

Human Rights Risks In Tech-Enhanced Incarceration: A Comparative Analysis



Syed Shaharyar Ahmed	LLM International Technology Law, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands s.s.ahmed@student.vu.nl
Sundus Rauf	HOD/Associate Professor, M A Raoof College of Law, The University of Lahore sundas.rauf@law.uol.edu.pk
Hadia Ashraf (Corresponding Author)	Lecturer/Coordinator, School of Law (IQ), The University of Lahore hadia.ashraf@iq.uol.edu.pk

Abstract: *The adoption of digital surveillance and electronic monitoring (EM) technologies by several countries is leading to the emergence of “digital prisons” as alternatives to incarcerations. Even though this has been displayed as a reformative initiative, yet these technological advancements often enhance and worsen carceral control, which disproportionately harms marginalized communities. This paper critically evaluates the concerns regarding privacy violations, algorithmic bias, as well as the elimination of due process. The paper attempts to establish that digital punishment frameworks should be considered as component of a broader carceral regime, instead of being labelled as decarceral innovations. The lack of adequate accountability measure and transparency mechanisms in technological systems vitiates the right to a fair trial and effective justice. Thoroughly analyzing international human rights principles in comparison with different case studies across jurisdictions, this paper stresses the need for introducing robust regulatory mechanisms and human oversights through deployment of digital correctional tools. It lastly concludes that although technology has played a crucial role in the rehabilitation and reformation of prison management, however, unchecked reliance on digital devices led to digital authoritarianism within judicial frameworks, which erodes the principles of human rights and exacerbates existing social inequalities.*

Keywords: Electronic monitoring, digital prisons, decarceration, digital surveillance, human rights

1. INTRODUCTION

The technological advancements have broadly reshaped the criminal justice frameworks across the world in past few years. One of the essential elements of this paradigm shift has been the replacement of traditional imprisonment mechanism with a bunch of “non-custodial” alternatives, for instance, the electronic monitoring (EM) or algorithmic-based supervision. Introduced as progress, cost-efficient, and more humane alternatives for incarceration, these developments are often referred to as being part of a larger strategy for

decarceration. However, if examined closely and strictly, it uncovers a disturbing paradox. While these technologies tend to minimize the visibility of incarceration, they tend to enhance the access of carceral control beyond the prison boundaries. These are being embedded into the routine lives of people, specifically those from the marginalized communities (Di Tella & Schargrodsky, 2013).

Electronic Monitoring (EM) refers to the deployment of digital devices such as the GPS-based ankle bracelets or smartphone operated applications for tracking physical locations of

individuals and enforce restrictions imposed upon by the Courts. Furthermore, carceral technology involves the use of surveillance tools, predictable algorithms, biometric databases, as well as AI-driven risk assessments for monitoring, classifying and supervising individuals within the evolved criminal justice framework. These devices collectively give birth to a novel phenomenon which is referred to as “digital prisons”. The concept of digital prisons, as per the experts, is a regime where physical confinement of the body of the individual is replaced with technology-led devices such as through digital surveillance and behavioral control while keeping the punitive nature of incarceration intact (Di Tella & Schargrodsky, 2013).

This paper elaborates that even though digital and electronic modes of incarceration have been marketed to be more humane and progressive alternatives for traditional imprisonment, they still are not void of carceral fundamentals. Rather, they enhance it, through making surveillance more penetrable, control more effective, and the deprivation of fundamental freedoms more socially acceptable. Moreover, these technologies have raised serious concerns regarding human rights violations, such as the violation of privacy, due process, mental well-being as well as the concept of equality before the law.

This paper starts with tracking the historical nexus behind the emergency of carceral technologies and relating them with the global shift towards “smart and digital” criminal justice framework. It later on deconstructs the notion of decarceration through evaluating how electronic monitoring enhances punitive constraints. The next part explores the human rights implications of such digital alternatives of traditional incarceration, through assessing key international legal frameworks. The notions of proportionality, transparency and accountability in the use of such digital tools has been evaluated with proposing policy-based and legal reforms for recalibration of carceral technology through an abolitionist and rights-based perspective (Anwar & Shah, 2016).

