I was getting anxious. I don't think I could do four months. You would

> have to live in a house where you could do your hobbies. It can be an asset by keeping you out of trouble. You keep putting things off and now you have the extra time to do things and if you have the place to do it that's great. I'm sure there are lots of people that screw up. They can't settle down. If it was longer there would be more problems. (03)

Relationships between Stress and Adaptation

As discussed in chapter 4 adaptation to stress is a complex process involving a variety of factors which influence how family members will respond to a stressful event or situation. In order to test whether stress in family members' lives produced difficulties for them in terms of their overall well-being, partial correlations and correlations were run on SPSS. It was hypothesized that adaptation would be positively influenced by family system resources and positive meaning, and negatively influenced by stress experiences. Variables such as family system resources (adaptability, cohesion, communication), and meaning were analyzed for their mitigating effect on the stress (reduce vulnerability to stress) generated by family life events and by stress associated with the EMP. In addition, family system resources and (positive) meaning influence overall well-being by facilitating adaptation. These variables should be positively related to adaptation.

The sources of strain are shown in Table 25. These sources include both strain associated with the EMP and family life events. A composite measure of "EMP strain" is also included in this analysis. In the analysis of this model the family would generally be the unit of analysis. However, individual respondents were the unit of analysis since scores on FACES, which provide a measure of family type were not significantly correlated between couples.

Partial correlations were run to control for the effect of the buffering variables. None of the sources of strain associated with the EMP were significantly associated with life satisfaction in the expected direction. In addition, a higher incidence of changes in family life events prior to and following the charge was not negatively associated with life satisfaction, when family resources and meaning were controlled for. Some sources of

strain, however, were significantly associated with adaptation in the wrong direction. For example, respondents who reported a loss of control over home life had significantly higher levels of life satisfaction when family type was controlled for (r=-.438, p=.002).

Table 25

Relationship Between Strain and Life Satisfaction Controlling for Family Type, Communication, and Meaning (N=54)

Individual EMP Strain Variables	Life Satisfaction controlling for: **family type**	**communication**	**meaning**
overall stress level	r= .451 (p=.002)*	r= .347 (p=.018)	r= .273 (p=.160)
loss of control over home	r= -.438 (p=.002)*	r= -.434 (p=.003)*	r= -.335 (p=.081)
lost decision-making power	r= -.047 (p=.755)	r= -.130 (p=.393)	r= -.234 (p=.231)
home responsibilities strain	r= .234 (p=.176)	r= -.179 (p=.305)	r= -.278 (p=.131)
no support strain	r= -.043 (p=.781)		
periodic check strain	r= .046 (p=.793)	r= -.031 (p=.859)	r=.084 (p=.654)
equipment strain	r= -.176 (p=.312)	r= -.012 (p=.945)	r= .149 (p=425)
work strain	r= .421 (p=.012)*	r= -.186 (p=.284)	r=.362 (p=045)*
social activity strain	r= -.107 (p=.540	r= -.287 (p=.094)	r= -.216 (p=242)
child activity strain	r= .031 (p=.859)	r= .026 (p=.882)	r= .079 (p=.674)
spousal activity strain	r= -.129 (p=.459)	r= -.092 (p=.592)	r= -.065 (p=.72)
spousal relationship strain	r= .190 (p=.274)	r= .152 (p=.385)	r= .284 (p=.122)
isolation from friends	r= -.138 (p=.330)	r= -.029 (p=.840)	r= .160 (p=373)

Table 25 (continued)

isolation from family	r= -.131 (p=.366)	r= -.123 (p=394)	r= .230 (p=198)
community isolation	r= .092 (p=.527)	r= .055 (p=702)	r= .271 (p=127)
privacy strain	r= -.282 (p=.060)	r= -.229 (p=.185)	r= -.199 (p=.284)
support network strain	r= .030 (p=.841)	r= .075 (p=619)	r= .173 (p=.378)
family life events (pre-charge)	r= .373 (p=.008)	r= .305 (p=.032)	r=.366 (p=.036)
(post-charge)	r= .196 (p=.173)	r= .175 (p=.224)	r=.326 (p=.064)
EMP Strain	r= -.152 (p=.385)	r= -.106 (p=.482)	r=-.071 (p=.721)

(* indicates a significant relationship)

The relationships between family system resources and meaning, and life satisfaction were also examined. None of these variables were found to be positively associated with life satisfaction as shown in Table 26. Interestingly, cohesion is significantly associated with well-being in the opposite direction expected. Therefore, respondents with higher levels of cohesion are significantly more likely to have lower levels of life satisfaction.

Table 26

Correlations Between Resources and Life Satisfaction

	life satisfaction
adaptability	r= .182, p=.187
cohesion	r= -.326, p=.016 *
communication	r= .191, p=.166
positive meaning	r= -.089, p=.524

Analyses of Relationships in the Double ABCX Model

There has been empirical testing of hypothesized relationships between pairs of variables in the Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation (McCubbin et al., 1980), and the model as a whole (Lavee et al., 1985). Support has been found for both these relationships and the model as a whole. The results of the present study did not confirm the hypothesis that the increased incidence of strain associated with family life events and the EMP results in lower levels of life satisfaction when meaning and family resources are controlled for. Theoretically, family system resources and positive meaning buffer the effects of strain and are positively associated with life satisfaction. These relationships were not supported. Measuring the incidence of stress and not levels of stress may have contributed to the lack of support for this relationship. Certain types of changes may be more stressful. There also may have been some intervening variables that were not controlled for. Although social support was measured in the current study and the lack of support was used as a source of strain, it may not have been adequately measured. Lavee et al. (1985) measured levels of social support (community support, friendship support, and community activity). This was not done in the present study. Social support was perceived as an important factor in dealing with stress.

Family system resources (cohesion and adaptability) may not be applicable to the current sample. The cohesion and adaptability scales have been tested on a variety of samples including: families with (male) delinquents, clinical and non-clinical families, families with runaways, schizophrenic and neurotic families, and sex offenders and their families (Olson et al., 1985). Druckman (1979) found that the cohesion and adaptability scales did not adequately describe families with female delinquents. The current sample may also be anomalous. It included a variety of adult offender types. With this group a significant relationship was found in the opposite to the expected direction for cohesion and well-being. This suggests that respondents whose families are less cohesive are more

satisfied with their lives. There was little correlation between life satisfaction and adaptability and communication. The correlation between couples on these measures was also particularly low.

Summary

The use of the family stress model to examine the impact of EMS on families in the present study did not result in significant relationships in the expected direction. Overall well-being was not positively associated with family resource variables and meaning, and negatively associated with stress experiences (EMP strain and family life events). Despite the lack of support for this hypothesis, the descriptive data collected are both useful and revealing.

Similar to previous findings, family members seemed to benefit from the program. Most viewed the program as positive: it was "better than going to prison", in light of the contributions that the offender could make to relationships within the family and maintaining family life, and for work reasons. Many respondents changed their views of the program. In some cases, the restrictiveness of the program and the discipline it imposed on family members (particularly offenders) was considered more difficult than initially anticipated. Others, however, viewed it as less restrictive. A greater incidence of stress appears to be associated with being charged and the ensuing court process, than with placement on the EMP. Most reponses to the charges were negative, and the court process was generally considered very stressful. Most respondents generally expected that prison might be an option. Therefore, it is not surprising that a positive response to the EMP was linked with feeling that home was better than jail.

Most respondents disclosed the program to someone, especially if they had a close relationship. Responses of others (including extended family members, friends, bosses/employers, neighbors, and co-workers) were generally positive. Responding in this way was viewed as helpful in dealing with the intrusion of the EMP into the home

environment and family life. Nonetheless, in some cases, there were difficulties explaining the program to children, as well as, others. For adults, non-disclosure was mainly related to embarrassment and fear of negative responses. Younger children were generally viewed as being too young to understand the situation. Supportive responses were helpful in dealing with the intrusion of the program into family members lives.

The restrictions placed on the offender in terms the activities that he can participate in outside the home also affect other household members (social, responsibilities, isolation, privacy) Many respondents reported that the activities with their partners and children were more restrictive. For some, this was offset by improved relationships and being together with their partner and children. Although the majority reported improved relationships, one third were affected negatively. Some felt that the changes in activities with children were negative while only one spouse felt that there was a negative impact on the quality of her relationship with her child. Thus, the negative view was not generalized to their relationships with children.

There were changes in various areas of home life. This is most evident for the spouse of the offender. Although some offender provided more assistance within the confines of the home, the spouse of the offender generally felt an even greater responsibility for taking on additional tasks and responsibilities. The spouse of the offender became responsible for running more errands, doing yard work, organizing and orchestrating children's activities outside of the home, shopping, and keeping their spouse comfortable. Spouses also reported having more difficulties with the changes that occurred. A small number of offenders, however, felt frustrated about not being able to fully participate in responsibilities, particularly where their children were concerned.

This increased pressure between the couple was compounded by decreased (both quality and quantity) contact with people who provide a network of support. Many felt isolated from family, friends and the community. This was particularly significant for the

offender where friends and the community were concerned. Although most said they received moral or emotional support from someone, a good number of spouses felt that additional support should have been available to them while their partners were on the program. In addition, the results indicate that some respondents have a low level of cohesiveness and adaptability which make it difficult to deal with stress. Moreover, the FILE scale indicates that a small number of families were overtaxed by the stress in their lives. The difficulty or potential difficulty for families is suggested by the responses to "serving a longer sentence". Many felt that there would be increased strain and tension in the home environment with a longer sentence. In addition, a substantial number felt that their privacy had been affected. Nonetheless, when life satisfaction was used as a measure of adaptation, various measures of stress (associated with the EMP and family life events) were not significantly associated with this variable (when the effects of family resources and meaning were controlled for).

Social support was viewed by many respondents as vital in dealing with the changes that the program imposed upon the family and home environment. For some, support from relatives, friends, a spouse and/or corrections staff was viewed as the most helpful factor in dealing with the program. "Time out" of the home for exercise and work are also considered important in coping with the restrictions imposed by the programme. For some spouses, the stability imposed by the restrictions on the offenders' behavior was also most helpful in coping with the program. Undoubtedly, most spouses preferred that their partner remain at home and continue to participate in the family as a parent, a partner, and income contributor. In fact, most spouses willingly made sacrifices to have their spouses at home. They made adjustments and provided additional comfort in order to make their partner's time on the program easier.

Ties with Other Research

Some of the findings in the present study are corroborated by findings in other studies examining the impact on the offender. Mainprize (1990) found that the EMP did not have much of an impact on work. This is generally consistent with the present research findings, although some offenders felt it necessary to quit their job due to the program's restrictions on their movement. Mainprize found a lack of social support for offenders on the program. This is consistent with the present study to the extent that it is clear that some families need additional support on the program. Although most respondents claimed that the EMP did not interfere with their support network, when questioned further respondents typically had less contact with family and friends. Many also felt isolated from family, friends and the community. Offenders were significantly more likely than spouses to feel isolated from their friends and the community.

Baumer and Mendelson (1989) and Mainprize's finding that there were benefits for family relationships is also supported by the findings of this study. The present study found partners' relationships were improved in that they were able to confront and resolve more issues, some spouses and offenders felt closer to each other, and their relationships were strengthened by the experience, and some couples got to know each other better through the confinement. As with previous research, the strain of home confinement also resulted in additional strain between the couples. More conflict, tension, and distance in relationships resulted from the restrictiveness of the activities that couples could do together. For some couples, the resolution of problem situations and finding new methods to deal with conflict also created additional strain in their relationship, at least in the initial part of the program.

Baumer and Mendelsohn (1989) found improvements in housework and childcare by offenders. The present study also found support for this finding to a limited degree. Although some offenders "helped more" with housework and childcare, their spouses took

on additional responsibilities with respect to these areas, particularly with those activities that required orchestration outside of the home. This created an additional source of strain for these spouses. The EMP was also found to have a rehabilitation potential through social discipline (Mainprize, 1988). Although the present study did not focus on the rehabilitative aspects of the program, some spouses reported that their partner's abstaining from alcohol was a benefit. For some spouses the program provided more predictability and regularity in their lives in that they knew where their partners were and when they would be home.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusions

This exploratory study examined how the EMS program affects the family, particularly couples' perceptions of changes in the family and home environment. The social-psychological impact of EMS on the family was explored utilizing a contextual model of family stress and adaptation. Interviewees were self-selected from the B.C. Corrections Branch EMP (in the Vancouver and Fraser Regions). Twenty-seven offenders and their spouses were interviewed. An almost equal number of subjects were interviewed from each region. Although each respondent was interviewed only once, an attempt was made to examine some of the changes that respondents experienced over the course of the program. The average time on the program was 84 days. Analyses are both descriptive and relational.

