

St. Cloud State University theRepository at St. Cloud State

Culminating Projects in Criminal Justice

Department of Criminal Justice

5-2018

Minority Status, Gender, and Electronic Home Monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota

Lisa M. McEwan

St. Cloud State University, lmcewan@stcloudstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/cjs_etds

Recommended Citation

McEwan, Lisa M., "Minority Status, Gender, and Electronic Home Monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota" (2018). *Culminating Projects in Criminal Justice*. 10.

https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/cjs_etds/10

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Criminal Justice at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Criminal Justice by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu.

**Minority Status, Gender, and Electronic Home Monitoring in
Hennepin County, Minnesota**

by

Lisa M. McEwan

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in Criminal Justice

May 2018

Committee Members:
Mario Hesse, Chairperson
John Baker
Susan Dowds

Abstract

This study examined the relationship of gender and minority status on juveniles who were placed on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The study used juvenile demographic information that was collected upon a juvenile's intake with a member of the department of community corrections. The results of the chi-square analysis that was conducted shows no statistical significant difference in gender or minority status of those placed on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Mother and Father for always being supportive in helping me achieve my goals. I would also like to thank my beautiful wife, Emily McEwan, whom I could not have accomplished this without.

I would like to thank Dr. Hesse for all the support and guidance he has provided in my time as a graduate student at St. Cloud State University and Dr. Baker and Dr. Dowds for giving the gift of time and serving on my committee.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	5
Chapter	
I: Introduction	6
II: Literature Review.....	10
Gender	14
Minnesota and Gender	17
Race.....	18
Minnesota and Race	20
III: Methodology.....	22
Method	22
Operational Linked Variables	23
IV: Results	25
V: Discussion and Conclusion	31
References.....	33

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Number of Juveniles Placed on Electronic Home Monitoring, Split into Minority Status and Gender	25
2. Number of the Juveniles Placed on Electronic Home Monitoring, Split into Gender and Race	28

Chapter I: Introduction

The United States has the highest incarceration rates in the world, although its crime rate does not differ significantly from countries such as Canada or the United Kingdom whose incarceration rate is much lower (UNODC). Yet, in 2015, America incarcerated 552 more individuals than Canada, per 100,000 (World Prison Brief).

The rise in incarceration began with government policies that were established when the “tough on crime” era began in the 1980s. This era observed a huge increase in the number of incarcerated individuals. In 1980, there were 19,000 individuals incarcerated in state prisons. By 2015, this figure had increased to 206,300 individuals. Although there has been an increase in the amount of people locked up, 95% of incarcerated individuals will be released back into their communities (Hughes & Wilson, 2018). The Bureau of Justice’s most recent statistics show that between 2005-2010, three out of four individuals re-entered prison within a five-year period (Durose, Cooper & Synder, 2014). Although there are more incarcerated individuals, the majority of them will be released back into their communities and it is clear that incarceration is not an effective rehabilitation tool.

In the past decade, there have been many independent and government organizations that are looking at alternatives to mass incarceration (ATI). The purpose of the ATI is to keep certain offenders out of prison or jail, still hold them accountable for their actions, and ensure the safety of the community. Alternatives to incarceration also focus on rehabilitation and redirecting criminals towards better futures. While President Obama was the sitting President, the Officer of National Drug Control Policy stated that federal agencies were looking to expand smart probation and continue to introduce problem solving court initiatives around the country. Smart probation began with a project called HOPE, Hawaii’s Opportunity Probation with Enforcement.

The HOPE program uses drug testing and other sanctions to change a probationer's criminal behavior. The program has been shown to reduce recidivism (Obama, 2016). The current administration, under President Trump, has taken a different route. There is currently no data to see what these changes will result in.

Probation and problem-solving courts are just a few alternatives to incarceration, there are also other options such as treatment or programming options that are available including: community service programs, daily reporting centers, and electronic home monitoring. Many of these programs hold offenders accountable while keeping them in their communities and providing them the opportunity to be productive and law-abiding citizens.

Electronic home monitoring's popularity has increased in the last few decades. It is more commonly known as house arrest. It is where the home replaces a jail or prison cell (Ball, 1987). Electronic home monitoring was created by the Schwitzgebel brothers, Ralph, a behavioral psychologist at Harvard and his brother Robert (Lilly & Nellis, 2013). Their intention was to enhance accountability of offenders (Renzema & Mayo-Wilson, 2005). Electronic home monitoring allows the individual to remain in the community, attend school or work, while still holding offenders accountable for their actions and monitoring their whereabouts twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Electronic home monitoring is a cost-effective tool and is usually the offender that pays for the device (Petersilia, 1998). Many researchers have argued that remaining in the community is a key part in changing an individual's behavior.

Electronic home monitoring is an alternative to incarceration that has versatile uses. It can be used both pre-trial and post-conviction and can be used on all types of offenders. Initially, it was used as an alternative to incarceration for low risk offenders, such as those convicted of driving while intoxicated. Since then, it has expanded to parolees and other more serious

offenders (Lily & Ball, 1993). Electronic home monitoring can and is used for both the juvenile and adult population. There is limited research that has been conducted on juveniles that have been placed on electronic home monitoring. Having limited research causes difficulty to fully understand the relationship between electronic home monitoring and juveniles. It is important that more research is conducted.

