

Stress and Collateral Consequences for Registered Sex Offenders

Richard Tewksbury
University of Louisville

Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine
University of Central Florida

Understandings of the effects of sex offender registries on registered sex offenders have shown a variety of social, economic and familial collateral consequences. These unintended accompaniments to official sanctioning may have serious deleterious effects on registrants' lives, and possible recidivism. This research adds to the existing literature by assessing the experiences of collateral consequences in a sample of 209 registered sex offenders in Oklahoma and Kansas. Analysis shows differences across housing issues (based on residential restrictions in one state) and urban/rural differences. Additionally, the sample reports moderate-to-extreme levels of stress, influenced primarily by public recognition, harassment and participation/completion of sex offender treatment. In conclusion, although some differences are revealed, overall the sample of RSOs is highly stressed, experience multiple collateral consequences and have fairly consistent experiences across geographic and cultural settings.

In the first decade of the 21st century sex offenders have been identified as the scourge of American society, and both laws and social responses to such offenders have quickly moved to make punishments (both official and unofficial) severe and long-lasting. Public awareness of sex offenders and offenses has dramatically increased, political rhetoric has intensified, lawmakers have moved to make criminal sentences significantly longer and applicable to a wider range of activities/offenses, and both public and official sanctions have enhanced the stigmatization that accompanies a conviction for a sexual offense. Central to the current legal response is sex offender registration. Today, used in all jurisdictions in the United States, sex offender registries (SORs) provide free and unlimited access on the in-

ternet to a wide range of information about convicted sex offenders (see Tewksbury and Higgins, 2005).

Primary in the rhetoric and justification regarding SORs are issues of enhancing public safety, especially the safety of children. New laws and sanctions applied to sex offenders explicitly address protecting children from sexual predators. However, such laws and sanctions are universally applied to all sex offenders. Scholarly inquiries suggest that the public strongly supports such laws, while simultaneously questioning the efficacy of sex offender treatment and believing (incorrectly) that most sex offenders recidivate (Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, and Baker, 2007; Zevitz, 2006). This rapid expansion of awareness and enhanced official responses to sex offenses and offenders has led to a number of (presumably) unintended, unanticipated and stressful consequences for sex offenders and communities. It is the purpose of the present paper to examine the types of consequences registered sex offenders experience, both at the hands of official sanctions and more information community interactions.

In order to best understand how sex offender registration effects registered sex offenders (RSOs) it is necessary to assess the experiences of such offenders directly, preferably in situations where offenders are subject to minimal legal or therapeutic oversight. The available literature shows that RSOs do suffer numerous forms of serious social and economic consequences, with few significant differences based on whether samples come from the community or treatment settings (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a, 2006b; Levenson, D'Amora and Hern, 2007; Levenson and Hern, 2007; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a, 2006b)

Specific consequences experienced by RSOs include loss of family contact, loss of friends, difficulties obtaining or maintaining employment, harassing mail and verbal confrontations, threats of violence and personal harm, and a strong sense of vulnerability and stigmatization. Violence directed at RSOs is rare, although it does occur (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a; Levenson, et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a; Zevitz and Farkas, 2000). More common is the experience of harassment and verbal confrontations in public settings (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a; Levenson, et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a). The most common reported collateral consequences for RSOs are feelings of vulnerability, stigmatization and housing difficulties (Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a; Levenson and Cotter, 2006a; Levenson, et al., 2007). These experiences are mutually influential, as an RSO finds him/herself unable to locate acceptable and affording housing, their sense of vulnerability likely increases as well.

Among the most common issues emanating from registration is the issue of housing, which is also a legally endorsed and created (in some communities) collateral consequence. The last several years have seen the development and rapid spread of state and local laws that prohibit RSOs from living within specified distances of "child congregation locations". As defined by the statutes in 22 states (and hundreds of local communities) such locations typically include schools, day care centers, public parks/playgrounds, and in some communities libraries and school bus stops (Nieto and Jung, 2006; also see Tewksbury, 2007). The protected zones around such locations range in distance from 500 to 2,500 feet (ap-

proximately one-half mile) in radius. When in place, typically these laws apply to all registered sex offenders, regardless of the age of their victim(s), despite the obvious goal of these policies as attempting to enhance the protection of children.

Residential restriction laws produce communities where there is little or no available housing for RSOs, and as a result large numbers of RSOs are either forced to move or are legally prohibited from living with family. In Florida, approximately one-quarter of a sample of registered sex offenders reported having to move due to that state's residence restriction law (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a). Twenty-six percent of sex offenders released from prison in Indiana were unable to return to their homes due to a residential restriction law (Levenson and Hern, 2007), and in Connecticut 27% of surveyed RSOs were forced to move (Levenson, et al., 2007). Not only are many RSOs unable to remain in their homes, but locating a residence that is not in proximity to a protected entity can also be a major challenge. In Orange County, Florida, Zandbergen and Hart (2006) have shown that 23% of all residential properties fall within 1,000 feet of schools and 64% are within 2,500 feet. However, when looking at properties that are within 1,000 feet of schools, parks, day care centers or school bus stops, only 3% of residential properties are available for RSO residence; when expanded to 2,500 feet only 0.02% (n=37) of properties are available to RSOs. Such is a case of the most extreme effects of a collateral consequence: housing is simply unavailable for RSOs in some communities.

Either being forced to move or being prohibited from living with/near family means that many RSOs are farther away from jobs, transportation and family support and as a result experience financial stresses (Levenson, 2008; Levenson, D'Amora and Hern, 2007). The importance of this is that when sex offenders are removed from a stable social, financial and familial life, they are likely to experience increased levels of stress and consequently their risk of recidivism may increase significantly (Colorado Department of Public Safety, 2004; Hanson and Harris, 1998, 2001; Kruttschnitt, Uggen and Shelton, 2000). While stress obviously carries with it a range of potential negative outcomes, the role of stress in sex offender recidivism remains somewhat unclear. Some research (Cortoni and Marshall, 2001; Griffith, 1999) suggests stress is an important precursor to sexual offending (especially for adolescent offenders). Most sex offender treatment programs/protocols also include addressing and managing stress as a major component of treatment (see Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2005). However, meta-analyses of factors predicting sexual offense recidivism have failed to identify the experience of stress as a significant factor (Hanson and Bussiere, 1998; Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2005). Regardless of whether stress is related to recidivism, the simple fact of being publicly presented as a registered sex offender is a cause of stress for many RSOs (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a, 2006b; Levenson, et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a, 2007; Zevitz and Farkas, 2000), and may be associated with a range of collateral consequences, including the inability to connect with neighbors and the community. This likely produces increased feelings of isolation, vulnerability and stigmatization.

In addition to difficulties in finding housing, an additional stressor for RSOs may be the (perceived) stigma that accompanies labeling as a registered sex offender (Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a, 2007). Such strong and persistent stigmas are powerful inhibitors of proso-

cial community engagement, employment, and educational pursuits (Uggen, Manza and Behrens, 2004), and may therefore work against sex offenders successfully (e.g. law-abidingly) reintegrating to communities.

Stigmas and stress are common experiences for RSOs, reported by respondents in multiple studies (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a; Levenson and Hern, 2007; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a, 2006b). Not surprisingly, nearly two-thirds (62%) of RSOs surveyed in Indiana and Connecticut report that registration induces significant stress to their lives, which is perceived by offenders to inhibit recovery and avoiding sexually re-offending. Thus, it is important to assess not only what are the collateral consequences RSOs experience, but also how they impact levels of stress experienced.