2. PAKISTAN’S CORRECTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND DIGITAL SHIFTS

Pakistan’s correctional framework has long suffered from chronic problems concerning overcrowding, improper infrastructure as well as inadequate rehabilitation mechanisms. As per the report of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan as well as international watchdogs, Pakistani prisons frequently contain nearly more than twice of their intended capacity. Overcrowding worsens the already dire conditions. Prisons face limited access to medical attention, sanitation as well as education or vocational opportunities (Nabi et al., 2021). This problem is further worsened through the slow pace of judicial proceedings, which has kept a large number of prisoners as under-trial prisoners instead of being convicts. Therefore, the traditional paper-based system for prison management directly leads of inefficient administration, which makes it difficult for tracking inmate records, parole criteria or case updates. This results in a correctional system which is overpopulated, opaque and prone to violation of human rights. Against this backdrop, the integration of digital technologies is crucial for modernizing prison administration and enhancing transparency (Qadeer et al., 2017).

Recognizing the administrative failure of proper recordkeeping, Pakistan has started to implement Prison Management Information Systems (PMIS) in specific provinces. These mechanisms are intended for digitization of inmate records, such as their personal data, case histories or health conditions which allows the relevant authorities to obtain real-time information. For example, Punjab, which is the most populated province, has piloted the PMIS system for monitoring inmate populations, managing transfers and tracking courts appearances. The Sindh government has also started incorporating digital reforms to connect prisons with judicial databases for streamlining the communication between courts and prison management system. Although, these initiatives are steps in the right direction, however, the implementation remains inconsistent. Inadequate infrastructure, insufficient training

of prison personnel, as well as frequent connection issues vitiate the effectiveness of PMIS. Furthermore, without adequate data protection framework, the digitization of prison information could lead to potential misuse, or unwanted surveillance or breach of personal privacy (Anwar & Shah, 2016).

Pakistan has also started deploying digital tools such as biometric verification as well as digital case tracking as part of digital justice reforms. Biometric systems are being used for authentication of prisoners, thereby reducing impersonation during parole or transfers and enhancing security within the prison facilities. Similarly, Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa are trying to integrate the prisons with e-courts and case management systems. This would allow prosecutors, judges as well as prison personnel for tracking progress of prisons digitally, thereby reducing delays in hearings. However, this integration of digital technologies is also being faced with challenges due to the absence of proper data protection framework as the biometric data could be used for surveillance or stolen in case of data breaches. Secondly, digital systems do not account for socio-economic contexts of prisons, many of those are from marginalized communities with limited access to legal aid. If not deploying without proper care, these technologies could further exacerbate existing social biases and discrimination instead of reducing them (Nabi et al., 2021).

3. THE RISE OF CARCERAL TECHNOLOGY

The global trend towards electronic surveillance in criminal justice has not emerged out of the blue. It is deeply connected with the crisis of mass incarceration which happened in the 20th century. For instance, even in countries like the United States, increasing prison populations due to strict crime policies, drug wars, as well as systemic racism led to facilities being overcrowded, costs being unbearable along with the surmounting criticism by the masses. As a response, private bodies and the governments started to explore other alternatives which could effectively limit the number of individuals in prisons which equally maintaining such carceral control over them. This gave rise in the

development of carceral technology, and therefore, devices were developed for extending state surveillance and monitoring beyond the prison walls under the guise of progressive decarceration (McKay, 2022).

The most important technology has been the electronic monitoring (EM), specifically deployed through GPS-based ankle bracelets which assist in tracking a person's real time location. Initially, it was introduced in the early 1980s as a part of pre-trial release and probation mechanisms. However, the EM technology evolved drastically in scope and nature over the years. Today, people who are subjected to EM can be easily subjected to geofencing, through which, digital boundaries can be enforced, wherein any violation enables automated notifications to law enforcement agencies. Some devices even use the voice recognition as well as video checking methods for ensuring effective compliance, further eliminating the difference between traditional confinement and digital surveillance (Kilgore, 2012).

