

Copyright

by

Emma Rae Hamilton

2021

**The Dissertation Committee for Emma Rae Hamilton
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

Collateral Consequences and Criminal Desistance among Sexual Offenders

Committee:

Delida Sanchez, Supervisor

Kevin O. Cokley

Matthew L. Ferrara

Tiffany A. Whittaker

Collateral Consequences and Criminal Desistance among Sexual Offenders

by

Emma Rae Hamilton

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2021

Collateral Consequences and Criminal Desistance among Sexual Offenders

by

Emma Rae Hamilton, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2021

Supervisor: Delida Sanchez

Collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders have been widely-referenced in the literature. There has yet to be a systematic examination of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, however, due measurement inconsistencies and the absence of a psychometrically validated instrument. The current study developed and validated a measure of collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders and linked collateral consequences to important psychosocial outcomes related to recidivism. Specifically, this study investigated 1) the underlying factor structure of collateral consequences commonly endorsed by sexual offenders through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) procedures; 2) the correlational relationships between the developed measure and important psychosocial variables including shame, hopelessness, social integration, perceived stigma, and perceived social support; and 3) whether or not the experience of collateral consequences significantly related to sexual and/or general reoffense.

Participants included 218 male registered sexual offenders in the state of Texas. Included in scale development were 66 items representing commonly-referenced collateral consequences, gleaned from prior literature, qualitative interviews with sexual offenders, and consultation with

experts. EFA results revealed a two-factor solution measuring both social (i.e., discrimination and harassment experiences) and psychological (i.e., negative affect and avoidance) consequences associated with a sexual offense conviction. Results indicated that both social and psychological collateral consequences were significantly correlated with indicators of social integration, perceived stigma, shame, and hopelessness. Only psychological consequences were significantly associated with perceived support from family, friends, and significant others. Notably, only experiences with social collateral consequences were significantly related to general (nonsexual) reoffending as well as reoffending through probation and parole violations and failure to register offenses. Results highlight the shared yet disparate influence of collateral consequences on psychosocial and behavioral functioning among sexual offenders. Limitations, future research directions, and practical implications of the current findings are discussed.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables.....	viii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two: Integrative Analysis of the Literature	9
Overview of Sexual Offender Laws and Recidivism.....	9
Labeling, Stigma, and Collateral Consequences	13
Collateral Consequences as Vehicles for Labeling	20
Formal Collateral Consequences.....	22
Informal Collateral Consequences.....	28
Measuring Collateral Consequences.....	36
The Current Study.....	44
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	48
Participants.....	48
Measures.....	49
Procedure.....	60
Chapter Four: Results.....	61
Preliminary Analyses.....	61
Exploratory Factor Analysis.....	66
Reliability and Validity.....	72
Correlational Results.....	74
Chapter Five: Discussion	77
The Two-Dimensional Construct of Collateral Consequences.....	77

The Relationship between Collateral Consequences and Psychosocial Variables.....	81
Collateral Consequences and Desistance.....	84
Study Limitations and Future Directions.....	86
Practical Implications.....	89
Conclusion.....	93
Appendices.....	111
Appendix A: Informed Consent.....	111
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire.....	114
Appendix C: Initial 66-Item Pool.....	117
Appendix D: Social Well-Being Scale.....	121
Appendix E: Desistance Measure.....	122
Appendix F: Agency for Desistance Questionnaire.....	123
Appendix G: Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma.....	124
Appendix H: Beck Hopelessness Scale.....	125
Appendix I: Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support.....	126
Appendix J: Experiences of Discrimination Scale.....	127
Appendix K: Positive Impression Management Scale.....	128
Appendix L: Social Inclusion Scale.....	129
Appendix M: Test of Self-Conscious Affect – Socially Deviant Version.....	130
Appendix N: Final 20-item Sex Offender Collateral Consequences Measure.....	133
References.....	134

List of Tables

Table 1: Items Assessing Collateral Consequences in the Literature	95
Table 2: Description of Sample	98
Table 3: Offense-Specific Characteristics of Sample	99
Table 4: Percent Missing Values on Retained 65 Items.....	100
Table 5: Tests of Normality on 65 Collateral Consequences Items.....	103
Table 6: Tests of Normality on Included Measures	107
Table 7: Pattern and Structure Coefficients, Communality Estimates, and Alpha Coefficients for the Two-Factor Oblique EFA	108
Table 8: Scale Intercorrelations	109

