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Executive Summary

The idea of using electronic monitoring (EM) for child support enforcement is popular among child support supervisors, sheriffs, and chief district judges throughout North Carolina. Research literature and case studies show that using EM for child support enforcement can be a cost-effective measure for counties. However, only 27% of the 71 counties that responded to an online survey indicate that their counties use EM for child support enforcement. If EM is popular among various governmental groups, then why are so few counties using this program? This study examines the perceptions of North Carolina child support supervisors, sheriffs, and chief district judges about the use of EM for child support enforcement.
Introduction

Many counties across the United States are facing jail overcrowding (NPR, 2010), and individuals incarcerated in jail cost the tax payers an average of $60 per day (Sullivan, 2010). As a way to decrease costs and cut down on jail overcrowding, counties are starting to look towards alternative forms of confinement, such as using electronic monitoring (EM) devices to keep someone in house arrest.

EM devices are bracelets or anklets that are placed on someone for the duration of a sentence. Currently in North Carolina, if a non-custodial parent (NCP) is unable to pay his or her monthly child support, and arrears are starting to get backed up, then a judge can place that parent in jail for a certain amount of time or, if the NCP has the ability to pay, until he or she does pay. This creates a dilemma for the county; when a NCP is in jail, he or she cannot work or find employment, meaning that the child is no closer to receiving the money than when the NCP was out of jail. Some counties, like Wake County, have embraced using EM for child support enforcement, and have reported savings in incarceration costs (Zingraff, 2010, p.20) as well as an increase in child support collection rates as a result of EM (Zingraff, 2007, p.19). However, survey responses from 71 North Carolina counties indicate that less than 30% of North Carolina counties use EM for child support enforcement. This begs the question of why, if EM is more effective, it is not more widely used. This study examines the perceptions of North Carolina child support supervisors, sheriffs, and chief district judges in order to better understand the factors that contribute to the adoption (or not) of EM for child support enforcement.

Methodology

Links to an electronic survey¹ were emailed to representatives from child support supervisors, sheriffs, and chief district judges across 100 counties in North Carolina (see Appendix A for surveys). Email addresses were provided by the North Carolina Sheriffs Association and the North Carolina Court System. Child support supervisors were emailed by a representative of the North Carolina Child Support Enforcement Program via a listserv. Every North Carolina county was represented by at least one child support supervisor on the listserv. These three groups were chosen because they are the government representatives that would be the most heavily involved in the process of using EM for child support enforcement. The surveys were qualitative in nature, tapping into opinions, logistical questions, and open-ended responses from the subjects. Respondents were promised anonymity. Overall, representatives of 71 North Carolina counties responded to the survey.

The response rates varied by group. A representative of the North Carolina Child Support Enforcement program was not sure of the exact number of child support supervisors on the listserv, but knew that there were at least 100 since at least one representative from each county in North Carolina is a part of the listserv. There were 73² respondents for child support supervisors, 22 respondents for sheriffs (out of 100), and 12 respondents for chief district judges (out of 42). Part of the reason that the nonparticipation among the sheriffs was so high might have been due to 2010 being an election year; the response rates from sheriffs and chief district judges were much lower than child support supervisors.

¹ The Qualtrics survey tool was used as the means of distributing the survey. There were some technical limitations for what could and could not be accomplished in the survey.

² There were 8 counties that had more than one child support supervisor respond.
Literature Review

Extensive research was consulted to determine whether EM in general is an effective and cost-saving measure used by local governments throughout the United States. A study by Dr. Rhonda Zingraff reviewed program effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Wake County’s use of EM for child support enforcement.

The research literature touched on three main themes: whether EM is effective in general, whether EM was used as a form of child support enforcement, and whether EM is a cost-saving program.

EM Effectiveness

In a well-controlled empirical study, Padgett, Blomberg, and Bales found that EM reduced the likelihood of revocation for a technical violation, revocation for a new offense, and revocation for absconding. In some cases the findings were quite significant. Despite individuals placed on EM having significantly higher “risk” levels than offenders not placed on EM, the individuals were less likely to be revoked for a technical violation (Padgett, Blomberg, and Bales, 2006, p.79). Individuals placed on EM were 94.7% less likely for revocation for a new violation than those that were not placed on EM (Padgett, Blomberg, and Bales, 2006, p.79).

Yeh ran a scenario involving the costs and benefits of placing all felony offenders in prison across the United States for 50% of the sentence and on EM for the other 50%. He found that EM and home detention could avert 781,383 crimes annually, including 466,748 violent crimes (Yeh, 2010, p. 1093).