While the effects of residential restrictions laws are clear in establishing large portions of communities as off-limits for RSOs, the social, psychological, and economic consequences such laws impose on RSOs have not been addressed to date. Further, the existing literature is limited to assessments of RSOs in urban communities (however, see Tewksbury, Mustaine and Stengel, 2007). These are significant limitations, and will be addressed in the present study.

The Present Study

The present study builds on the literature in three primary ways. First, we quantitatively assess the collateral consequences experienced by registered sex offenders with a survey administered to RSOs in the community, and provide a descriptive discussion of these experiences. Second, the present study provides comparisons in the collateral consequences and accompanying stress experienced by RSOs across several groups. More specifically, we examine differences between the RSOs in Oklahoma (a state with residential restrictions) and the RSOs in Kansas (a state with no residential restrictions). This allows an assessment of the impact residential restrictions have on the experiences, collateral consequences, and stress of RSOs. Further, we examine the differences between RSOs in urban areas and those in rural areas. Third, we also advance the literature by examining the amount of daily stress experienced by RSOs as a result of their listing on the SOR, as well as the sources of this stress. Thus, we examine these research questions:

1. What are the types of collateral consequences that RSOs experience, how much stress do they experience and how do they manage stress?
2. Are there differences between the types and extent of collateral consequences experienced by RSOs in states with and with residential restrictions laws?
3. Are there differences between RSOs residing in rural and urban communities in their experienced collateral consequences, stress and stress management approaches?
4. What are the sources of stress experienced by RSOs?

Methods

All data for the present study were collected using a questionnaire designed specifically for

this study. We utilize the existing literature in identifying the types of collateral consequences experienced by RSOs, the sources of their stress and approaches for managing stress.

Sample

We accessed the complete listing of RSOs from the SORs in Oklahoma and Kansas during the first week of April 2007. These two states are good representatives of states with residential restrictions and states with no residential restrictions. After each complete list was obtained we removed all duplicate entries, individuals listed as incarcerated and individuals listed with no known address. From this population we randomly selected 25% of registrants in each state (OK = 1098, KS= 800) to receive the mailed survey. A total of 1,898 surveys were sent. Approximately 100 surveys were returned due to non-existent addresses or individuals having moved and left no forwarding address. The recipients' addresses of these returned surveys were checked against the SOR. For those RSOs that were listed with a new address on the registry, the survey was re-addressed and re-mailed. For those whose address on the SOR matched the address on the returned mail, these individuals were removed from the sample. A total of 76 (4%) RSOs were identified as having incorrect addresses on the SORs.

The final sample consists of 209 RSOs from Oklahoma (n=125) and Kansas (n=84). This is an 11.5% response rate for those who received the survey. While this is not a high response rate, it is not unexpected. Other research with registered sex offenders in the community has reported similar response rates.¹

Survey, Variable, and Sample Description

The 26 item instrument assesses aspects of registered sex offenders' lives since being listed on the sex offender registry. These aspects include information about their listing on the registry, whether they have seen their listing, the proportion of family members, friends, and colleagues who know about their listing on the registry, and whether or not they feel they are recognized in public as a sex offender. Additionally, information is assessed about their offense and the legal ramifications of it, the consequences experienced as a result of being on the SOR, current alcohol and drug use, and any changes since their listing, levels of stress, and any strategies used to cope with or reduce this stress. These are the types of experiences that are emerging and being discussed in the extant literature. We also assessed common demographic variables. We discuss these measures more specifically below.

Measures of the offense, registration, legal responses

First, we collected information about the offense, registration and legal elements of the incident that placed these RSOs on the SOR. Respondents were asked what year and month they were placed on the Sex Offender Registry, and the length of their listing (10 years, 20 years, lifetime, or other). RSOs in the sample had been on the registry since 1985 at the earliest, and 2007 at the latest. The most common year of placement was 2005. The most frequent response for the length of their listing was for 10 years.

RSOs were also asked to describe their victims. For this they were asked, "For the

sexual offenses that you have been convicted of, is/are the victim(s):” In answer, RSOs were asked to check all that applied from among the choices: females, males, children/minors, multiple victims, and relatives. Fully 70% of the RSOs sampled had a female victim, 56% had victims who were minors, 22% had offended against a relative, 14% had a male victim, and only 4% had multiple victims.² Because RSOs could check more than one type of victim, we further condensed victim descriptions in order to get a better idea of who these RSOs sexually offended. For further description, 20% of the sample had a female victim who was also a relative, 16% of the sample had sexually offended against a female relative who was a child. Three percent of the sample had a male relative as a victim, and approximately the same number had sexually assaulted a male relative who was a child.

Continuing, we asked several questions regarding the proportion of others in the sex offenders’ lives who knew about his/her listing as a sex offender. To gauge this, respondents were asked 3 questions, “Approximately what portion of your family knows about your sexual offense conviction(s)?”, “Approximately what portion of your friends, co-workers, and other people you consider a part of your life (other than family) knows about your sexual offense conviction(s)?”, and “Based on your listing on the Sex Offender Registry, how often do you believe you are recognized in public as a convicted sex offender?”

In general, many of the people in these offenders’ lives knew about their convictions. Fully 69% of the sample indicated that everyone in their families knew about their convictions. Also, 16% said that nearly everyone (90% or more) knew, and 5% revealed that most of their family members (60-90%) knew about their convictions. Regarding friends, co-workers, and others who were apart of these RSOs’ lives, 30% indicated that every one of their friends, etc. knew and 16% said almost all (90% or more) knew, and 12% specified that most people (60-90%) knew about their convictions. Finally, these sex offenders revealed that they felt they were recognized in public as a sex offender approximately 1-2 times per month. Interestingly, the modal response for this question was that they believed that they were never recognized in public as a convicted sex offender. This suggests that while most of the people with whom the RSO interacts on a regular basis know about the conviction, it appears that not many members of the public are aware of those who are on the sex offender registry.

Finally, we asked respondents to indicate their participation in sex offender treatment programs. For this, we asked respondents to indicate, “Which of the following statements is most accurate?” Response choices included a variety of categories that measured whether the RSO had completed any sex offender treatment program, whether s/he participated in, but did not complete, any sex offender treatment program, or whether s/he did not participate in any sex offender treatment program.

On average, RSOs had completed at least one sex offender treatment program (63% completing a program in the community, prison, or both), only fifteen percent had participated, but not completed, a sex offender treatment program, and nearly 19% of the sample had not participated in a program either in prison or the community.

Measures of collateral consequences

We assessed the typical types of negative experiences that registered sex offenders may

have encountered on a regular or recent basis. These types of experiences were assessed with a variety of questions. First, RSOs were asked whether they had moved since being placed on the SOR, and if they had moved, was it required because of a residential restriction law (both questions had yes/no answer choices). On this measure, the sample was relatively evenly split, with 52% of the respondents having moved since being registered, and 27% of those who had moved doing so because of residential restrictions.

Further, respondents were asked, "*As a result of your placement on the Sex Offender Registry, do you believe any of the following has ever happened to you?*" In response, RSOs were asked to check off any items they had experienced from a list. This list included the following: "Felt uncomfortable due to others staring, pointing, etc.", "Lost a job", "Been denied a promotion at work", "Been harassed by a coworker", "Been harassed by a customer/client", "Been forced to move due to legal restrictions", "Been forced to move due to social/community pressure," "Been forced to move due to financial issues/cost", "Noticed people recognize you as a sex offender", "Been treated rudely in a public place", "Been asked to leave a business or restaurant", "Lost a friend when they found out you are on the Sex Offender Registry", "Been denied contact with children or family members", "Been harassed in person", "Been assaulted/attacked", "Received harassing/threatening telephone calls", and "Received harassing/threatening mail/flyers/notes".