Historical Context of EMS

The first chapter documented how EMS expanded. EMS programs have expanded rapidly since their introduction in the U.S. in 1984. Its increase is attributed to the commercial availability of the technology, the development of microcomputer and microprocessor technologies, overcrowding in prisons, and the need to find a cost efficient alternative that allowed for greater control of the offender than traditional probation. Conceived as an alternative to prison, it is now employed at various stages of criminal justice (from pre-trial to aftercare). Technical, administrative and therapeutic aspects have dominated the literature on EMS. As jurisdictions have adopted EMS, concern for the effects on the offender and family have become important. There is concern that it may be *intensifying* control over those who would have otherwise been subject to a less intrusive alternative, such as probation. There has been little systematic evaluation and assessment

of the operation and impact of such programs (Ball and Lilly, 1988; Vaugh, 1990). To date, only a couple of systematic studies have examined the impact on the offender (Mainprize, 1990; Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1990).

Controversy over EMS

The value of EMS as a community sanction is clearly unsettled. In chapter 2 the debate about community corrections, including EMS, is examined in the context of civil liberties, social control and the debate about community control. The key controversies include: its legality, the nature of its intrusiveness, and net-widening.

The issue of net-widening is a central focus in the literature on community corrections and EMS. Critics have generally assumed that the development of community corrections is associated with an expansion and intensification of state control. However, there is little empirical evidence to support this. McMahon (1992) has shown how two important Canadian studies (Chan and Ericson, 1981; Hylton, 1982) on this issue are seriously flawed. A re-analysis of Chan and Ericson's study of the Ontario system by McMahon shows that there has *not* been an increase in people coming into the system. Instead, there has been an intensification of control for those already in the system. Ontario's Ministry of Correctional Services expanded its operations through additional programs that offenders on probation and in prison participate in. Mainprize (1992) found evidence that strongly suggests that organizational expansion for EMS is occurring. More personnel are required to operate this program than if this alternative had not been developed.

The issue of cost effectiveness is closely tied to the issue of net-widening since being subject to additional controls or bringing more individuals into the system generally costs more money than would have otherwise been the case. The social costs borne by the family also need to be considered. Although EMS may be less intrusive on an offender's privacy than prison, this sanction may be more invasive and harmful for the family. The

intrusiveness of this technology and the state's monitoring of the home and offender, and its effects on the family and home environment need to be considered. Since the home becomes a quasi-prison structure the family becomes involved in the net of social control. These issues have been examined primarily from the perspective of program advocates and administrators, and critics of EMS, only secondarily from the point of view of the offender. The family's perspective on these issues has been overlooked.

EMS and Expansion of the Social Control System

In the second half of chapter 2 the emergence of electronic monitoring was explored in the context of community correctional development to provide a broader understanding about its use at this particular juncture in history. Garland's thesis on the expansion and intensification of state control was utilized to gain a theoretical understanding of the emergence of EMS and community control. His focus is on the political and ideological factors that accompanied community corrections. The change to an expanded network of community control took place within a broader social transformation. The system was experiencing serious difficulties in its administration and legitimacy in the context of a social crisis. A new logic developed out of "a complex and fragmented process of struggle." It was not a radical social transformation as the power of reformers was not great enough to undermine the deeper structures of capitalism. In order for reformers to gain representation compromises were made that fit with the existing ideological structures in place (the cause of crime focused on character of the individual rather than the inequities of the system). Ideology played a crucial role in making the transformation more acceptable by representing the state as benevolent and helping, rather than as punitive and oppressive. The change included: a more diverse array of sentencing options changing the position of the prison to a back-up for other institutional and community-based programmes; individuals were no longer treated as equal and sentenced according to the severity of their crime, but were examined in

accordance with their circumstances and individual peculiarities; and with a diverse array of sanctions and a deterministic philosophy, classification and assessment became key objectives.

These changes allowed the system to extend its control to the home and the family through the soft end of the system or the "normalising sector". Correctional personnel could then invade the home and engage family members to participate in the normalisation process of the offender. EMS can be viewed as part of the state's net-widening effort within the normalising sector. Offenders serve their sentence at home and are subject to unannounced checks at home. If program conditions are violated, the prison may be used as a back-up. It allows for a refinement of the classification system by differentiating another offender group (Mainprize, 1990).

Other critical writers such as Scull, (1984), Chan and Ericson (1981), and Cohen (1985) view economics as an important factor in the implementation of community corrections. The development of community corrections was required as a cost efficient "alternative". However, implementation of community corrections failed to produce a cheaper alternative. Instead, the control system was allowed to expand and intensify. For Chan and Ericson (1981) the organizational dynamic is also an important factor in thwarting reformers efforts in producing a more effective and efficient system.

EMS was introduced as a more cost-efficient "alternative" to imprisonment. Although this is one of the major impetuses for its introduction, there is a lack of evaluative evidence to support this assertion. Ball et al. (1993) claimed that cost savings resulted when EMS was used as an alternative to incarceration.

Some Benefits to the Exercise of State Power

The focus on the system as ever-expanding and intensifying its power is a one-sided view of power. McMahon (1992) challenges this conception of power. A more

balanced view considers the liberative aspects. Reforms can reduce control. The role of human agency should not be neglected. EMS appears to represents an extension and intensification of the penal control system, by its intrusion on the home and into the lives of family members. Nonetheless, there are potential benefits if EMS is used an alternative to imprisonment. The present study sheds light on some of the positive aspects of this program. When considered as an alternative the offender avoids the dehumanizing aspects of prison. This may be a particular concern for racial minorities who may deal with additional inequities in prison. Most viewed the program as positive as it is better than prison, and it allows for the offender to participate in the family. Not only were family relationships and family life maintained, some respondents reported an improved relationship with their partner. Some spouses also felt that their partner had benefited from the discipline imposed by the program.

The Intrusion of EMS on the Home Environment

In order to understand some the drawbacks of this sanction the meaning of the home to the family becomes crucial. It is important to understand the impact of EMS in this environment since it impinges on the family's privacy and potentially isolates family members from the community, friends, and extended family members. Chapter 3 traces how the home lost its productive function. The removal of economic functions from the home that came with industrialization increased privacy and intimacy in the home environment and intensified its emotional quality. The social control function of the community was eroded with the removal of economic functions from the home. Couples' relationships are now more focused on emotional intimacy and support, and companionship than in the past. Although privacy and intimacy may be positive, negative consequences of social isolation can also occur, especially domestic violence. This may be particularly problematic since in general, the greater the social isolation, the higher the risk of spousal violence (Gelles and Cornell, 1985). EMS has the potential of increasing

isolation for family members in their homes which may increase the likelihood that abuse and violence will occur particularly with the added stress that accompanies this sanction. A substantial number of respondents felt isolated from their friends, family members, and the community. "Significantly" more offenders felt isolated from their friends and the community. Family members spent less time with friends and extended family members. There was no indication of violence among the couples interviewed in this study.

Nonetheless, the opportunity for privacy is important for self-preservation, dignity and self-respect (Goffman, 1959; Marx, 1989). Almost half of the respondents felt their privacy was invaded in the present study. This included: periodic checks by corrections staff; having the corrections vehicle in the neighborhood; electronic devices in the home; and by interruptions on the telephone as a result of the receiver-dialer component. These intrusions resulted in not feeling as relaxed at home, feeling bothered by the visits, having intimate time with their partner disturbed, feeling that they were being watched, and feeling different from other families. Many respondents, however, felt that the visits by corrections officers were acceptable. Some offenders even welcomed the social contact. Thus, the perceptions of the impact on privacy do not seem that severe.

EMS and the Model of Family Stress and Adaptation

The contextual model of family stress and adaptation was adapted from the Double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation (McCubbin and Patterson, 1982) and Walker's (1985) discussion of the importance of examining the context in which stress occurs in the family. This model assesses how family members adapt to a stressful situations in the context of other life events and resources that are available to them during this process. The Double ABCX model highlights the importance of adaptive resources in responding to and adapting to stressful experiences. These resources may be important in dealing with stress associated with EMS. It was hypothesized that increases in stressful experiences and other family life events with decreasing levels of resource capability

would result in lower levels of adaptation or well-being. This hypothesis was not supported by the current research. However, this does not mean that this model does not have applicability or utility to families on EMS. Overall the descriptive findings suggest that the EMP has both positive and negative impacts on family members. However, the negative effects of the program on those interviewed did not significantly effect family members general sense of well-being. Respondents were generally satisfied with most aspects of their lives. The themes that emerge from these findings will be discussed below.

EMS may expand the net of social control on an organizational basis (Mainprize, 1992), and because the offender serves his or her sentence in the home the state's control is enhanced through family participation. Family members may assist with the normalisation process (Garland, 1992) by helping to ensure that the offender does not violate the conditions of the program. There is some evidence in this study that this occurred. This is indicated by the attention and concern to the time restrictions imposed by the program and the willingness to accommodate to the offender's restrictions on the program. Restrictions placed on the offender curtailed social activities of other family members, particularly spouses. Not only did some spouses go out less, in some cases social activities within the home were affected so as to conceal the offender's program status.

Privacy is an important consideration with the intrusion of EMS into the home environment. As discussed above, privacy can impact how a person feels about themselves. Although EMS represents an intrusion into the home environment, only approximately half of the respondents felt that their privacy was invaded. A number of physical aspects of the program can undermine an individual's privacy: through periodic checks by corrections staff, having a corrections vehicle in the neighborhood, by having the electronic devices in the home, and through interruptions on the telephone as a result

of the receiver-dialer component attached to the phone. These intrusions by equipment and staff resulted in some respondents not feeling as relaxed at home, feeling bothered by the visits, feeling intimacy with their partner was disturbed, feeling that they were being watched, feeling different from other families, and feeling uncomfortable about the vehicle in their neighborhood. Although these responses generally do not seem that severe, it is difficult to know what kind of long-term impact, if any, they will have of family members. Many respondents, however, felt that visits by corrections officers were acceptable. Some offenders even welcomed the social contact.

EMS has the potential of increasing isolation for family members in their homes which may increase the likelihood that abuse and violence will occur in this environment, particularly with the added stress that accompanies this sanction. A substantial number of respondents felt isolated from their friends, family members and the community. Significantly more offenders (all males) felt isolated from their friends and the community. For many a feeling of isolation was accompanied by a decrease in social contact with friends and family. In addition, family members spent less time with friends and extended family members. Although the reported effects of isolation were generally not that severe, the sample interviewed is likely to be a more cooperative group (Mainprize, 1990). The risk that violence is occurring in the home may be greater for those who did not consent to be interviewed. If family violence was occurring while on EMS, it would be unlikely that these families would have wanted the further intrusion of a researcher into their home environment.

Social support is crucial in dealing with stress (McCubbin and Patterson, 1982). This is important since EMS was found to interfere with social contact and support in the present study. Many participants spent less time with friends and relatives and felt isolated from friends, relatives and the community. This may be particularly important in this context since support from someone was considered as on of the most helpful things in

coping with the program. In addition, a small number requested that counselling should be available to families on the program.

This program suggests that the exercise of the state's power can be positive. The present study sheds light on some of the positive effects of the program on the families. When considered as an alternative the offender avoids the dehumanizing aspects of prison. In addition it allows the offender to participate in the family in terms of his role as a father, a spouse, and an income contributor. Beyond maintaining family relationships and family life, it may lead to improved relationships with in the family. It also may produce more "social discipline" through alcohol abstinence maintained as a condition of the program (see Mainprize, 1990).

Nonetheless, some potentially difficult situations may also result for family members. The program not only affects the offender's social activities, but others in the household are also affected. In some cases both children's and spouses' activities were more restrictive. Some partner relationships were affected negatively. Spouses also felt an even greater responsibility for taking on additional tasks and responsibilities for organizing and orchestration of children's activities outside the home, doing yard work, running more errands, shopping and keeping the offender comfortable. Although the findings show no extremely detrimental effects, it is not clear that such effects do not occur especially if a family experiences a high level stress, isolates themselves, does not tell anyone about the program, and does not have the resource capability to deal effectively with the changes.

Limitations of Research

The findings of the present study are limited in a number of ways. The measures used in this model to assess some of the relationships in the family model of stress and adaptation have some limitations. Some of the measures of strain associated with the EMP that were employed were not standardized and may have also been unreliable

indicators. However, certain standardized measures (e.g., family system resources and family life events) were also not found to be significantly associated with life satisfaction. Another limitation of the measurement of this model is that in the present study the incidence of stress associated with the EMP was measured. It did not include an assessment of levels of stress. In stress investigations using the Double ABCX model the family is generally the unit of analysis. In the present sample this was not done since there was little correlation between couples for family system resources. In addition the scales used in this model may not be applicable to the current sample. Family system resources were not significantly correlated with well-being in the expected direction. In future studies other measures of adaptation might be employed since this study only utilized one measure of this concept. Other types of buffering variables might also be tested, including levels of social support.

The current sample may also affected by demand characteristics. Families that consent to be interviewed are likely to be a more cooperative group in general. Some of the female respondents stated that they would "move heaven and earth" to have their partner at home, and not in jail. Some respondents may have also been affected by the fear that disclosure of information that negatively reflects on the operation of the program may jeopardize their participation or their spouse's participation in the program. Most couples that were interviewed, however, appeared to be fairly relaxed and disclosed sensitive information (e.g., some respondents revealed that they had violated program conditions).

