"Feeling Almost like Everyone Else" – Israel's Electronic Monitoring Program: *Perceptions and Attitudes among Released Prisoners and Their Supervisors*

Efrat Shoham[1], Rotem Efodi[2] & Shirley Yehosha-Stern[3]

[1] Department of Criminology, Ashkelon Academic College, Ashkelon, Israel

[2] Research Department, Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority, Israel

[3] Department of Criminology, Ashkelon Academic College, Israel

Correspondence: Efrat Shoham, Department of Criminology, Ashkelon Academic College, Ashkelon, Israel. E-mail: shoham@netzer.org.il

Abstract

The growing use of various methods for electronic monitoring (EM) in the Western criminal justice system has led researchers to examine the social and personal consequences of this type of monitoring. This article examines perceptions toward the EM program among supervised released prisoners and their supervisors in Israel. Questionnaires were given to all released prisoners participating in the EM program in 2010, as well as to 12 supervisors and Parole Board members. The EM program's strong focus on occupation, therapy, and developing a good relationship with a therapist, compared with the alternative of continued custody, appears to have led most released prisoners to express, or at least declare, a high level of positive expectations for the future and a sense of partnership with the normative circles surrounding them. However, supervisors expressed a high level of ambiguity over the program's goals and operational protocols. While program supervisors emphasized the importance of the rehabilitation and therapeutic elements of EM, Parole Board members showed mixed reactions toward the program.

Keywords: electronic monitoring, released prisoners, attitudes, Israel

1. Introduction

In January 2006, the Israeli Interior Ministry launched an electronic monitoring program for detained prisoners and prisoners released on license. Under the program, EM during custody or house arrest offers an alternative to prison time, which allows the authorities to ensure that prisoners released on license remain in their homes, or within a defined area.

Towards the end of 2006, the Israeli Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority began the EM program for prisoners released on license (for a description of the Israeli Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority's work, see Amir, Horowitz & Sagiv, 2005). The majority of those on the Israeli EM program are male, and the monitoring period is usually one year (for longer prison terms, the monitoring period is two years). The Interior Ministry and the State Attorney's Office determined that the EM program is not intended for sex offenders, domestic violence abusers or drug dealers because of the risk of reoffending from the monitoring location – *i.e.* from their home – as well as their high risk status. Most prisoners in the EM program also receive some type of therapeutic or occupational supervision, and some continue with this even after the EM period is over (Shoham, Yehosha, Efodi, & Diamant, 2010).

1.1 The EM Program in Israel Relies on the Criminal Procedure Law (Powers of Enforcement– Arrest) 1996 and serves as a substitute for imprisonment in detention facilities. The program enables the use of electronic devices to monitor supervised individuals detained in their homes or other defined areas.

Unlike most Western countries, and mostly due to bureaucratic considerations, Israeli telecommunications media has not yet switched over to satellite phones. Therefore, the EM program is operated using the radio frequency (RF) method. RF systems are based on the principle of maintaining an electronic tether between the device (*i.e.*, bracelet) worn by the offender and the receiver unit (using a conventional telephone line). Most countries use

global positioning satellite (GPS) technology, as an alternative tool to enhance the supervision of offenders in the community (Lilly, 2006).

Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority consultants and supervisors conduct suitability tests prior to a prisoner's release on license, to decide whether or not to include a particular prisoner in the EM program. They then make recommendations to the relevant Parole Board regarding a prisoner's need and/or suitability for EM. The EM program allows the coordination of a unique, personal monitoring regime for each supervised released prisoner, according to his personal characteristics and rehabilitation needs.

The population of released prisoners able to participate in Israel's EM program includes the following groups (from an interview with the National Supervisor of the Prisoners' Rehabilitation Authority, 2009):

(1) Prisoners with "weak personality" who are easily manipulated by others, who require intensive supervision during the critical period after release to prevent them from contacting criminals, and who without EM would not have been designated suitable for early release.

(2) Prisoners who committed serious offenses, but who participated in therapeutic programs while in prison.

(3) Prisoners who had previously been in a therapeutic monitoring program, and for whom EM would be an opportunity to tighten their monitoring conditions.

The EM program, implemented as a pilot among prisoners released on license in Israel, is part of a trend that has developed over the past three decades in the West. This trend involves integrating members of a unique group (such as prisoners) into the community, while restoring responsibility for these individuals to the family and society.

The EM program helps released prisoners returning to the community to maintain a normative lifestyle, while developing necessary life skills such as job seeking, and while providing restricting conditions and intensive supervision to reduce their chances of reoffending (Black & Smith, 2003; Gable & Gable, 2005; Padgett, Bales & Blomberg, 2006; Renzema, 2010).

Integrating the EM program with traditional community supervising systems has both changed and redefined supervisor-supervised relationships. The move also allows for clearer and more objective guidelines for community supervision (Shoham, Yehosha-Stern & Efodi, 2013). While many researchers have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the EM program in comparison to other more traditional community programs (Bottos, 2008; Nellis & Bas, 2012; Renzama, 2010), as yet no studies in Israel have examined the attitudes of supervisors or supervised released prisoners towards the EM program.

This paper aims to examine attitudes and perceptions of released prisoners participating in the EM program and their supervisors towards the program's positive and negative effects.

1.2 Perceptions of the EM Program among Supervised Released Prisoners

Over the past three decades, there has been a change in the main issues of the public and academic debate on the use of EM in the criminal justice system. (Renzame, 2010). In the 1980s, when EM was first employed in the criminal justice system, the debate focused on moral and legal issues. However, over the last decade the focus of public debate has shifted towards questions of economic feasibility (Payne, DeMichele & Okafo, 2009; Payne & Gainey, 2004) as well as the social significance of EM for prisoners and their families (Albrecht, 2005). In line with this shift, the European Convention on EM in the Service of the Criminal Justice System in the Netherlands has emphasized the importance of examining supervised released prisoners' attitudes towards EM.

Although studies examining verbal opinions have certain limitations (Bottos, 2008), they can nevertheless help identify how convicted criminals assess the degree of suffering they attribute to the various types of punishments to which they are subjected.

In a qualitative study of 49 supervised released prisoners, Gainey & Payne (2000) found that respondents were concerned with a number of main issues regarding privacy, shame, disruptions to their normal course of life, and social limitations. Nevertheless, most of the supervised released prisoners participating in the study agreed that EM has a rehabilitative role, because it allows prisoners to work, be in regular contact with their families and assist with domestic chores.

Various studies have shown that the issue of shame connected with the EM bracelet affects mostly married women and men (Hucklesby, 2009). Bales, *et a*l. (2010) argue that if in the past the public attributed a relatively low level of risk to released prisoners under EM, today supervised released prisoners are considered high risk, because the public tends to assume that EM prisoners must be sex offenders. In their study, Bales, *et al.* interviewed 105 supervised released prisoners, and described how supervised monitoring has given rise to a set

of problems which, they argue, are significant in social and employment arenas. The negative labeling accompanying EM may dissuade many employers from hiring supervised released prisoners (Mayer, 2004).

While supervised released prisoners and their families attribute negative outcomes to EM, they can also find positive consequences of the program. A study by Lobly & Smith (2010), conducted among supervised released prisoners and their family members in the UK, indicates that early release under EM is perceived by prisoners' families as a more efficient way of rehabilitating released prisoners, which allows them to organize their lives in a more normative way compared to past lifestyles. A majority of prisoners and their family members surveyed said that they prefer release under EM than prison time (Payen & Gainey, 2004). In a study among electronically supervised released prisoners in England, Dodgson et al (2001) found that most supervised released prisoners (67%) were satisfied with the sessions they had with their supervising parole officers. Similar findings were also reported among supervised released prisoners in Germany (Mayer, 2004) and Canada (Bonta, Rooney & Wallace-Capretta, 1999).