On average, sex offenders in the sample had experienced 5 types of collateral consequences from this list. The most common consequences that they experienced (at least 1/4th of the sample experienced) were, feeling uncomfortable due to others staring (51%), being denied contact with children or family (50%), losing a friend when they found out the RSO was on the SOR (47%), noticing people recognizing them as sex offenders (40%), being treated rudely in public (36%), losing a job (35%), being harassed in person (35%), and being forced to move due to legal restrictions (29%). All other forms of consequences had been experienced by at least 10 percent of the sample.

We also asked an open-ended question that inquired, "What has been the biggest effect on you of being on the sex offender registry?" Responses were coded into 8 categories: housing issues, employment issues, emotional distress or depression, social losses (embarrassment or harassment), registry/legal requirements or changes, multiple (above noted) issues, all of the noted issues, or no big effects have been experienced since being placed on the registry. The most frequently noted big consequence is social losses with nearly 1/4th of the sample saying this was the biggest effect they had experienced. Next, 18% of the RSOs revealed that legal or registry requirements or changes were the biggest consequence they had experienced. Following, 13% noted employment had been the biggest consequence, 9% said emotional distress, 8% noted housing restrictions, and 12% said some or all of the above. Only 3% of the sample indicated that nothing had been a big effect on them since being on the Sex Offender Registry.

Measures of alcohol and drug use

In order to assess the use of alcohol and illegal drug use among these RSOs and whether or not this use had changed since their placement on the registry, we utilized 5 questions. For both alcohol and illegal drugs (separately), we asked, "On average, during the past month,

how many *days per week* did you consume alcohol/use illegal drugs (marijuana, cocaine, etc.)? For these two questions, respondents were asked to indicate the number of days per week. For the use of alcohol, we inquired further, "On average, during the past month, what percent of time you drank alcohol did you get drunk?" For this, RSOs estimated the "percent of the times I drank." Finally, for both alcohol and illegal drug use, we asked (separately), "Since being listed on the sex offender registry, would you say that you now drink/use drugs:" Here, answer choices are, "A great deal more/more often", "Somewhat more/more often", "The same amount/number of times", "Somewhat less/less often", "A great deal less/less often".

Interestingly we did not find a lot of alcohol and drug use among the RSO respondents. This is not unexpected since many are likely to have these types of restrictions as part of their parole/probation. Nonetheless, we did find that RSOs drank anywhere from 0 – 7 days a week, and on average, they drank less than 1 day per week, with the modal response being zero days per week. Of those who did drink alcohol, the average amount of time they got drunk was only 3% of the time, with the modal response being 0% of the time. Regarding change, these respondents indicated that, on average, they drank somewhat less often than they had before being listed on the SOR. Regarding drug use, these respondents used illegal drugs anywhere from 0 – 7 days per week, with the mean being 2 days per week (although the modal response for this question was zero days per week). Additionally, on average, these RSOs used illegal drugs somewhat less often than before their listing on the SOR.

Measures of Stress Coping Strategies

Continuing, we measured how these RSO respondents coped or handled the stress in their lives. This was assessed with an open-ended question, "What do you do to control/reduce the stress you feel in your life?" Answers were condensed into 12 types of responses: talk to family and/or friends, recreation, community participation (church, AA), therapy (including sex offender therapy), work, pray/meditate, take medication, use alcohol and/or drugs, isolate themselves/stay at home, try not to think about it/stay busy, mixed methods (some combination of the above), or nothing. The most common coping strategies were recreation (18%), and talking to their family and friends (10%). Fully, 81% of the sample reported they did do something to try and reduce their stress levels, as compared to only 7% who did "nothing" in order to control their stress³.

Demographics

Finally, we asked respondents about their demographic characteristics (sex, age, race, whether or not they lived in an urban or rural area, and if they had any dependents). These characteristics were assessed with the following questions, "Your age: (answer was open-ended)", "Your sex: (answer choices were male or female)", "how many persons, other than yourself, do you completely or partially support financially?", "Your race: (answer choices were White, Asian, Native American, African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Mixed Race, and Other)", and "In what county do you live?". In order to determine whether the county was urban or rural, we consulted the US Census designation of MSAs.

The average age of the sample is 45 years old, with the modal category 51 and a range of 15 – 80 years old. The vast majority of the sample is male (94%) and White (82%). On average, these RSOs are supporting 1 other person; however, the modal response to this question was zero. Finally, respondents were fairly evenly split regarding their location of residence. Approximately, 41% of the sample lived in urban areas, and 40% of the sample lived in rural areas.⁴ In Oklahoma, 53.4% live in rural areas and 46.6% live in urban areas, while in Kansas, 43.1% live in rural areas and 56.9% live in urban areas.

Dependent Variable

In the regression portion of the analysis, we use Level of Stress as the dependent variable in the model. This indicator was measured via a question on the survey that asked, “On an average day, how much stress do you experience, *as a result of being on the sex offender registry?*” Respondents were asked to gauge their responses by circling a number on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 indicating no stress, and 10 indicating a great deal of stress. On average, RSOs indicated that their level of daily stress was moderate: 6 on the 10-point scale; however, the modal response here was their level of stress being extremely high – 10 on the 10-point scale.

Data Analytic Strategy

In order to describe the types of collateral consequences these RSOs experience, as well as the accompanying stress, their drug and alcohol use, their legal/registry restrictions, and their methods of coping with stress, we utilize descriptive statistics. In order to compare RSOs in Oklahoma and those in Kansas, and RSOs in urban and rural areas, we utilize differences of means tests, using independent samples t-tests based on our expectation of equal variances. Finally, to assess which types of legal or collateral consequences most impact these RSOs’ levels of daily stress, we use OLS regression.

Findings

Experiences of RSOs Quantified

Regarding the experiences and collateral consequences suffered by these RSOs, we can say, in quantitative summary, that they are a group who has sexually offended young females. They are middle-aged, male, and White. They are known to be convicted sex offenders by most of their family members as well as the people they know on a personal level. They are not, however, necessarily recognized as RSOs by a large portion of the public. Additionally, they have completed a sex offender treatment program, whether it was in prison, in the community, or both. About one-half of them have moved since being listed on the SOR; approximately 1/4th of the total sample were forced to move because of residential restrictions placed on them. They have experienced a moderate amount of collateral consequences due to being registered sex offenders, and the majority of these are stigmatization consequences (feeling uncomfortable due to others staring, people noticing them as sex offenders, being treated rudely, being harassed, losing friends and contact with family). Only a few of the frequent consequences experienced could be classified as being something other than social consequences of stigmatization. Some of the RSOs experienced the loss of a job, being ha-

passed by co-workers, or having to move due to legal restrictions. Additionally, the sample is not likely to be using alcohol or illegal drugs, and their usage of these substances decreased somewhat since they were placed on the SOR.

Continuing, the respondents in the sample are a moderately to extremely stressed group. They are likely to use one or several strategies in order to control or reduce this stress, and the most common strategies are engaging in recreation, talking to family members or friends, or trying to stay busy and not think about it. These descriptions provide discussion for our first research question. While this picture is one representing the complete sample, we now turn to the differences of means tests to assess any variations in the experiencing of collateral consequences, the use of stress reduction strategies, alcohol and drug use, registry specifics and consequences, and demographics across different groups of RSOs.

Group Comparisons

Initially, we conducted several differences of means tests to assess any variations between RSOs living in Oklahoma (state with residential restrictions) and Kansas (state with no residential restrictions). We also assessed differences between RSOs living in urban and rural areas. To conduct these independent sample differences of means tests we compare the group means of all included indicators.