One private organization that is crucial when discussing juveniles and alternatives to incarceration is the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI). The JDAI was launched in the early 1990s. It was launched due to the overreliance on detention of juveniles. Detention was widespread and growing nationwide, even though many of the detained youth posed little to no threat to public safety (Casey, 2018). Today this organization is a leader in a national movement to ensure that juveniles are not inappropriately removed from their families and communities (Casey, 2016).

One alternative to detention of juveniles that the JDAI took interest in was electronic home monitoring. The JDAI works with many counties and states around the United States. In Hennepin County, Minnesota, the JDAI and Hennepin County have an established partnership. Their specific aim is to eliminate inappropriate or unnecessary use of secure detention for youth, prevent racial and ethnical disparities, and to redirect resources to communities for youth and their families (Rehabilitation).

The purpose of this descriptive study is to examine the number of juveniles, based on minority status and gender that have been placed on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota. The data used in this study is secondary data that was collected from a secure Hennepin County database. The original data was taken by an Hennepin County Department of Community Corrections employee during the juvenile's intake process.

The study will examine if there is disparity between being placed on electronic home monitoring and gender and being placed on electronic home monitoring and minority status. This study examines those juveniles court ordered onto electronic home monitoring. It does not consider any other sanctions that juveniles were court ordered to receive or if no sanction was given at all.

Chapter II: Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to provide descriptive research on juveniles who are placed on electronic home monitoring, examining the variables of minority status and gender. The study will examine if there is disparity between minorities and non-minorities that are placed on electronic home monitoring. It will also examine if there is disparity between males and females placed on electronic home monitoring.

Electronic home monitoring also known as house arrest, home confinement, home incarceration or home detention is an alternative sanction to incarceration for adults and juveniles.

The first device that monitored individuals was created in 1964 by the Schwitgebel brothers, from 1964-1970, they used devices to monitor the locations of parolees, mental health patients and research volunteers in Boston (Beck, Klein-Saffron & Wooten, 1990). The brothers intended the devices to be used to reinforce and reward positive behavior (Beck et al, 1990). By the middle of 1970, they had developed the technology enough to build a prototype that allowed the probation officer and offender to communicate via a two-way coded system inbuilt into the technology (Beck et al, 1990). However, the Schwitgebel brothers struggled to get people interested in the device (Gable & Gable, 2005). It was not until 1983, when district court judge Jack Lowe was looking for a method to keep certain offenders out of prison, that he convinced a computer salesman, Michael Gross, to develop a system to monitor five offenders in New Mexico (Gable et al, 2005). This is where home monitoring began to expand at a rapid pace. By 1985, Kenton County, Kentucky began a pilot project of home monitoring. It was the third program of its kind in the whole of the United States, yet by the following year, there were 45 similar programs implemented across the US, and by 2005, estimates state that approximately

20% of community-based supervision now involves electronic home monitoring (Gable, et al, 2005). Electronic home monitoring is now a successful tool that is frequently used by judges across the United States. It is an alternative to incarceration, yet also provides a more punitive punishment than probation.

When discussing alternatives to incarceration, it is important that the public's opinion is taken into consideration. The public has a big influence over laws and policies. In 2012, Mellman examined the public's perception of the current criminal justice system. He discovered that the public's main concern in the United States is that people want to work and live in safe communities where offenders are held accountable and those who engage in illegal activity face fair and just consequences (Mellman, 2012). There is also the common belief the American system relies too much on mass incarceration and there are better and more cost-effective ways of punishing non-violent offenders. Electronic home monitoring is one of those ways. It provides a punitive sanction that is viewed as much more positive light in comparison to being in a jail or prison facility by those who have committed offences yet is also a restrictive sanction placed upon individuals. It also meets the cost-effective method as those on electronic home monitoring as usually expected to cover the cost of their equipment (Gainey & Payne, 2000). Electronic home monitoring also meets many goals of criminal justice organizations. It incapacitates offenders, it holds them accountable for their actions, while being a cost-effective sanction, and still provides them the opportunity to be a productive citizen in society by working in their communities and remaining in the family home.

Due to the public's concerns about overcrowding and mass incarceration, America has begun to rely heavily on electronic home monitoring. The sanction is similar to work release in prison, but much more cost effective due to not having to pay the cost of housing an offender and

charging those placed on home monitoring (Payne, et al, 2002). Payne conducted research on how different offenders experienced electronic home monitoring. They first looked at the demographic makeup of the criminal justice system. Statistics show that America has locked up minorities at a substantially higher rate than non-minorities. In 2013, black juveniles were four times more likely to be committed as white juveniles, American Indian juveniles were more than three times more likely (Rovner, 2016). The research also considers if gender influences perceptions of alternative sanctions. It is widely known that women make up a small percentage of the overall prison population. This make up will ultimately result in different perspectives of sanctions.