Chapter One: Introduction

Among the variety of concerns regarding general offender legislation, sentencing, and post-incarceration reentry, sexual offender registration and community notification laws have garnered ongoing attention due to the potential impact on areas of life that extend beyond the punishment phase (Pinard, 2006; 2010; Pinard & Thompson, 2005). Researchers, policymakers, and law experts alike have theoretically linked current sexual offender policies to detrimental psychosocial outcomes for offenders, as well as an increased risk that such policies may foster a return to crime (Kruttschnitt et al., 2000; Robbers, 2009; Tewksbury, 2007; Wakefield, 2006; Wetterling & Wright, 2009). The vehicles that have been suggested to facilitate reoffending for sexual offenders are deemed collateral consequences and are handed down both directly and indirectly as a result of conviction (Roberts, 2008). Researchers have postulated that as an individual is denied civic and social participation, in the form of collateral consequences and as a result of conviction, he or she may be more likely to reoffend (Levenson et al., 2007; Robbers, 2009; Schaible & Hughes, 2011). The current study intends to provide support for this important link through the development of an instrument measuring collateral consequences among sexual offenders.

Collateral consequences have been defined as the indirect sanctions that result from criminal convictions (Pinard, 2006). In contrast to direct consequences of conviction, defined as automatic and immediate effects resulting from criminal conviction, collateral consequences are unique in that they reflect unintended penalties associated with the sheer fact of conviction rather than punishment handed down directly from the courts (Pinard, 2006). By this definition, collateral consequences often outlast direct consequences – particularly as they affect various life areas for offenders, including educational, occupational, interpersonal, and psychological

functioning (Levenson et al., 2007). Related, collateral consequences have similarly been defined as an interconnected system of disadvantage that amplifies disparities in economic and social well-being (Wheelock, 2005; Wheelock & Uggen, 2005). Yet these definitions have commonality in that each references exclusion from prosocial society through the indefinite denial of certain liberties (Pinard, 2006). Collateral consequences appear to be synonymous with indefinite civil disenfranchisement, or a “civil death” befalling those with a criminal record (Ewald, 2002; Higgins & Rolfe, 2017).

Collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders in particular have been widely-referenced in the literature (Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson et al., 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005). Commonly reported collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders include challenges to employment, housing, finances, isolation, interpersonal and romantic difficulties, harassment, and ostracism, as well as emotional challenges such as shame, hopelessness, and humiliation (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Accounts of these consequences have primarily been documented in descriptive and qualitative format (Lasher & McGrath, 2012). There has yet to be a systematic examination of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, however, specifically due measurement inconsistencies and the absence of a psychometrically validated instrument designed to assess the wide range of offender experiences (Kirk & Wakefield, 2018). Lack of adequate measurement has hindered the study of collateral consequences, though theoretical discussions continue to link collateral consequences to important criminogenic outcomes (Craun & Bierie, 2014; Kirk & Wakefield, 2018; Vuolo, 2017). For example, collateral consequences have been theoretically linked to psychological outcomes for sexual offenders including shame, hopelessness, and depression, as well as behavioral outcomes, such as offender efforts to reintegrate and desist from future offending

(Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Schaible & Hughes, 2011; Tewksbury & Zgoba, 2010). The purpose of the current study was to propose an organizational framework by which to measure collateral consequences systematically among sexual offenders, with the hopes that a strong framework could produce sound measurement, and, consequently, greater empirical support for the role of collateral consequences in criminal recidivism.