Research conducted in the United States (Gainey, Payne, Brian & O'Toole., 2000) suggests that among released prisoners, EM is perceived as a reflection of the beginning of trust placed in them by the public as well as a strengthening of their relationship with society. A high level of satisfaction toward EM was also found among family members of supervised released prisoners, especially spouses (NAO, 2006) who considered the monitoring as an opportunity to strengthen their own relationship with the supervised released prisoner.

The findings of these studies are in line with the Positive Criminology approach, which argues that positive changes can be achieved among criminals who operate under negative stress conditions, such as incarceration or other limiting conditions, by exposing them to human strengths and socialization, such as *via* personal and professional growth and social acceptance. This approach refers to the positive experiences to which one is exposed in one's immediate environment – with one's family, community and therapeutic surroundings, that keep one at a distance from deviation and crime (Ronel, 2006; Ronel & Elisha, 2010). Positive Criminology emphasizes the importance of positive experiences in the eyes of the individual experiencing them, and considers risk factors in one's life as a potential for growth and development, and not just vulnerability. The perspective of the theory is positive and the rehabilitating interventions based on it focus on an individual's strength factors, on positive feelings and positions such as hope and optimism, compassion, love and forgiveness (Ronel & Haimoff-Ayali, 2009). A central theory that demonstrates the Positive Criminology approach is re-integrative shaming (Braithwaite, 2000), which is based on a clear distinction between the criminal-individual's personal identity and his negative actions. This theory stems from the concept that rehabilitative interventions are more efficient when they include a process of crime shaming along with re-integrating the criminal into a normative community. The approach is based on the social acceptance of the criminal rather than ostracizing and excluding him from society (Lane, Turner, Fain & Sehgal, 2007).

The EM program includes the denunciation and shaming element through the electronic bracelet, meaning there is recognition of the criminal's risk and the danger he poses, along with social acceptance: he returns to his home and family, he is occupationally integrated, and he is engaged in beneficial therapy.

A meta-analysis performed by Renzema (2010), which reviewed evaluation studies conducted on EM in the criminal justice system between 1986-2010, indicates that for most criminals on an EM program, the positive effects overtake the negative, or at least EM is not considered detrimental compared to the alternative of imprisonment.

1.3 Attitudes of supervisors towards the EM Program

Integrating released prisoners in an EM program reflects a significant change compared with past community programs in Israel. This change mainly involves the inclusion of a component of intense supervision, alongside the therapeutic components available in other community programs (Shoham, Yehosha-Stern & Efodi, 2013).

To evaluate how successful EM project has been among prisoners released on license, it is also important to examine the beliefs and the expectations towards the EM project among the various professional agencies tasked with implementing the program (Hucklesby, 2011). Over the past decade, there have been several studies examining the perceptions of professionals to the EM program (Crawley & Crawley, 2008; Dodgson et al., 2001; Hucklesby, 2009). A study conducted among probation officers in the UK (Mortimer, 2001) showed that most (76%) expressed positive attitudes towards the program. The probation officers perceived the EM program as a framework that enabled the supervised released prisoner's life routine to be organized efficiently. They believed that the program had a lower level of negative labeling compared to imprisonment, and equally importantly was used as a powerful and efficient tool for bargaining when trying to obtain a supervised released prisoner's cooperation.

However, this positive attitude among probation officers is not necessarily the same in other countries. In Germany, for example, it was found (Mayer, 2004) that probation officers expressed the highest level of objection to an EM program compared to prison officers or judges.

The difference in attitude between professions related to the level of success each attributed to the program, to questions of its operation, and to expectations of the program. According to Haverkamp (2002), the gap between expectations mostly stems from the fact that probation officers are oriented toward therapy, and wish to see a therapeutic component alongside the supervisory one.. On the other hand, prison service personnel and prosecutors tend to have a stricter approach in their attitude towards supervised released prisoners.

Hucklesby (2011) explains these disagreements through a distinctive credo or "array of beliefs", which characterize different professions within the law enforcement system. This array, composed of values and beliefs, shapes the field and professional career of law enforcement personnel. Hucklesby, notes that different researchers (Liebling, 2004; Rutherford, 1993) have identified at least three separate sets of beliefs that characterize professionals working within the criminal justice system: the punishment credo, the efficiency credo and the care or humanity credo.

Professionals who adhere to the punishment credo are hostile towards offenders, focus on condemning them and distancing them from society, and believe in the "Crime Control model"(Packer, 1968), including a harsh, quick penal response to each breach of the law. Professionals who adopt the efficiency credo do not present an ideological approach, but rather focus on efficacy-benefit economic issues. Their main interest is in the smooth and efficient running of the law enforcement system, and therefore they are less interested in the moral issues surrounding such a system.

Professionals who adopt a care/humanity credo show a certain level of empathy towards offenders and their needs. Their beliefs are in line with the "Due Process model" (Packer, 1968), which considers cautious, reliable action and the maintaining of the accused's civic rights as the central values in criminal proceedings (for a description of the differences between the Crime Control and Due Process models, see Larnau, 2001). Hucklesby (2011) found that even though those supervising electronically-monitored offenders share similar belief systems, there are also significant differences in the levels of fear that they experience towards the offenders they are monitoring, and regarding the various strategies they use to reduce their sense of vulnerability vis-à-vis the offenders

Gable & Gable (2005) claim that, despite the fact that the EM program was intended as a tool for positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior, in practice in many countries it has been implemented in programs with a penal orientation, which is why it does not provide the supervised released prisoner with the feeling of a safety-net or hope for the future. In Israel (Shoham, Yehosha-Stern & Efodi, 2012), the EM program incorporates a significant element of therapy and social support, designed to help supervised released prisoners re-enter the community and develop pro-social behavior.

The study's methods and findings describe the perceptions of the supervised released prisoners and of their supervisors, will be presented and discussed in two separate sections. The first part of this study presents quantitative data examining positive and negative attributes given by released prisoners on the EM program. The second section presents a qualitative study examining the perceptions of Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority (PRA) supervisors participating in the EM project, and of Parole Board members tasked with approving the early release of prisoners under court license.

2. First Part-Satisfaction from the EM Project among Supervised Released Prisoners

2.1 Methodology

The first stage aims to examine the perceptions of released prisoners towards the EM program, and how they perceive their chances of integration in normative society following the monitoring period. To examine the attitudes of supervised released prisoners towards the project, questionnaires were handed to all prisoners who had participated in the EM project in the north, south and center districts of Israel for a period of at least three months between October 2010 and October 2011.The questionnaire, compiled by the researchers, includes 34 closed questions with answers on a scale from 1 to 5, such that 1 = not true at all and 5 = very true. The questions examine four key areas selected on the basis of a review of the relevant literature, and the comments of supervisors from the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority. The four areas were: (1) normative perceptions (α=0.80) e.g.: "Work helps me feel like everyone else"; (2) negative aspects of the EM project (α=0.70) e.g.: "the electronic tag bothers me in my social life"; (3) positive aspects of the EM project (α=0.78) e.g.: "the electronic tag helps me not fall back into a life of crime"; (4) future expectations (α=0.78) e.g.: "I believe I`ll succeed in my

life".

The questionnaires were given to participants when they came to meetings and during conversations with their Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors. To avoid possible bias in the procedure and maintain ethical rules, supervised participants completed the questionnaires individually and privately, and then placed into a sealed envelope in order to maintain the supervised prisoner's anonymity. Supervised prisoners with reading or writing difficulties were assisted by a secretary or another employee with whom the prisoner did not have a supervisory or therapeutic relationship.