Since interviews occurred while the offender was still on the program the measures of outcome are limited. It is unclear from this research whether there are any long-term impacts that resulted from the changes created by the program's constraints. Another factor that may have confounded the results is that the program operated somewhat differently in each region. For example, in the Fraser region program participants were

given a two hour "time out" period from the program on weekends or on days that they were not working. It was not necessary that this time be structured. In contrast, this was not the case in the Vancouver region. Program participants were only allowed time out if it was structured and staff needed to be aware of where the offender was at all times.

Future Research and Policy Implications

Future research will be necessary in order to determine whether there are in fact any positive or negative long term impacts. It will also be important in future research to include female offenders with male partners. Another crucial area of concern will be to assess more completely the effect that the program has on children. To fully assess the impact of the program on the family children will also need to be interviewed. A future study might further explore some of the problems that were found in this study with the Double ABCX model.

The findings have implications for sentence management. This research indicates that there are many positive effects for family members associated with offenders serving time at home. Nonetheless, if EMS interferes with family members' support, particularly spouses who are not on the program, further support should be provided for families on the program. It is clear that some families need additional support while a member is on the program. In addition, it is important to assess family member's well-being at various times in the program. This, however, presents a dilemma since it provides a further intrusion that the family may not want. Having someone available for family members to talk to on a voluntary basis or providing a group support network for families on the program may be helpful. Another important addition would be to allow offenders time out for exercise. This may be an important area where offenders can release stress. Several offenders expressed that this was an important avenue for the release of stress for them. Another area of concern was the lack of information available about the program. Both offenders and spouses expressed interest in having more information about the program.

It would be useful to provide some sort of orientation for family members. In general, having offenders involved in some form of constructive activity and having an outlet for stress is important.

EMS can increase stressful experiences for family members by increasing isolation (including less social support), reducing privacy, shifting roles and responsibilities for household labour, and reducing social and physical activities. The benefits include: improved partner relationships, maintaining family relationships and family life, avoiding the dehumanizing conditions of prison, increased discipline, alcohol abstinence. Generally the benefits of EMS seemed to outweigh the stress associated with the program. Nonetheless, it is unclear what kind of long term impact the program will have on families.

APPENDIX A

Interview Consent

Having been asked by Diana Doherty, Masters Candidate in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University to be interviewed regarding my experience on the Electronic Monitoring Systems program, I have voluntarily agreed to participate. My consent is based on an understanding of following principles and procedures:

1) All information and reponses provided are strictly confidential. To ensure anonymity the interview schedule will be coded with a number (not my name) and individual responses will not be read by corrections staff.

2) Participation in this interview is completely voluntary and I am free to terminate the interview at any time. This interview will not affect my relationship or my partner's relationship with the B.C. Corrections Branch.

3) I will be asked some questions on the structure of my family, how myself and other family members have reacted to and adjusted to the EMS program in our home, if any changes have occurred in family activities, house chores, childcare, work, social activities, in the way decisions are made, and if such changes have resulted in any improvements and/or difficulties for my family. I will also be asked about a number of other stressful events (e.g., increased financial debt, loss of a family member) that may have occurred in my family's life prior to or after my involvement with the EMS program.

4) I will be asked personal information (e.g., age, income) for the purposes of comparing families.

5) I understand that the interviewer is conducting this research for her masters thesis. It is independent of the Ministry of Solicitor General, Corrections Branch, although a copy of the findings will be made available to the Corrections Branch upon completion of a report on the research findings.

6) The interview will take about 90 minutes to complete.

7) I also understand that I may register any complaint I might have about the study with the researcher, Diana Doherty, or with Dr. John Lowman, Director of Graduate Programmes, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University.

_____ _____

Interviewee's Signature Date

APPENDIX B

Interview Coding Scheme / Interview Schedule

codes: N=2, Y=1, N\A=0,

no information=leave blank

VARIABLE	**CODING SCHEME**	
1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
2. Record Number (3)	no special code	° °
2. Region (Vancouver or Fraser) (4)	1=V / 2=F	° °
3. Date of Interview (5-10) month,day,year	00 00 00	° °
4. Length of Interview (11-13)	in minutes	° °

I FAMILY STRUCTURE AND BACKGROUND

1. time together (14-15)	in years	° °
2. gender (16)	1=M / 2=F	° °
3. # of children (17)	no special code	° °
4. ages of children (18-27)	in years	° °
5. couple formally married? (28)	Y / N	° °
6. previously formally married? (29)	Y / N	° °
7. divorced? (30)	Y / N	° °
8. previously common law? (31)	Y / N	° °
9. child from current relationship? (32)	Y / N	° °
10. child at home? (33)	Y / N	° °
11. child with other parent? (34)	Y / N	° °

[The above 11 questions determine present marital status and whether families were blended.]

12. other co-residents (35)	Y / N	° °
13. relationship of co-resident (36)	1=friend 2=relative 3=other	° °
14. most contact with relatives (37)	1=yours 2=partners 3=equal	° °

15. primary responsibility for childcare (38)	1=wife 2=husband 3=shared	° °
16. primary responsibility for chores (39)	1=wife 2=husband 3=shared	° °

17. primary responsibility for maintenance (40)	1=wife 2=husband 3=shared 4=landlord	° °
18. age of interviewee (41-42)	in years	° °
19. Education (43)	1=some high school 2=completed high school 3=some college 4=complete college 5=some university 6=completed university 7=graduate degree 8=technical school 9=elementary school	° °
20. Individual income (44-45)	1= < 5,000 2= $5,000-$9,999 3= $10,000-$14,999 4= $15,000-$19,000 5= $20,000-$24,999 6= $25,000-$29,999 7= $30,000-$34,999 8= $35,000-$39,999 9= $40,000-$44,999 10= $45,000-$49,999 11= $50,000-$54,999 12= $55,000-$55,999 13= $60,000-$64,999 14= $65,000-$69,999 15= $70,000-$74,999 16= >$75,000	° °
21. Employment status (46) (at time of interview)	1=unemployed 2=employed	° °
22. years employed in present job (47-48)		° °
23. employed in usual occupation (49)	Y / N	° °

24. Type of Occupation (50)	1=tradesperson- (welder, roofer, plumber pipefitter, ironworker, jeweler, builder, mechanic, painter, machine operator, carpenter 2=professional-(social worker, architect, teacher, accountant/tax consultant 3=Business Owner/management- sales representative Tower Operator (supervisory) production manager, retail manager, crew chief- aircraft maintenance, business manager 4=Cleaning/Maintenance Services- window cleaner, janitor 5=clerical- stats clerk, secretary, accounting clerk 6=Service Industry- retail sales, Insurance Underwriter, newspaper carrier, waitress, nail technician, massage therapist, Immigration Consultant 7=homemaker 8=Misc- sailer, shipper reciever, truck driver, artist,	° °
The occupation or job that the subject was employed/involved in at the time of the interview was recorded.		
25. Religious affiliation (51)	1=Muslim (Islamic) 2=Protestant 3=Buddhist 4=Sikh 5=Jehovah Witness 6=Catholic 7=none	° °
26. Involvement in religion (52) (intensity)	1=low 2=high	° °
[This measure is assessed based on whether the respondent claimed to have an active involvement in a religion that they were affiliated with.]		
27. Racial composition (53)	1=caucasian 2=East Indian 3=Filipino 4=black 5=Native Indian 6=Other	° °

28. Current Charge(s) (54-63)	01=driving while disqualified 02=impaired (over .08) 03=dangerous driving 04=failure to blow 05=fraud 06=theft over $1000 07=possess. of stolen property 08=B&E 09=robbery 10=breach of trust 11=living off the avails 12=trafficking (PPT) 13=conspiracy to traffic 14=trafficing a substance represented to be a narcotic 15=sexual assault	° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °
Some respondents have multiple charges for current sentence. Code each charge. Code up to five charges. (For absent charges code 00.)		
29. Previous sentence in institution (64)	Y / N	° °
30. Part of current sentence in institution (65)	Y / N	° °
31. Length of current EMP sentence (66-68)	in days	° °
32. Previously on EMP (69)	Y / N	° °

Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	° °

II PERCEPTION OF THE SITUATION

I would now like to ask you what your reactions were when you first learned about your partner's offence:

1. How did you feel (feelings)?

2. What did you do (actions)?

3. How did you view the situation (perceptions)?

4. How did your partner respond?

Response to initial charge:

Emotional Response to charge:

angry? (4)	Y / N	° °
fearful? (5)	Y / N	° °
apprehension? (6)	Y / N	° °
devastated? (7)	Y / N	° °
relieved? (8)	Y / N	° °
unhappy? (9)	Y / N	° °
guilty? (10)	Y / N	° °
panicky/anxious? (11)	Y / N	° °
surprised or shocked? (12)	Y / N	° °
worried? (13)	Y / N	° °
not surprised? (14)	Y / N	° °
nervous? (15)	Y / N	° °
ashamed? (16)	Y / N	° °
embarrassed? (17)	Y / N	° °
bitter? (18)	Y / N	° °
depressed? (19)	Y / N	° °
disgusted? (20)	Y / N	° °
disapointed? (21)	Y / N	° °
disbelief? (22)	Y / N	° °
confused? (23)	Y / N	° °
no response (e.g., delayed effect)? (24)	Y / N	° °

Reason for the emotional response:

it doesn't fit with his family upbringing (25)	Y / N	° °
nature of the incident (26)	Y / N	° °
didn't think he was driving (27)	Y / N	° °
mother is a recovering alcoholic (28)	Y / N	° °
previous relationship was with an alcoholic (29)	Y / N	° °
I asked him to drive because of my medical condition (30)	Y / N	° °
potential/anticipated consequences associated with the charge (31)	Y / N	° °
it was advertised in the paper (32)	Y / N	° °
her husband was capable of such a thing (33)	Y / N	° °
no control over the situation (34)	Y / N	° °
police officer fabricated the charge (35)	Y / N	° °
she was pregnant (36)	Y / N	° °
had no idea that he had a drug problem (37)	Y / N	° °
it was not the first incident (38)	Y / N	° °
he is my "meal ticket" (economic hardship) (39)	Y / N	° °
he was inconsiderate of how this would affect her life (40)	Y / N	° °
her family might find out (41)	Y / N	° °
it was a stupid thing to do (42)	Y / N	° °
knew he was an alcoholic (43)	Y / N	° °
anticipation of family members or others response (44)	Y / N	° °
it was his first offence (45)	Y / N	° °
stress that this has caused the family (46)	Y / N	° °

unsure of what to do (47)	Y / N	° °
the affect that it will have on family members48	Y / N	° °
she was unaware of what her husband had done(49)	Y / N	° °
had concerns about his behavior (50)	Y / N	° °

Actions taken following charge:

called a lawyer (51)	Y / N	° °
stopped drinking or quit doing drugs (52)	Y / N	° °
hollered and screamed at him (53)	Y / N	° °
he kept drinking (54)	Y / N	° °
talked to P.O. about his drinking behavior (55)	Y / N	° °
went to see a counsellor (56)	Y / N	° °
got more involved with family (57)	Y / N	° °
talked to our priest (58)	Y / N	° °
discussed situation with partner (59)	Y / N	° °
went to church (60)	Y / N	° °
consulted other family members (61)	Y / N	° °
watched how he would handle it (62)	Y / N	° °
provided support to partner (63)	Y / N	° °
denied everything (64)	Y / N	° °
fled province of charge (65)	Y / N	° °

Attitude / View towards charge:

accepted responsibility for charge (66)	Y / N	° °
viewed charge as unfair (67)	Y / N	° °
fatalistic about charge (68)	Y / N	° °
felt part of it was her fault (69)	Y / N	° °
it was a big mistake (70)	Y / N	° °
last chance to turn my life around (71)	Y / N	° °
worried about how it would affect his or their future (72)	Y / N	° °
felt it was his responsibility to deal with it (73)	Y / N	° °
another hurdle to get through (74)	Y / N	° °

Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	° °

Emotional Response to the Court Process:

disappointed? (4)	Y / N	° °
a lot of stress? (5)	Y / N	° °
nervous? (6)	Y / N	° °
upset (cried)? (7)	Y / N	° °
resentment? (8)	Y / N	° °
felt he was treated well? (9)	Y / N	° °

Reasons for emotional response:

could not get on with life (e.g.make plans, set goals) (10)	Y / N	° °
did not know the outcome (11)	Y / N	° °
waiting for outcome (12)	Y / N	° °
hopes were dashed as case progressed to trial (13)	Y / N	° °
lawyer never defended anyone with such a lengthy record (14)	Y / N	° °

Response/Attitude towards Sentence:

expected a lighter sentence (fine, restitution)(15)	Y / N	° °
expected a harsher sentence (jail) (16)	Y / N	° °
expected sentenced received (EMP) (17)	Y / N	° °
got a good deal (18)	Y / N	° °
system was too lenient (19)	Y / N	° °
mixed (20)	Y / N	° °
expected justice (21)	Y / N	° °

I would now like to ask you how you initially responded to your partner being placed on the EMS program:

5. How did you feel (feelings)?

6. What did you do (actions)?

7. How did you view the situation (perceptions)?

8. How did your partner respond?

Initial Response to EMP

Emotional Response to EMP:

1=positive (happy, greatful, lucky, good idea, appreciative, excited) 2=negative (isolated, disappointed, resentful) 3=neutral (preference, relieved, surprised) (22)	° °

Associated Reasons for response:

financial/business/employment concerns (23)	Y / N	° °
relationship concerns (24)	Y / N	° °
concern for children (25)	Y / N	° °
life continuity (26)	Y / N	° °
could monitor his progress (27)	Y / N	° °
good for taxpayers (28)	Y / N	° °
home is better than jail (29)	Y / N	° °
kept family/marriage together (30)	Y / N	° °
could conceal status (31)	Y / N	° °
nothing positive comes from jail (32)	Y / N	° °
does not have to deal with racial problems in jail (33)	Y / N	° °
can become part of family again (34)	Y / N	° °
had safety concerns while in jail (35)	Y / N	° °
more beneficial for him to stay in jail (36)	Y / N	° °
it was a lot harder on him in jail (37)	Y / N	° °
jail does not deal with the problem associated with the offence (38)	Y / N	° °
visiting jail imposed practical difficulties (39)	Y / N	° °
good candidate since he had already been punished (40)	Y / N	° °
good candidate since he is not violent (41)	Y / N	° °

9. Was there a shared family view of this situation?
   1. Yes
   2. No

   10. If yes, what was it?

   11. How was it arrived at?

Shared View	(42)	Y / N	° °

12. If not, what different views did (nuclear)family members hold

[Almost all interviewees claimed that family members shared similar views of the placement of the offender on the program. These views coincided with the above responses and reasons.]