Females make up 7% of the total prison population (Carson, 2016). Payne states that previous research shows that women are less likely to be incarcerated than males, however those who are incarcerated have different needs to their male counterparts. This is due to approximately 80% having dependent children. Therefore, these women rely on the state to help them find caregivers for their children, establish communication with families, and to maintain parental rights. These needs lead to different programs offered to male and female inmates.

Previous research has shown that black males prefer prison to intensive supervision while white males prefer community-based sanctions. Among gender, research show that, females prefer alternative sanctions over incarceration (Payne et al, 2002). Payne was looking to discover if it was the sanction that was experienced differently or if it was the perception of the sanction that was different. They found that electronic home monitoring appeared to be perceived equally among all the different groups although they did find some subtle differences, where women felt more shame wearing the bracelet than their male counterparts, and black males felt that it was a more restrictive sanction than white males. Overall, electronic home monitoring is a sanction that

keeps people out of detention facilities, it allows them to remain in the community, and at home with their family while also being a productive member of society.

Unfortunately, there is still a lot of research to be conducted on juveniles and electronic home monitoring. In 1989, Michael Charles published a nine-month pilot project that had taken place in Allen County. They concluded that well run juvenile electronic monitoring programs had many advantages, including making the juvenile responsible for their behavior, but deterring any future delinquent behavior (Charles, 1989).

Electronic home monitoring is seen as an intermediate sanction, it is not as restrictive as being placed in a detention center, yet not as free as routine probation. If an offender violates the terms of the home monitoring agreement, they will have to report to the detention center.

Previous research shows that all different groups experience electronic home monitoring in a similar way, however, there appears to be little research done on the demographics of who is sanctioned to home monitoring.

There has been discussion about minorities and their over representation in the criminal justice system. Almost all statistics show that America has locked up minorities at a much higher rate than non-minorities. The JDAI is significant because it has become a leading organization that has managed to reach out to government leaders to enact policy change. The JDAI realized that juvenile minorities were being incarcerated at a much higher rate than non-minorities. By 2008, JDAI jurisdictions had managed to reduce the number of detained minorities by 873. This is a significant figure because prior to this and even at the time, there was an ever-increasing rate of detained minorities (Maggard, 2015). Even after this, there were figures released in 2013, by the sentencing project, that showed black juveniles were four times more likely to be committed as white juveniles, and American Indians were three times more likely to be committed than their

white counterparts (Rovner, 2016). This figure shows although work was accomplished there is still a significant difference in the detention and experience of the criminal justice system that minority youth have versus non-minority youth.

Before looking at the demographics of juveniles and their placement onto electronic home monitoring, it is significant to note that in 2011, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention published a study showing that detention of a juvenile does not decrease the risk of recidivism and for those who are in detention centers for low level crimes, it increases their likelihood of going on to commit further crimes. It also notes that even if a juvenile commits a serious offence, this does not mean they are on track to continue committing offences into their adulthood. The juveniles who do go onto continue to commit offences into their adulthood, do so because of substance abuse (Mulvey, 2011). If they are provided with community-based sanctions, and the proper support and treatment programs, there is a high likelihood that most of these juveniles will go on to lead a very productive and lawful lifestyle. Juveniles who are left in the community recidivate less than those who are detained, as many as 70% who are detained in juvenile detention centers are rearrested within a two-year period (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). It is important to note that from 1998 to 2016, bar a blip in 2006, juvenile crimes have been steadily decreasing across the United States (BJS, 2017).

Gender

Tracy, Kempf-Lenoard & Abramoske-James, argue the strongest predictor of crime is gender, although it is often overlooked. Many researchers have concluded that universally males continually exceed crime rates of females. Although this is significant, there have been many misconceptions or lack of data when examining gender disparity and crime. Some researchers have claimed that biological differences such as periods, menopause and pregnancy are all

related to causality of women's criminality. Others, such as Lombroso have claimed that if a female commits a criminal act it is due to that female being abnormal, non-feminine and exhibiting more masculine traits (Tracy et al, 2009). Others have chosen to simply ignore women's criminal behavior. Thrasher in 1927 argued that girls and woman who are involved in gang's is due to the female taking on the role of a male (Tracy et al, 2009). These misconceptions and gender stereotypes leave female criminality causality misunderstood and do not truly represent female criminality.

Along with misconceptions, there has also been a frequent dismissal of female criminality. Many have justified this by arguing there is only a small sample of females available and that males are more violent and serious offenders than their female counterparts (Tracy et al, 2009). Although evidence supports this, it does have the unintended consequence that when comparing males and females and their criminality it exaggerates gender disparity. Whereas, Tracy et al argue, that males and females could be more similar than what has been previously thought. In adulthood they have similar rates of being involved in index crimes, theft offences and offences using weapons. It has also been shown that female juvenile offenders are as likely to continue criminality into their adulthood as male chronic offenders and more so than non-chronic male offenders.