Zingraff conducted a study for the Wake County, North Carolina Human Services, Child Support Enforcement Office that looks into Wake County’s EM program for child support enforcement. She looked at NCPs who were placed on EM for an average of 3.5 months, and observed their payment histories for six months prior and six months after their actual house arrest. Zingraff concludes that over time, individuals placed on EM for child support enforcement “exhibit a more stable pattern of compliance over time and they tend to show greater gains in consistency and effectiveness as well” (Zingraff, 2007, p.19).

EM as a Cost-Saving Program

For Wake County, it costs the taxpayers $68.00 per diem for jail costs versus $12.03 per diem to place an offender on EM (Zingraff, 2010, 20). Wake County’s average total costs of placing one person on EM for child support enforcement comes to around $1263.15, and the average total costs of placing someone in jail comes to around $1591.20 (Zingraff, 2010, p.20). Wake County saves an average of $328.05 per individual by using EM instead of traditional jail incarceration. The social value in crime reduction would be $481.1 billion annually, with a $12.70 gain for every dollar spent on EM and home detention (Yeh, 2010, p. 1094).

Survey Results and Analysis

Overall, 71 North Carolina counties are represented in the survey results. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents representing 71 counties indicated that they use EM for child support enforcement. Response rates from the groups surveyed drastically differed between elected and non-elected positions. All
respondents did not respond to every question. Due to the small response rate from the chief district judges, some of their responses are not included in the following analysis.

**EM Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?</th>
<th>Child support supervisors</th>
<th>Sheriffs</th>
<th>Chief District Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of using EM for child support enforcement is a popular one among all three government departments surveyed. Over three quarters of responding child support supervisors and sheriffs, arguably the two departments most involved in running such a program, believe that EM should be used (Appendix C).

**Barriers to Implementing an EM Program**

Given how popular the idea of using EM for child support enforcement appears to be among the three key government departments that would be assigned with implementing it, it is puzzling why only 27% of respondents from the counties indicated that EM was used in their county. Table 1 shows the responses on why subjects believe that an EM policy for child support enforcement has not been used in their jurisdiction.

**Table 1: If your county/counties does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement, why do you suppose that is? Check all that apply.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to EM</th>
<th>Child support supervisors</th>
<th>Sheriffs</th>
<th>Chief District Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative concerns</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness concerns</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the program</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from the sheriff’s office</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from the courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from child support agency</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Seven child support supervisors, 2 sheriffs, and 1 chief district judge responded that their district already uses electronic monitoring for child support enforcement. Their responses were not included in the table.
Sixty-eight percent of child support supervisors and 69% of sheriffs believed that cost was a major reason for their county to not have an EM for child support enforcement program. This contradicts what is known about the cost factor. Zingraff found that EM is a cheaper form of incarceration to jail.

Governmental relations regarding the issue of using EM for child support enforcement was the next highest issue for respondents. Child support supervisors were 13% more likely to believe that administration concerns were a reason for not having an EM program for child support enforcement than sheriffs (38% for child support supervisors versus 25% for sheriffs). Some of this may be because child support supervisors do not spend as much time around county administration as the sheriff does, and the perception may not completely fit reality. Responses of sheriffs indicated they were slightly more likely to believe that lack of consensus among the three departments more associated with child support enforcement is a factor than child support supervisors (31% and 27%), although the responses were high enough to note the significance.

Regarding poor departmental communications or opposition by another department being the cause of not having an EM for child support enforcement program, child support supervisors and sheriffs were more likely to identify the other department as a factor (6% of child support supervisors’ responses indicated that opposition from the sheriff’s office was a factor versus 8% of sheriffs’ responses indicating that the child support agency was a factor). Interestingly, both child support supervisors and sheriffs were unwilling to place the blame on their departments for the lack of such a program. Only 3% of child support supervisors said that a lack of a program was due to opposition from child support supervisors, and none of the sheriffs indicated that the lack of a program was due to the sheriff’s office.

“Knowledge of the program” and “effectiveness concerns” scored similarly among child support supervisors and sheriffs at approximately 25% each. While subjects are familiar with the concept of using EM for child support enforcement, it appears that they are not as familiar with the specifics about the program. Knowledge (or lack thereof) of how a program works can affect their concerns about whether a program is effective or not.

Respondents’ Perceptions of EM

Subjects were allowed to give open-ended responses to the question “Why do you think that EM should or should not be used for child support enforcement?” (See Appendices E1-E3). For child support supervisors, 16 respondents indicated that EM should be used because the NCP could continue to work while on EM, while 5 respondents indicated the same for sheriffs. “It would allow NCPs who have been found in contempt to be prosecuted, yet continue to work while being monitored by law enforcement,” said one child support supervisor.

Both groups also expressed that it would be easier to find NCPs if they were electronically monitored (9 respondents for child support supervisors, 5 respondents for sheriffs). “We have some child support payers who like to flee and those who are always going to work somewhere but never seem to get there. I feel that the electronic monitoring would be a great tool for those type of people,” responded one child support supervisor in support of EM.