13. Has this created any problems/difficulties for the family?

Problems created by different views (43)	Y / N	° °

14. Has there been any change in your view (or, if unified, the families' view) of the program?

1. Yes
2. No

Changes in View of the Program (44)	Y / N	° °

15. If yes, how has your view changed?

Types of changes in view:

View program as more restrictive? (45)	Y / N	° °
Program involved more discipline? (46)	Y / N	° °
Program was less restrictive? (47)	Y / N	° °
lacked info. about program boundaries, rules, limits? (48)	Y / N	° °
Staff were slow with w/ requests for assistance? (49)	Y / N	° °
Staff member had a poor attitude? (50)	Y / N	° °
pre-program admin. problem? (51)	Y / N	° °
He's miserable if she goes out and has a good time? (52)	Y / N	° °
more respect for the Program? (53)	Y / N	° °
inconvenience to family time out? (54)	Y / N	° °
checks were exercised w/ discresion (55)	Y / N	° °
found it difficult to follow through on childcare responsibilities (56)	Y / N	° °
thought he handled it better than anticipated57	Y / N	° °
didn't expect distancing from partner (58)	Y / N	° °
put a lot of responsibility on the family (59)	Y / N	° °

16. How much stress/disruption have you felt as a result of your partner being placed on the program?

1 2 3 4 5 intensity scale

level of Stress/disruption (60)	1-5 intensity scale	° °

Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	° °

17. Does the placement of your spouse on this program have meaning for you and other family members in your/their life?
    1. Yes
    2. No

18. If yes, what meaning does it hold for you (e.g., spiritual)?

Program Meaning:

no meaning? (4)	Y / N	° °
learning experience/lesson? (5)	Y / N	° °
life continuity? (6)	Y / N	° °
punishment? (7)	Y / N	° °
appreciate/respect freedom more? (8)	Y / N	° °
paying debt to society? (9)	Y / N	° °
better than jail (10) (not as severe, given a break, can be productive)	Y / N	° °
still trustworthy in court's eyes? (11)	Y / N	° °
more routine life? (12) (associated with alcohol abstinance and program discipline)	Y / N	° °
changed roles in doing hh. chores? (13)	Y / N	° °
feels he has lost freedom? (14)	Y / N	° °
given hime a chance to reflect on his life and/or behavior? (15)	Y / N	° °
feels responsible for future EMP candidates?(16)	Y / N	° °
community, judicial system views him as not so bad or not dangerous? (17)	Y / N	° °
represents a humane image of the CJS?(18)	Y / N	° °
more controlling than intermittent sentence? (19)	Y / N	° °
feels more responsible for rehab. aspect of sentence? (20)	Y / N	° °
he is being unjustly punished? (21)	Y / N	° °
has a disciplining effect? (22)	Y / N	° °
easier to maintain family life, keeps family together? (23)	Y / N	° °
been given a second chance (24)	Y / N	° °
turning point in their life (25)	Y / N	° °

19. Has this helped the family to cope with the placement of your spouse on EMS?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Did meaning help coping with the program? (26)	Y / N	° °

20. Are other family members aware that your spouse is on the program? (nuclear and/or extended)

1. Yes
2. No

21. If so, what family members are aware that your spouse is on the program?

22. How have they responded?

23. How has this affected you?

24. How has this affected (nuclear) family members?

25. If no, why not?

Children aware of program (27)	1=none 2=some 3=most 4=all	° °

Response of Children:

more settled to have father home (e.g., nightmares stopped) (28)	Y / N	° °
child does not understand why his father cannot participate in certain activities (29)	Y / N	° °
appear happy to have father at home (30)	Y / N	° °
wanted him at home (31)	Y / N	° °
difficulty explaining situation to friends (32)	Y / N	° °
pleased that he didn't go to jail (33)	Y / N	° °
teenager feels inconvenienced by phone interuptions (34)	Y / N	° °
daughter has lots of questions (35)	Y / N	° °
caught his son lying (36)	Y / N	° °
feels that it may be strange for his sons to have their father locked up like a "troll" in their house (37)	Y / N	° °
child is angry that father cannot participate in activities outside of the home (38)	Y / N	° °
children were initially uncomfortable (39)	Y / N	° °
acceptable (40)	Y / N	° °

[In some cases the offender spent time in jail before being placed on the program. The child's response is, in these situations, associated with the absence of the father for a short period of time. Some of the above responses were based on the fact that children did not know about the program.]

Reasons child(ren) not told:

1=not close to child 2=children do not have good rel. w/ partner (41) 3=child was too young to understand 4=concerned about the psych. effects of telling children	° °

Other Family members aware (42)	1=none 2=some 3=most 4=all	° °

Response of family members:

1=positive (e.g., supportive) 2=negative (e.g. nonsupportive) (43-44) 3=teasing/joviality 4=neutral (accepted it) 5=no response	° °

[Respondents may have more than one type of response given that respondents reported on the responses of different family members.] If only one response code second response as 0.

Reasons family not aware of program status:

family not close/little contact (45)	Y / N	° °
anticipate negative/ non-supportive response (46)	Y / N	° °
embarrassed (47)	Y / N	° °
did not want to violate partner's trust (48)	Y / N	° °
does not want family to see her as a failure (49)	Y / N	° °
we are not proud of it (ashamed) (50)	Y / N	° °

Effect of Family's response on you:

no effect (51)	Y / N	° °
helpful (52)	Y / N	° °
feels better about circumstances (53)	Y / N	° °
easier to cope with (54)	Y / N	° °
difficult to take at times (55)	Y / N	° °
recognizes his need to feel accepted (56)	Y / N	° °
feels pressure to live up to family expectations (57)	Y / N	° °

26. Is anybody else aware that your spouse is on the program?

27. If yes, how have they responded?

28. How has this affected you?

29. How has their response affected family members?

30. If no, why not?

Others Aware

neighbors (58)	Y / N	° °
close friends (59)	Y / N	° °
employer/boss (60)	Y / N	° °
co-workers (61)	Y / N	° °
everyone else (62)	Y / N	° °

Response of others:	1=positive	° °
	2=negative (63-64)	° °
	3=neutral (e.g. curious)	° °
	4=no response or unaware of response	

(This includes friends, co-workers, boss, neighbors. In some cases, the different responses are discussed as a generalized response.] If only one response code second response as 0.

Reasons for not telling others:

not close (65)	Y / N	° °
embarrassed (66)	Y / N	° °
anticipate nonsupportive response (67)	Y / N	° °
ashamed/humiliated (68)	Y / N	° °
distrust (e.g., may use it against you)(69)	Y / N	° °
husband did not want her to tell anyone(70)	Y / N	° °

Effect of Others response on you:

no effect? (71)	Y / N	° °
helpful? (72)	Y / N	° °
feels better about circumstances? (73)	Y / N	° °
easier to cope with? (74)	Y / N	° °
difficult to take at times? (75)	Y / N	° °
recognizes his need to feel accepted? (76)	Y / N	° °
feels pressure to live up to family expectations? (77)	Y / N	° °

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	°5°

V HOME CONFINEMENT STRAIN

I would now like to ask you about what changes you have experienced in family life since your partner's placement on the EMS program.

Spousal Involvement

1. Prior to EMS, how much time did you spend with your partner on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

Spousal time spent together pre EMP (4)	1-5 scale	° °

2. After EMS, how much time are you spending with your partner on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

Spousal time spent together on EMP (5)	1-5 scale	° °

[Assess whether a change occurred between pre-EMP and EMP time periods]

3. Prior to EMS, what types of activities did you do together with your partner?

4. What types of activities are you now doing with your partner?

5. What are your future expectations about the activities you and your partner will do together?

Change in activities while on EMP (6)	Y / N	° °

Type of change while on EMP:

less active (7)	Y / N	° °
loss of outdoor or outside of home activities (8)	Y / N	° °
engaging in activities alone while partner is at home (9)	Y / N	° °
doing more things together (10)	Y / N	° °

6. How do you view the changes that have occurred in the types of activities that are now done with your spouse?

View of changes in activities:

felt it was restrictive? (11)	Y / N	° °
felt it was disruptive? (12)	Y / N	° °
felt it was frustrating? (13)	Y / N	° °
felt it was annoying? (14)	Y / N	° °
felt it was disappointing? (15)	Y / N	° °
felt it was less disruptive? (16)	Y / N	° °
acceptable? (17)	Y / N	° °
it has helped? (18)	Y / N	° °

Reason(s) for this View:

it was only for a short duration? (19)	Y / N	° °
at least we are together? (20)	Y / N	° °
sensitivity to leaving him alone? (21)	Y / N	° °
felt guilty about going out alone? (22)	Y / N	° °
helped/ learning experience? (23)	Y / N	° °
felt locked up or had difficulty with program discipline? (24)	Y / N	° °
missed doing activities? (25)	Y / N	° °
has been good for us as a couple? (26)	Y / N	° °
makes more demands on her time (controlling)? (27)	Y / N	° °
better communication, talked more (28)	Y / N	° °
didn't feel there was a big change (29)	Y / N	° °
felt guilty because he was depriving his partner of doing things together (30)	Y / N	° °
slowed down his life (31)	Y / N	° °
had difficulty thinking up things to occupy him (32)	Y / N	° °

7. Has your relationship with your partner become more affectionate/loving since being placed on EMS? (or has the quality of your relationship changed?)

Change in spousal relationship:

closer? (33)	Y / N	° °
more affectionate? (34)	Y / N	° °
argued more? (35)	Y / N	° °
more distance/less physical contact? (36)	Y / N	° °
more strained, tension? (37)	Y / N	° °
got to know each other better? (38)	Y / N	° °
relationship was strengthened? (39)	Y / N	° °
less affectionate? (40)	Y / N	° °
no change (41)	Y / N	° °

Your involvement with the Child(ren)

8. Prior to EMS, how much time did you spend with the child(ren) on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

9. After EMS, how much time are you spending with the child(ren) on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

time spent with children pre EMP (42)	1-5 scale	° °

time spent with children on EMP (43)	1-5 scale	° °

[Assess whether there is a difference between pre-EMP and EMP time periods.]

10. Prior to EMS, what types of activities did you do with the child(ren)?

11. After EMS, what types of activities are you doing with the child(ren)?

change in types of activities while on EMP? (44)	Y / N	° °

Type of change while on EMP:

restricted in types of activities (45)	Y / N	° °
loss of participation in activities? (46)	Y / N	° °
took on more responsibility for outdoor activities? (47)	Y / N	° °
talking more? (48)	Y / N	° °
spent more time with son? (49)	Y / N	° °
spent more time playing in home with child? (50)	Y / N	° °
focus on intellectual activities? (51)	Y / N	° °
has more fun with children? (52)	Y / N	° °
conflict over spending time with son vs. partner? (53)	Y / N	° °

12. What are your future expectations about the activities you will be doing together with the child(ren)?

13. How do you view the changes that have occurred in the types of activities that are now done with the child(ren)?

View of changes

1=positive	
2=negative (54-55)	° °
3=neutral (acceptable)	° °

14. Has your relationship with the child(ren) become more affectionate/loving since your partner's placement on EMS?

Change in relationship w/ children

1=closer 2=more affectionate (56) 3=no change 4=more independence from mother 5=more strain with son	° °

Other Involvement with the Child(ren)

15. Prior to EMS, how much time were others (daycare, etc.) spending with the child(ren) on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

16. After EMS, how much time are others spending with the child(ren) on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

time spent with others in home prior to EMP	(57) 1-5 scale	° °
time spent with others on EMP (58)	1-5 scale	° °

[Assess whether there is a difference between pre-EMP and EMP time periods.]