Turning to the comparison between RSOs in a state with residential restrictions and one without, we find that there are only a few indicators that have significantly different values between the Oklahoma RSOs and the Kansas RSOs. First, looking at Table 1 we find that several indicators related to housing are different. Registered sex offenders in Oklahoma are significantly more likely to have been forced to move due to residential restrictions (not a surprise, since RSOs in Kansas are not subject to statewide restrictions), they are also significantly more likely to view housing problems as the biggest consequence of being listed on the sex offender registry. Oklahoma RSOs also tend to be significantly older than Kansas RSOs, and they are significantly more likely to report that they believe they are recognized in public due to their status as a registered sex offender. Oklahoma RSOs are also significantly more likely to have been harassed by a co-worker. In handling their stressors, Oklahoma RSOs are more likely to participate in community activities (like church or AA), and to pray or meditate.

So, in addressing the second research question, we find Oklahoma registered sex offenders, due to their location in a state with residential restrictions, do, indeed, experience more housing difficulties and stresses. And, while there are a few other differences between the Oklahoma RSOs and the Kansas RSOs, these differences are minimal. Except with selected housing issues, Oklahoma and Kansas RSOs are more alike than different regarding the collateral consequences they experience, the strategies they use to combat stress, their alcohol and drug use, and their experiences with the SOR.

We now turn to the third research question and examine the differences between the RSOs who live in urban and rural communities, as noted in Table 2. After conducting an independent samples difference of means test, we find that there are few differences between these two groups of RSOs. Specifically, we find that urban RSOs have significantly greater proportions of friends, co-workers, etc. who know about their conviction as sex offenders.

They also believe that they are significantly more likely to be recognized in public than rural RSOs. Continuing, urban RSOs drink alcohol significantly more days per week than rural RSOs. Finally, rural RSOs report significantly more frequently that the biggest effect of being on the SOR is the legal or registry restrictions or changes. These findings suggest that urban RSOs are more exposed as sex offenders to others in their areas, and while they drink more often, they are more able to accommodate the legal restrictions placed upon them. Nevertheless, in the broader view (considering all of the areas of possible difference), urban and rural RSOs are much more similar than they are different in their experiences due to their listing on the SOR.

Indicators of Stress at the Multivariate Level

Turning to research question number 4, we conduct several intermediary regression models using groups of variables where the included indicators are measuring similar types of stressors.⁵ To specify, we regress groups of variables measuring offense and registry issues, collateral consequences experienced, alcohol and drug use, strategies to manage stress, and demographics.⁶ Table 3 notes the variable groupings and their significance in explaining daily stress experienced. This table is informational and will not be discussed in detail. However, it is important to note that in all variable groupings, most of the indicators are not significant explanations for the amount of daily stress RSOs report. The category having the highest proportion of significant variables (4 out of 8) is the one measuring offense and registration characteristics/problems/issues. Interestingly, we also find that no demographics are significant indicators of stress levels.

Turning to Table 4 we see the final model assessing the sources of the daily levels of stress reported by these RSOs. In the final model, only 3 of the 10 variables in the model are significantly associated with stress levels. Additionally, the model explains 31% of the variation in individuals' daily stress. To specify, with every .30 increase in the frequency in which an RSO believes s/he is recognized in public, the amount of stress s/he experiences increases by one point on the 10-point scale. Additionally, RSOs who have experienced receiving harassing mail, flyers, and/or notes have higher levels of stress than those RSOs who have not experienced that type of harassment. For every 1.46 increase in RSOs' reports that they are being harassed via the mail, there is a 1 point increase in their level of daily stress. Finally, as RSOs go from not participating to participating in treatment to completing treatment, they experience a 1 point reduction in stress levels. These findings, while rather minimal are in the expected directions. We would expect that stress would increase as RSOs believe people recognize them more often as convicted sex offenders. This potentially increases the possibilities of being harassed in public, being treated rudely in public, or any other type of public confrontation about who they are. Further, receiving faceless harassment like mail, notes, or flyers may also produce a feeling of vulnerability since one may not know who is harassing them, thus, this harassment could happen at any time. The effect of treatment programs is also expected. While the efficacy of treatment programs maybe questioned (see Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005) regarding their success at reducing recidivism, we do know that these programs often emphasize stress management strategies. For this sample, we see that completing treatment

has the greatest effect on reducing stress. It is also interesting to note here that none of the coping strategies these RSOs used had a significant impact on reducing their levels of stress.

Conclusions

The present study examined the typical types of collateral consequences and self-perceived level of stress that are experienced by registered sex offenders as a result of their listing on a sex offender registry, whether there were any meaningful differences in the types of consequences and stress experienced by different groups, and what the sources of this heightened stress are.

As such, our contribution to the literature is threefold. We provide a descriptive summary of the types of collateral consequences experienced, the levels of stress experienced and the ways that RSOs manage their stress. We also afford a comparison of the collateral consequences and amounts of stress across two distinctions of RSOs (RSOs living in a state with residential restrictions vs. RSOs living in a state with no residential restrictions; RSOs living in urban areas vs. RSOs living in rural areas). Previous literature suggests (but does not assess) that states with residential restrictions produce a different experience for RSOs due to the related problems they suffer in finding acceptable and affordable housing (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a, 2006b; Tewksbury, 2007). Additionally, we would expect RSOs in urban and rural areas would encounter different consequences from being listed on the SOR due to the different opportunities for housing, employment, etc. that is present in urban as compared to rural areas. Finally, we contribute to the literature by empirically examining possible specific sources of the heightened stress that registered sex offenders live through due to their listing on the SOR.

We find support for previous research regarding the types of collateral consequences these RSOs face. In this sample, the more common collateral consequences experienced were difficulties with housing (having to move due to legal restrictions, moving since their listing on the registry), employment (losing a job, being harassed at work since being placed on the registry), and social stigmatization (feeling uncomfortable due to others staring, being recognized as a sex offender, being treated rudely, being harassed, losing friends and contact with family). These are similar to the findings of previous research (Levenson and Cotter, 2006a, 2006b; Levenson, et al., 2007; Levenson and Hern, 2007; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006a). On average, these RSOs were moderately stressed, with many being extremely stressed. Most used at least one strategy to manage or reduce their levels of daily stress.

When comparing across groups, we do not find support for the belief that RSOs living in states with residential restrictions and those living in states with no residential restrictions have different types of experiences and difficulties. Nor do we find support for views that urban and rural RSOs face different types or amounts of obstacles. For each comparison across groups only minimal significant differences were found, although they were expected differences (Oklahoma RSOs did experience more housing difficulties; urban RSOs did have more friends, co-workers who knew them as sex offenders, and they were more likely to believe they were recognized in public more often). As such, while there were some meaningful differences between these two groups of RSOs their similarities were much more preponderant. In fact, taking a broader examination of the areas of poten-

tial difference, we would have to conclude that, for this sample, RSOs, no matter their restrictions or locations of residence experience essentially the same types of collateral consequences and problems, thus, quite possibly the same levels of daily stress.

Finally, we examine the sources of RSOs' daily levels of stress. First, on average, this sample is a moderately to extremely stressed group. Given the multitude of negative effects of stress on individuals it is important to identify the strong sources of stress in RSOs' daily lives. Heightened levels of stress undoubtedly produce difficulties in community integration, in maintaining employment and support networks, and in becoming a productive and contributing member of society. We find the biggest sources of RSOs' heightened daily levels of stress are being recognized in public and receiving harassing notes, mail, or flyers. Completing treatment contributes to reducing stress. These are important findings, as it indicates that RSOs are more stressed when they are more vulnerable, and more strangers are able to recognize them or harass them. Perhaps more importantly, though, is the finding that most of the indicators of potential stress (all of the types of collateral consequences they experienced since their listing on the SOR), are not significant sources of their levels of daily stress.