The most recent bureau of justice statistics shows that in the United States, women make up 7% of the correctional population (Carson, 2016). It is also known that woman have a different experience of being incarcerated to men. Statistics show that with less serious crimes, such as shoplifting, and drug use, male and female crime rates are much closer. It is only when taking into account serious offences and violent offences where there is a larger discrepancy between males and females (Belknap, Holsinger & Dunn 1997). When discussing women and

crime, an important link is that many females that commit crimes have a history of abuse. There is research that shows a female who has been sexually abused has a much higher chance of entering the criminal justice system, either as a child or adult (Belknap et al, 1997).

In 2014, the National Center for Juvenile Justice conducted research that showed males are arrested at a much higher rate than females. Out of the male juvenile population of 16,954,000 aged between 10-17, 684,300 male juveniles were arrested in comparison to a female juvenile population of 16, 254, 800, only 278,000 were arrested (ODJJP, 2014). In 2015, the OJJDP conducted similar research, finding that males are more likely to commit and be arrested for 2.3 times as many crimes as females (Puzzanchera, 2017). This shows there is still disparity between the genders. Even though there is evidence that in the last two decades, females have become more prevalent in the juvenile justice system there is still a large disparity. Conrad, in 2014, stated that figures collected between 1985- 2009, showed that delinquent crimes committed by females increased by 86%.

Although juvenile crimes have been decreasing since 1998, except for 2006, females have become more prevalent in the juvenile justice system. By 2008, females had increased their overall arrest rate by 3% from 1999. Although crime was decreasing with this population, the female population decreased significantly less than male population in most categories of crime. An example is in the case of disorderly conduct, where male arrest rates decreased by 5% while the female arrest rate increased by 18% (Gottesman & Schwarz, 2011). In 2012, it did not look like this trend was stopping. There were still several categories of crime, such as aggravated assault, simple assault, larceny-theft, vandalism, and disorderly conduct where, although there was now a decrease in the arrest rate, females still were not decreasing at the faster rate of their male counterparts (Puzzanchera, 2014).

In 1980, females attributed to 17% of juvenile arrests. In 2010, this figure rose to 29%. All the data is stating that since the 1980s there has been a big increase in the number of female juveniles encountering the criminal justice system. As stated earlier, one of the big areas of increase for juvenile females was aggravated and simple assault. The OJJDP argue this can only be down to one of two things, different factors at play influencing the volume or nature of low-violating behaviors or differential responses to how females and males were treated. With laws being implemented and a perspective shift it can determine how law enforcement reacts. The OJJDP refer to how law enforcement handles domestic assaults as one reason to explain this increase.

Minnesota and Gender

In 2010, the fourth district court of the Minnesota Judicial Branch released statistics on two different areas. They used data from Hennepin County, Minnesota, the county with the largest population. The first area researched was looking to see if there were any significant differences between gender and charged versus non-charged cases. The courts looked at all arrests over a 16-month period. The results showed that although most of the charged and non-charged cases were male, there was no significant differences between gender (MN Courts, 2010). The courts then analyzed arrest offences that are charged in court. The results showed there was a significant difference between males and females at both the arrest and charge level. Due to there being more males in the sample, more males were arrested for mandatory, other felony and non-felony cases. This being stated, females were more likely to be arrested and charged for domestic and domestic related offences (MN Courts, 2010).

Race

There are two things that are renowned about America and its criminal justice system. The first is that America is known for mass incarceration. The second is that minorities are incarcerated at a substantially higher rate than non-minorities.

Although there is a staggeringly higher number of minorities in the criminal justice system, when it comes to youth, researchers found there were very few differences in crimes committed by minority versus non-minority youth. They did find that there are some behavioral differences, such as minority youth are more likely to commit more violent offences. However, violent offences only make up approximately 5% of arrests (Rovner, 2016). White youth are more likely to use drugs. Both minority and non-minority youth are equally likely to get into fights, steal, sell drugs, carry weapons and commit status offences such as skipping school (Rovner, 2016). Statistics as recent as 2013, still show that minority youth, specifically black youth were arrested at a rate of 738 per 10,000, in comparison to 322 white youth arrested per 10,000. This shows there is still a significant racial disparity in the juvenile justice system, where a portion of society has a higher chance of being arrested due to their race.

There are many researchers who have tried to understand the reasons behind the clear disparity that exists. Some argue that minority youth are more likely to be committing delinquent acts while on the street or in other observable places, whereas white youth commit delinquency from inside their homes. Others argue that is down to bias by the police and other individuals working in the criminal justice system. Bias is subjective and therefore difficult for researchers to measure. Whatever the reasons maybe it is undeniable that racial disparity exists in America.

This reason is why foundations like the Juvenile Detention Alternative initiative were founded. Not only does the JDAI seek to decrease the number of juveniles in detention centers, it

also seeks to decrease racial disparity within the system. It discussed over representation of disproportionate minority confinement occurs when racial groups representation in confinement exceeds their representation in the general population (Hoytt, Schiralidi, Smith & Ziedenberg, 2002).