The potential cost-saving aspects that EM could bring were brought up in the open-ended responses (6 respondents for child support supervisors, 4 respondents for sheriffs). “This would be a cost effective
benefit. Currently there are individuals who get arrested and sit in the jail and are happy to do so. They are being fed and taken care of at the taxpayer's expense,” said one child support supervisor.

Some child support supervisors expressed concern that an EM program would mean more manpower for a child support agency (5 respondents) and others were afraid the program would not be effective (4 respondents). Other sheriffs were unconvinced that EM would increase child support collection (2 respondents). “The majority of dead beat dads do not respond to any type of responsibility and to me this process would be a waste of time. I also know some would say they can work and not go to jail; again the majority do not care and will not pay support under any circumstances” said one sheriff.

Chief district judges expressed more doubts about the effectiveness of an EM program than the other two departments (4 responses). A chief district judge disagreed with its use, saying “Electronic monitoring is not a significant punishment (punish me by letting me stay in my home, eat my food and watch my TV), and I have not seen any studies that show Electronic Monitoring results in increased child support collection.” Chief district judges were more likely to say that an EM program would be cheaper for their jurisdictions (5 responses). One chief district judge commented, “It enables defendants to look for work instead of being incarcerated at tax payer expense.”

**Conclusion**

Twenty-seven percent of county representatives that responded to the survey indicated that their county uses EM for child support enforcement. The low usage is interesting considering that most child support supervisors, sheriffs, and chief district judges that responded to the survey indicated they believe that EM for child support enforcement should be used by counties as an alternative to incarceration. According to the survey results, perceptions about the cost and administration concerns are two of the largest causes for why such a small percentage of North Carolina counties use EM for child support enforcement. However, these perceived boundaries do not line up with what the research and Wake County case study say. As local governments continue to cut their budgets and search for ways to save money without decreasing service quality, counties and judges need to take a hard look at their county’s child support policy and see if they believe that a switch to EM would be a good cost-saving measure.
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APPENDIX A

A.1

Survey for child support supervisors

1. What county or counties does your child support agency represent?
   a. [Text response]

2. In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?
   a. [Text response]

4. Is Electronic Monitoring used as an alternative to incarceration in your county?
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. If your county/counties does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement, why do you suppose that is? Check all that apply.
   a. My county/counties uses Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement.
   b. Costs
   c. Knowledge of the program
   d. Administrative concerns
   e. Time
   f. Opposition from child support agency
   g. Opposition from the courts
   h. Opposition from the sheriff’s office
   i. Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)
   j. Effectiveness concerns
   k. Other

6. How is Electronic Monitoring used in your county/counties? Check all that apply.
   a. My county/counties does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement
   b. Sex offenders
   c. Drug charges
   d. Child support enforcement (civil or criminal)
   e. Other violent crimes
   f. Over non-violent crimes
   g. Other

7. If your county/counties has used Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement in the past and then discontinued the program, why did it do so? Please select all that apply.
   a. We use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement and it has not be discontinued
   b. We have not used Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement
c. Cost of the program  
d. Program was ineffective  
e. Opposition from child support agency  
f. Opposition from the courts  
g. Opposition from the sheriff’s office  
h. Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)  
i. Other, please specify  

8. How satisfied are you with your county’s Electronic Monitoring policy in regards to child support enforcement?  
   a. My county/counties does not have an Electronic Monitoring policy for child support enforcement  
   b. Very Dissatisfied  
   c. Somewhat Dissatisfied  
   d. Neutral  
   e. Somewhat Satisfied  
   f. Very Satisfied  

9. Do you have any further comments?  
   a. [Text response]  

10. Would you like a copy of this study?  
    a. Yes  
    b. No  

A.2  
Survey for sheriffs  

1. In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No  

2. Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?  
   a. [Text response]  

3. Is Electronic Monitoring used as an alternative to incarceration in your county?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No  

4. If your county/counties does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement, why do you think that is? Check all that apply.  
   a. My county uses Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement.  
   b. Costs  
   c. Knowledge of the program  
   d. Administrative concerns  
   e. Time  
   f. Opposition from child support agency  
   g. Opposition from the courts
1. In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. For what offenses do you place the offenders on Electronic Monitoring? Check all that apply.
   a. My county does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement
   b. Sex offenders
   c. Drug charges
   d. Child support enforcement (civil or criminal)
   e. Other violent crimes
   f. Other non-violent crimes
   g. Other, please specify