This necessitates more research. If we are to aid RSOs in their efforts to reintegrate into the community and reduce recidivism, we must be aware of the consequences they experience, which are the most stressing and what ways of managing the stress are most effective. In the future, researchers must consider additional types of consequences that RSOs might endure. This study suggests that stranger recognition or actions by strangers may be the most stressing. As such, future researchers must consider other ways that strangers can impact the lives of RSOs. It may also be that unexpected stressors are more difficult to endure than expected ones. For example, it may be that treatment programs, focusing on managing stress, point out the employment and housing difficulties RSOs experience, and it may be that RSOs have been somewhat estranged from their families. Because they expect these difficulties and have been provided ways to handle them (via treatment), they are not as stress producing as those which are unexpected.

It is also possible that these findings are due to sample bias. It may be that the only RSOs who responded to the survey were those who were relatively content with their circumstances, while those RSOs who were angry or unsatisfied did not respond to the invitation to participate. If the response rate had been higher we may have had more of a broad spectrum of RSO circumstances and experiences from which to draw conclusions. It is also possible that Oklahoma and/or Kansas are unique states that do not allow generalizability. Even so, this sample used in the present research does not show any signs of more significant or different issues/problems than those used in previous research.

In the end, this research provides interesting findings and raises some interesting questions. It is important to understand the experiences of registered sex offenders, as well as their levels of stress if we are to reduce recidivism and enhance the safety of our communities.

Richard Tewksbury is Professor of Justice Administration at the University of Louisville. He holds a PhD in sociology from The Ohio State University and has published extensively on sex offender registration, sexual offending, correctional institution culture and men's sexuality. He can be contacted at tewks@louisville.edu.

Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Central Florida. She holds a PhD in sociology from The Ohio State University and has published extensively in the areas of sex offender registration, criminal victimization risks and sexual assault. She can be contacted at emustaine@gmail.com.

References

- Burchfield, K.T and W. Mingus. 2008. Not in my neighborhood: Assessing registered sex offenders' experiences with local social capital and social control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 35 (3): 356-374.
- Colorado Department of Public Safety. 2004. *Report on Safety Issues Raised by Living Arrangements For and Location of Sex Offenders in the Community*. Denver: Sex Offender Management Board.
- Cortoni, F. and W. L. Marshall. 2001. Sex as a coping strategy and it's relationship to juvenile sexual history and intimacy in sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: An International Journal of Research and Treatment*, 13: 27-43.
- Griffith, C.T. 1999. *A Study of Stress and Cognitive Distortions in Adolescent Male Offenders and Non-offenders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University.
- Hanson, R.K. and M. T. Bussiere. 1998. Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 66 (2): 348-362.
- Hanson, R.K. and A.J.R. Harris. 1998. *Dynamic Predictors of Sexual Recidivism*. Ottawa, Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hanson, R.K. and A.J.R. Harris. 2001. A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 13 (2): 105-122.
- Hanson, R..K. and K.E. Morton-Bourgon. 2005. The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73 (6): 1154-1163.
- Kruttschnitt, C., C. Uggen and K. Shelton. 2000. Predictors of desistance among sex offenders: The interaction of formal and informal social controls. *Justice Quarterly*, 17 (1): 61-88.
- Levenson, Jill S. 2008. Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21, (2): 153-166.
- Levenson, J.S., Y.N. Brannon, T. Fortney, and J. Baker. 2007. Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 7 (1): 1-25.
- Levenson, J.S. and L.P. Cotter. 2006a. The effect of Megan's Law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21 (1): 49-66.
- Levenson, J.S. and L.P. Cotter. 2006b. The impact of sex offender residence restrictions: 1,000 feet from danger or one step from absurd? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49 (2): 168-178,
- Levenson, J.S., D.A. D'Amora, and A.L. Hern. 2007. Megan's law and it's impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 25: 1-16.

- Levenson, Jill S. and A. Hern. 2007. Sex offender residence restrictions: Unintended consequences and community reentry. *Justice Research and Policy*, 9 (1): 1-16.
- Nieto, M and D. Jung. 2006. *The Impact of Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders and Correctional Management Practices: A Literature Review*. Sacramento: California Research Bureau.
- Tewksbury, R. 2007. Exile at home: The unintended consequences of sex offender residency restrictions. *Harvard Civil Rights, Civil Liberties Law Review*, 42 (2): 531-540.
- Tewksbury, Richard. 2005. Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21, (1): 67-81.
- Tewksbury, Richard. 2004. Experiences and attitudes of registered female sex offenders. *Federal Probation*, 68, (3): 30-33.
- Tewksbury, R. and G. Higgins. 2005. What can be learned from an online sex offender registry site? *Journal of Community Corrections*, 14, (3): 9-11, 15-16.
- Tewksbury, R. and M.B. Lees. 2007. Perceptions of punishment: How registered sex offenders view registries. *Crime & Delinquency* 53 (3):380-407.
- Tewksbury, R. and M.B. Lees. 2006a. Perceptions of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum* 26 (3): 309-334.
- Tewksbury, R. and M.B. Lees. 2006b. Sex offenders on campus: An examination of university-based sex offender registries and the collateral consequences of registration. *Federal Probation* 70 (3): 50-56.
- Tewksbury, R., E.E. Mustaine and K. M. Stengel. 2007. Residential concentrations of rural registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31 (2): 49-63.
- Uggen, C., J. Manza and A. Behrens. 2004. Less than the average citizen: Stigma, role transition and civic reintegration of convicted felons. In S. Maruna and R. Immarigeon (Eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- United States Bureau of the Census 1999. Metropolitan Areas and Components. Available at: <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/metro-city/99mfips.txt> (accessed June 11, 2007).
- Zandbergen, P A. and T.C. Hart. 2006. Reducing housing options for convicted sex offenders: Investigating the impact of residency restriction laws using GIS. *Justice Research and Policy*, 8 (2): 1-24.
- Zevitz, R. G. 2006. Sex offender community notification and it's impact on neighborhood life. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 5 (4): 41-62.
- Zevitz, R.G. and M.A. Farkas. 2000. Sex offender community notification: Managing high risk criminals or exacting further vengeance? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 18: 375-391.