After the defined period of the study, 80 questionnaires were returned. Three questionnaires were filled by female released prisoners, and were excluded from the study due to their low numbers; two other questionnaires were filled improperly and were therefore excluded. There were no released prisoners who refused to participate in this study. A total of 75 questionnaires were finally collected and approved for use. It should be noted that this number was lower than expected, since during the second half of 2011 the Ministry of Interior, in charge of the project, froze referrals of new released prisoners to the EM project during their early license-release period. . In 2012, the authorities renewed their referrals of released prisoners to the EM program. The Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority provides monitoring and rehabilitation solutions to around 100 released prisoners under EM at any given time.

2.2 The Sample

41% of supervised released prisoners participating in the study were from Israel's Southern Region (n=31), 32% were from Israel's Northern Region (n=24), and 27% were from Israel's Central Region (n=20). 65% of participants were single, separated or divorced, and 35% were married. 67% of supervised released prisoners were Jewish, 26% were Arab (the ethnicity of 7% percent of the participants was unknown). We divided the supervised released prisoners into two age groups – younger prisoners (28 years old and younger) and older prisoners (over 28 years old). 35% of participants were in the younger group, while 65% were in the older group. 64% of participants were parents. 76% of participants had served one or two prison terms, while the remaining 24% had served three or more prison terms.

This study evaluates the EM program applied on released prisoners and aims to examine, inter alia, the supervised individuals' satisfaction with the program. Due to the unique properties of the program – which is still defined as a pilot – we could not assemble, at this stage, an appropriate control group. Therefore, this study does not enable comparison between findings obtained in other released prisoners' rehabilitation programs.

2.3 Findings

The following describes the distribution of responses by released prisoners in the EM program regarding the program and their view of its personal and social consequences.

Table 1. Allocation of negative components to the EM Program

Allocation of Negative Features to EM (%)			
	Not true	Medium	True
The electronic bracelet interferes with working in my desired job	36	4	60
I hide the electronic bracelet from my friends	48.6	17.6	33.8
Because of the electronic bracelet I feel detached from my former friends	67.1	9.6	23.2
Because of the bracelet I feel like I am still in prison	41.4	22.7	36
I am ashamed to be seen in my environment with an electronic bracelet	33.3	9.3	57.3

N=75

Table 2. Allocation of positive features to the EM project

Allocation of Positive Features to EM (%)			
	Not true	Medium	True
My relationship with my spouse has improved since I was released under electronic monitoring	29.2	10.8	60
I think my parents are satisfied with the electronic bracelet	46.2	16.9	36.9
I think my spouse is satisfied with the electronic bracelet	53.9	13.8	32.3
The bracelet prevents me from returning to a criminal lifestyle	53.4	8.3	38.3
The bracelet allows me to re-integrate in the normative world	56.7	6.8	36.5

N=75

Table 3. Normative conceptions among supervised released prisoners

Normative Conceptions among Supervised Released prisoners (%)			
	Not true	Medium	True
I feel comfortable asking help from my therapists	9.4	13.3	77.3
A man may talk about his problems	4	6.7	89.3
I feel that I belong to the normative society outside prison	5.3	14.7	80
I think it is important to share things with others	8	16	76
Work helps me feel like everyone else	5.6	11.1	83.3
Work helps me feel like I have started again with a clean slate	5.5	5.5	89
I feel I have someone to turn to	2.7	8.1	89.2
I have a good relationship with my therapist	1.4	8.1	90.5
I think it is important that other people ask me how I feel	6.6	18.7	74.6

N=75

Table 4. Expectations for the future among supervised released prisoners

Positive Expectations for the Future among Supervised Released Prisoners (%)			
	Not true	Medium	True
I am not afraid of anything	52	22.7	25.3
I believe I will be successful in life		4	96
I fear going back into prison	40	4	56
I believe that once the EM period is finished I will be able to find a regular job	4	4	90.6

N=75

Table 5. Average stands regarding the EM Project among supervised released prisoners

	Average	Standard deviation	Score range	Cronbach's alpha
Allocation of positive components to the project	2.87	1.13	1-5	0.78
Allocation of negative components to the project	2.91	1.21	1-5	0.70
General normative conceptions	4.49	0.62	1-5	0.80

N=75

Table 1 shows that supervised released prisoners broadly agree on positive and negative feelings toward the EM project. The main positive influences reported by the respondents are concerned with the satisfaction of

prisoners' parents and spouses regarding the EM program, and with prevention of reoffending. The main negative influences attributed to the EM program are concerned with the negative labeling that comes with the electronic bracelet, and the limitation it poses when job seeking and maintaining a social life.

A very high mean level (4.49) of normative conceptions was found among the respondents, including the need to take responsibility, realizations that one must work for a living, that one may talk about one's problems, and that the respondents can be a part of normative society.

The prisoners also expressed a high level of self-control, and reported that they can manage their anger and ask for help if needed.

Since there was a low correlation between matters concerning respondents' future expectations, we decided to present each issue separately. It seems that, at least on a declarative level, nearly all respondents said they believed they could succeed in life. Most also voiced the belief that they could find regular employment after the monitoring period ended.

Table 4 also shows that, alongside their belief that they will be successful in life, 60% of respondents feared returning to prison.

Correlations between Socio-Legal characteristics and perceptions towards EM

This section of the study aims to examine the correlation between the four areas examined and the socio-legal characteristics of released prisoners in the EM program.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) shows no correlation between the age of supervised released prisoners, their ethnicity or family status, and levels of normative perceptions; or regarding how they viewed the positive and negative aspects of their participation in the EM project.

A significant correlation was only found between the number of children a respondent had and the allocation of positive features to EM (t (72) = 1.95, $p < 0.05$). Among supervised released prisoners with no children, a higher average level of allocating positive features to EM was found. A significant difference was found between normative perceptions among supervised released prisoners and the number of prison terms served. The highest level of normative perceptions was found among supervised released prisoners who served more than three prison terms (f (2.28) = 6.09, $p < 0.05$).No difference was found in respondents' allocation of positive or negative features to the EM project among those who had served a low number of prison terms, and among those who had served three or more prison terms.

Therefore, we used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine whether there was a difference in how respondents allocated positive or negative features to the EM project according to length of prison term and recent prison term. A significant difference between the duration of the last prison term served was found only in relation to normative perceptions among those supervised. After controlling for the length of the last prison term, the results indicated that there is also no difference in normative perceptions in relation to the number of terms served by those supervised.

A Mann-Whitney test showed that there were no significant differences in how respondents allocated positive or negative features to the EM project, or to normative perception level relative to the length of time the released prisoner was under EM. Further, we found no significant differences in the level of positive future expectations among respondents in the younger (up to age 28) and older groups, or among Jewish or Arab respondents. Nevertheless, the Mann-Whitney test shows a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between Jewish and Arab released prisoners regarding their fear of returning to prison. This fear was higher among Jews (M = 3.8, SD = 1.67) than among Arabs (M = 2.7, SD = 2.05). The greatest fear of returning to prison was found among respondents released from their first prison term (M = 3.7, SD = 1.7).

2.4 Discussion

Evaluation studies conducted on EM programs in various parts of the world present different methods to measure the success of the program. Some focus on how EM can reinforce the Crime Control model, and reduce the rate of reoffending during and after EM; while others aim to understand the broader humane and rehabilitation implications of these programs (Bottos, 2008; Renzama, 2010). The EM pilot program conducted for prisoners released on license in Israel belongs to the latter type *i.e.* programs that perceive the monitoring element as a tool to allow offenders to be reintegrated into society and who, without monitoring, would not be deemed suitable for early release (Shoham, Yehosha-Stern & Efodi, 2012).