3. If your county has used Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement in the past and then discontinued the program, why did it do so? Please select all that apply.
   a. We use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement and it has not been discontinued
   b. We have not used Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement
   c. Cost of the program
   d. Program was ineffective
   e. Opposition from child support agency
   f. Opposition from the courts
   g. Opposition from the sheriff’s office
   h. Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)
   i. Other, please specify

4. How satisfied are you with your county’s Electronic Monitoring policy in regards to child support enforcement?
   a. My county does not have an Electronic Monitoring policy for child support enforcement
   b. Very dissatisfied
   c. Somewhat Dissatisfied
   d. Neutral
   e. Somewhat Satisfied
   f. Very Satisfied

5. Do you have any further comments?
   a. [Text response]

6. Would you like a copy of this study?
   a. Yes
   b. No

A.3

Survey for chief district judges

1. In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?
   a. Yes
   b. No
2. Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?
   a. [Text response]

3. Is Electronic Monitoring used as an alternative to incarceration in your district?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. If your district does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement, why do you think that is? Check all that apply.
   a. My district uses Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement.
   b. Knowledge of the program
   c. Administrative concerns
   d. Time
   e. Opposition from child support agency
   f. Opposition from the courts
   g. Attitudes in the sheriff’s office
   h. Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)
   i. Effectiveness concerns
   j. Costs
   k. Other

5. For what offenses do you place the offenders on Electronic Monitoring? Check all that apply.
   a. My district does not use Electronic Monitoring
   b. Sex offenses
   c. Drug offenses
   d. Child support enforcement (civil or criminal)
   e. Other violent crimes
   f. Other non-violent crimes
   g. Other, please specify

6. If your district has used Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement in the past and then discontinued the program, why did it do so? Please select all that apply.
   a. We have an Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement policy and it has not been discontinued
   b. We have not had an Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement policy
   c. Cost of the program
   d. Program was ineffective
   e. Opposition from child support agency
   f. Opposition from the courts
   g. Opposition from the sheriff’s office
   h. Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)
   i. Other, please specify

7. How satisfied are you with your district’s Electronic Monitoring policy in regards to child support enforcement?
   a. My county does not have an Electronic Monitoring policy in regards to child support enforcement
   b. Very Dissatisfied
c. Somewhat Dissatisfied  
d. Neutral  
e. Somewhat Satisfied  
f. Very Satisfied  

8. Are you in a single-county or a multi-county district?  
a. Single  
b. Multi-county district  

9. Which county (or counties) in your district is this policy in effect?  
a. [Text response]  

10. Do you have any further comments?  
a. [Text response]  

11. Would you like a copy of this study?  
a. Yes  
b. No  

APPENDIX B  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is Electronic Monitoring used in your county/counties/jurisdiction for child support enforcement?</th>
<th>Child support supervisors</th>
<th>Sheriffs</th>
<th>Chief District Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your opinion, should Electronic Monitoring be used for child support enforcement?</th>
<th>Child support supervisors</th>
<th>Sheriffs</th>
<th>Chief District Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D  

| If your county/counties does not use Electronic Monitoring for child support enforcement, why do you suppose that is? Check all that apply.  

4 | Child support supervisors | Sheriffs | Chief District Judges |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative concerns</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consensus among departments (child support, judges, sheriff’s office)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 7 child support supervisors, 2 sheriffs, and 1 chief district judge responded that their district already uses electronic monitoring for child support enforcement. Their responses were not included in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness concerns</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the program</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from the sheriff’s office</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from the courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition from child support agency</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

E.1

**Child Support Supervisors**

**Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool for NCPs to still work or job search and be punished</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in locating NCP</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches them to be accountable to child(ren)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM saves money compared to jail</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More money collected</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More manpower for child support agency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not effective or accurate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreases jail overcrowding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail is effective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only under right circumstances</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges are more likely to put someone on EM than jail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good tool and is effective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most child support cases are not criminal cases</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM is a deterrent to getting behind on payments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff department does not think child support delinquency warrants jail time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM requires a landline that most people do not have</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.2

**Sheriffs**

**Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCP can still work to pay off child support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to find NCP in order to serve child support warrant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM saves money</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce jail overcrowding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to monitor the NCP does not lead to higher child support collection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts should determine whether a person should be on EM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expenses would have to be paid by spouse who cannot afford the child support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only for people who owe over $10,000 before they can be harder to find</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time because majority of NCPs do not care and will not pay under any circumstances</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM should not be used in excess</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E.3**

### Chief District Judges

Why do you think that Electronic Monitoring should or should not be used for child support enforcement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saves money for county</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment not appropriate in child support cases</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM will not increase child support collection rate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps NCP develop good lifestyle habits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows the NCP look for work/continue working</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits jail overcrowding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to track NCPs movements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative to incarceration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in jail does not help pay child support payments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>