Thus far, qualitative and exploratory examinations into collateral consequences have offered valuable information regarding the most salient collateral consequences for offenders (Tewksbury, 2007; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). In an attempt to systematize the range of collateral consequences documented to affect sexual offenders, a number of organizational definitions have been postulated in the research. Collateral consequences are often referred to as either formal, as an expression of law or legal sanction, but not arising as a direct result of conviction, or informal, consequences arising independently of legal authority, such as interpersonal or psychological harm (Logan, 2013). Formal consequences may be handed down directly from the court or sentencing body and serve to limit the civic and social interactions of former offenders through direct law (Logan, 2013; Roberts, 2008). Informal collateral consequences, conversely, are often social in nature. Informal consequences similarly serve to limit civic and social participation for offenders, but are often executed by community members, neighbors, employers, and family members and friends, out of self-protection or a desire to distance themselves from the “deviant” individual (Logan, 2013; Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Collateral consequences have similarly been dichotomized as intended versus unintended consequences, or primary versus secondary collateral consequences, which parallel the definitions of formal versus informal consequences, respectively. For example, formal, intended, and primary consequences each denote sanctions handed down directly to the offender

and protected by statute. According to mainstream definitions, these consequences include employment and residence restrictions, as well as stipulations associated with community supervision (e.g., curfews, internet restrictions; Wheelock, 2005). Informal, unintended, or secondary consequences that arise from societal response to the offender's criminal behavior, on the other hand, may result in social exclusion, relationship difficulties, and behavioral avoidance (Levenson et al., 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Logan, 2013; Tewksbury, 2007).

Despite the myriad of terms used to categorize collateral consequences, the overarching theme across the literature conceptualizes formal consequences as those most proximal to sentencing, such as court-imposed sanctions that accompany direct punishment, and informal consequences as those most distal from formal sentencing, including the interpersonal and psychological consequences that occur at the individual level (Burchfield & Mingus, 2014). Yet defining collateral consequences in this way can be problematic, as formal collateral consequences are easily conflated with direct consequences. Formal consequences tend to arise through operation of law and/or accompany direct punishment. Thus, the essence of collateral consequences as unintended, enduring, and social in nature, are better encapsulated within the definition of informal collateral consequences. For purposes of the current study, the use of the term *collateral consequences* refers to negative experiences that occur secondary to direct punishment and formal sanctions, and include, for example, stigma and harassment experiences, shame, and dysphoria. This conceptualization, while parsimonious, allows for more nuance in understanding the inter- and intrapersonal aspects of collateral consequences, particularly those of vital interest to offender outcomes and, subsequently, public safety.

Importantly, a number of offender outcomes have been linked to experience with collateral consequences. At the individual level, collateral consequences have been linked to

psychological outcomes such as perceived stigma, self-isolation and experiential avoidance, feelings of worthlessness and hopelessness, shame, depression, and suicidality (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005). Collateral consequences, and the barriers imposed by such sanctions, have been similarly predictive of reduced prosocial integration among offenders, further sequestration to deviant groups and subcultures, and decreased perceived ability to desist from crime (Lloyd & Serin, 2012; Robbers, 2009). Collateral consequences further extend to associated others – family members and cohabitants may suffer financial difficulties, housing instability, social exclusion, and negative mental health effects as a result of being stigmatized alongside the offender (Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). At the community level, collateral consequences can relegate sexual offenders to certain neighborhoods, influencing property values, neighborhood transition, and crime rates (Barnes et al., 2009; Linden & Rockoff, 2006; Pope, 2008). Perhaps most importantly, each of the aforementioned outcomes exerts a critical influence on the offender’s likelihood to reoffend (Lees & Tewksbury, 2006; Levenson & D’Amora, 2007; Zevitz, 2006). This holds significant weight when considering the initial goal of sexual offender policies, to increase public safety.

The hypothesized mechanisms underlying the pathway from existing sexual offender policies to future recidivism are thought to be a function of popular criminogenic theories of reoffense, particularly Labeling Theory and Reintegrative Shaming Theory (Braithwaite, 1989; Lemert, 1967; Link et al., 1989). First, Classic Labeling Theory suggests that formal labeling provides a direct pathway to subsequent crime and delinquency (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1967). That is, formal criminal proceedings, and the public announcement that accompanies such proceedings, are the catalyst that propels an individual toward acceptance and internalization of the deviant identity, which lead to an eventual return to crime (Goffman, 1963; Lemert, 1967).