Besides EM, the carceral toolkit now deploys AI-based risk assessment algorithms, which are used for informing bail decisions, assessing eligibility for parole, as well as sentencing. The devices such as Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) used in the United States or HART in the UK, are intended for carrying out the assessment of a person's likelihood of committing an offence again, through reliance on the historical data. However, such data is often biased through racial and socioeconomic considerations, which results in the outcome being discriminatory and misleading. Similarly, facial recognition technology (FRT) is constantly being deployed into surveillance regimes, specifically for the monitoring during probation and parole, which raises serious concerns regarding precision, primarily in the case of minority groups, as it eliminates the anonymity of such persons in public spheres (Brennan et al., 2008).

Globally, the deployment of carceral technology has displayed uneven yet converging trends. In the United States, electronic monitoring is commonly deploying for immigration

enforcement, post-release suspension as well as juvenile justice. However, in the European Union, countries such as France, Germany and the Netherlands have been seen to use these technologies as part of the “smart judicial reforms”. In Australia, these technologies are used against domestic violence offenders, youth monitoring, as well as in high-risk bail cases. The Global South, including Brazil, India and South Africa, is steadily adopting these technologies, with minimal oversight in the contexts of deep socio-legal inequalities (Brennan et al., 2008).

The proliferation of such technologies highlights a rapid transformation towards redefining the notions of punishment and control, both in theory and implementation. While traditional incarceration is limited through defined boundaries and physical restrictions, there is no such limitation known to the carceral technologies as they effectively penetrate homes, neighborhoods, as well as the global digital cyberspace. Although, they tend to guarantee public security and efficiency, but in reality, they often enhance and reinforce existing power regimes, through manifesting virtual incarceration while disproportionately effecting low-income, racialized and migrant members of the community. This increase of punitive control under the guise of innovation required immediate legal and policy-based re-assessment (Xu, 2020).

4. DIGITAL PRISONS AND THE ILLUSION OF DECARCERATION

The utilization of digital surveillance and electronic monitoring (EM) as reformed alternatives to incarceration is based on a strong narrative that these devices help in reducing the prison populations while offering more humane modes of punishment. Government, technology companies, as well as some penal reform advocates have accepted this argument, thereby placing carceral technologies as key mechanisms for decarceration. However, this perspective is being increasingly challenged. While EM might appear less severe as compared to a physical confinement, its penetration abilities often complement rather than replacing imprisonment, which extends into the digital and

private realms. Instead of being liberatory, the electronic monitoring has been creating a concept of “prison without walls” (Zivanai & Mahlangu, 2022).

Electronic monitories use a mechanism of constant surveillance and behavioral monitoring, mostly without any physical limitations like that of a prison. Therefore, individuals who are subjected to EM, face rigid curfews, strict restrictions on movement, mandatory reporting, as well as automated compliance measures. Technologies like the GPS tracking, geofencing as well as biometric verification have made it convenient to monitor real time movement of such persons. Violations, whether accidental or intentional, could lead to re-incarceration. This omnipresent monitoring leads to a state of hypervigilance and psychological distress, which undermines the advantages of living beyond a prison. Since the carceral logic remains in field, yet its mechanisms are made invisible to the masses and more appealing to the policymakers (Järveläinen & Rantanen, 2020).

Instead of eradicating punishment, digital incarceration shifts the burden towards a person’s home and community. Under EM, a person’s home becomes a place of confinement, mostly without adequate support mechanisms. Family members are often drawn into the legal processes, who then bear the emotional, fiscal, and logistical burden of compliance. For instance, people might need a working smartphone, proper internet, as well as constant electricity for compliance with the application-based tracking or video check-ins. Missing a check-in due to lack of electricity or any malfunction in phone could be treated as a violation, which might trigger punitive consequences. Therefore, carceral responsibility has been devolved to the families and communities, with the digital technologies doing the surveillance work, once done by prison guards (Black & Smit, 2003).