EM programs like the Israeli pilot, which emphasize rehabilitation as well as the level of cooperation by supervised released prisoners, are significant when attempting to understand released prisoners' perspectives. It

is important to emphasize that research such as this reflects only the rethoric position of the participants (Shkedi, 2003), and there is a significant concern that while these prisoners are released on license (one that is contingent on their displaying normative, positive behavior), there will be a bias in their responses.

As in other studies conducted in the West (Nellis & Bas, 2012; Hucklesby, 2009), Israeli supervised released prisoners reported that the main negative consequences of participating in the project are finding a "good" job, and the feelings of shame attributed to wearing an electronic bracelet. Unlike some studies (for example, see Bottos, 2008), this study did not find any significant correlations between feelings of shame and other variables such as familial status or age. Further, half of the participants in this study reported a low level of shame associated with the electronic bracelet. Only a third of the supervised released prisoners who participated in the study reported hiding the bracelet from their family and friends, or said they genuinely considered it a social disability. This finding is somewhat contradicting with the integrative role attributed by Braithwaite (1995), to the feeling of shame, as a tool for reintegration in society among release prisoners. Our finding is purportedly positive, because it contributes to the claim that the released prisoners expressed a certain sense of integration into the general population. The same is true for participants' responses regarding normative perceptions and expectations for the future. However, it is also possible that this finding stems – either partially or in fully – from participants' fear that they could be returned to custody should they be deemed unsuitable to remain in the EM program.

It seems that the supervised released prisoners perceive the negative or positive effects of EM are related to their perceptions of the program from the outset. Released prisoners who see the EM program as a sort of "gift" that allows them to leave prison will tend to attribute more positive qualities to it. Offenders who consider the EM program as more confining compared to other monitoring programs in the community will tend to attribute more negative features to it.

In addition to the positive or negative features participants attributed to the program, we also studied their expectations for the future, and the frequency of normative perceptions among them. The transition from the status of prisoner to prisoner released on license is complex and confusing. This change of status requires the prisoner released on license to give up an array of beliefs and norms, which contradict those of the criminal sub-culture in prison (for the description of this array, cf. Shoham and Tzaichner, 2008).The new definition of released prisoner on license transforms what was previously a seamless line between life in prison and life within the general population into something more complex (for more on the roles of monitoring and therapeutic systems on this seamless line, cf. Taxman, Byrne & Tharnner, 2002).

The study's findings show that even though the participants are hardened criminals, who had not easily obtained a reduction in their sentence, most of them appear to demonstrate a relatively high level of positive and normative perceptions, at least on a declarative level. These perceptions are expressed in the sense of trust they feel in their therapists, and the willingness they show to receive help and to speak about the difficulties and problems they face.

These findings can be considered as an expression of their sense of social acceptance. The assistance received by supervised individuals during the EM program is perceived by them as a positive aspect of social acceptance. According to the Positive Criminology approach, choosing to change one's way of life can be achieved through rehabilitative programs that emphasize development of interpersonal skills and capabilities. These programs empower criminals with a supportive environment, which accepts them despite their negative actions and the risk they are considered to pose. According to this approach, only when an individual is exposed to positive alternatives, he can choose to change out of free will (Ronel & Elisha, 2010). The EM program in Israel has placed considerable emphasis on the therapeutic component, apparently in an attempt to develop personal strengths among supervised individuals through exposing them to social acceptance, support, encouragement and forgiveness, alongside their occupational re-integration. All of the above can account for the positive positions and gratitude held by Israeli supervised individuals towards the program, and they form an opportunity for the development of pro-social behavior and willingness for change.

These findings correlate with previous studies, which found released prisoners expressed gratitude for the assistance they received in other community-based rehabilitation programs (Harris & Maruna, 2005; Maruna, 2001; Maruna, Immarigeon & LeBel, 2004).

Additional support for these findings can be found in Hucklesby (2008), who claimed that in most cases, supervised individuals report that their interaction with their supervisors had a crucial influence on their attitude and willingness towards the EM program. Supervised individuals who reported good interaction with their supervisors demonstrated positive willingness to the program, as opposed to those reporting negative interaction

with their supervisors (Hucklesby, 2008).

Released prisoners' future expectations are also worthy of discussion. The study's findings show that a high percentage of participants demonstrate optimism, and believe that despite their past they will be successful later in life. Nevertheless, 56% of participants express a fear of returning to prison. The findings show that Israeli Arab released prisoners express less fear of returning to prison compared to Jewish released prisoners. This may be explained by Arabs' perceived chance of being re-arrested and imprisoned. Several studies undertaken in Israel, show that the likelihood of an Israeli Arab defendant being re-arrested and imprisoned, is greater than for Jewish defendants. Much like studies in the United States, which show that law enforcement discriminate against African Americans and other minorities, studies in Israel also point to a connection between judicial decisions and the defendant's ethnicity. In their comprehensive study, Rattner and Fishman (1998) found that Israeli Arabs' chances of conviction and the severity of punishments meted against them were higher than for Jewish defendants. Another extensive study found that the odds of an Israeli Jew being released from imprisonment are higher than those of an arrested Arab individual (Gazal, Sulitzeanu-Kenan, Einav & Shubash. 2008).

These data lead us to two complementary explanations for the findings obtained in this study. It is possible that Arab released prisoners express less fear of returning to prison than their Jewish counterparts because their arrest and detention would mainly depend on external factors such as the police or court, and less on them and their behavior. In addition, we can hypothesize that because of the high number of Arab Israelis among the prison population, Arab inmates suffer less from prison-related stigmas that do Jewish Israelis, and therefore express less concern towards being incarcerated. Another possible explanation is the higher level of fatalism, which is more characteristic of Arab culture than of the Jewish-Western one (Mazaoue -Margia, 2001).

3. Second Part- Supervisors' Perceptions of the EM Program: A Qualitative Study

3.1 Methodology

In Israel, prisoners who complete two-thirds of a prison sentence may file a request for early release to the Parole Board. Each Parole Board comprises three members with voting rights, and an additional member from the Israeli Prison Service (IPS) who does not have voting rights. The Board is headed by a judge, usually retired, while the other two members are appointed by the Justice Ministry, and usually come from criminology, social work, psychology or education backgrounds. Each Board member's vote has equal weight. Various data are presented to the Board, including a social worker's report on the prisoner's conduct; his function and the treatment he underwent while in prison; an intelligence officer's report; information from the Israel Police regarding disputes and/or intelligence information, and relevant medical authorizations. The Parole Board is solely responsible for deciding whether to release a prisoner under EM at the end of two-thirds of his prison term. This Board also has the authority to cancel this early release should a prisoner violate his monitoring conditions, in which case the prisoner will return to complete his prison term.

This part of the study aims to assess the perceptions of supervisors from the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority and from members of the Parole Boards towards the EM program in Israel. The study aims to understand their perspectives regarding the aims of the program, which prisoners are suitable for it, and the difficulties they experience in their work in the program.

To collect the data, we conducted semi-structured interviews with eight employees of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority, as well as and with four Parole Board members. The officials interviewed from the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority were: the Parole Board coordinator, a national supervisor, a district administrator, an EM coordinator, the head of the Religious Rehabilitation field, an employment consultant and two district consultants. All the interviewees worked – directly and indirectly – with released prisoners supervised under the EM program. In addition, we interviewed four Parole Board members from committees working alongside the Israel Prison Service, one of whom was a retired judge.

The position holders selected for this study represent a relatively wide professional range, and therefore were able to contribute a myriad of perspectives and insights. Therefore, the qualitative element of the study allows for a better integrative and holistic understanding of issues relating to EM, from both supervisory and treatment points of view. This element of the study also provides understanding from those involved in "enforcing" the EM program, i.e. those tasked with discussing and deciding on a prisoner's early release.