Revisionist work on labeling has paid closer attention to potential intermediate processes between labeling and recidivism (Bernburg & Krohn, 2003; Bernburg et al., 2006). In particular, Modified Labeling Theory holds that labeling and subsequent social exclusion take place incrementally through continued experience with minor labeling events, that is, through experiencing collateral consequences (Bernburg et al., 2006; Link et al., 1989). Offenders learn to anticipate stigma from law-abiding society and choose to withdraw from various aspects of their lives rather than risk being “found out.” Social sanctions combined with self-selected exclusion are theorized to facilitate reoffending by impeding entry into prosocial society (Moore et al., 2016).

Complementary to Labeling Theory, Reintegrative Shaming Theory holds that sexual offenders are subjected to severe stigma, social rejection, and community exclusion as a byproduct of their conviction (McAlinden, 2007). The offender’s experience with social stigma and exclusion is theoretically driven by the imposition of collateral consequences. As opposed to reintegrative shaming, wherein offenders are welcomed back into society after the punishment phase has been completed, this process is termed “disintegrative shaming,” and exhibits an inverse relationship to offender rehabilitation (Robbers, 2009). Reintegrative shaming emphasizes deviancy in the behavior, whereas disintegrative shaming identifies the person as inherently and perhaps irreversibly wrong, or “bad” (Tangney et al., 2011). Research testing disintegrative shaming among offenders has linked the experience of shame with a number of unfavorable outcomes, including low self-control, high stimulus-seeking, externalization of blame, and poor psychological adjustment (Tangney et al., 2011; Tangney et al., 2014). This suggests that disintegrative shaming may foster psychological and behavioral processes that promote future criminal behavior (Tangney et al., 2014).

While collateral consequences appear to be central to recidivism outcomes for sexual offenders according to Labeling and Reintegrative Shaming Theories, they have yet to be systematically measured in the literature. Current literature has offered thorough qualitative examinations of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Research has primarily focused on providing unidimensional deconstructions of what are considered the most salient consequences of a sexual offense conviction (e.g., residence restrictions; Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Meloy et al., 2008). Yet both the scope and nature of collateral consequences vary extensively among individual offenders as well as across geographical location (i.e., state-specific statutes), making it difficult to draw conclusions about offender experiences. Further, research attempting to offer a blanket examination of consequences affecting sexual offenders may in fact be too broad – examinations often conflate direct and collateral consequences, and lack of definitional agreement obscures the true effect of collateral consequences on offender reintegration (Kirk & Wakefield, 2018). Just as what has been concluded about sexual offender punishment and risk has been stunted by conceptualizations of homogeneity between offenders (Harris & Socia, 2016), so too is our understanding of collateral consequences stunted by a lack of depth into the ways in which offenders may experience collateral consequences.

The current study builds upon what has been documented in the literature by examining more nuanced interpersonal and intrapsychic aspects of collateral consequences. Distinct experiences of collateral consequences were elicited both through a systematic review of the literature, as well as what was gathered through qualitative interviews with registered sexual offenders in Texas as part of a pilot study to the current research. The creation of an empirically validated measure of collateral consequences is a much-needed area of development in

understanding pathways to recidivism for sexual offenders. The current study developed and validated a comprehensive measure of collateral consequences, as well as correlated this measure to relevant variables associated with the experience of collateral consequences for sexual offenders. Findings from this study have important implications in more cohesively conceptualizing the experience of collateral consequences among registered sexual offenders to determine how these experiences ultimately affect social reintegration and desistance from crime, with the overarching goal of informing public safety efforts.