The shift has led to the emergence of new modes of inequality, specifically for racial minorities and socially disadvantaged segments, who are already disproportionately treated in the criminal justice system. For instance, in the

United States, Black and Latinx people are more likely to be placed under EM owing to the systemic bias in policing as well as judicial discretion. The costs of EM like equipment fees, monitoring services or even technical assistance are mostly passed onto the persons, which indirectly creates a “pay-to-be-free” dynamic. Those who are unable to afford the financial costs of compliance might face extended incarceration, which thereby reinforces the cycle of punishment and poverty (Bhatia, 2021).

Ultimately, digital prisons do not eradicate the punitive nature of incarceration but rather they decentralize and digitize it. They reproduce and even worsen the racialized and class-based injustices of traditional prison regime, which guising them under the umbrella of technological advancement. The concept of decarceration needs to be critically reassessed. If people are subjected to constant threat of confinement, owing to such invasive technologies, and deprived to fundamental freedoms, then the difference between prison and its digital replacements becomes only of form, and not of substance (Bhatia, 2021).

5. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

As countries are rapidly shifting towards digital surveillance tools for revolutionizing criminal justice system, this is put several human rights at risk. Since carceral technologies are mostly deployed without effective legal safeguards or ethical guidelines. EM devices can track a person’s real-time location constantly, and this data is often shared with law-enforcement agencies. The lack of transparency regarding the data sharing, collection and security violates the data protection rights. Furthermore, geofencing tools can designate areas to be “off-limits”, which can exclude people from full participation in social life. This leads to an invasive mode of control which extends even beyond the objectives of criminal justice and trespasses the personal freedoms and liberties (Milanovic, 2014).

Furthermore, the forum of appeal against such violations is limited and complicated. People often are not aware about the assessment and logic deployed by such machine learning models

for algorithms. This leads to a grave procedural injustice, since subjects are unable to challenge, verify or comprehend the rationale behind such decisions which directly restrict their fundamental liberties. EM and other carceral technologies rely on historical data which enables that to make decisions based on algorithmic bias and systemic discrimination. Consequently, black, indigenous, and racial communities are disproportionately allocated higher risk scores, which makes them prone to stringent surveillance or being subjected to traditional incarceration. For example, it has been observed that black individuals have been marked as high risk by devices like COMPAS, despite having lower recidivism rates as compared to their white counterparts (Milanovic, 2014).

Carceral technologies also cause severe psychological harms. For instance, constant surveillance, restricted movement, as well as the fear of re-incarceration leads to a state of chronic anxiety and mental stress. Monitored people are more likely to suffer from insomnia, depression, paranoia as well as social withdrawal. These effects are further exacerbated through the social stigma attached with wearing EM devices which serve as reminders of their criminal status, which often leads to public shaming, discrimination at the workplace, and even social isolation. It also complicates the family dynamics as homes are the new prisons due to the digital surveillance. Children might internalize the criminalization of their family member. For instance, the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), has utilized digital surveillance on asylum seekers and individuals who are undocumented. These programs often operate with little to no judicial oversight, which subject migrants to constant surveillance without a conviction and increase their susceptibility to trauma or deportation (De Genova, 2013).

6. LEGAL AND ETHICAL ANALYSIS

The emergence of digital carceral technologies poses serious threat to the established norms of international human rights law and legal frameworks. The use of these technologies needs to be carefully reassessed against the legal norms of necessity, transparency,

proportionality and accountability. As per the Article 9 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), every individual has the right to liberty and security, while Article 17 safeguards individual against unlawful or arbitrary interference with his privacy. Similarly, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), provides under Article 8, the right to private and family life which is subjected only to lawful and necessary restrictions. The UN Human Rights Committee (UNHRC), has elaborated that any restriction on rights must meet the needs of legality, proportionality and necessity. Therefore, if digital surveillance measures are not grounded in law or applied arbitrarily, they might construe human right violations (De Zayas, 2005).