The JDAI looked at the figures and saw that by 1997, 30 out of 50 states totaling 83% of the population, minority youth represented the majority of youth in detention. This included states like Minnesota, where 90% of the population was white (Hoytt et al, 2002). The OJJDP went further and discovered that in every state, with the exception of Vermont, the minority population of detained youth far exceeded their general population. The JDAI came up with guiding principles to reduce the clear disparity. They included ensuring all children be treated equally within the criminal justice system, being aware that racial disparities occur due to conscious and subconscious racism. Both individuals and agencies needed to take responsibility in resolving the issue, that data needed to be continually collected and analyzed, and leadership was needed to help transform the system. They began in five counties, looking at multi-agency collaborations, changing how admissions decision were being made, how cases were handled, and began creating alternatives to detention facilities. Although there were ups and downs, they appeared to be have success on reducing reliance on detention while not increasing re-arrest or failure to appear rates. This has now evolved into nationwide policies and procedures that are used in many counties. Their strategies remain the same; providing objective admission screening instruments so that only high-risk juveniles are kept, continually looking at new or enhancing alterative sanctions, expediting the case processing to reduce length of stay, and new policies and practices for probation violations, warrants and awaiting placement cases (Hoytt et al, 2002). JDAI notes that they try to influence and change the justice system for all youth and

disparities between racial groups, yet they also understand that there were and still are other factors that contribute to the racial disparity in the criminal justice system that they are unable to effect change in.

The JDAI although unable to always enact change that is outside of the juvenile justice system are now a key foundation in how the United States treats its juveniles. It has had many successes that show they have managed to reduce the reliance of placing children in detention facilities. They have made significant difference in reducing racial disparity and appear to continually play a pivotal role in juvenile justice.

Minnesota and Race

Minnesota is not unlike many other states across America. It has a disproportionate number of minorities within the criminal justice system. Minority youth in Minnesota constituted 22% of the total youth population but represented 46% of juvenile arrests. In 2009, Minnesota sought to change this statistic, it enacted a law to address racial and ethnic disparity, the data collected and analyzed would be on race, ethnicity and gender (DPS, 2012). The data was collected and revealed large disparity between race in the Minnesota's juvenile justice system. It showed that African American youth are six time more likely to be arrested than white youth, American Indian youth are four times more likely to be detained in secure confinement and twice as likely to be petitioned to court than white youth, that minority youth with the exception of the Asian population were half as likely to receive probation and that African American youth were six times more likely to be charged as an adult (DPS, 2012). This data led Minnesota to really shift into a period of looking at rehabilitative model, using diversion programs and partnering with organizations such as the JDAI whose aim is to reduce the incarceration of juveniles and minimize racial disparities.

In 2010, the Honorable Lucy Wieland who was the co-coordinator of the JDAI in Hennepin County requested a study be conducted on youth who were arrested on new offences and brought to the Juvenile Detention Center in Minneapolis. The study focused on those who were then formally charged, looking at level of offense when arrested and when charged, examining the variables of race, ethnicity and gender, and arresting police agency. The study also analyzed arrests where no formal charging was assigned. The results showed that looking at all arrests, those who were formally charged versus those who were not, there was a significantly higher percentage of minorities arrested and never charged. The demographics of the sample they used who were formally charged was 84% male, 69% Black, 19% White, and 11% Hispanic. The results showed that there were significantly more minority youth were charged with 15 and six-point offences (Schaefer & Podkopacz, 2010).

In 2015 the US Census Bureau provided estimates of the population demographics of Minnesota. It showed the minority population made up 19% of the total population, the other 81% is made up of white people (US Census, 2015). The US Census Bureau's data for July 2016, in Hennepin County showed a population estimate of 1,232, 483. The demographics showed that 75.2% of the population is made up of white people. The other 24.8% is made up of minority populations (US Census, 2016). The demographics have not changed significantly since 2010. It is clear to see that looking at the racial make-up on Hennepin county, there is a much larger proportion of minorities that are entering the criminal justice system.

Chapter III: Methodology

This descriptive study will provide research on juveniles who are placed on electronic home monitoring, examining the variables of race and gender. The study will examine if there is a disparity between minorities and non-minorities that are court ordered onto electronic home monitoring. It also examines if there is disparity between males and females being court-ordered onto the program. Pre and post adjudicated juveniles are included in the study.

The data examined below was collected by individual department of community corrections in Hennepin County, Minnesota. All results will pertain specifically to Hennepin County.

The following non-directional hypotheses will be analyzed and addressed:

Ho: Neither males or females are disproportionately placed on Electronic Home Monitoring

Ha: There is a disproportionate number of males or females placed on Electronic Home Monitoring

Ho: Neither Minorities or Non-Minorities are placed on Electronic Home Monitoring disproportionately

Ha: Minorities or Non-Minorities are placed on Electronic Home Monitoring disproportionately

Method

This study provides data on gender and minority status of juveniles who were placed on electronic home monitoring between Thursday, October 5th, 2017 and Thursday, December 7th, 2017. A total period of nine weeks. One juvenile was not used in this study due to not being present at the time of intake, therefore, the researcher was unable to verify demographic information. If any juvenile left the program for any reason and then was put back onto electronic home monitoring during this time, their demographic details were only used once. The

study uses both pre and post adjudicated juveniles. It is important to note that Juveniles do not cover the cost of being placed on EHM. Hennepin County Department of Community Corrections that covers the cost of all juvenile EHM programming.