Chapter Two: Integrative Analysis of the Literature

Overview of Sexual Offender Policies and Recidivism

During the 1990s, unprecedented laws were passed largely in response to highly publicized sexual offenses and a renewed interest in sex offender legislation in the U.S. The first was the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children Sex Offender Registration Act (Wetterling Act), passed in 1994, which mandated that all states employ a registration system for convicted sexual offenders. Behind the inception of the Wetterling Act was a drive to track and monitor offenders who targeted children specifically (Lewis, 1996). Megan's Law, passed in 1996, introduced the concept of community notification for sexual offenders, effectively mandating that all states release relevant sexual offender information to members of the community in which the offender resides. Megan's Law broadened the scope of registration to include both sexual offenders who targeted children as well as adults. While the Wetterling Act and Megan's Law formed the foundation on which current federal laws are built, it was not until the 2000s that sexual offender registration and community notification laws became solidified as nationally commissioned practice in the United States. In 2006, President George W. Bush signed the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act (AWA), which aimed to establish a comprehensive national registration system that organized offenders into three tiers of risk based on the type of sexual offense committed. The AWA also imposed criminal sanctions on individuals who violated the guidelines set by Megan's Law, as well as mandated states to create and maintain state-based sexual offender registry websites. Further, the AWA lengthened registration periods for sexual offenders, and tightened legislation related to community notification procedures. Reflected in Title I of the AWA, this set of laws is also and perhaps more commonly referred to as the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA).

In general, the majority of individuals convicted of a sexual offense who are required to register and are subject to community notification requirements meet the following criteria: 1) have committed a sexual offense recognized by state or federal law as a registerable offense, 2) have been identified by a local, state, or federal law enforcement agency, 3) have been arrested by a law enforcement agency for a sexual offense, 4) have gone through legal procedures including arraignment, pleading (or contesting the charges), undergoing a criminal trial, and conviction for a sexual offense, and 5) their crime or conviction was committed within the legislative window that requires registration (i.e., after implementation of the Wetterling Act/SORNA, or retroactively; Wright, 2003).

Registration laws require that sexual offenders periodically register, usually with local law enforcement, their residential history and current home address, as well as other personal information. Community notification, in contrast, requires the dissemination of personal information about local sexual offenders, including physical description, home address, criminal history, and other information. Dependent upon state law, community notification is conducted through the posting of flyers, door-to-door visits by police, community meetings, newspaper publications, or online notices (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Along with SORN laws, several states have passed additional legislation targeting sexual offenders, such as requiring offenders to carry identification cards as well as mandating repeat offenders to undergo chemical castration via anaphrodisiac drugs (Barnes, 2011; Mancini, 2009). Residence and employment restrictions are two of the more recent amendments to sexual offender policies in the U.S., and will be discussed in subsequent sections (Lester, 2007; Wilkins, 2002). In sum, registration, community notification, and other policies enforcing increased monitoring of sexual offenders share a

common purpose: to reduce rates of sexual offending through deterrence of both first-time offending as well as potential reoffending.

In terms of rates of sexual offending in the U.S., public perception and media reporting of sexual offenses paint the picture of a severe and pervasive influx of sexual predators. Yet overall, recent research shows an observable decline in sexual offenses in the U.S. (Finkelhor & Jones, 2012). Arrests, sentences, and prison terms for sexual offenses, however, remain elevated. Compared to other types of criminal offenses (e.g., violence, weapons, drugs, fraud), sexual offenses carry the highest rates of sentencing (i.e., higher prison terms; Motivans, 2015). For example, in 2012, the most recent year for which data were available, 96.8% of those convicted of a sexual offense were sent to prison versus the 77.3% average for all offenses (Motivans, 2015). Sexual offenses also have the highest median prison terms. In 2012, sexual offenders received an average term of 96 months compared to the average term for all offenses, 33 months (Motivans, 2015).

Despite the sizable punishments for sexual offenses, however, rates of recidivism for sexual offenders is lower than those for other types of offenses (Langan et al., 2003). Langan et al. (2003) examined recidivism patterns among 9,961 male sexual offenders released from 15 states in the U.S. and found a sexual recidivism rate of 5.3% after three years post-offense. These rates parallel those demonstrated by other researchers (Sample & Bray, 2003). In comparison, rearrest rates for drug offenders and property offenders reached 66.7% and 73.8% after three years, respectively (Langan & Levin, 2002). After five years, rates of recidivism for sexual crimes have been shown to range between 10% and 15% (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). Rates of recidivism for sexual crimes have further been shown to be as low as 6.5% with treatment, and as high as 19.2% without treatment, for a 5-year follow up period (Hanson et al.,

2009; Sample & Bray, 2003). In terms of long-term rates of reoffense, sexual recidivism rates reached 24% after 15 years, and 27% after 20 years (Harris & Hanson, 2004).