The data collected in this study were analyzed in a systematic and deliberate manner, by structuring the information gathered so as to interpret and understand its implications.

We performed our analysis using the topical analysis method, which allowed us to focus on what the informants said and described, while examining the words and expressions used and their meaning, as well as textual

sections and their contexts (Shkedi, 2003). This approach (also known as the Categorical Approach) focuses on the part and not the whole, and is most suitable when examining a specific question or phenomenon shared by a number of people (Leiblich, Tuval-Mashiach & Zilber, 2010). We used the ATLAS.ti software for Qualitative Analysis to collect and encode the interviews.

Five main themes emerged from the analysis of the interviews, each divided to sub-topics. The themes relevant for this study are: description and characterization of released prisoners suitable for EM; the goals of the program, as perceived by the interviewees; difficulties and problems they encounter during their work with EM; the conflict – if any – between the therapeutic and monitoring approaches; and interviewees' perception of the EM program, via a metaphorical prism and analysis of the terms and metaphors used by the interviewees.

We examined the respondents' verbal responses on an explicit level, while maintaining constant reference to their organizational context. This analysis method allowed us to discern hidden layers of perceptions and beliefs, which will be presented in this chapter.

3.2 Finding

3.2.1 Who Is Suitable for the EM Program?

The issue of a prisoner's suitability for the EM program, according to his supervisors and Parole Board members, can be divided to two main issues – the type of offence committed and the personality and social-demographic characteristics of the prisoner.

Regarding the type of offence, there is considerable confusion among supervisors as to the issue in question – *i.e.* what types of offenders may be suitable for the project.

For example, one respondent said:

> *"Property crimes… are usually suitable and in need of supervision… I don't think it's very suitable for sex offenders… although maybe it is, because it will keep them from walking around committing felonies…"* (Interviewee 8).

Contrary to this, another respondent believed that:

> *"You should really use electronic monitoring on more severe crimes, like murder, drug dealing, sex offenders"* (Interviewee 6).

The Parole Boards members chose not to refer to the nature of offences, but gave a broader perspective on the characteristics of the prisoner.

Further, the issue of a prisoner's suitability for the project was examined against a wider perspective of his personality and criminal characteristics.

All those interviewed believed that the project was more suitable for younger prisoners, while relating age to relevant social characteristics such as *"easily influenced… limitless"*, etc.

> *"The program is suitable, in my opinion, for younger people, those who are not yet tired of crime, because that's a real-time limitation, and one that can't be cheated. It's not monitoring like our rehabilitation programs that merely 'surprise' the prisoner, it has to be monitoring the prisoner at all times, constantly, non-stop"* (Interviewee 4).

> *"This is the most suitable program for prisoners who are easily influenced in nature, as well as for young prisoners, as they are more adventurous"* (Interviewee 3).

Parole Board members believed that the age of the prisoner affects suitability and need for tighter supervision than usual:

> *"…young folk who need help with issues of boundaries, mostly men because women are more restrained by nature…"* (Interviewee 4).

> *"I think it's more suitable for the younger ones… but not for teenagers"* (Interviewee 1).

In addition, interviewees referred to prisoners' risk level, seeing the EM as a tool to reduce this, and to distance released prisoners from dangerous situations in the future:

> *"It's most suitable for people who committed crimes against property, general violence offences, drug abusers… because one of the things it teaches them is not to hang out in the streets at night, to stay away from places and people… it makes it easier for them."* (Interviewee 7).

3.2.2 What Are the Main Goals of the Program?

All interviewees were asked about the goals of the EM program.

Since the question was posed as an open question without bias towards a specific approach, it allowed us to examine the perceptions of Prisoners Rehabilitation Authority supervisors and Parole Board members toward the program's unofficial goals.

As expected, responses fell into two groups: goals that emphasize therapy and rehabilitation; and those emphasizing supervision and monitoring of the released prisoner while safeguarding the public.

Analysis of the interviews shows that Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors lean more towards acknowledging the therapeutic and rehabilitation goals of the program than they do supervision and penal goals (eight references compared to five, respectively). The opposite trend is characteristic of Parole Boards (four references to therapeutic and rehabilitation goals compared to 10 references to supervision and penal goals).

For example, Interviewee 3 emphasizes the therapeutic goal of the project:

> "It is a corrective experience of boundaries, since they didn't have any during childhood and now they have the opportunity to acquire some in an external manner" (Interviewee 3).

Aside from the therapeutic viewpoint, most supervisors said the program structures a supervised released prisoner's daily routine, providing an effective rehabilitation and therapeutic tool:

> "The goal, in my opinion, is to create a framework for the supervised released prisoner that will provide him with boundaries and routine, put him in a structured environment and keep him away from dangerous situations and people who could put him at risk of regressing back into a life of crime" (Interviewee 6).

Interviewee 8 made similar comments:

> "It frames their day, defines their activity hours and leisure hours, and their stay in the house, including a defined construction of their weekend. It obligates the supervised released prisoner to create a daily agenda in a way that allows him to complete everything – to participate in treatment, medical treatments, hobbies, social meetings and so on".

Analysis of the interviews shows that Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors did not completely disregard the supervisory aspects of the program, even if they were more implicit:

> "It adds boundaries. A night detention was always an option but they disregarded it. The very presence of the bracelet makes them think: 'they will come and knock on my door, the inspector will come, why do I need this?'" (Interviewee 7).

> "I think the goal is to safeguard or protect the public. Because criminals who are harsh and dangerous… the committee wants more safety means to maintain public order – so that this person won't go roaming the streets at certain hours" (Interviewee 1).

Unlike the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority, the Parole Boards were more inclined to acknowledge the supervisory and penal goals of electronic bracelets, as opposed to their rehabilitation goals:

> "It does not construct his daily routine, it just limits him, closing him in." (Interviewee 1).

> "The goal of the program is to neutralize the risk a released prisoner poses." (Interviewee 2).

> "The goal is supervision; it is a way to stop the prisoner from committing additional offences, at least during his license period" (interviewee no.3).

Compared to the ten phrases attributing a supervisory role to EM, only four phrases attributed a therapeutic or rehabilitating effect to the bracelet:

> "Another goal of the bracelet is education. The bracelet stops the man, thus helping him in fulfilling the other terms of his parole like work, night detention, therapeutic meetings, etc. It is actually an additional way to uphold the release conditions." (Interviewee 3).

3.2.3 Difficulties and Problems with the EM Project

The respondents were asked to raise the difficulties they encountered in the EM program. As expected, since they are partly responsible for running the program the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority encountered more difficulties operating the program than did the Parole Boards.

Analysis of the interviews revealed two main categories of difficulties and issues, which can be categorized as

technical *vs.* organizational difficulties.

Technical difficulties:

Analysis of the interviews shows that feelings of frustration among those running the program are associated with an inability to monitor and respond to breaches and bureaucratic requirements related to one-time furloughs, or to technical breaches related to faults with the bracelet.

All these are perceived as irrelevant to the released prisoner's rehabilitation process, and even as hindrances:

> *"Technically speaking, if a man violated his terms last night – I would not know about it because there's a long procedure, I'll only get to hear about it two weeks from that moment, at best. It's like cold coffee. If you need to respond – it has to be as fast as possible, while it's fresh, otherwise [the prisoner] is no longer in that place. It loses importance and effect"* (Interviewee 1).