The demographic information used in this study was collected when the juvenile had their intake process with an employee of Hennepin County's Department of Community Corrections.

The data collected, and this research does not examine other sanctions that juveniles received. It focuses on those placed on court ordered electronic home monitoring.

The collected data was analyzed using the software program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The statistical test that was run is a Chi-Square. A Chi-Square analysis examines how well the observed data fits the distribution expected. It also tests how likely it is that an observed distribution resulted from chance. A p- value of 0.5 was used when computing Chi-Square. This study is using independent categorical variables. In gender, this is split into male and female, in minority status this is split into: White, Black, American Indian, Multi-race and Other. The dependent variable is being court-ordered onto electronic home monitoring.

This study includes all juveniles who were court ordered onto electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County between the dates of October 5, 2017 to December 7, 2017. A total of nine weeks.

Operational Linked Variables

Juvenile- Individual between the ages of 10-17 years old. Juveniles in Minnesota are youth charged with a criminal law violation who were below the age of 18 years old at the time of the offense, arrest or referral to court. In Minnesota for a child to be deemed delinquent, the child must be older than 14 years of age.

Gender- The Biological Sex someone was born with, either born as a Male or a Female. This study examines Gender as an Independent variable looking to see if there is disparity between male and females and being placed on electronic home monitoring.

Minority Status- A Non- Minority is an Individual who self identifies as white. A Minority is an Individual who identifies as other than white. In this study that includes, Black, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or more races and those who identified as Other. Minority Status is this study is an independent variable, it examines whether there is disparity between minority status and being court ordered onto electronic home monitoring.

Chapter IV: Results

Table 1

Number of Juveniles Placed on Electronic Home Monitoring, Split into
Minority Status and Gender

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Race	Minority	Count	105	19	124
		Expected Count	105.1	18.9	124.0
		% within Race	84.7%	15.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	94.6%	95.0%	94.7%
		% of Total	80.2%	14.5%	94.7%
	Non-Minority	Count	6	1	7
		Expected Count	5.9	1.1	7.0
		% within Race	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	5.4%	5.0%	5.3%
		% of Total	4.6%	0.8%	5.3%
Total	Count	111	20	131	
	Expected Count	111.0	20.0	131.0	
	% within Race	84.7%	15.3%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	84.7%	15.3%	100.0%	

The data was provided by Hennepin County's Home Monitoring Unit. The sample includes 131 Juvenile's that were court ordered to Home Monitoring in Hennepin County between October 5, 2017 and December 7, 2017. By examining Table 1, It shows there were a much larger number of juveniles that identified as a minority that were placed in the program.

94.6% of juveniles placed on Electronic Home Monitoring Identified as a Minority. There was also a high male to female ratio. 84.7% of the 131 juveniles were male. This means that there were 15.3% of females who were placed on Electronic Home Monitoring. Previously discussed was the current percentage of female inmates in American Prisons, and Jails as approximately 7%. This shows there is double the number of juvenile woman that are incarcerated on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County.

The Expected frequency in the Chi Square Statistic's purpose is to examine whether there are divergences from the observed data, and if that observance would be expected under the null hypothesis. The observed and expected numbers that Chi Square analysis calculated in Table 1 shows there is very little difference in the two numbers. There were 105 observed minority males, the expected number was 105.1, there was 19 minority females versus the 18.9 expected number. This shows that there is no significant difference between observed and expected values based on race and gender.

Computed Chi-Square value from the 131 Juveniles placed on Electronic Home Monitoring in
Hennepin County

$$X^2(2) = .006, P > .05$$

The Chi-Square Value for this data is .006, since the calculated Chi-Square has a significance of .941. This was tested at the $P < .05$, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no statistical significance between gender, race and those placed on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Phi Output based on Tables 1

$$P(1) = -.006, P > .05$$

The Phi Value indicates the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Gender and being placed on electronic home monitoring, and race and being placed on electronic home monitoring. Phi Value is measured on a scale from -1 to 1, the closer the value is to -1 or 1 the stronger the relationship between the variables, the closer the value is to zero the weaker the relationship is. Based on table 3 and the computed Phi square value of -.006, indicates there is little to no relationship between race, gender and being placed on electronic home monitoring.

The first tables show there is no significance between males, females, minorities and non-minorities. To ensure the results the researcher had obtained were valid, a second Chi Square analysis was examined. The main difference being that instead of having larger categories of simply minority and non-minority, it included categories of race split up into black, white, American Indian and other. Other included Asian, Hispanic, 2 or more races and those who listed other as their race. Unfortunately, the data could not be split up further due to lack of numbers the raw data provided.