Of note, sexual offenses encompass a wide variety of crimes, and sexual offender subtypes differ in likelihood to reoffend. Individuals who offend against children, particularly male children, have the highest rates of recidivism, reaching 35% after 15 years from first offense (Harris & Hanson, 2004). Individuals who commit rape are similarly rearrested at elevated rates and for the same offense, reaching 24% after 15 years (Harris & Hanson, 2004). Sexual offenders tend to have higher rates of general recidivism (reoffense for a nonsexual crime) than for sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). Sexual offenders also tend to have a lower overall arrest rate than non-sexual offenders (43% compared to 68%, respectively), however their sexual rearrest rate is four times that of non-sexual offenders (5.3% compared to 1.3%, respectively; Langan et al., 2003).

To address risk for recidivism, registration and community notification have been credited with delivering “social control on the cheap” (Logan, 2015), and a handful of studies have demonstrated some efficacy of registration and community notification in reducing sexual recidivism rates among sexual offenders (Barnoski, 2005; Park et al., 2014; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011). The vast majority of studies, however, have found no effect of these policies on preventing sexual reoffense (Adkins et al., 2000; Letourneau, Levenson, Bandyopadhyay, Armstrong, et al., 2010; Letourneau, Levenson, Bandyopadhyay, Sinha et al., 2010; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011; Sandler et al., 2008; Schram & Milloy, 1995; Tewksbury et al., 2012; Zevitz, 2006). A handful of studies have suggested the potential for registration and community notification to actually increase recidivism risk by precipitating collateral consequences that hinder reintegration into prosocial society (Letourneau & Armstrong, 2008; Prescott, 2012;

Wakefield, 2006; Zevitz, 2006). For example, Letourneau and Armstrong (2008) found that registered juvenile sexual offenders were more likely to be convicted of subsequent offenses compared to non-registered offenders. The majority of sexual offenders in Zevitz's (2006) study felt the pressure from registration and community notification would "drive them back to prison." Prescott (2012) highlighted the dialectic between preventing and facilitating recidivism as a function of sexual offender laws in the U.S. He stated, "While a law that restrains a released offender has the potential to reduce recidivism if that law makes the commission of crime more difficult or if it mitigates various risk factors, such a law also has the potential to increase recidivism if it worsens those circumstances (e.g., unemployment, unstable housing) known to contribute to reoffending (Prescott, 2012, p. 55)."

At the offender level, certain psychosocial mechanisms may underlie this disconnect between strict offender monitoring and the theoretical goal of reduced reoffense. A well-established concept in the literature proffers an explanation for the negligent effects of sexual offender policies on criminal behavior: criminal labeling and the application of a deviant stigma as a sanction against the sexual offender, and the collateral consequences of being labeled as such. These psychological and social consequences may be instrumental in dampening the effect of sexual offender policies on increased public safety and may instead contribute to an increased risk to return to crime (Levenson, 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a).

Labeling, Stigma, and Collateral Consequences

The label of sexual offender inspires a deep-seated feeling of repugnance in U.S. society. The common sexual offender is assigned his or her label in a highly public, repeated, and permanent manner, and as such, may feel that such a label is self-defining (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). Theories have held that defining oneself based on a devalued social label can cause

negative consequences both at the individual and societal level. Labeling Theory (Lemert, 1951) in particular has held widespread prominence in the field of sociology and criminology, specifically among scholars attempting to contextualize deviant behavior. At its most basic definition, Labeling Theory holds that individuals who are formally identified, labeled, or stigmatized in any special way will eventually behave as designated by the label (Becker, 1963; Tannenbaum, 1938). Of greatest relevance to criminologists, once the individual is labeled *deviant* or *criminal*, he or she will be more likely to internalize and endorse the negative stereotypes attached to the label (Lemert, 1974). Labeling Theory further suggests that once a person is labeled a deviant, he or she will be denied basic opportunities necessary for reintegration and reform, and will thus be more likely to return to crime (Becker, 1963). Empirical examinations of Labeling Theory have repeatedly found that individuals who were convicted and incarcerated for a particular crime recidivated at a higher rate than those whose charges were dropped or dismissed (Chiricos et al., 2007; Worrall & Morris, 2011).