National legal systems often don't possess adequate measures for regulating carceral technologies. For instance, in the United States and Australia, the use of EM is regulated through some administrative rules and court orders, mostly with minimal oversight and lack of independent audits. Data obtained through ankle monitors and algorithms is often outsourced to private bodies, which leads to exploitation of user data. Furthermore, several states have not even reformed the existing criminal mechanisms or privacy laws for addressing the consequences of digital punishment. This legal dilemma creates an environment where surveillance could be misused and people are prone to penal control without adequate remedy (De Zayas, 2005).

The ethical validity of carceral technology rests on whether its usage is necessary and adequate for achieving a legitimate objective. The principle of proportionality, requires that any limitation on fundamental rights must be in accordance with the nature of violation caused. EM, might fail this test if utilized for parole or pre-trial cases where then offences are less severe. Therefore, it would be unfair to deploy EM on individuals accused on non-violent offences or who are awaiting immigration proceedings, since they pose minimal threat to society. This raises concerns regarding the notion of net-widening, whereby more people are brought under punitive control who would

have been release otherwise. From an ethical perspective, these technologies risk breaching equality, leading to technological authoritarianism under the guise of security and effectiveness. The privatization of such tools further adds to the dilemma, and questions whether these decisions are made justly through non-transparent and unaccountable private actors (Lageson, 2021).

7. TOWARDS A DECARCERAL DIGITAL FUTURE

The increasing use of digital punishment technologies highlights a paradigm shift in punitive control mechanism. While labelled as being progressive alternative to incarceration, tools such as electronic monitoring often exacerbate the consequences of imprisonment. A truly decarceral future needs to go beyond the digitization of punishment in order to embrace an effective transformative justice framework which prioritizes human dignity and community resilience. One visible path rest in the approaches towards restorative justice, which calls for reparation, accountability and recovery instead of surveillance or exclusion. Community-based interactions such as victim-offender mediation, and community accountability boards have displayed progress in eliminating recidivism while promoting long-term rehabilitation. In contrast to digital surveillance, these methods do no isolate or stigmatize the people, but rather it focuses on reintegration and collective responsibility (Lageson, 2021).

Policy reforms should be based on the norms of transparency, oversight and accountability. It is the duty of the governments to establish effective legislative frameworks for handling the use of carceral technologies, including strict limitations on consent mechanisms, duration, as well as public access to algorithmic criteria. Judicial oversight needs to be mandated for all modes of digital monitoring, so that it could be ensured that EM is only applied very strictly needed and in manner proportionate to the offence caused. Furthermore, there must be a right to appeal against the algorithm decisions, while the risk assessment tools be audited independently. Privacy protections must be

ensured, with limitation of data sharing and retention, specifically with third-party vendors. Lastly, a critical examination is necessary so that technology could support emancipation more than surveillance. We have reached at a crossroads where the choice is not between traditional and digital punishment, but rather between justice and punitive control (Holland et al., 2015).

8. CONCLUSION

Although, electronic monitoring and digital surveillance are framed as progressive mechanisms, they mostly reinforce the existing structures of carceral control, instead of effectively replacing them. Rather than being an effective alternative to imprisonment, these technologies have extended surveillance to homes, thereby burdening families and normalizing a constant state of supervision. This paper has elaborated that the emergence of carceral technology must be carefully re-examined through a human rights-centric and anti-carceral perspective. Electronic monitoring, algorithmic biases, as well as geofencing technologies are not entirely neutral. They carry the existing biases of the judicial system, thereby disproportionately targeting the marginalized communities. Furthermore, the opacity of these mechanisms raises doubts regarding privacy, due process as well as legal accountability. As governments and legal systems are shifting towards technological alternatives, it is crucial to recalibrate justice beyond digital fixes. Therefore, the path forward needs more than technological tweaks, it strives for a fundamental paradigm shift in redefining safety, accountability and social harm. It is imperative to invest in restorative, community-based alternatives which empower people and repair relationships, instead of replicating and enhancing the horrors of incarceration through digital means. A just society is built on the ideals of equality, dignity and care, instead of mere risk scores or ankle monitors.