Interviewee 2 also emphasizes this problem:

> *"There is a lot of bureaucracy involved in working with the Parole Boards, because the committee asks for a time range of at least two weeks to examine requests, and that's when a lot of the commotion and mess occurs… the committees don't always make it on time, the decision doesn't reach the supervised released prisoner or the supervisor in time. I have no idea whether the person could get a permit and if I can even manage to get a hold of the supervisor. There are also a lot of therapeutic entities and supervisors, and we don't have control over that.*"

Interviewee no. 7 details the difficulties revolving technical malfunctions of the bracelets:

> *"At first I thought it was "teething troubles", but no. There are a lot of technical problems that appear as violations, and it drives both supervised released prisoners and us crazy. It's not some "teething troubles", it keeps happening… it happens many years after it started, and these things involves beeping [of the bracelet] that has nothing to do with any violation"*.

He adds and specifies that:

> *"Another difficulty is related, in my opinion, to the fact that each violation is considered as such, even though sometimes the device is about two minutes late. It's idiotic and messes with the person's life, as well as his family and neighbors. We shouldn't be petty, and it's a waste of money too… and there are dozens of such occasions"* (Interviewee 7).

Analysis of the interviews shows that these technical difficulties preoccupy and greatly hinder the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority. A total of 16 references to this issue were found in their statements.

The Parole Boards also referred to this subject, although not to a significant degree, as was expected:

> *"The difficulties are mostly procedural. For example, it is not clear whether the telephone company can connect a line or not, a permit for a licensed prisoner's apartment relocation is almost always problematic because you need a permit from the telephone company again, disconnections and such"* (Interviewee 3).

Organizational difficulties:

Aside from the criticism regarding technical difficulties and bureaucracy that complicates work procedures, the supervisors also expressed criticism of the system, which they said complicates the work in the EM program.

The criticisms center on the lack of defined protocol and clear, guiding policy:

> *"I've been looking at the protocols and I am still not sure who's responsible for the supervised released prisoner"* (Interviewee 7).

Interviewee 1 claims that:

> *"There are no meetings and no learning sessions, or any ability to learn from the experience of others. We should clarify protocols and have meetings about it"*.

The status of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority *vis-a-vis* other entities regarding referral and consolidation of EM rehabilitation programs also attracted criticism from respondents.

The interviewees claim that the Authority is passive and weak when confronted with such entities:

> *"We have become passive, when we used to be active. Today, we are very passive and can't recommend early release under conditions of electronic monitoring"* (Interviewee 1).

> *"We should be active partners, and less passive. Since this is about rehabilitation and not arrest. This*

involves rehabilitation and therapy, it has other goals. This way, the issue of rehabilitation will be implemented; an example to this is the fact that we don't have a "say" when confronting the committees" (Interviewee 2).

Another issue raised by supervisors concerns the lack of resources allocated to the program, which makes recruiting designated human resources for the job more difficult:

"Look at me. On top of everything I do, I also have to handle the violations, reports, their requests, send them to the committees and so on. This lands a lot of tasks on my desk to both supervise and check up on, we need more human resources to do that, and we get none" (Interviewee 1).

"The biggest problem is the lack of resources, we don't have the money to operate and deal with the program and this is very hard work" (Interviewee 3).

The Parole Board members deal with the basic difficulties of operating the program, and criticize what they see as a lack of sufficient care for the released prisoners:

"The issue of care in the program should be improved. The supervision should be carried out with more care than just one treatment hour per week; or even worse, once every couple of weeks." (Interviewee 2).

3.2.4 The Dialog between Rehabilitation and Control

When examining the view of the interviewees towards the EM project, we found that the interviews contained many motifs expressing duality, and sometimes even polarity, in their views of the project. In almost all the interviews, it was obvious that interviewees experienced some kind of inner dialog about the role and status of supervision compared to that of care and rehabilitation, and that interviewees tried to examine the relationship - if any - between these two elements. It seems that the duality between these two aspects increased when interviewees were asked what they thought about the addition of GPS technology to the electronic bracelet. We found that this trend existed equally among the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors as well as Parole Board members. Interviewee 1, for example, evaluated the difficulty in carrying out his job, both as a therapist and as a supervisor: *"I am not a police detective nor do I want to be part of the police. He [the prisoner] tells me his version and I write it down"*.

Interviewee 2 also pondered the place of rehabilitation in the monitoring tool of the electronic bracelet: *"Morally speaking, 'Big Brother is watching'. We need to check whether monitoring a person's activity so closely weighs down the rehabilitation or helps it. A person who always knows he's being followed… that might explode in your face. I wouldn't want to be followed… it is a harsh feeling."*

Interviewee 5 added to that: *"To put a bracelet on a man is not the focus of therapy and rehabilitation."* As mentioned, the members of the Parole Boards also tended to discuss the relationship between treatment and supervision, and in their opinion it is not always clear which of these aspects should be emphasized:

Interviewee 1: *"It was very hard for me in the committees, I try not to sit with some judges because they are persistent with their own perception, assuming that you should care for the safety of the public and nothing more… they don't know how to evaluate the rehabilitation"*

Interviewee 4 added: *"The problem is we have a negative message here – 'we let you out but we don't really trust you'."*

3.2.5 Metaphors, Imagery and Conceptualization

To conclude the qualitative analysis of this study, we examined interviewees' perceptions and conceptualizations of the EM program *via* analysis of their own words and the way in which, sometimes unconsciously, they chose to describe their position.

Metaphors and imagery project emotions, thoughts and worldview, especially when a discussion is unplanned. Therefore, metaphors assist in conceptualizing ideas and perceptions that are hard to explain by using terminology drawn from more familiar fields of human experience (Cooperberg, 2010).

In the interviews with Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors, 11 uses of imagery and metaphor were identified, some of which are described below:

"It is a process." (Interviewee 1)

"It is another layer of treatment and does not replace it." (Interviewee 4)

"It is a harsh frame, a clear one." (Interviewee 5)

> *"Gradual treatment." (Interviewee 2)*

> *"Learning boundaries and acceptance of authority." (Interviewee 1)*

> *"A gradual process which allows one to adjust." (Interviewee 4)*

> *"A corrective experience of boundaries."*

> *"Boundaries instead of walls."*

An analysis of this conceptualization and imagery shows that the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors interviewed consider the EM program as having rehabilitative and therapeutic properties, and therefore see it as an essential, effective, and worthy tool.

The analysis of the words the supervisors used in their interviews clearly points to the realization that, in their opinion, an "ordinary" rehabilitation program is not sufficient for all prisoners, and that the bracelet is a tool that may help some prisoners, rather than disturbing or hindering their rehabilitation.

However, a content analysis of the imageries used by the 4 interviewees who were members of Parole Boards shows that they expressed more restrained support of the project, some going so far as to express objection to its essence and its overuse:

> *"Soon enough they'll put a collar around their necks, like they do a dog."*

> *"It's a way to subjugate a man."*

> *"You cannot humiliate a man and break his spirit; it's the Big Brother style"*

> *"The walls of prison were converted into bracelets but the man is still a prisoner."*

3.3 Discussion

The second part of the study presents the perceptions of program operators and members of Parole Boards regarding the EM program. We conducted semi-structured interviews that allowed us to obtain both structured and systematic information, and an expression of participants' feelings, beliefs and emotions regarding the project. The descriptions and perceptions expressed in the study combined cognition with emotion, and action with a respondent's inner thoughts and perceptions. Most of the themes that emerged were constructed from a reading and analysis of the interviews, which pointed to a particular phenomenon and its scope. In this way, we constructed and conceptualized the main categories of the emergent themes. From the content analysis we performed on the interviews, we learned that participants felt disoriented and uncomfortable when asked to discuss the issue of which prisoners are suitable for the EM program.