17. Prior to EMS, what types of activities were your child(ren) involved in outside the home?

18. After EMS, what types of activities are your child(ren) involved in outside the home?

19. If there have been changes, how do you view the changes that have occurred?

Familial Involvement

20. Prior to EMS, how much time did the family spend together in the home on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

21. After EMS, how much time is the family spending together on average during a week?

1 2 3 4 5

time spent with family in home prior to EMP	(59) 1-5 scale	° °
time spent with family on EMP (60)	1-5 scale	° °

[Assess whether there is a difference between pre-EMP and EMP time periods.]

22. Prior to EMS, what types of activities did the family do together as a group?

23. After EMS, what types of activities is the family doing together?

24. If there have been changes, how do you view the changes in family activities that have occurred?

25. Has there been changes in the amount of time that family members spend in the home?

1. Yes
2. No

Family spending more time in the home together? (61)	Y / N	° °

26. If yes, what kind of changes have there been.

[see discussion of activities above]

Change in family activities? (62)	Y / N	° °

Type of change in family activities:

less active (63)	Y / N	° °
more home-based (64)	Y / N	° °
spends more time alone away from home (65)	Y / N	° °

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	°6°

Power/Decision-making and Role Changes

27. Do you feel that the way problem/conflict situations are resolved in your family have been affected by EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

28. If yes, how has this been affected by EMS?

29. Have there been changes over time in the way in which the family copes with these types of situations?

Change in handling conflict situations? (4)	Y / N	° °

Types of Changes in handling conflict:

more discussion? (5)	Y / N	° °
resolve more issues? (6)	Y / N	° °
husband cannot actively participate? (7)	Y / N	° °
less discussion? (8)	Y / N	° °
confront more issues? (9)	Y / N	° °
less conflict/arguments? (10)	Y / N	° °
more stress since no outlet for stress(11)	Y / N	° °

30. Do you feel you have lost any control or influence over your home life as a result of EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

31. If yes, what influence or control have you lost?

Loss of control over home life? (12)	Y / N	° °

Effect of influence lost:

1=positive 2=negative (13) 3=neutral	° °

32. Do you feel that the program has in any way changed the way decisions are made with your spouse?

__ areas where you now have more control or influence
__ areas where you less control or influence
__ areas where your partner has more control
__ areas where your partner has less control

Changes in decision-making:

more control (e.g.) (14)	Y / N	° °
less control (15)	Y / N	° °
partner less control (16)	Y / N	° °
partner more control (17)	Y / N	° °
no change (18)	Y / N	° °

33. Have any of the following areas of home life been affected as result of placement of your spouse on EMS:

__ household chores
__ home maintenance
__ household management
__ child-care responsibilities
__ finances
__ other _____

Areas of home life effected:

household chores (19)	Y / N	° °
home maintenance (20)	Y / N	° °
household management (21)	Y / N	° °
finance (22)	Y / N	° °
development of hobbies/ projects (23)	Y / N	° °
he has better time management (24)	Y / N	° °
childcare responsibilities (25)	Y / N	° °

34. Have responsibilities or roles shifted in any of these areas?
    1. Yes
    2. No

35. If so, what kind of changes have occurred?

Responsibilities shifted in Areas? (26)	Y / N	° °

Types of Shifts in Responsibility:

more resp. for household chores (27)	Y / N	° °
more resp. for household management (28)	Y / N	° °
more resp. for home maintenance (29)	Y / N	° °
more resp. for childcare (30)	Y / N	° °
spouse has more resp. for household chores	(31) Y / N	° °
spouse has more resp. for household management (32)	Y / N	° °
spouse has more resp. for home maintenance	Y / N (33)	° °
spouse has more resp. for childcare (34)	Y / N	° °

36. Has this created any difficulties or problems for family members.

Types of Difficulties created by the change:

more arguments? (35)	Y / N	° °
difficulty in handling chores, childcare responsibilities alone? (36)	Y / N	° °
feels more pressure, stress associated with increased responsibility? (37)	Y / N	° °
frustration over not being able to do things (38)	Y / N	° °
no problem? (39)	Y / N	° °

37. Are family members working together to deal with these changes?

Working together to deal with the change? (40)	Y / N 3=unsure	° °

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	°7°

Relatives and Other Networks

38. What type of involvement does the family have with the community?

Community Involvement? (4)	Y / N	° °

39. Has the amount of time you spend with relatives changed since your partner's placement on EMS? (increase or decrease)

Change in times spent with Relatives

1=increase 2=decrease (5) 3=no change	° °

40. If so, how much as the amount of time you spend with relatives changed?

1 2 3 4 5

Amount of change in time spent w/ relatives (6)	1-5 scale	° °

41. Has the amount of time you spend with friends changed since your partner's placement on EMS? (increase or decrease)

Change in time Spent with Friends

1=increase 2=decrease (7) 3=no change	° °

42. If so, how much as the amount of time you spend with friends changed?

1 2 3 4 5

Amount of change in time spent w/ friends (8)	1-5 scale	° °

43. Have any family members received support or help from any of the following since your partner's placement on EMS?

__ family
__ friends
__ social service agencies
__ church
__ professional counselling and help
__ other community organization or group
__ other _____

Family Members received Support from

family (9)	Y / N	° °
friends (10)	Y / N	° °
social service agency (11)	Y / N	° °
church / religious organization (12)	Y / N	° °
professional counselling (13)	Y / N	° °
AA sponsor (14)	Y / N	° °
community organization (15)	Y / N	° °
received no support (16)	Y / N	° °
work associates (17)	Y / N	° °

44. Where was the most support received?

Received most Support from :

family (18)	Y / N	° °
friends (19)	Y / N	° °
social service agency (20)	Y / N	° °
church/religion (21)	Y / N	° °
professional counselling (22)	Y / N	° °
AA sponsor (23)	Y / N	° °
A&D program (24)	Y / N	° °
community organization (25)	Y / N	° °

45. What type of assistance or support did family members receive?

Type of assistance received:

emotional/moral (26)	Y / N	° °
financial (27)	Y / N	° °
practical (28)	Y / N	° °
counselling (29)	Y / N	° °
educational (30)	Y / N	° °

46. Did family members feel that they received the support they needed?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Family members received support they needed? (31)	Y / N	° °

47. Did the support family members needed change over time?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Change in support needed over time? (32)	Y / N	° °

48. If yes, how did the support needed change? [were there times when more support was needed?]

Most support needed:

1=initial part of program 2=middle part of the program (33-34) 3=at the end of the program 4=throughout program 5=related to specific event	° ° ° °

49. Do you feel that the support network you have for dealing with stress and other types of difficulties has been available to you on the EMS program?

Support Network available on EMP? (35)	Y / N	° °

50. What has the response of the EMS corrections staff been like?

[not sure if this question is too sensitive to code?]

51. Have the corrections staff adequately explained the program to you?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Adequate explanation of program? (36)	Y / N	° °

[more detail here?]

52. Have you requested the assistance of corrections staff?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Requested assistance of corrections staff? (37)	Y / N	° °

Staff response to requests:

1=helpful/accomodating 2=slow time response (38) 3=request denied	° °

53. What type of assistance did you ask for?

Type of assistance requested:

requested change in work scheduling? (39)	Y / N	° °
requested overtime at work? (40)	Y / N	° °
requested information about the program? (41)	Y / N	° °
requested time out for shopping/banking? (42)	Y / N	° °
requested time out for medical reasons? (43)	Y / N	° °
requested time out for job search? (44)	Y / N	° °
requested time out or chane in time for recreation? (45)	Y / N	° °
requested time out for holiday festivities? (46)	Y / N	° °
requested assistance with parole paperwork? (47)	Y / N	° °
referral for counselling (48)	Y / N	° °

54. How did they respond?

55. Do you feel that you could get assistance if you need it from program staff?

56. Is there anything that you have felt reluctant or hesitant to ask the staff about?

57. How have periodic checks by the corrections staff affected family members and home life?

Affect of Periodic checks:

checks not inconvenience/accepted it? (49)	Y / N	° °
checks were embarrassing? (50)	Y / N	° °
checks resulted in keeping house tidier (household management)? (51)	Y / N	° °
checks associated with worrying about discovery? (52)	Y / N	° °
annoyance associated with time of checks? (53	Y / N	° °
checks disturbed sex life/intimacy? (54)	Y / N	° °
checks effected dinner scheduling? (55)	Y / N	° °
checks had no effect? (56)	Y / N	° °

Affect of Equipment:

apprehensive about discovery? (57)	Y / N	° °
made excuses about phone interruptions? (58)	Y / N	° °
interupted phone calls? (59)	Y / N	° °
nervous about time restrictions? (60)	Y / N	° °
concerned about concealing bracelet? (61)	Y / N	° °
bracelet is uncomfortable (62)	Y / N	° °
device in home made her feel uncomfortable (63)	Y / N	° °

58. Has your partner's being on the program affected any family member's involvement with the community?

1. Yes
2. No

Community involvement Affected (64)	Y / N	° °

59. If yes, how has it affected their involvement with the community?

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	°8°

60. Has your partner's being on the EMS program affected any family member's work?

1. Yes
2. No

Change with work? (4)	Y / N	° °

61. If yes, how has it affected their work?

Type of change with work:

scheduling difficulties with work? (5)	Y / N	° °
quit job? (6)	Y / N	° °
changed job? (7)	Y / N	° °
restricted work activities? (8)	Y / N	° °
restricted the amount of overtime hours? (9)	Y / N	° °
worked more (10)	Y / N	° °
felt isolated at work (11)	Y / N	° °
more energy for work (12)	Y / N	° °
nervous about time restrictions (13)	Y / N	° °

Associated reasons for changes with work:

type of work required frequent location changes (14)	Y / N	° °
did not want to burden staff with request? (15)	Y / N	° °
required sufficient notice (16)	Y / N	° °
did not want boss to find out (17)	Y / N	° °
could not socialize with business associates (18)	Y / N	° °
could not work at home on his own projects	Y / N	° °
partner worked more	Y / N	° °
corrections staff denied request	Y / N	° °
conflicted with spouse's community hours	Y / N	° °
alcohol abstinance	Y / N	° °

62. Has your partner's being on the EMS program affected any family member's education?

1. Yes
2. No

63. If yes, how has it affected their education?

64. Has your partner's being on the EMS program affected any family member's social activities?

1. Yes
2. No

65. If yes, how has it affected their social activities?

Affect on Social Activities:

see less of friends? (24)	Y / N	° °
see less of family? (25)	Y / N	° °
more home entertainment? (26)	Y / N	° °
apprehension about having visitors in the home? (27)	Y / N	° °
feels upset when wife goes out? (28)	Y / N	° °
did not want to leave spouse alone? (29)	Y / N	° °
feels guilty about going out? (30)	Y / N	° °
wanted to be with spouse? (31)	Y / N	° °
can't do things together? (32)	Y / N	° °
can't go out and visit/do activities/socilize? (33)	Y / N	° °

(collapse above with activities?)