| Variables | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | |
|--|---|------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | F | Sig. | t | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| % Family that knows about SO convictions | 2.21 | 0.14 | -1.25 | 0.21 |
| | | | -1.22 | 0.23 |
| %Friends, Co-workers, others who know about SO convictions | 0.10 | 0.75 | 1.09 | 0.28 |
| | | | 1.09 | 0.28 |
| How often recognized in public due to SOR listing | 1.98 | 0.16 | 2.53 | 0.01 |
| | | | 2.50 | 0.01 |
| Moved since being on SOR? | 2.12 | 0.15 | 0.77 | 0.44 |
| | | | 0.77 | 0.44 |
| Felt uncomfortable due to others staring/pointing/etc | 0.91 | 0.34 | -0.84 | 0.40 |
| | | | -0.84 | 0.40 |
| Lost a job | 0.15 | 0.70 | -0.19 | 0.85 |
| | | | -0.19 | 0.85 |
| Denied work promotion | 0.43 | 0.51 | -0.33 | 0.74 |
| | | | -0.33 | 0.74 |
| Harassed by co-worker | 16.26 | 0.00 | 1.90 | 0.06 |
| | | | 1.97 | 0.05 |
| Harassed by customer/client | 2.16 | 0.14 | 0.73 | 0.47 |
| | | | 0.74 | 0.46 |
| Forced to move due to legal restrictions | 54.55 | 0.00 | 3.33 | 0.00 |
| | | | 3.51 | 0.00 |
| Forced to move due to social/community pressure | 0.43 | 0.51 | -0.33 | 0.74 |
| | | | -0.33 | 0.74 |
| Forced to move due to financial issues/cost | 2.76 | 0.10 | -0.84 | 0.40 |
| | | | -0.82 | 0.41 |
| Noticed people recognize you as a SO | 6.80 | 0.01 | -1.63 | 0.10 |
| | | | -1.61 | 0.11 |
| Treated rudely in public | 0.10 | 0.75 | 0.16 | 0.87 |
| | | | 0.16 | 0.87 |
| Asked to leave restaurant/business | 1.00 | 0.32 | 0.50 | 0.62 |
| | | | 0.51 | 0.61 |
| Lost a friend who found out about SOR listing | 1.04 | 0.31 | -1.59 | 0.11 |
| | | | -1.59 | 0.11 |
| Denied contact with children/family members | 0.01 | 0.94 | -0.06 | 0.96 |
| | | | -0.06 | 0.96 |
| Harassed in person | 0.64 | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.69 |
| | | | 0.40 | 0.69 |
| Assaulted/attacked | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.11 | 0.91 |
| | | | 0.11 | 0.91 |
| Harassing/threatening phone calls | 0.01 | 0.91 | -0.05 | 0.96 |
| | | | -0.05 | 0.96 |
| Harassing threatening mail/flyers/notes | 0.05 | 0.82 | -0.12 | 0.91 |
| | | | -0.12 | 0.91 |
| What has been the biggest effect of being on the SOR? | 10.28 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 0.31 |
| | | | 1.07 | 0.28 |
| On average in last month, days drank alcohol per week | 4.45 | 0.04 | 0.84 | 0.40 |
| | | | 0.93 | 0.35 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|-------|
| When drank, how often drunk | 7.19 | 0.01 | -1.36 | 0.18 |
| | | | | -1.22 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drink more/less? | 8.19 | 0.01 | -1.64 | 0.10 |
| | | | | -1.65 |
| On average in last month, days used illegal drugs per week | 4.32 | 0.04 | -1.01 | 0.31 |
| | | | | -0.92 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drugs more/less? | 0.15 | 0.70 | 0.45 | 0.66 |
| | | | | 0.45 |
| Daily stress due to SOR | 0.74 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.98 |
| | | | | 0.03 |
| Age | 1.04 | 0.31 | 2.99 | 0.00 |
| | | | | 2.94 |
| Sex | 7.21 | 0.01 | -1.33 | 0.18 |
| | | | | -1.22 |
| Race | 0.01 | 0.92 | -0.05 | 0.96 |
| | | | | -0.05 |
| whether the county of residence is urban or rural | 0.83 | 0.36 | -1.30 | 0.19 |
| | | | | -1.30 |
| Successfully completed a treatment program wherever | 0.21 | 0.65 | -0.22 | 0.82 |
| | | | | -0.22 |
| sum of all the collateral consequences in Q13 higher values = experienced more types of consequences | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.96 |
| | | | | 0.04 |
| Biggest consequence is housing restrictions | 33.13 | 0.00 | 2.61 | 0.01 |
| | | | | 2.93 |
| Biggest consequence is emotional distress | 10.19 | 0.00 | -1.59 | 0.11 |
| | | | | -1.50 |
| Biggest consequence is employment | 4.37 | 0.04 | -1.05 | 0.29 |
| | | | | -1.02 |
| Biggest consequence is social losses, embarrassment, harassment | 6.60 | 0.01 | -1.33 | 0.19 |
| | | | | -1.30 |
| Biggest consequence is legal or registry req. or changes | 1.09 | 0.30 | -0.53 | 0.60 |
| | | | | -0.52 |
| Biggest consequence is all mentioned | 8.18 | 0.00 | 1.39 | 0.17 |
| | | | | 1.51 |
| Biggest consequence is job and social losses | 0.92 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.63 |
| | | | | 0.49 |
| Biggest consequence is housing and job | 19.70 | 0.00 | 2.09 | 0.04 |
| | | | | 2.51 |
| Biggest consequence is nothing or none | 1.87 | 0.17 | 0.68 | 0.50 |
| | | | | 0.71 |
| RSO talks to family and friends to control stress | 0.96 | 0.33 | -0.49 | 0.62 |
| | | | | -0.48 |
| RSO does recreation activities to control stress | 0.75 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.67 |
| | | | | 0.43 |
| RSO does community activities to control stress (eg church AA) | 20.36 | 0.00 | -2.16 | 0.03 |
| | | | | -1.76 |
| RSO does therapy to control stress | 0.69 | 0.41 | -0.42 | 0.68 |
| | | | | -0.40 |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|------|-------|------|
| RSO works to control stress | 9.28 | 0.00 | 1.47 | 0.14 |
| | | | 1.59 | 0.11 |
| RSO prays or meditates to control stress | 35.66 | 0.00 | 2.69 | 0.01 |
| | | | 3.30 | 0.00 |
| RSO takes medication to control stress | 1.41 | 0.24 | -0.59 | 0.55 |
| | | | -0.57 | 0.57 |
| RSO takes alcohol or drugs to control stress | 5.81 | 0.02 | 1.18 | 0.24 |
| | | | 1.31 | 0.19 |
| RSO isolates himself or stays home to control stress | 0.60 | 0.44 | -0.39 | 0.70 |
| | | | -0.38 | 0.71 |
| RSO tries to stay busy and not think about it to control stress | 20.47 | 0.00 | -2.21 | 0.03 |
| | | | -2.03 | 0.05 |
| RSO uses multiple methods to control stress | 0.01 | 0.91 | 0.06 | 0.95 |
| | | | 0.06 | 0.95 |
| RSO does nothing to control stress | 0.22 | 0.64 | -0.23 | 0.81 |
| | | | -0.23 | 0.82 |
| RSO does something to control stress | 0.22 | 0.64 | 0.23 | 0.81 |
| | | | 0.23 | 0.82 |