It seemed that a lack of protocols and clear instructions for the EM program resulted in a lack of professional conformity and different, sometimes opposing, positions among supervisors. This was also true of the issue of the EM program's goals as the respondents saw them. Here, it seemed that the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority supervisors tend to see the program as having rehabilitation and therapeutic goals more than did the Parole Board members, who considered the program to have monitoring goals, and thus expressed the need to maintain public safety.

In an attempt to provide interpretive insight to the words the interviewees used, we performed an analysis of the conceptualizations, imagery and metaphors they employed to describe the project or their feelings towards it. It is important to note that interviewees expressed these elements independently, without prompting from interviewers.

Analysis of these terms showed that interviewees from the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority tended to describe the project in a therapeutic, rehabilitating and procedural manner, which is consistent with the "Rehabilitating Beliefs" credo (Hucklesby, 2011), whereas analysis of the Parole Board members showed an interesting duality of data. Unlike the Penal Beliefs credo described by Hucklesby– which is prominent among those in the law-enforcement system who adhere to the Crime Control model, and who tend to place the penal factor in the center - the Parole Board members expressed a greater degree of hesitation, and - in some cases - even aversion to the program and what it represents, alongside support for the penal element of the program. This is mostly due to ethical issues related to the ongoing monitoring and handcuffing of people after their release from prison.

All those participating in this study were given the opportunity to present the numerous and varied issues they encountered when running the EM program. These issues can be divided into technical and organizational difficulties. The main difficulties that participants described arose from repeated technical malfunctions, bureaucracy and foot-dragging behalf of the Prison Service, issues which make work difficult and tedious; plus a lack of clear protocols, and of material and human resources. The analysis of the interviews shows that the

participants experienced ambiguous feelings, as a result of the clash between the rehabilitation-therapeutic and the monitoring-penal approach. Respondents from both the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority and Parole Boards discussed the connection between treatment and monitoring, and the apparent basic contradictions between them. While the electronic bracelet is seen as a means of supervision, monitoring and control over a released prisoner, the EM program also has rehabilitation and even therapeutic properties. Therefore, Israel's EM program for released prisoners seems to have achieved several goals, both on a monitoring and a rehabilitation level, which do not necessarily contradict each another but which are goals that can coexist.

An examination of the responses of supervised released prisoners gives us basic insight into the idea that supervision alone is insufficient to change a criminal lifestyle. Instead, in order to allow released prisoners to choose an alternative way of life, released prisoners also need therapy and opportunities to learn new life skills.

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, there is no doubt that placing a released prisoner under electronic monitoring is a harsh measure, both for the individual and his environment. The electronic bracelet is a disturbing and limiting factor, and may even be visible in a way that induces fear and social stigma. Nevertheless, it appears that most released prisoners participating in the EM project in Israel do not show hostility, rage or anger towards the system that applied the EM bracelet.

Instead, many of them show the opposite response; and even when prisoners do attribute negative feelings towards the electronic bracelet, it seems they find an equal amount of positive aspects to it. Further, most released prisoners on the EM program express, at least declaratively, a high level of positive expectations for the future, and a sense of participation in wider social circles, as evidenced by the relatively high frequency of normative perceptions among the supervised population..

It seems that the unique properties of the EM program in Israel, including the fact that the program incorporates therapeutic and rehabilitative components alongside the monitoring component, have helped reduce the sense of alienation and increase positive, normative perceptions among supervised released prisoners. However, we do note that, in the absence of an appropriate control group, we cannot conclude whether the positive findings are necessarily and solely the result of the supervised prisoner's participation in the EM program.

Analysis of interviews with program supervisors revealed a sense of vagueness and a lack of certainty over the organizational and therapeutic purposes of the EM program. As a result, the program's goals are also not clear to supervisors. Further, it seems there is confusion over which prisoners are best suited for the program in the first place, apparently because supervisors are not given a distinctive profile, of which released prisoners would benefit from this type of rehabilitation program, nor which personality, family and other external characteristics would make a prisoner suitable for the EM program. Another important issue raised in the interviews concerns the difficulties supervisors encounter while running the program, on both a technical and an organizational level, which mostly stem from a lack of designated budget and high workloads.

Issues such as a lack of clear work protocols, extensive bureaucracy, and foot-dragging over treatment, set against a background of insufficient human and other resources, highlights the ambiguities and lack of clarity that supervisors face in this area. These issues suggest that there is a need to clarify and define the ways in which the security and rehabilitation aspects of the Israeli EM program intersect with each other.

It seems that, paradoxically, it is precisely the lack of clear and defined proceedings that enables a supervisor to exercise broad discretion and adjust his responses to a particular supervised individual and to violations he commits. That may be the reason for the high satisfaction expressed by the supervised individuals, who may see their supervisors as people who take their needs into consideration, and whose responses are not arbitrary.

This study attempts to understand the personal aspects and experience of both supervised released prisoners and supervisory personnel. Its findings aim to improve knowledge and understanding of an important aspect of the EM program that has been largely overlooked in the current literature. The study of supervisors' subjective perceptions toward the EM program can lead to a better, more efficient running of the program from the perspectives of both supervised released prisoners and supervisors. By understanding released prisoners' personal experiences, therapeutic staff will be able to tailor treatments to a prisoner's specific needs, thereby increasing the success rate of the EM program by, among other things, reducing reoffending rates.

Indeed, the next stage of this evaluation study aims to examine the level of criminal behavior among electronically-monitored released prisoners four years after their monitoring period has ended. To that end, we examined rates of arrests and incarceration during a follow-up period of up to four years, among a cohort of all license-released prisoners participating in the EM program, and compared them to the recidivism rates among a

control group taken from a cohort of all released prisoners found unsuitable for early release just before the EM program was launched. The primary findings of this next stage of our study clearly show that, at the end of a four-year follow-up period, rates of re-incarceration among the control group are three times higher than the study group. The findings of the study regarding recidivism among released prisoners under EM will be discussed in our next article.

This study has at least two, possible limitations. The first is the relatively low number of questionnaires that were returned in the quantitative part of the study (*n*=75). The number of returned questionnaires was smaller than expected, since during the second half of 2011 the Israeli Ministry of Interior, which was responsible for this initiative, stopped directing released prisoners to electronic monitoring for their parole period, and therefore the number of supervised released prisoners decreased during the period of the study. The second limitation is the fact that the questionnaires were completed by supervised individuals at the offices of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority, the body responsible for supervising the initiative. This may have caused respondents to avoid giving candid answers, and given rise to biased answers aimed at appeasing the respondents' therapists. While the researchers worked as best they could to minimize this bias, *inter alia* by using anonymous questionnaires delivered in sealed envelopes, one cannot ignore the possibility that the positive approaches demonstrated by the supervised prisoners stem, at least partially, from the will to appease their therapists and supervisors.

However, the findings of this study enrich existing knowledge in the field of community rehabilitation programs as a whole, and EM programs in particular. Community rehabilitation programs acknowledge the complexity of human behavior and of the capacity to change, even if this is a long, difficult process.

References

Albrecht, H. (2005). *Electronic monitoring in Europe. A summary and assessment of recent developments in the legal framework and the implementation of electronic monitoring*. Retrieved March 6, 2007, from http://www.iuscrim.mpg.de/forsch/onlinepub/albrecht.pdf

Amir, M., Horowitz, M., & Sagiv, B. (2005). *Rehabilitation of released prisoners within the community*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Criminology Institute and the Prisoners' Rehabilitation Authority. (Hebrew)

Bales, W., Mann, K., Blomberg, T., Gaes, G., Barrick, K., Dhungana, K., & McManus, B. (2010). *A Quantitative and qualitative assessment of electronic Monitoring. Report submitted to the office of justice program.* USA: National Institute of Justice U.S. Department of Justice.