66. Do you feel more isolated from your friends than before your partner was placed on EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

67. If yes, how has this affected you?

Feel isolated from friends (34)	Y / N	° °

Affect of Isolation from friends:

missed friends? (35)	Y / N	° °
depression? (36)	Y / N	° °
no effect? (37)	Y / N	° °
accepted it as it was only a short duration? (38)	Y / N	° °
hindered development friendships? (39)	Y / N	° °
felt bothered by the isolation? (40)	Y / N	° °
wished he could get out more (41)	Y / N	° °
put strain on their relationship (42)	Y / N	° °
accepted it as it was better as contrasted to jail (43)	Y / N	° °
good time for reflection on life (44)	Y / N	° °

68. Do you feel more isolated from other family members than you did before your partner was placed on EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

69. If yes, how has this affected you?

Isolation from family (45)	Y / N	° °

Affect of isolation from family:

1=distancing from family 2=holding back things that were on her mind 3=frustrating (46-47) 4=loss of activities		° ° ° °

70. Do you feel more isolated from the community than you did before your partner was placed on EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

71. If yes, how has this affected you?

Isolation from Community (48)	Y / N	° °

Affect of Isolation from Community:

misses activity (49)	Y / N	° °
not involved as much (50)	Y / N	° °
feels guilty about lack of involvement (51)	Y / N	° °
not sure of how community views him (52)	Y / N	° °

74. Has the amount of privacy that family members have changed since your partner's placement on EMS?

1. Yes
2. No

Change in privacy? (60)	Y / N	° °

75. If yes, how has this changed?

76. How has this affected you?

Type of change in privacy:

restricts being alone with partner? (61)	Y / N	° °
restricts romantic time with partner? (62)	Y / N	° °
structure life around visits? (63)	Y / N	° °
not as relaxed at home? (64)	Y / N	° °
uncomfortable if not dressed? (65)	Y / N	° °
feeling of being watched (big brother)? (66)	Y / N	° °
gov't vehicle was conspicuous? (67)	Y / N	° °
don't always want people around? (68)	Y / N	° °
bothered by the disruption of visits (69)	Y / N	° °
visits to home were disruptive (70)	Y / N	° °
no time alone in home	Y / N	° °
family is different from next door neighbour	Y / N	° °

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3)	no special code	°9°

II EVALUATION AND FUTURE EXPECTATIONS

1. What do you think your life will be like after the program?

Life after program:

neutral (e.g., resume) (4)	Y / N	° °
positive change (5)	Y / N	° °
negative change (6)	Y / N	° °

2. Do you feel that EMS will have any long-term impact on your life?

Long term Effect of the program:

learned a lesson? (7)	Y / N	° °
discipline? (8)	Y / N	° °
memory of situation? (9)	Y / N	° °
learned more about self? (10)	Y / N	° °
deterrent? (11)	Y / N	° °
helped relationship -closeness? (12)	Y / N	° °
spouse has more patience? (13)	Y / N	° °
more comfortable being at home? (14)	Y / N	° °
more assertive? (15)	Y / N	° °
life continuity? (16)	Y / N	° °
got a break? (17)	Y / N	° °
learned to do things in the home unit (18)	Y / N	° °
thought about/ re-evaluated life situation / his behavior (19)	Y / N	° °
none? (20)	Y / N	° °

3. Do you feel that there is anything that could have been done to make the program easier to adjust to or to cope with?

Changes that would Make the program Easier to Cope with:

smaller bracelet (21)	Y / N	° °
time out (22)	Y / N	° °
didn't need community hours (23)	Y / N	° °
be allowed to work in yard/ garage (24)	Y / N	° °
more counselling (25)	Y / N	° °
orientation for family members and \or more information about the program (26)	Y / N	° °
nothing (27)	Y / N	° °
easier if person is working (28)	Y / N	° °
needs more of a rehabilitation component for alcoholics (29)	Y / N	° °

4. What has been most helpful to you?

Most helpful thing on the program:

spouse is at home? (30)	Y / N	° °
family support? (31)	Y / N	° °
on program rather than in jail? (32)	Y / N	° °
support of friends? (33)	Y / N	° °
partner's support? (34)	Y / N	° °
contract work with corrections? (35)	Y / N	° °
flexibility of program staff? (36)	Y / N	° °
playing computer games (ninetendo)? (37)	Y / N	° °
being able to exercise? (38)	Y / N	° °
having two hours out / time out? (39)	Y / N	° °
having partner's support w/children? (40)	Y / N	° °
being able to resume family life, be at home with family? (41)	Y / N	° °

positive\supportive attitute of program staff? (42)	Y / N	° °
being occupied by studying? (43)	Y / N	° °
program discipline on spouse? (44)	Y / N	° °
knowing his family need him? (45)	Y / N	° °
still able to be productive? (46)	Y / N	° °
stability associated with spouse not drinking? (47)	Y / N	° °
greater communication w/ partner? (48)	Y / N	° °
spouse could get back to work (49)	Y / N	° °
spouse could contribute financially (50)	Y / N	° °
nothing? (51)	Y / N	° °
A & D program / education (52)	Y / N	° °
time to reflect on life (53)	Y / N	° °
shortness of the program (54)	Y / N	° °

5. If you had the power, what changes would you make to the program?

Changes to Program:

increase or allow for exercise time? (55)	Y / N	° °
allow for family time? (56)	Y / N	° °
Allow for time out? (57)	Y / N	° °
extend boundaries to yard and garage? (58)	Y / N	° °
allow participation in childcare respon. outside of the home? (59)	Y / N	° °
back up system in case of power failure? (60)	Y / N	° °
training in positive thinking for officers? (61)	Y / N	° °
counselling available for families/individuals? (62)	Y / N	° °
explain program to spouse? (63)	Y / N	° °
officers should spend more time to assess how family is doing (64)	Y / N	° °
education for parole officers (65	Y / N	° °
psychological screening for offenders (66)	Y / N	° °
gradual extension of privileges (67)	Y / N	° °
no change? (68)	Y / N	° °
smaller bracelet (69)	Y / N	° °
more information on program guidelines (70)	Y / N	° °
should be more individualized to the offender (71)	Y / N	° °
make better use of offender's time (72)	Y / N	° °
need flexibility with respect to doing community hours (73)	Y / N	° °
closer monitoring, particularly of problem cases (74)	Y / N	° °
more counselling / motivation for rehabilitation (75)	Y / N	° °
allow more flexibility with work scheduling (76)	Y / N	° °
alcohol restrictions shouldn't apply to those without problem (77)	Y / N	° °

1. Identification Code (1-2)	01-54	° °
Record Number (3-4)	no special code	°10°

6. Any advice to others whose partners are going to be placed on the program?

Advice to Others:

follow the rules (includes not drinking)? (5)	Y / N	° °
engage in hobbies? (6)	Y / N	° °
one day at a time? (7)	Y / N	° °
be patient? (8)	Y / N	° °
set ground rule with partner? (9)	Y / N	° °
think of the positive aspects? (10)	Y / N	° °
provide support to partner (e.g., do extras, give him some space, etc.)? (11)	Y / N	° °
good to have a support network? (12)	Y / N	° °
entertain more at home? (13)	Y / N	° °
it's better than going to jail? (14)	Y / N	° °
go for counselling as partner is sober? (15)	Y / N	° °
not as easy/less freedom than you think? (16)	Y / N	° °
good program for families? (17)	Y / N	° °
deal with your problems at the start (18)	Y / N	° °
have someone to talk to other than your partner (19)	Y / N	° °
thinking about his family helps keep him within the rules (20)	Y / N	° °
know all your options / information about the program before placement on the program (21)	Y / N	° °
no advice (22)	Y / N	° °
good program as partner cannot go out drinking (23)	Y / N	° °
when asking for time out be liberal (24)	Y / N	° °
keep working (25)	Y / N	° °
a lot of restrictions like jail (26)	Y / N	° °

7. How would you feel if your spouse's EMS sentence was longer?

Response to Longer Sentence

acceptable (would adapt) (27)	Y / N	° °
not acceptable (28)	Y / N	° °
would have difficulty (29)	Y / N	° °

Reasons for Response:

more fighting/arguing would occur (30)	Y / N	° °
need to loosen up on restrictions (31)	Y / N	° °
wouldn't want to put his family through it (32)	Y / N	° °
feels guilty when he can't do things (33)	Y / N	° °
better than going to jail (34)	Y / N	° °
would mean putting off plans (35)	Y / N	° °
would need something constructive to do (36)	Y / N	° °
difficult with type of job (37)	Y / N	° °
whole family is stuck in the home (38)	Y / N	° °
difficult to get on with life (39)	Y / N	° °
discipline is difficult (40)	Y / N	° °
it would just be a lengthier time to wait (41)	Y / N	° °
frustrations would grow (42)	Y / N	° °
may cause you to break the rules (43)	Y / N	° °
doesn't go out a lot anyway (44)	Y / N	° °
would destroy the family (45)	Y / N	° °
inconveniences would become problems (as you can only put things off for a short period of time) (46)	Y / N	° °
more stress would result (47)	Y / N	° °
it would put stress on the relationship (48)	Y / N	° °
it would begin to effect my work (49)	Y / N	° °
gives you extra time to do hobbies (50)	Y / N	° °
hard to deal with problems that require intervention outside of the home (51)	Y / N	° °
family would need someone to come in and provide support (52)	Y / N	° °
couple/family would grow apart (separation of activities) (53)	Y / N	° °
makes it difficult to get a job (54)	Y / N	° °
difficult if not working (55)	Y / N	° °
discipline would be more difficult (56)	Y / N	° °
longer waiting period for the family to do things together (57)	Y / N	° °
still paying his taxes (58)	Y / N	° °
wouldn't change anything (59)	Y / N	° °
disciplining effect is good (i.e., he has abstained from alcohol) (60)	Y / N	° °
would feel more pressure to reveal situation to her partner (61)	Y / N	° °
better chance for rehab. (since more likely to stop drinking) (62)	Y / N	° °
likes the stability (associated with spouse not drinking) (63)	Y / N	° °

8. How would that affect the family?

9. How would you feel if your partner was placed on EMS again?

FAMILY BACKGROUND

I would like to ask you some background information about your family.

1. Number of years together:_____

2. Number of children:_____ Ages:_____

3. Previously married?____ Separated____ Divorced?____

4. If yes, are any of your child(ren) from a previous marriage (or relationship)?
   1. Yes
   2. No

5. If yes, are they presently living with you?
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Do you have other co-residents?
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. If yes, what is their relation to you?
   1. Friend
   2. Relative. List type _____

8. Whose relatives do you have most contact with?
   __ yours
   __ partner's/spouse's
   __ equal

9. How are child care responsibilities distributed in your family?
   __ wife is primarily responsible
   __ husband is primarily responsible
   __ responsibility is shared
   __ other _____

10. How are chores distributed in your family?
    __ wife is primarily responsible
    __ husband is primarily responsible
    __ responsibility is shared
    __ other _____

11. How is household maintenance distributed in your family?
    __ wife is primarily responsible
    __ husband is primarily responsible
    __ responsibility is shared
    __ other _____

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Date:_____ Length of Interview:_____

Place of Interview:_____

Sex: M / F Age:_____

What is the highest grade or level of education you have completed?
__ some high school
__ completed grade 12
__ some community or technical college
__ completed community or technical college
__ some university
__ completed university

What is your present occupation:_____

Usual Occupation:_____ How long?____ FT/PT

Annual (Gross) Income: <$5,000__ $5,000-$9,999__ $10,000-$14,999__ $15,000-$19,999__ $20,000-$24,999__
$25,000-$29,999__ $30,000-$34,999__ >$34,999__

Have there been any changes in income level as a result of placement on the EMS program?
1. Yes
2. No

What happened to your income:
__ increase
__ decrease
__ stay the same
__ other _____

Ethnic Group:_____

Religious Affiliation:_____

Date of charge: _____

Charge under current sentence:_____

Date of placement on EMS:_____

Length of EMS placement:_____

Charge under current sentence:_____

Have you ever served a sentence in a correctional institution/prison?
1. Yes
2. No

FACES

Directions: I would like to know about the type of family you have or how things are structured in your family. Please circle the number that best describes your family situation.

1	2	3	4	5
almost never	once in a while	sometimes	frequently	almost always

---

DESCRIBE YOUR FAMILY NOW:

1. Family members ask each other for help.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. In solving problems, the child(ren)'s suggestions are followed?

   1 2 3 4 5

3. You approve of each others friends.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. Child(ren) have a say in their discipline.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. We like to do things with just our immediate family.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. Different persons act as leaders in our family.

   1 2 3 4 5

7. Family members feel closer to other family members than to people outside the family.

   1 2 3 4 5

8. Our family changes its way of handling tasks.

   1 2 3 4 5

9. Family members like to spend their free time with each other.

   1 2 3 4 5

10. Parent(s) and children discuss punishment together.

1 2 3 4 5

11. Family members feel very close to each.

1 2 3 4 5

12. The children make decisions in our family.

1 2 3 4 5

13. When our family gets together for activities, everybody is present.

1 2 3 4 5

14. Rules change in our family.

1 2 3 4 5

15. We can easily think of things to do together as a family.

1 2 3 4 5

16. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.

1 2 3 4 5

17. Family members consult other family members on their decisions.

1 2 3 4 5

18. It is hard to identify the leader(s) in our family.

1 2 3 4 5

19. Family togetherness is very important.

1 2 3 4 5

20. It is hard to tell who does which household chores.

1 2 3 4 5

Communication:

Response Choices				
1 Strongly Disagree	2 Moderately Disagree	3 Neither Agree Nor Disagree	4 Moderately Agree	5 Strongly Agree

1. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my partner.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. When we are having a problem, my partner often gives me the silent treatment.

   1 2 3 4 5

3. My partner sometimes makes comments which put me down.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. I am sometimes afraid to ask my partner for what I want.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. I wish my partner was more willing to share his/her feelings with me.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my partner tells me.

   1 2 3 4 5

7. I often do not tell my partner what I am feeling because he/she should already know.

   1 2 3 4 5

8. I am very satisfied with how my partner and I talk with each other.

   1 2 3 4 5

9. I do not always share negative feelings I have about my partner because I am afraid he/she will get angry.

   1 2 3 4 5

10. My partner is a good listener.

    1 2 3 4 5

FAMILY LIFE EVENTS

I would like to know about changes that occur in the course of family life. I would like to know if any of these changes happened to a member of your family--including you.