Table 2

Number of the Juveniles Placed on Electronic Home Monitoring, Split into Gender and Race

Race * Gender Crosstabulation					
			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Race	White	Count	6	1	7
		Expected Count	5.9	1.1	7.0
		% within Race	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	5.4%	5.0%	5.3%
		% of Total	4.6%	0.8%	5.3%
	Black	Count	80	16	96
		Expected Count	81.3	14.7	96.0
		% within Race	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	72.1%	80.0%	73.3%
		% of Total	61.1%	12.2%	73.3%
	American Indian	Count	3	2	5
		Expected Count	4.2	.8	5.0
		% within Race	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	2.7%	10.0%	3.8%
		% of Total	2.3%	1.5%	3.8%
	Other	Count	22	1	23
		Expected Count	19.5	3.5	23.0
		% within Race	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	19.8%	5.0%	17.6%
		% of Total	16.8%	0.8%	17.6%
Total	Count	111	20	131	
	Expected Count	111.0	20.0	131.0	
	% within Race	84.7%	15.3%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	84.7%	15.3%	100.0%	

Although Table 4 has smaller categories of Race, there is still little difference between the expected and observed frequencies. The biggest difference of observed and expected is apparent in the Other category, where the observed frequency is 22 for Males, the expected is 19.5, and where the observed for Other Females is 1, the expected is 3.5. This is a very small divergence between the two frequencies. This table does allow us to examine closer the minority category. There are 73.3% Black juveniles placed on Electronic Home Monitoring, 3.8% American Indian juveniles, 17.6% who identified as Other on the program and 5.3% White juveniles.

Computed Chi-Square value from the 131 Juveniles placed on Electronic Home Monitoring in Hennepin County, Minnesota

$$X^2 (3) = 4.64, P > .05$$

The Chi-Square Value for this data sample is 4.635. The significance level if this value is .201. Therefore, there is no association between race, gender and being placed on electronic home monitoring. The second set of tables concur with the results of the first, there is no statistical significance shown between the variables of race, gender and being placed on home monitoring in Hennepin County.

Phi output based on Table 2

$$P(3) = 1.9, P > .05$$

The computed Phi Square Value is .188. This value indicates there is a very weak positive association between race, gender and being placed on electronic home monitoring.

The second set of tables show that even when splitting the minority groups up, there was still no statistical significance shown. Therefore, it must be concluded that there is no significant difference between minority and non-minority placed on electronic home monitoring in

Hennepin county, and there is no significant difference between male and female juveniles placed on electronic home monitoring in Hennepin county

Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to provide descriptive research to examine the relationship between gender and electronic home monitoring, and minority status and electronic home monitoring. The data sample was collected from Hennepin County's electronic home monitoring unit. The initial data was collected by a Hennepin County Department of Community Corrections employee. The data was analyzed using a Chi-Square analysis.

The results show that there is no statistical significance between juvenile's race and gender that are placed on EHM. There is no significant difference between minorities and non-minorities placed on EHM in Hennepin County. The observed and expected number of both minorities and non-minorities were very close, showing there was little difference between the observed numbers and what was expected. There was no significant difference between males and females placed on EHM, again the observed numbers were very close to the expected numbers calculated through the Chi Square analysis.

Even though the results of the Chi-Square do not show there is statistical significance between juvenile's race and gender that are placed on electronic home monitoring. When we break the figures down these results are no different from the ones that we have seen in the past few decades regarding the higher proportion of males and minorities that are in the criminal justice system. There is a much higher rate of minority individuals that are sanctioned to electronic home monitoring. There is substantially higher population of males that are sanctioned to electronic home monitoring.

The breakdown of the data collected shows that out of 131 juveniles, 111 were male. From the 111, 80 of those were black juveniles, 6 were white, and 25 were classed as other, meaning they had a minority status. Even when we consider the 20 females that were placed on

the program, 16 identified as black. Only 1 white female was placed on the program between October 5th to December 7th. These statistics show the continued involvement of minority youth in the criminal justice system. Although, there has been a movement from detention centers to alterative sanctions, it appears that there is still an over-representation of minorities in the criminal justice system.

The Goodness of Fit Chi-Square analysis showed that all the categories were not of equal value. There was a much higher proportion of Minority Male's and Black Males when the categories were further split up.

There are a few limitations to this research study. The study could have been much more in depth. The study focuses on one sanction juveniles in Hennepin County, MN are placed on and their demographics. It does not look further than that. There was a small sample sized used, ideally the study would have taken place over a longer period. It is important to note this study was providing descriptive research on juvenile's demographics of minority status and gender in Hennepin county that were court ordered onto electronic home monitoring. It did not look at alterative sanctions or dismissed cases. The chi square analysis that was used in this study considers the variables and how much are in each to work out if there is significant association between them.