| Variables | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | |
|---|---|------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | F | Sig. | t | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| % Family that knows about SO convictions | 1.15 | 0.28 | -0.47 | 0.64 |
| | | | -0.47 | 0.64 |
| % Friends, Co-workers, Others who know about SO convictions | 4.88 | 0.03 | -3.39 | 0.00 |
| | | | -3.40 | 0.00 |
| How often recognized in public due to SOR listing | 1.61 | 0.21 | -3.26 | 0.00 |
| | | | -3.26 | 0.00 |
| Moved since being on SOR? | 0.30 | 0.58 | -0.28 | 0.78 |
| | | | -0.28 | 0.78 |
| Felt uncomfortable due to others staring/pointing/etc | 0.35 | 0.56 | -0.77 | 0.44 |
| | | | -0.77 | 0.44 |
| Lost a job | 12.41 | 0.00 | -1.84 | 0.07 |
| | | | -1.85 | 0.07 |
| Denied work promotion | 7.63 | 0.01 | -1.36 | 0.18 |
| | | | -1.36 | 0.18 |
| Harassed by co-worker | 2.75 | 0.10 | -0.83 | 0.41 |
| | | | -0.83 | 0.41 |
| Harassed by customer/client | 7.84 | 0.01 | -1.37 | 0.17 |
| | | | -1.38 | 0.17 |
| Forced to move due to legal restrictions | 9.65 | 0.00 | -1.57 | 0.12 |
| | | | -1.57 | 0.12 |
| Forced to move due to social/community pressure | 7.16 | 0.01 | -1.32 | 0.19 |
| | | | -1.32 | 0.19 |
| Forced to move due to financial issues/cost | 13.30 | 0.00 | -1.77 | 0.08 |
| | | | -1.78 | 0.08 |
| Noticed people recognize you as a SO | 1.38 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.55 |
| | | | 0.59 | 0.55 |
| Treated rudely in public | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.11 | 0.91 |
| | | | 0.11 | 0.91 |
| Asked to leave restaurant/business | 4.68 | 0.03 | -1.07 | 0.29 |
| | | | -1.07 | 0.29 |
| Lost a friend who found out about SOR listing | 6.95 | 0.01 | -1.90 | 0.06 |
| | | | -1.90 | 0.06 |
| Denied contact with children/family members | 0.11 | 0.75 | -0.92 | 0.36 |
| | | | -0.92 | 0.36 |
| Harassed in person | 0.18 | 0.67 | -0.21 | 0.83 |
| | | | -0.21 | 0.83 |
| Assaulted/attacked | 4.08 | 0.05 | -1.00 | 0.32 |
| | | | -1.00 | 0.32 |
| Harassing/threatening phone calls | 2.49 | 0.12 | -0.78 | 0.43 |
| | | | -0.79 | 0.43 |
| Harassing threatening mail/flyers/notes | 23.20 | 0.00 | -2.31 | 0.02 |
| | | | -2.31 | 0.02 |
| What has been the biggest effect of being on the SOR? | 0.07 | 0.80 | 0.26 | 0.80 |
| | | | 0.26 | 0.80 |
| On average in last month, days drank alcohol per week | 16.78 | 0.00 | -2.50 | 0.01 |
| | | | -2.52 | 0.01 |
| When drank, how often drunk | 1.13 | 0.29 | -0.64 | 0.52 |
| | | | -0.64 | 0.52 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drink more/less? | 0.19 | 0.67 | 1.02 | 0.31 |
| | | | 1.01 | 0.32 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|------|
| On average in last month, days used illegal drugs per week | 3.52 | 0.06 | -0.92 | 0.36 |
| | | | -0.92 | 0.36 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drugs more/less? | 0.02 | 0.89 | 1.45 | 0.15 |
| | | | 1.45 | 0.15 |
| Daily stress due to SOR | 0.99 | 0.32 | -0.78 | 0.44 |
| | | | -0.78 | 0.44 |
| Age | 1.08 | 0.30 | -0.49 | 0.63 |
| | | | -0.49 | 0.63 |
| Sex | 0.45 | 0.50 | -0.34 | 0.74 |
| | | | -0.34 | 0.74 |
| Race | 1.79 | 0.18 | 0.83 | 0.41 |
| | | | 0.83 | 0.41 |
| Successfully completed a treatment program wherever | 0.38 | 0.54 | 0.15 | 0.88 |
| | | | 0.15 | 0.88 |
| sum of all the collateral consequences in Q13 higher values = experienced more types of consequences | 0.74 | 0.39 | -1.88 | 0.06 |
| | | | -1.88 | 0.06 |
| Biggest consequence is housing restrictions | 2.27 | 0.13 | 0.75 | 0.45 |
| | | | 0.74 | 0.46 |
| Biggest consequence is emotional distress | 1.55 | 0.22 | -0.62 | 0.54 |
| | | | -0.62 | 0.53 |
| Biggest consequence is employment | 14.16 | 0.00 | -1.80 | 0.07 |
| | | | -1.83 | 0.07 |
| Biggest consequence is social losses, embarrassment, harassment | 0.01 | 0.92 | -0.05 | 0.96 |
| | | | -0.05 | 0.96 |
| Biggest consequence is legal or registry req. or changes | 19.19 | 0.00 | 2.15 | 0.03 |
| | | | 2.12 | 0.04 |
| Biggest consequence is all mentioned | 4.38 | 0.04 | -1.03 | 0.31 |
| | | | -1.05 | 0.30 |
| Biggest consequence is job and social losses | 6.96 | 0.01 | 1.29 | 0.20 |
| | | | 1.27 | 0.21 |
| Biggest consequence is housing and job | 10.34 | 0.00 | -1.55 | 0.12 |
| | | | -1.60 | 0.11 |
| Biggest consequence is nothing or none | 0.06 | 0.81 | 0.12 | 0.90 |
| | | | 0.12 | 0.90 |
| RSO talks to family and friends to control stress | 14.06 | 0.00 | -1.78 | 0.08 |
| | | | -1.84 | 0.07 |
| RSO does recreation activities to control stress | 5.03 | 0.03 | 1.12 | 0.26 |
| | | | 1.11 | 0.27 |
| RSO does community activities to control stress (eg church AA) | 7.24 | 0.01 | -1.31 | 0.19 |
| | | | -1.42 | 0.16 |
| RSO does therapy to control stress | 2.13 | 0.15 | 0.73 | 0.47 |
| | | | 0.70 | 0.48 |
| RSO works to control stress | 0.00 | 0.95 | -0.03 | 0.98 |
| | | | -0.03 | 0.98 |
| RSO prays or meditates to control stress | 3.80 | 0.05 | 0.97 | 0.34 |
| | | | 0.94 | 0.35 |

| | | | | |
|---|------|------|-------|------|
| RSO takes medication to control stress | 1.49 | 0.22 | 0.61 | 0.54 |
| | | | 0.60 | 0.55 |
| RSO takes alcohol or drugs to control stress | 5.82 | 0.02 | -1.18 | 0.24 |
| | | | -1.23 | 0.22 |
| RSO isolates himself or stays home to control stress | 3.80 | 0.05 | 0.97 | 0.34 |
| | | | 0.94 | 0.35 |
| RSO tries to stay busy and not think about it to control stress | 1.27 | 0.26 | -0.56 | 0.58 |
| | | | -0.57 | 0.57 |
| RSO uses multiple methods to control stress | 0.22 | 0.64 | -0.24 | 0.81 |
| | | | -0.24 | 0.81 |
| RSO does nothing to control stress | 0.23 | 0.63 | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| | | | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| RSO does something to control stress | 0.23 | 0.63 | -0.24 | 0.81 |
| | | | -0.24 | 0.81 |

| Variables/ Groupings | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics Tolerance |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|--------------------------------------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | |
| Collateral Consequences | | | | | | |
| (Constant) | 4.02 | 0.37 | | 10.85 | 0.00 | |
| Felt uncomfortable due to others staring/pointing/etc | 1.98 | 0.58 | 0.30 | 3.44 | 0.00 | 0.53 |
| Lost a job | 0.33 | 0.52 | 0.05 | 0.62 | 0.53 | 0.70 |
| Denied work promotion | 0.54 | 0.66 | 0.06 | 0.82 | 0.41 | 0.65 |
| Harassed by co-worker | -0.93 | 0.64 | -0.12 | -1.45 | 0.15 | 0.58 |
| Harassed by customer/client | -0.76 | 0.84 | -0.07 | -0.90 | 0.37 | 0.63 |
| Forced to move due to legal restrictions | 0.78 | 0.56 | 0.11 | 1.39 | 0.17 | 0.67 |
| Forced to move due to social/community pressure | -0.10 | 0.70 | -0.01 | -0.14 | 0.89 | 0.59 |
| Forced to move due to financial issues/cost | 0.19 | 0.64 | 0.02 | 0.30 | 0.76 | 0.69 |
| Noticed people recognize you as a SO | 0.16 | 0.59 | 0.02 | 0.27 | 0.78 | 0.54 |
| Treated rudely in public | 1.18 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 1.98 | 0.05 | 0.53 |
| Asked to leave restaurant/business | -0.38 | 0.86 | -0.03 | -0.44 | 0.66 | 0.66 |
| Lost a friend who found out about SOR listing | 0.24 | 0.50 | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.63 | 0.70 |
| Denied contact with children/family members | 0.02 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.96 | 0.79 |
| Harassed in person | 0.29 | 0.61 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.64 | 0.52 |
| Assaulted/attacked | -0.27 | 0.88 | -0.03 | -0.31 | 0.76 | 0.57 |
| Harassing/threatening phone calls | 0.07 | 0.73 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.92 | 0.62 |
| Harassing threatening mail/flyers/notes | 1.23 | 0.63 | 0.15 | 1.94 | 0.05 | 0.70 |
| Adjusted R-Square = .218 | | | | | | |
| SEE = 2.957 | | | | | | |