Black, M., & Smith, R.G. (2003). Electronic monitoring and the criminal justice system. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice, 254,* 1-6.

Bonta, J., Rooney, J., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1999). *Electronic monitoring in Canada.* Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada.

Bottos, S. (2008). *An overview of electronic monitoring in corrections: The issues and implications* (No. R-182). Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Braithwaite, J. (1995). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J. (2000). Democracy, community and problem solving. In G. Burford, & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Family group conferencing: New directions in community-centered child and family practice*. New York: Adline de Gruyther. Retrieved on November 21, 2009, from http://www.iirp.org./library/vt/vt_brai.html

Crawley, E., & Crawley, P. (2008). Understanding prison officers: *Culture, cohesion and conflict*. In J. Bennett, B. Crewe, & A. Wahidin (Eds), *Understanding prison staff* (pp. 134-152). Devov, Willan Publishing.

Cooperberg, A. (2010). "The four-worlds model" for interactive conversation analysis. In L. Kassan, & M. Krumer-Nevo (Eds.), *Methods for the analysis of qualitative data* (pp. 155-180). Be'er Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev. (Hebrew)

Dodgson, K., Goodwin, P., Howard, P., Llewellyn-Thomas, S., Mortimer, E., Russell, M., & Weiner, M. (2001). *Electronic monitoring of released prisoners: an evaluation of the Home Detention Curfew scheme*. Home Office Research Study 222, London: Home Office.

Gable, R. K., & Gable, R. S. (2005). Electronic monitoring: Positive intervention strategies. *Federal Probation, 69,* 1-7.

Gainey, R. R., & Payne, B. K. (2000). Understanding the experience of house arrest with electronic monitoring: An analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and*

Comparative Criminology, 44, 84-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X00441008

Gainey, R. R., Payne, B. K., Brian K., & O'Toole, M. (2000). The relationships between time in jail, time on electronic monitoring, and recidivism: An event history analysis of a jail-based program. *Justice Quarterly*, *17,* 733-752. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418820000094741

Gazel,O.,Solizaino-Keinen, R,. Einav, G., & Shobash, E. (2008). Jews and Arabs in early remand extention. *Law, 38*, 1-29. (Hebrew)

Harris, N., & Maruna, S. (2005). Shame, shaming and restorative justice: A critical appraisal. In D. Sullivan, & L. Tifft (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice: A global perspective* (pp. 452-462). London: Routledge.

Haverkamp, R. (2002). *Implementing Electronic Monitoring. A comparative, empirical study on attitudes towards the measure in Lower Saxony/Germany and in Sweden. Research in brief, 14*, 1-23.

Hucklesby, A. (2008). Vehicles of desistance: the impact of electronically monitored curfew orders. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 1*(8), 51-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1748895807085869

Hucklesby, A. (2009). Understanding Offenders' Compliance: A Case Study of electronically monitored curfew orders. *Journal of Law and Society*, *36*(2), 248-271. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2009.00465.x

Hucklesby, A. (2011). The working life of electronic monitoring officers. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 11*(1), 59-76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1748895810392185

Lane, J., Turner, S., Fain, T., & Sehgal, A. (2007). Implementing "corrections of lace" ideas: The perspective of clients and staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(1), 76-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854806288436

Larnau, H. (2001). Reforms in the Detention Law for the purpose of investigation in Israel. Ph.D dissertation submitted to the Criminology Institute, Faculty of Law. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University. (Hebrew)

Leiblich A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (2010). Between the whole and its parts, between content and form. In L. Kassan, & M. Krumer-Nevo (Eds.), *Methods for the analysis of qualitative data* (pp. 21-42). Be'er Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev. (Hebrew)

Liebling, L. (2004). Prisons and their moral performance *corrective services workers, employment support workers and prisoners and offenders toward– a study of Values, quality, and prison life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lilly, J. R. (2006). Issues beyond empirical EM reports. *Criminology and Public Policy, 5,* 93-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2006.00105.x

Lobly, D., & Smith, D. (2010). Persistent young offenders. An evaluation of two Pprojects. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 49*, 94-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2009.00600_5.x

Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books.

Maruna, S., Immarigeon, R., & LeBel, T. (2004). Ex-offender reintegration: theory and practice. In S. Maruna, & R. Immarigeon (Eds.), *After crime and punishment: Pathways to ex-offender reintegration.* Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Mayer, M. (2004). *Evaluation of a pilot project on electronic monitoring.* Retrieved March 1, 2007, from http://www.iuscrim.mpg.de/forsch/krim/mayer_en.html

Mazaoue-Marja, M. (2001). *Attitudes of stuff members towards integration of retarded people in the community.* Haifa:University of Haifa. (Hebrew)

Mortimer, E. (2001). Electronic monitoring of released prisoners: An evaluation of the Home Detention Curfew Scheme. In Home Office Findings No 139. Tabs: England.

NAO. (2006). *The electronic monitoring for adult offender.* London: The Stationery.

Nellis, M., & Bas, R. (2012). *Electronically Monitored Punishment: International and critical perspectives.* London: Taylor and Francis.

Packer, H. (1968). *The limits of the criminal sanction.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Padgett, K. G., Bales, W. D., & Blomberg, T. G. (2006). Under surveillance: An empirical test of the effectiveness and consequences of electronic monitoring. *Criminology and Public Policy, 5,* 61-92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2006.00102.x

Payne, B. K., DeMichele, M., & Okafo, N. (2009). Attitudes about electronic monitoring: Minority and majority

racial group differences. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(2), 155-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.02.002

Payne, B. K., & Gainey, R. R. (2004). The electronic monitoring of offenders released from jail or prison: Safety, control, and comparisons to the incarceration experience. *The Prison Journal, 84,* 413-435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0032885504269345

Ratner, A., & Fishman, G. (2004). Justice to everybody? Jews and Arabs in the judiciary system in Israel. In L. Aden, A. Sadmi, & I. Kim (Eds.), *Justice seekers: studies in crime and criminal justice in Israel* (pp. 85-110). Tel-Aviv: Tcherikuver and Beit Berel Press. (Hebrew)

Renzema, M. (2010). Rationalizing the use of electronic monitoring. *Journal of Offender Monitoring, 22*(1), 5-11.

Ronel, N. (2006). When good overcomes bad: The impact of volunteers on those they help. *Human Relations, 59*(8), 1133-1153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726706068802

Ronel, N., & Elisha, E. (2010). In a different perspective: Introducing positive criminology. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 55*(2), 305-325. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X09357772

Ronel, N., & Haimoff-Ayali, R. (2009). The family experience of adolescents with an addicted parent. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology.*

Rutherford, A. (1993). *Criminal Justice and the Pursuit of Decency.* Winchester, Waterside Press.

Shoham, E., Yehosha-Stern, S., Efodi, R., & Diamant, A. (2010). Between supervisor and supervisee: the EM project implementation among released prisoners of the Prisoners' Rehabilitation Authority. *A window to prison, 14,* 86-112. (Hebrew).

Shoham, E., Yehosha, S., & Efodi, R. (2013) Socio-Legal Characteristics and Parole Violation among Israeli Released Prisoners during Electronic Monitoring. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 57,* 864-887. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12439864

Shoham, E., & Tzeichner, S. (2008). *Tattooed identity.* Be'er Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev. (Hebrew)

Shkedi, A. (2003). *Words that attempt to touch: qualitative study – theory and application.* Tel Aviv: Ramot Publishing – Tel Aviv University. Chapter 2 (pp. 37-54). (Hebrew).

Taxman, F. S., Byrne, J. M., & Tharnner, M. H. (2002). *Evaluating the implementation & Impact of a seamless system of care for substance abusing offenders – The HIDTA model.* Final Report, Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Service.

Copyrights