МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
КАФЕДРА ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ
ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧНИЙ ЦЕНТР

МАТЕРІАЛИ

VIII МІЖВУЗІВСЬКОЇ НАУКОВО-ПРАКТИЧНОЇ

КОНФЕРЕНЦІЇ

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО НАВЧАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧНОГО ЦЕНТРУ

КАФЕДРИ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ

“TO LIVE IN A SAFER WORLD”

(Суми, 28 березня 2014 року)

The eighth scientific practical student`s, postgraduate’s and teacher’s

LSNC conference

Temperatures ended up dropping severely and when he came out in the morning he found his mixture frozen with the stirring stick still in it.

ANKLE MONITORS FOR OFFENDERS‘ CONTRL

A.V.Semenova, YU-05
A.M.Diadechko, ELA

An ankle monitor is a device that is required to be worn by offenders under house arrest. Some states may offer house arrest to offenders convicted of less serious crimes.

The ankle monitor is an electronic device which sends a radio frequency signal containing location and other information to a receiver. The device cannot be easily removed. Any tampering with the device can often trigger an alarm. If an offender moves outside of an allowed range, the police will be notified.

Electronic monitoring was originally developed by a small group of researchers at Harvard University in the 1960s, headed by R. Kirkland Schwitzgebel and his twin brother, Robert Schwitzgebel. In 1983, Judge Jack Love in Albuquerque, New Mexico, inspired by a Spider-Man comic strip, initiated the first judicially sanctioned program using monitoring devices. These were produced by Michael T. Goss, a former Honeywell computer sales representative. Shortly thereafter, programs began in Florida using a cuff invented by Thomas Moody.

Within six years, at least 16 manufacturers were listed in the Journal of Offender Monitoring. In 2006, as estimated, 130,000 units were deployed daily in the United States. They also gained popularity in the United Kingdom, but adoption in the rest of the EU was a little slower. A collection of early equipment and a written summary, with photographs of the history of commercial devices in the United States is housed at the Archives of the History of American Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, USA.

In most cases, an ankle monitor system consists of three main components: an ankle bracelet, an on-site receiver, and a remote receiver. When tethered around the ankle, the bracelet unit takes regular or constant readings of desired information, such as the user’s location. Using either radio transmission or GPS technology, these

readings are sent to an on-site transmitter, usually located in the user's home. Next, the readings are relayed to a remote receiver, which may be located at a police station or monitoring service center. If the readings indicate a breach by the user, such as leaving the home while under house arrest, the proper authorities are alerted and act accordingly.

There are many kinds of an ankle monitor:

Alcohol monitoring is an effective technology for offenders with alcohol-related crimes (driving while intoxicated, habitual traffic offenses).

Drug Court utilizes electronic monitoring as an alternative to jail for offenders who are in the Drug Court Program in Denver District court.

Juvenile monitoring program works with juveniles, their parents/guardians, and probation officers to address specific needs to promote successful completion of electronic monitoring sentences. The program uses a variety of technologies to monitor juvenile offenders.

Post-conviction cases are the largest of the programs administered by the Electronic Monitoring Program, accounting for 57% of offenders monitored. The Courts utilize this program as an alternative sentence to jail and/or a condition of probation. The offender is required to meet with a probation officer either weekly or bi-weekly to address issues, verify employment, treatment, community service, school, and other court approved activities.

The effectiveness of monitoring in reducing crime is uncertain, especially as most people who violate parole are not committing crimes. It is thought that the monitoring may serve as a deterrent to criminal behavior; however, a thorough and comprehensive review of research literature has indicated that, over a period of three years, monitoring did not reduce crime more than other prison diversion programs.

The inventors, Kirkland and Robert Gable, who are now emeritus Professors of Psychology at California Lutheran University and the Claremont Graduate University, have been strongly advocating the use of positive incentives in monitoring programs.