| Offense/Legal/Registry Characteristics | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| (Constant) | 8.35 | 0.94 | | 8.88 | 0.00 | |
| Length of SOR listing | 0.39 | 0.21 | 0.13 | 1.89 | 0.06 | 0.95 |
| Child victim | -0.06 | 0.46 | -0.01 | -0.13 | 0.90 | 0.91 |
| Relative victim | 0.45 | 0.54 | 0.06 | 0.83 | 0.41 | 0.91 |
| % FAMILY that knows about SO convictions | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.80 |
| % FRIENDS/CoWORKERS/OTHERS that knows about SO convictions | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 2.14 | 0.03 | 0.75 |
| How often recognized in public due to SOR listing | -0.61 | 0.09 | -0.50 | -6.81 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Does your state have a residency restriction law? | -0.08 | 0.49 | -0.01 | -0.17 | 0.86 | 0.97 |
| Treatment measurement: completed, participated but not completed, no participation | -0.64 | 0.28 | -0.16 | -2.28 | 0.02 | 0.94 |
| Adjusted R-Square = .214 | | | | | | |
| SEE = 2.871 | | | | | | |

| Alcohol and Drug Use | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| (Constant) | 8.05 | 1.63 | | 4.95 | 0.00 | |
| On average in last month, days drank alcohol per week | -0.30 | 0.44 | -0.10 | -0.67 | 0.50 | 0.73 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drink more/less? | -0.18 | 0.74 | -0.07 | -0.24 | 0.81 | 0.79 |
| On average in last month, days used illegal drugs per week | 0.17 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.54 | 0.59 | 0.71 |
| Since being listed on SOR, drugs more/less? | -0.26 | 0.77 | -0.10 | -0.34 | 0.73 | 0.78 |
| Adjusted R-Square = .029 | | | | | | |
| SEE = 2.987 | | | | | | |
| Strategies to Manage and Reduce Stress | | | | | | |
| (Constant) | 7.00 | 0.86 | | 8.14 | 0.00 | |
| RSO talks to family and friends to control stress | -0.55 | 1.12 | -0.05 | -0.49 | 0.62 | 0.46 |
| RSO does recreation activities to control stress | -1.74 | 1.01 | -0.22 | -1.73 | 0.09 | 0.34 |
| RSO does community activities to control stress | 0.00 | 2.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.84 |
| RSO does therapy to control stress | -3.00 | 1.82 | -0.14 | -1.64 | 0.10 | 0.80 |
| RSO works to control stress | -0.64 | 1.22 | -0.05 | -0.53 | 0.60 | 0.54 |
| RSO pray or meditates to control stress | -0.90 | 1.33 | -0.06 | -0.68 | 0.50 | 0.62 |
| RSO uses medication to control stress | 1.00 | 1.49 | 0.06 | 0.67 | 0.50 | 0.69 |
| RSO uses alcohol or drugs to control stress | 0.00 | 1.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.72 |
| RSO isolates himself or stays home to control stress | 0.45 | 1.30 | 0.03 | 0.35 | 0.73 | 0.60 |
| RSO stays busy, tries not to think about it | -0.06 | 1.16 | -0.01 | -0.05 | 0.96 | 0.50 |
| RSO uses multiple ways to control stress | -1.25 | 1.01 | -0.16 | -1.23 | 0.22 | 0.35 |
| Adjusted R-Square = .006 | | | | | | |
| SEE = 3.217 | | | | | | |

| Demographic Characteristics | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| (Constant) | 5.14 | 1.16 | | 4.42 | 0.00 | |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.02 | -0.02 | -0.18 | 0.86 | 0.98 |
| Sex | -1.82 | 1.33 | -0.11 | -1.36 | 0.18 | 0.98 |
| How many people, other than yourself, do you completely/partially support financially? | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 1.02 | 0.31 | 0.96 |
| race is white or other | 0.59 | 0.72 | 0.07 | 0.82 | 0.41 | 0.97 |
| whether county of residence is in an urban or rural county | 0.40 | 0.56 | 0.06 | 0.72 | 0.47 | 0.98 |
| Adjusted R-Square = .005 | | | | | | |
| SEE = 3.408 | | | | | | |

Table 4: Final Model of Intermediate Significant Stressors Regressed on Level of Daily Stress

| Variables in the Final Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance |
| (Constant) | 7.30 | 0.93 | | 7.85 | 0.00 | |
| Length of SOR listing | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.06 | 0.84 | 0.40 | 0.98 |
| % Friends, Co-workers, Others who know about SO convictions | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.96 | 0.34 | 0.83 |
| How often recognized in public due to SOR listing (higher = less often) | -0.34 | 0.11 | -0.30 | -3.24 | 0.00 | 0.53 |
| Felt uncomfortable due to others staring/pointing/etc | 0.84 | 0.52 | 0.14 | 1.63 | 0.10 | 0.63 |
| Treated rudely in public | 0.61 | 0.54 | 0.10 | 1.13 | 0.26 | 0.62 |
| Harassing threatening mail/flyers/notes | 1.46 | 0.52 | 0.20 | 2.79 | 0.01 | 0.86 |
| On average in last month, days drank alcohol per week | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.11 | 1.63 | 0.11 | 0.94 |
| Treatment measurement: completed, participated but not completed, no participation | -0.68 | 0.27 | -0.18 | -2.56 | 0.01 | 0.94 |
| RSO does recreation activities to control stress | -0.88 | 0.53 | -0.11 | -1.64 | 0.10 | 0.94 |
| RSO does therapy to control stress | -1.39 | 1.33 | -0.07 | -1.04 | 0.30 | 0.93 |
| Adjusted R-Square | .313 | | | | | |
| SEE = 2.545 | | | | | | |

Endnotes

¹ Burchfield and Mingus (2008) report a response rate of “less than 15 percent”. Tewksbury (2004, 2005) reported response rates of 15% and 20%. Tewksbury and Lees (2006b) reported a 23% response rate with surveys. Tewksbury and Lees (2006a) reported a 12% response rate for qualitative interview invitations. Levenson and Hern (2007) report a response rate of 74% for survey administration, but they worked with clients in a treatment program. Levenson, D’Amora and Hern (2007) obtained an 82% response rate surveying in-patient treatment clients. Levenson (unpublished) reports a 56% response rate for RSOs participating in an out-patient treatment program in Florida. What these figures suggest is that many RSOs decline when invited to participate in research, and that as control over individuals diminishes (moves from in-patient to out-patient to “regular” life in the community, response rates consistently decline.

² Percentages may not add up due to missing responses.

³ Percentages may not add up due to missing responses.

⁴ Percentages may not add up due to missing responses.

⁵ While factor analysis is a commonly used method of data reduction, we cannot use that method here as most of the variables are dichotomous and either nominal or ordinal. Factor is not an appropriate way of reducing those types of data.

⁶ For each model we regress the grouping of variables against the amount of daily stress experienced. Those variables that are significant at the .1 level are carried forward to the final regression model.