"DID THE CHANGE HAPPEN IN YOUR FAMILY?" [*Past Changes*]

In the Year Prior to the Charge (please circle yes or no)

I. Intrafamily Strains

1. Increase of husband/father's time away from the family.

2. Increase of wife/mother's time away from family.

3. A member appears to have emotional problems.

4. A member appears to depend on alcohol or drugs.

II. Marital Strains

5. Spouse/parent was separated or divorced.

III. Childbearing Strains

6. Spouse had a difficult pregnancy.

IV. Finance and Business Strains

7. Increased financial debts.

8. Went on social assistance.

9. Change in conditions (economic, political, weather) that hurts family investments and/or income.

10. A member started a new business.

11. Purchased or built a home.

V. Work - Family Transitions and Strains

12. A member changed to a new job/career.

13. A member lost or quit a job.

14. A member retired from work.

15. A member started or returned to work.

VI Illness and Family Care Strains

16. Family member becomes seriously ill.

17. Close relative or friend of the family became seriously ill.

18. Close relative or friend of the family became seriously ill or injured.

VII. Losses

19. A parent/spouse died.

20. A child member died.

21. Death of a family member and/or close relative.

22. Close friend of the family died.

23. Married son or daughter was separated or divorced.

IX. Family Violations

24. A member ran away from home.

[*Present Changes*]

"DID THE CHANGE HAPPEN IN YOUR FAMILY?"

After the Charge (please circle yes or no)

I. Intrafamily Strains

1. Increase of husband/father's time away from the family.
2. Increase of wife/mother's time away from family.
3. A member appears to have emotional problems.
4. A member appears to depend on alcohol or drugs.
5. Increase in conflict between husband and wife.
6. Increase in arguments between parents and child(ren).
7. Increase in conflict among child(ren) in the family.
8. Increased difficulty in managing child(ren).
9. Increase in the number of problems or issues that do not get resolved.
10. Increased conflict with in-laws or relatives.

II. Marital Strains

11. Spouse/parent was separated or divorced.

12. Increased difficulty in resolving issues with a "former" or separated spouse.

III. Childbearing Strains

13. Spouse had a difficult pregnancy.

14. A member gave birth to or adopted a child.

IV. Finance and Business Strains

15. Increased financial debts.

16. Went on social assistance.

17. Change in conditions (economic, political, weather) that hurts family investments and/or income.

18. A member started a new business.

19. Purchased or built a home.

20. Delay in receiving child support or alimony payments.

V. Work - Family Transitions and Strains

21. A member changed to a new job/career.

22. A member lost or quit a job.

23. A member retired from work.

24. A member started or returned to work.

25. A member stopped working for an extended period (e.g., laid off, leave of absence, strike).

26. Decrease in satisfaction with job/career.

27. A member was promoted at work or given more responsibilities.

28. Family moved to a new home/apartment.

VI Illness and Family Care Strains

29. Family member becomes seriously ill.

30. Close relative or friend of the family became seriously ill.

31. Close relative or friend of the family became seriously ill or injured.

32. Increased responsibility to provide direct care or financial help to husband's and/or wife's parent(s).

33. Experienced difficulty in arranging for satisfactory child care.

VII. Losses

34. A parent/spouse died.

35.A child member died.

36. Death of a family member and/or close relative.

37. Close friend of the family died.

38. Married son or daughter was separated or divorced.

VIII. Transitions "In and Out"

39. A member was married.

40. Young adult member left home.

41. A member moved back home or a new person moved into the household.

42. A spouse started school (or training program) after being away from school for a long time.

IX. Family Violations

43. A member ran away from home.

44. A member dropped out of school or was suspended from school.

VI LIFE SATISFACTION SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: We would like to know how you feel about various aspects of your life in general. For each question, please circle the number under the response which best represents how you feel.

1. How do you feel about the lower mainland of British Columbia as a place to live in?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. And what about your particular neighbourhood. All things considered, how do you feel about your neighbourhood as a place to live?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. How do you feel about your house or apartment?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. How do you feel about the <u>amount</u> of education you have received?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. How do you feel about your job?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. How do you feel about the amount of fun and enjoyment you have?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. Of course most people get sick now and then, but overall, how do you feel about your own health?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. How do you feel about the income you and your family have?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. All things considered, how do you feel about your marriage or relationship? Which number comes closest to how satisfied you feel?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. All things considered, how do you feel about your family life - the time you spend and the things you do with members of your family?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. In general, how do you feel about your life as a whole?

Delighted	Pleased	Mostly Satisfied	Mixed	Mostly Dissatisfied	Unhappy	Terrible
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

REFERENCES

Anderson, B.S. and Zinsser, J.P. (1988). **A History of Their Own: Women in Europe From Prehistory to the Present Volume I.** New York: Harper & Row.

Anderson, M. (1971). **Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aries, P. (1962). **Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life.** (R. Baldick, Trans.) New York: Knopf.

Aries, P. (1979). The Family and the City in the Old World and the New. In V. Tufte and B. Myerhoff (eds.), **Changing Images of the Family.** London: Yale University Press.

Austin, J. and Krisberg B. (1981). Wider, Stronger and Different Nets: The Dialectics of Criminal Justice Reform. **Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.** 18 (1): 165-196.

Austin, J. and Krisberg, B.(1982). The Unmet Promise of Alternatives to Incarceration. **Crime and Delinquency,** 28: 374-409.

Ball, R.A. and Lilly, J.R. (1985). Home Incarceration: An International Alternative to Institutional Incarceration. **International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice,** 9(3), 85-97.

Ball, R.A. and Lilly, J.R. (1986). A Theoretical Examination of Home Incarceration, **Federal Probation,** 50, 17-24.

Ball, R.A. and Lilly, J.R. (1986). The Potential Use of Home Incarceration for Drunken Drivers, **Crime and Delinquency,** 32, 224-247.

Ball, R.A. and Lilly, J.R. (1988). Home Incarceration with Electronic Monitoring. In Joseph E. Scott and Travis Hirshi (eds.) **Controversial Issues in Crime and Justice.** Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Ball, R.A., Huff, C.R. and Lilly, J.R. (1988). **House Arrest and Correctional Policy: Doing Time at Home.** Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Baumer, T.L. and Mendelsohn, R.I. (1988). Correctional Goals and Home Detention: A Preliminary Empirical Assessment. Paper presented to the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 9-12.

Baumer, T.L. and Mendelsohn, R.I. (1990). **The Electronic Monitoring of Nonviolent Convicted Felons: An Experiment in Home Detention, Final Report.** Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Baumer, T.L. and Mendelsohn, R.I. (1991). Electronically Monitored Home Confinement: Does It Work? In Byrne J.M. and Lurigio A. (Eds.), **Smart Sentencing? An Examination of the Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions.** Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Beck, B. (1969). Issues in the Use of an Electronic Rehabilitation System for Chronic Recidivists, **Law and Society Review,** 3, 611.

Beck, B. (1979). The Limits of Deinstitutionalization. In M. Lewis (ed.), **Research in Social Problems and Public Policy.**

Bennett, J. (1984). The Tie that Binds: Peasant Marriages and Peasant Families in Late Medieval England. **Journal of Interdisciplinary History**, 15, 111-129.

Berkner, L.K. (1972). Rural Family Organization in Europe: A Problem in Comparative History. **Peasant Studies Newsletter,** 1, 145-156.

Berry, B. (1985). Electronic Jails: A New Criminal Justice Concern. **Justice Quarterly,** 2, 1-24.

Berry, B. (1986). More Questions and More Ideas on Electronic Monitoring: Response to Lilly, Ball and Lotz, **Justice Quarterly**. 3 (5): 363-70.

Berry, B. and Matthews, R. (1989). Making the Right Connections: Electronic Monitoring and House Arrest. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Washington.

Boyd, N. (ed.) (1986). **The Social Dimensions of Law.** Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

Burkhart, W.R. (1986). Intensive Probation Supervision: An Agenda for Research and Evaluation, **Federal Probation,** June, 75-77.

Burman, S. (ed.) (1979). **Fit Work for Women.** London: Croom Helm in association with Oxford University Women's Studies Committee; Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Burr, W. (1982). Families Under Stress. In H.I. McCubbin, A.E. Cauble and J.M. Patterson (eds.) **Family Stress, Coping, and Social Support.** Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Burr, W.R. (1973). **Theory Construction and the Sociology of the Family.** New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Burtch, B.E. (1986). Electronic Monitoring of Offenders: Public Safety, Safeguards, and Costs. Prisoners' Rights Sub-Committee, British Columbia Civil Liberties Association.

Burtch, B.E. (1988). State Control, Technology, and Community: The Politics of Electronic Monitoring of Offenders. Unpublished Manuscript, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University.

Burtch, B.E. (1989). Position Statement on Electronic Monitoring of Offenders. **The Democratic Commitment,** 23 (1), 3-7.

Casey, J. (1989). **The History of the Family.** Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Chan, J.B.L. and Ericson, R.V. (1981). **Decarceration and the Economy of Penal Reform**. Toronto, University of Toronto Centre of Criminology, Research Report, no. 14.

Cobb, S. (1979). Social Support and health through the life course. In M.W. Riley (Ed.), **Aging from Birth to Death.** Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cohen, S. (1979). The Punitive City: Notes on the Dispersal of Social Control. **Contemporary Crisis,** Oct., 343- .

Cohen, S. (1985). **Visions of Social Control.** Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cohen, S. and Scull, A. (1983). **Social Control and the State: Comparative and Historical Essays.**

Corbett, Jr., R.P. and Fersch, E.A. (1985). Home as Prison: The Use of House Arrest. **Federal Probation,** 49, 13-17.

Cromwell, R.E. and Olson, D.H. (1975). **Power in Families.** New York: Wiley.

Culhane, C. and Martin, D. (1989). Panel Discussion on Electronic Bracelet Monitoring Program., Sponsored by Elizabeth Fry Society, Toronto, Ontario.

Currie, E. (1985). **Confronting Crime: An American Challenge.**

del Carmen, R. V. and Vaughn, J.B. (1986). Legal Issues in the Use of Electronic Surveillance in Probation. **Federal Probation,** 50, 60-69.

Demos, John (1970). **A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Douglas, P. (1968). **American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education.** New York: AMS Press. HD 4885 U5 D63

Duby, G. (1978). **Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-Century France.** Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. HQ 513 D8 On Reserve

Duby, G. (1992). **A History of Women in the West.** Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Eichler, M. (1983). **Families in Canada Today: Recent Changes and Their Policy Consequences.** Toronto: Gage Publishing Limited.

Farber, B. (1972). **Guardians of Virture: Salem Families in 1800.** New York: Basic Books.

Flandrin, J.L. (1979). **Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household, and Sexuality.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, D. and Schmidt, A.K. (1985). Electronically Monitored Home Confinement. **National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Reports,** Nov. 2-6.

Fox, R.G. (1987). Dr. Scheitzgebel's Machine Revisited: Electronic Monitoring of Offenders. **Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology,** 20, 131-147.

Friel, C.M. and Vaughn, J. (1986). A Consumers Guide to Electronic Monitoring of Probationers. **Federal Probation,** 50, 3-14.

Friel, C.M., Vaughn, J. and del Carmen, R. (1987). **Electronic Monitoring and Correctional Policy: The Technology and Its Application.** National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.

Gable, R.K. (formerly Schwitzgebel, R.K.) (1986). Application of Personal Telemonitoring to Current Problems in Corrections. **Journal of Criminal Justice,** 14, 167-176.

Garland, D. (1985). **Punishment and Welfare: A History of Penal Strategies.** Hants, England: Grower Publishing Company, Ltd.

Gelles, R.J. and Cornell, C.P. (1985). **Intimate Violence in Families.** Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

George, L. (1980). **Role Transitions in Later Life.** Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Gerety, P. (1980). A French Program to Reduce Pretrial Detention. **Crime and Delinquency,** 26, 22-34.

Gettinger, S. (1984). **Assessing Criminal Justice Needs.** National Institute of Justice Research in Brief. Rockville, MD: NCJRS.

Gies, Frances and Gies, Joseph (1987). **Marriage and the Family in the Middle Ages.** New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Gillis, J.R. (1985). **For Better, For Worse: British Marriages, 1600 to the Present.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Gittins, D. (1985). **The Family in Question: Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies.** London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd.

Goffman, E. (1959). **The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.** New York: Doubleday.

Goode, W. (1963). **World Revolution and Family Patterns.** New York: Basic Books.

Greven, P.J. (1970). **Four Generations: Population, Land and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts.** Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Greenburg, D. (1975). Problems in Community Corrections. **Issues in Criminology,** 10, 1-33.

Hanawalt, B.A. (1986). **The Ties That Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England.** New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Hansen, D. and Hill, R. (1964). Families under Stress. In H. Christensen (Ed.), **Handbook of Marriage and the Family**. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hayden, D. (1981). **The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities.** Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. HQ 1426 H33

Hayden, D. (1984). **Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work and Family Life.** New York: Norton.

Herlihy, D. (1983). The Making of the Medieval Family: Symmetry, Structure, and Sentiment. **Journal of Family History,** 8, 116-130.

Herlihy, D. (1985). **Medieval Households.** Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hill, R. (1949). **Families Under Stress.** New York: Harper & Row.

Hill, R. (1958). Generic features of families under stress. **Social Casework,** 39, 139-150.