Lemert (1974) further elaborated on this concept by distinguishing between primary and secondary deviance: primary deviance inspires the initial criminal act, while secondary deviance occurs when the individual accepts the label and acts upon it. Thus, labeling theory posits that the label *deviant* can be both a cause and an effect of criminal behavior (Restivo & Lanier, 2015; Robbers, 2009). Later extensions of labeling theory suggest the link between labeling and subsequent criminal behavior may be less overt than originally hypothesized. Link et al. (1989) put forth Modified Labeling Theory, which introduces perceived stigma as a mediator between formal labeling and recidivism. Lemert's traditional Labeling Theory holds that the individual is directly denied opportunities as a result of being formally labeled deviant. Under Modified Labeling Theory, the formal process of labeling is considered in conjunction with social stigma

and stereotype to influence future offending behavior (Moore et al., 2016). For example, the individual is formally labeled through conviction, learns to anticipate stigma, and purposefully avoids involvement in activities for fear of confronting negative reactions from mainstream society (Moore et al., 2016). Perceived stigma is an important component in considering the trajectory from labeling to reoffense. Underlying perceived stigma is the belief that one's group, and by association, oneself, is permanently devalued by society. This belief negatively impacts self-esteem and self-efficacy, which in turn affects expectations about one's future behavior, mental health, and decision-making (Corrigan et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2016). Modified Labeling Theory has been empirically supported among sexual offender populations in the extant literature (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012; Moore et al., 2016). Importantly, findings indicated that the more an offender anticipated devaluation, the more likely he was to avoid activities that would facilitate positive social integration (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012).

The relationship between criminal labeling and recidivism is further bolstered by a related theoretical concept, disintegrative shaming. Braithwaite's (1989) Reintegrative Shaming Theory (RST) highlights the impact of structural and societal forces on social integration and subsequent offending behavior. According to RST, the processes involved in offender societal shaming may be either *reintegrative* or *disintegrative*. Societies that promote reintegrative shaming afford offenders an avenue to return to law-abiding society once the punishment phase is complete. Other societies adopt a disintegrative approach to shaming and tend to rely on stigmatizing offenders as a form of ongoing social control. Disintegrative shaming supports alienation of "deviant" subcultures, malintegration, and subcultural involvement that leads to subsequent offending (Schaible & Hughes, 2011). Such social exclusion has been linked to self-defeating behavior, loss of meaning, impaired self-regulation, increased aggression, and

decreased prosocial behavior (Baumeister et al., 2005; Twenge et al., 2007; Twenge et al., 2001; Twenge et al., 2002). Research has generally observed increased rates of offending in societies with a disintegrative approach to shaming (Tittle et al., 2003; Schaible & Hughes, 2011).

Sexual offenders in U.S. society are subjected to disintegrative shaming as a function of strict monitorial policies (e.g., registration, community notification, residence and employment restrictions) that persist past the punishment phase. Robbers (2009) demonstrated the effect of disintegrative shaming by examining collateral sanctions as they relate to reintegration into prosocial society. Sexual offenders unanimously reported being prohibited from engaging in activities that would not only increase their own connection to the community, and thus weaken risk for reoffense, but would lead to positive gains for the community (e.g., volunteering, participating in church-related activities; Robbers, 2009). Robbers (2009) concluded that disintegrative shaming puts forth the message that sexual offenders 1) do not deserve to contribute to society, and 2) are at such a level of deviance that rehabilitation is not possible.

This loss of social involvement and opportunities can be understood as a byproduct of the stigma applied to individuals convicted of a sexual offense. Labeling Theory holds that deviance is not assigned to an individual as the consequence of a single deviant act, but rather develops through the ongoing sanctions he receives after committing the act (Becker, 1963). Thus, the label of *deviant* and the stigma associated with that label, arise as a result of legal and social sanctions rather than the execution of the deviant act itself (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). These social sanctions are more commonly understood in the offender literature as collateral consequences, or the indirect, unintended, and enduring sanctions that arise from criminal convictions (Pinard, 2006). Labeling and perceived stigma have been repeatedly identified as causal and consequential to collateral consequences, respectively, for both general (Moore et al.,

2016; Restivo & Lanier, 2013) and sexual (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012; Robbers, 2009) offenders.