Tech-enhanced incarceration provides both an opportunity and challenge for the Pakistan's correctional framework. On one hand, measures such as Prison Management Information System (PMIS), biometric verification as well as digital

case verification and tracking shows the commitment towards reducing administrative defects, addressing overcrowding and enhancing accountability in a system plagued by mismanagement. While, on the other hand, these technologies also introduce severe risks associated with human rights which cannot be ignored. For instance, the absence of comprehensive data protection framework and weak institutional protections increase the risk of data privacy breaches, misuse of surveillance or conduct of discriminatory practices. In a country where prison population is mostly composed of under-trial prisoners from marginalized groups, unchecked use of technology could reinforce existing biases and discriminatory practices instead of reducing them. Furthermore, algorithmic or biometric devices, if used without judicial supervision, risk violating fundamental rights of due process, dignity as well as equality before the law. Therefore, for Pakistan, the solution lies in balancing innovation with the protection of rights of prisoners. Digital reformation must be coupled with adequate legislation, transparent accountability measures and proper training of judicial and prison staff. Only through this viable approach can technology serve as a medium of justice instead of oppression, thereby making sure that modernization strengthens the human rights in the correctional paradigm instead of eroding them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anwar, Z., & Shah, S. Z. (2016). A history of prison reforms in Pakistan. *Global Regional Review*, 1(1), 35–47. [https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2016\(i-1\).03](https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2016(i-1).03)
- Bhatia, M. (2021). Racial surveillance and the mental health impacts of electronic monitoring on migrants. *Race & Class*, 62(3), 18–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396820963485>
- Black, M., & Smith, R. G. (2003). Electronic monitoring in the criminal justice system. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 254, 1. <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2003-07/apo-nid7949.pdf>

- Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Ehret, B. (2008). Evaluating the predictive validity of the COMPAS Risk and Needs Assessment system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854808326545>
- De Genova, N. (2013). Spectacles of migrant ‘illegality’: the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1180–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783710>
- De Zayas, A. (2005). Human rights and indefinite detention. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87(857), 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1816383100181172>
- Di Tella, R., & Schargrodsky, E. (2013). Criminal Recidivism after Prison and Electronic Monitoring. *Journal of Political Economy*, 121(1), 28–73. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669786>
- Holland, P. J., Cooper, B., & Hecker, R. (2015). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace. *Personnel Review*, 44(1), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-11-2013-0211>
<https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.2137>
- Järveläinen, E., & Rantanen, T. (2020). Incarcerated people’s challenges for digital inclusion in Finnish prisons. *Nordic Journal of Criminology*, 22(2), 240–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2578983x.2020.1819092>
- Kilgore, J. (2012). Would you like an ankle bracelet with that?: Winners and losers in electronic monitoring. *Dissent*, 59(1), 66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dss.2012.0012>
- Lageson, S. E. (2021). Captivating technology: race, carceral technoscience, and liberatory imagination in everyday life. *Contemporary Sociology a Journal of Reviews*, 50(1), 28–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094306120976390b>
- McKay, C. (2022). The Carceral Automaton: Digital prisons and technologies of detention. *International Journal for Crime Justice and Social Democracy*, 10(4).
- Milanovic, M. (2014). Human Rights Treaties and Foreign Surveillance: Privacy in the Digital Age. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2418485_code655207.pdf?abstractid=2418485&mirid=1&type=2
- Nabi, M., Hussain, S., & Kamran, M. (2021). OVERCROWDED PRISONS IN PAKISTAN: UNDERSTANDING THE CRITICAL ROLE OF PROBATION, PAROLE OFFICERS AND COURTS. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 03(01), 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.52567/pjsr.v3i01.185>
- Qadeer, M. I., Amar, A., Mann, J. J., & Hasnain, S. (2017). Polymorphisms in dopaminergic system genes; association with criminal behavior and self-reported aggression in violent prison inmates from Pakistan. *PLoS ONE*, 12(6), e0173571. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173571>
- Xu, X. (2020). To repress or to co-opt? authoritarian control in the age of digital surveillance. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(2), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12514>
- Zivanai, E., & Mahlangu, G. (2022). Digital prison rehabilitation and successful re-entry into a digital society: A systematic literature review on the new reality on prison rehabilitation. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2116809>