Hilton, R. (1975). **The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages.** Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Holroyd, J. (1974). The Questionnaire on Resources and Stress: An Instrument to Measure Family Response to a Handicapped Family Member. **"Journal of Community Psychology.** January, 2, 92-94.

Hughes, Diane (1975). Domestic Ideals and Social Behavior: Evidence from Genoa. In Charles E. Rosenberg (ed.) **The Family in History.** Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hylton, J.H. (1980) Evaluating Correctional Programs: The Case for Qualitative Research. **Crime et/and Justice,** 7-8, 198-208.

Hylton, J.H. (1981). **Reintegrating the Offender: Assessing the Impact of Community Corrections.** Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Hylton, J.H. (1982). Rhetoric and Reality: A Critical Appraisal of Community Correctional Programs. **Crime and Delinquency,** 28, 314-373.

Ingraham, B.L. and Smith, G.W. (1970). Controlling Human Behavior with Electronics, **The Futurist,** April, 60-62.

Ingraham, B.L. and Smith, G.W. (1972). Electronic Surveillance and Control of Behavior. **Issues in Criminology,** 7, 35-53.

Jolin, A. (1987). Electronic Surveillance Program, Clackamas County Community Corrections (Oregon Evaluation), Oregon City, OR.

Klein, D.M. (1983). Family Problem Solving and Family Stress. **Marriage and Family Review,** 6, 85-112.

Lasch, C. (1980). The Family as a Haven in a Heartless World. In A. Skolnick and J.H. Skolnick (eds.) **Family in Transition** (3rd ed.), pp. 80-91. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Lasch, C. (1984). **The Minimal Self: Psychic Survival in Troubled Times.** New York: W.W. Norton.

Laslett, B. (1973). The Family as a Public and Private Institution: A Historical Perspective. **Journal of Marriage and the Family.** August, 35, 480-494.

Laslett, B. (1979). The Significance of Family Membership In Tufte, V. and Myerhoff, B. (eds.), **Changing Images of the Family,** London: Yale University Press.

Laslett, B. and Wall, R. (eds.) (1972). Household and Family in Past Time. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laslett, P. (1965). **The World We Have Lost.** New York: Scribner's.

Laslett, P. (1977). **Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations: Essays in Historical Sociology.** London: Cambridge University Press.

Laslett, P. (1984). **The World We Have Lost further explored: England Before the Industrial Age** (3rd ed.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Lavee, Y., McCubbin, H.I. and Patterson, J.M. (1985). The Double ABCX Model of Family Stress and Adaptation: An Empirical Test by Analysis of Structural Equations with Latent Variable. **Journal of Marriage and the Family,** 47, 811-825.

Lee, G.R. (1979). Effects of Social Networks on the Family. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye, and I.L. Reiss (eds.), **Contemporary Theories about the Family (Vol. 1): Research Based Theories.** New York: Free Press.

Leslie, G.R. and Korman, S.K. (1989). **The Family in Social Context, 7 ed.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Levine, D. and Wrightson, K. (1991). **The Making of an Industrial Society: Whickham, 1560-1765.** Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lilly, J.R. and Ball, R.A. (1987). A Brief History of House Arrest and Electronic Monitoring. **Northern Kentucky Law Review,** 13(3), 343-374.

Lilly, J.R., Ball, R.A., Curry, G.D. and McMullen, J. (1993). Electronic Monitoring of the Drunk Driver: A Seven-Year Study of the Home Confinement Alternative. **Crime & Delinquency,** 39 (4), 462-484.

Lowman, J., Menzies, R. and Palys, T. (eds.) (1987). **Transcarceration: Essays in the Sociology of Social Control.** Brookfield, USA: Gower.

Luxton, M. (1980). **More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home.** Toronto: Women's Press.

Macfarlane, A. (1970). **The Family Life of Ralph Josselin: A Seventeenth Century Clergyman.** New York: W.W. Norton.

Macfarlane, A. (1978). **The Origins of English Individualism: The Family, Property, and Social Transition.** Oxford: Blackwell.

Mainprize, S. (1992). Electronic Monitoring in Corrections: Assessing Cost Effectiveness and the Potential for Widening the Net of Social Control. **Canadian Journal of Criminology,** April, 161-180.

Mainprize, S. (1990). Incorporating Electronically Monitored House Arrest into British Columbia Corrections: The Processes of Power, Knowledge, and Regulation in the Debut of a Punishment Technique. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia (Ph.D.) Dissertation.

Marx, G.T. (1990). Privacy and Technology. **The World & I,** (September), 523-541.

Marx, G.T. (1981). Ironies of Social Control: Authorities as Contributors to Deviance through Escalation, Nonenforcement and Covert Facilitation. **Social Problems,** 28, 221-246.

May, E.T. ((1991). Myths and Realities of the American Family. In P. Aries and G. Duby (eds.), **A History of Private Life: V - Riddles of Identity in Modern Times.** Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Matthews, R. (1979). Decarceration and the Fiscal Crisis. In B. Fine et al. (eds.), **Capitalism and the Rule of Law.** London: Hutchinson.

Maxfield, M.G. and Baumer, T.L. (1990). Home Detention with Electronic Monitoring: Comparing Pretrial and Postconviction Programs. **Crime & Delinquency,** 36(4), 521-536.

McCubbin, H.I. and Patterson, J.M. (1983a). The Family Stress Process: The Double ABCX Model of Adjustment and Adaptation. **Marriage and Family Review,** 6: 7-37.

McCubbin, H.I. and Patterson, J.M. (1983b). Family Stress and Adaptation to Crises: A Double ABCX model of family Behavior. In D.H. Olson and B.C. Miller (Eds.) **Family Studies Review Yearbook (Vol. 1).** Beverly Hills. CA: Sage Pub.

McCubbin, H.I. and Patterson, J.M. (1982). Family Adaptation to Crisis. In H.I. McCubbin, A.E. Cauble and J.M. Patterson (Eds.), **Family Stress, Coping and Social Support.** Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

McCubbin, H.I., Cauble, A.E. and Patterson, J.M. (Eds.) (1982). **Family Stress, Coping and Social Support.** Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

McCubbin, H.I., Patterson, J.M. and Wilson, L.R. (1981). **Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes.** U. of W., Madison, WI.

McCubbin, H.I., Joy, C.B., Cauble, A.E., Comeau, J.K., Patterson, J.M. and Needle, R.H. (1980). Family Stress and Coping: A Decade Review. **Journal of Marriage and the Family,** 42, 855-871.

McMahon, M.W. (1992). **The Persistent Prison? Rethinking Decarceration and Penal Reform.** Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Meyer, J.A. (1971). Crime Deterrent Transponder System. **IEEE Trans Aeros Electronic Sys,** 7, 2-22.

Ministry of Attorney General. Corrections Branch. (1987). Electronic Monitoring System for Offender Supervision. Discussion Paper (2nd ed.). Victoria, British Columbia.

Mitterauer, M. and Sieder, R. (1982). **The European Family: Patriarchy to Partnership from the Middle Ages to the Present.** Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Montgomery, J. (1982). **Family Crisis as Process: Persistence and Change.** Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Morris, P. (1965). **Prisoners and their Families.** London: George Allen and Unwin.

Mount, F. (1982). **The Subversive Family: An Alternative History of Love and Marriage.** London: Jonathan Cape Ltd.

Morgan (1966). (2nd ed.). **The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in 17th-century New England.** New York.

Nett, E. (1988). **Canadian Families Past and Present.** Toronto: Butterworths Canada Ltd.

Neville, L. (1989). Electronic Monitoring System for Offender Supervision. Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Solicitor General [EMS Pilot Project Evaluation, May].

Oakley, A. (1985). **The Sociology of Housework.** New York: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Olson, D.H. (1991). Commentary: Three-Dimensional (3-D) Circumplex Model and Revised Socring of FACES III. **Family Process,** 30, 74-79.

Olson, D.H., Fournier, D.G. and Druckman, J.M. (1982). ENRICH. Minneapolis: PREPARE-ENRICH, Inc.

Olson, D.H., Portner, J., and Lavee, Y. (1985). **FACES III**. St. Paul, Minnesota:University of Minnesota.

Olson, D.H. and McCubbin, H.I. (1982). Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems, V: Application to Family Stress and Crisis Intervention. In H.I. McCubbin, A.E. Cauble and J.M. Patterson (Eds.), **Family Stress, Coping and Social Support.** Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I. and Associates (1983). **Families: What Makes them Work.** Beverly Hills, California: Age Publications Inc.

Pearlin, L. and Schooler, C. (1978). The Structure of Coping. **Journal of Health and Social Behavior,** 19: 2-21.

Petersilia, J. (1986). Exploring the Option of House Arrest. **Federal Probation,** June, 50-55.

Petersilia, J. (1987). Expanding Options for Criminal Sentencing. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, R-3544-EMC.

Petersilia, J. (1988). House Arrest. National Institute of Justice/Crime File, Study Guide.

Pilisuk, M. and Parks, S.H. (1983). Social support and family stress. In H.I. McCubbin, M.B. Sussman and J.M. Patterson (Eds.), Social Stress and the Family: Advances and Developments in **Family Stress Theory and Research,** New York: Haworth Press. Pages 137-156.

Pittman, J.F. and Lloyd, S.A. (1988). Quality of Family Life, Social Support, and Stress. **Journal of Marriage and the Family,** 50, 53-67.

Pollock, L.A. (1983). **Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500-1900.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renzema, M. (1989). Annual Monitoring Census: Progress Report. **Journal of Offender Monitoring,** 2, 20-21.

Renzema, M. and Skelton, D.T. (1990). Use of Electronic Monitoring in the United States: 1989 Update. U.S. Department of Justice. **NIJ Reports.** November/December.

Rubin, T.H. (1985). **Juvenile Justice: Policy, Practice, and Law.** Santa Monica, Cal.: Goodyear.

Rush, F.L. (1987). Deinstitutional Incapacitation: Home Detention in Pre-Trial and Post-Conviction Contexts. **Northern Kentuky Law Review,** 13(3), 375-408.

Schmidt, A.K. (1989). **Electronic Monitoring of Offenders Increases.** NIJ Reports (No. 212), Jan./Feb.: 1-5.

Schmidt, A.K. and Curtis, C.E. (1987). Electronic Monitors. In B.R. McCarthy (ed.), **Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance** (Issues in Criminal Justice, Volume 2). Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.

Schwitzgebel, R.K. (1968). Electronically Monitored Parole, **Prison Journal,** 48(2), 34.

Schwitzgebel, R.K. (now Gable, R.K.), (1969). Development of an Electronic Rehabilitation System for Parolees. **Law and Computer Technology,** 2, 9-12.

Schwitzgebel, R.K., Schwitzgebel, R.L., Panke, W.N., and Hurd, W.S. (1964). A Program of Research in Behavioral Electronics. **Behavioral Science,** 9, 233-238.

Tilly, L.A. and Scott, J.W. (1978). Women's Work and the Family in Nineteenth Century Europe. In Charles E. Rosenberg (ed.) **The Family in History.** Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Scull, A.T. (1977). **Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant - A Radical View.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Scull, A.T. (1981). Progressive Dreams, Progressive Nightmares: Social Control in the Twentieth Century America. **Stanford Law Review,** 33, 301-316.

Scull, A.T. (1984). **Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant - A Radical View.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Segal, L. (ed.) (1983). **What is to be done about the Family?** Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Shorter, E. (1975). **The Making of the Modern Family.** New York: Basic Books.

Silver and Wortman (1980). Coping with Undesirable Life Events. In J. Garber and M.E.P. Seligman (eds.), **Human Helplessness.** New York: Academic Press.

Skolnick, A. (1978). **The Intimate Environment of the Family: Exploring Marriage and the Family.** Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.

Skolnick, A.S. (1987). **The Intimate Environment: Exploring Marriage and the Family,** 4th ed. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Stone, L. (1977). **The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800.** New York: Harper & Row.

Straus, M.A. and Hotaling (1980). **The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence.** Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thompson, E.P. (1977). Happy Families: Review of Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800. **New Society,** 499-501.

Thrupp, S. (1948). **The Merchant Class of Medieval London.** Ann Arbor.

Tilly, J. and Scott, L. (1987). **Women, Work, and Family.** New York, NY: Routledge.

Timko, F. (1986). Electronic Monitoring - How it all Began: Conversations with Love and Goss. **Journal of Probation and Parole,** 27 (Fall), 15-17.

Trumbach, R. (1976). Europe and Its Families: A Review Essay of Lawerence Stone, The Family Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800. **Journal of Social History,** 13, 136-143.

Vaughn, J.B. (1987). Planning for Change: The Use of Electronic Monitoring as a Correctional Alternative. In Belinda R. McCarthy (ed.), **Intermediate Punishments: Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic Surveillance** (Issues in Criminal Justice, Volume 2). Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.

Walker, Alexis J. (1985). Reconceptualizing Family Stress. **Journal of Marriage and The Family,** , 827-837.

Wall, R., Robin, J. and Laslett, P. (1983). **Family Forms in Historic Europe.** New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wrightson, Keith (1982). **English Society 1580-1680.** London: Hutchinson.