References

- Age, Race & Ethnicity / MN State Demographic Center. (2015). Retrieved from <https://mn.gov/admin/demography/data-by-topic/age-race-ethnicity/>
- Ball, R., Huff, C. R., & Lilly, J. R. (1987). *House arrest and correctional policy: Doing time at home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beck, J. L., Klein-Saffran, J., & Wooten, H. B. (1990). Home confinement and the use of electronic monitoring with federal parolees. *Fed. Probation*, 54, 22.
- Belknap, J., Holsinger, K., & Dunn, M. (1997). Understanding incarcerated girls: The results of a focus group study. *The Prison Journal*, 77(4), 381-404.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics Reentry Trends in the U.S.: Highlights. (2018, February 13). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/reentry/reentry.cfm>
- Carson, E. A., & U.S. Department of Justice. (2018, January). Prisoners in 2016. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p16.pdf>
- Charles, M. T. (1989). Electronic monitoring for juveniles. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 12(2), 147-169.
- Criminal Justice Facts | The Sentencing Project. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts>
- Department of Public Safety Office of Justice Programs. (2012). Disproportionate Minority Contact in Minnesota's Juvenile Justice System. *On the Level*. Retrieved from https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/Documents/On%20The%20Level_FINAL.pdf
- Development Services Group, Inc. 2014. "Home Confinement and Electronic Monitoring." Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Home_Confinement_EM.pdf Prepared by Development Services Group, Inc., under cooperative agreement number 2013-JF-FX-K002.
- Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Synder, H. N. (2014, April). Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005-2010. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rprts05p0510.pdf>
- Gable, R. K., & Gable, R. S. (2005). Electronic monitoring: Positive intervention strategies. *Fed. Probation*, 69, 21.

- 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(1), 84-96.
- Gottesman, D., & Schwarz, S. W. (2011). Juvenile Justice in the U.S. Facts for Policymakers. *National Center for Children in Poverty*. Retrieved from http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_1038.html
- Hoytt, E. H., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B. V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2002). Reducing Racial Disparities in Juvenile Detention. *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform* 8.
- Hughes, T., & Wilson, D. J. (2018, February 13). Reentry trends in the United States. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/reentry/reentry.cfm>
- “Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.” The Annie E. Casey Foundation 2017, www.aefc.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai/
- Lilly, J. R., Ball, R. A., Curry, G. D., & McMullen, J. (1993). Electronic monitoring of the drunk driver: A seven-year study of the home confinement alternative. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(4), 462-484.
- Lilly, J. R., & Nellis, M. (2013). States of America. *Electronically Monitored Punishment: International and Critical Perspectives*, 21.
- Maggard, S.R. (2015). Assessing the impact of the juvenile detention alternative initiative (JDAI): Predictors of secure detention and length of stay before and after JDAI. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(4), 571-597.
- Mulvey, E. P. (2011). *Highlights from pathways to desistance: A longitudinal study of serious adolescent offenders*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention.
- National Center for Juvenile Justice (December 6, 2017). Juvenile Arrest Rates by Offense, Sex, and Race.
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (n.d.). Hockenberry, Puzzanchera - Juvenile Court Statistics 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjj.org/Publication/Juvenile-Court-Statistics-2014.aspx>
- Office of National Drug Control Policy. (2016). Alternatives to Incarceration. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/ondcp/alternatives-to-incarceration>
- Payne, B. K., & Gainey, R. R. (2002). The influence of demographic factors on the experience of house arrest. *Fed. Probation*, 66, 64.

- Petersilia, J., & National Institute of Justice (U.S.). (1988). *House arrest*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Public Opinion Strategies, & The Mellman Group. (2012, March). Public Opinion on Sentencing and Corrections Policy in America. Retrieved from http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2012/03/30/pew_nationalsurveyresearchpaper_final.pdf
- Puzzanchera, Charles, and Crystal Robson. 2014. *Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Court, 2010*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Rehabilitation, C. C. (n.d) Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiatives. Retrieved November 01, 2017, from <http://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/racial-disparities-in-youth-commitments-and-arrests/>
- Renzema, M., & Mayo-Wilson, E. (2005). Can electronic monitoring reduce crime for moderate to high-risk offenders?. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(2), 215-237.
- Rovner, J. (2016, June 16). States of Incarceration: The Global Context 2016. Retrieved November 01, 2017 from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/global/2016.html>
- Schaefer, S. S., & Podkopacz, M. R. (2010). Decision Point Analysis: Juvenile Arrests and Juvenile Charged Offenses. *Minnesota Judicial Branch*. Retrieved from [http://www.mncourts.gov/mncourtsgov/media/assets/documents/4/reports/Decision Point Analysis Juvenile Arrest and Juvenile Charged Offenses in Hennepin County \(2010\).pdf](http://www.mncourts.gov/mncourtsgov/media/assets/documents/4/reports/Decision_Point_Analysis_Juvenile_Arrest_and_Juvenile_Charged_Offenses_in_Hennepin_County_(2010).pdf)
- Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C. (eds.). 2014. *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2014 National Report*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Tracy, P. E., Kempf-Leonard, K., & Abramoske-James, S. (2009). Gender Differences in Delinquency and Juvenile Justice Processing. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55(2), 171-215. doi:10.1177/0011128708330628
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2018). UNODC Data. Retrieved from <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/statistics.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Hennepin County, Minnesota. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/hennepincountyminnesota/POP060210>

World Prison Brief, Institute for Criminal Policy Research. (2015). Highest to Lowest - Prison Population Rate | World Prison Brief. Retrieved from http://www.prisonstudies.org/highest-to-lowest/prison_population_rate?field_region_taxonomy_tid=All