Collateral consequences for individuals with a criminal conviction have been defined in the literature as civil penalties that accompany, yet arise independently, from formal punishment (Lafollete, 2005). Collateral consequences are also often referred to as “second punishment” or “invisible punishment” (La Fond, 2000; Travis, 2002). As opposed to direct consequences of a criminal conviction, that is, potential jail or prison terms, fines, community supervision, and any other criminal punishment imposed by the judge post-conviction (Roberts, 2008), collateral consequences encompass negative experiences that persist after the court-imposed punishment phase. Pinard (2006) elaborated on the concept of direct versus collateral consequences, stating that collateral consequences stem from the *fact* of conviction, rather than from what the judge directly decrees as punishment. For sexual offenders, registration and community notification requirements are thought to straddle the line between a direct and collateral consequence, as they both inherently accompany a sexual offense conviction yet are considered to extend the punishment phase through perpetual hindrance of re-entry into society (Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Indeed, researchers consider certain sexual offender-specific collateral consequences as “intended” in that they appear in state and federal statutes and regulations, or may be enforced locally, at the city level (e.g., residence restrictions; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Roberts, 2008). The traditional concept of collateral consequences singularly encompasses unintended consequences, defined as experiences that negatively impact some area of the individual’s social, occupational, or interpersonal life as a byproduct of the original sexual offense conviction.

Conveniently, the use of modifiers such as *formal* versus *informal* denote intended versus unintended collateral consequences in the literature, respectively (Logan, 2013). According to

law scholars, *formal* collateral consequences are “attached by express operation of law” (Logan, 2013), and include formal sanctions such as occupational restrictions, loss of public housing eligibility, loss of right to vote, and deportation. Essentially, formal collateral consequences are protected by law. As opposed to formal collateral consequences, *informal* collateral consequences are not an expression of law, but rather arise independently of legal authority (Logan, 2013). In general, informal consequences negatively impact areas of social, medical, economic, and psychological functioning for individuals with a criminal conviction. Of note, while both formal and informal consequences are generally referenced in the literature as collateral in nature, formal consequences can more closely resemble direct punishment and have been eliminated from some conceptualizations of collateral consequences (Lafollette, 2005). Specifically, because formal consequences arise from law and/or policy, it has been argued that such restrictions are better considered as intentional aspects of punishment that, unlike informal consequences, are 1) a result of the fact of conviction, and 2) made known to the offender during the punishment phase, at time of sentencing/probation.

Sexual offender researchers have, for the large part, been diligent in highlighting the contrast between formal versus informal collateral consequences. For example, Burchfield and Mingus (2008) conceptualized collateral consequences as functions of control imposed by formal and informal structures that operate to limit an offender’s access to social capital. Social capital is defined as value derived from and facilitated by social ties (Putnam, 2001), and is a necessary resource in promoting reintegration for the formerly incarcerated (Rose & Clear, 2003). First, *formal* control includes the restrictive policies and intensive supervision by sexual-offender-specific probation and parole agents. Though sexual offender laws and probation stipulations are essentially direct consequences of sentencing, the authors frame these restrictions as collateral in

nature, based on the disparate impact these policies exert on social reintegration in comparison to policies applied to non-sexual offenders. Second, *informal* social control is the force by which local residents take responsibility for preventing problems within their communities (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993). Local residents may exert informal social control by mobilizing community members against a sexual offender in the neighborhood, circulating information about his presence, and preventing him from engaging in prosocial community activities.

In line with formal versus informal social control, Burchfield and Mingus (2014) identified formal and informal collateral consequences of registration and community notification. Formal collateral consequences appear to be a result of formal social control and are defined as those that directly impede reintegration efforts, such as unemployment and housing instability. Formal consequences are primarily restrictive in nature and include ancillary laws that function to keep registered offenders away from certain neighborhoods, places of employment, and areas where children may be present. Informal collateral consequences, in contrast, result from negative social response, and include experiences of harassment, loss of relationships, and ostracism. Informal social control efforts by employers, neighborhood contacts, and community members tend to produce informal collateral consequences for the offender (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008). Further, informal consequences may impede reintegration by extending negative treatment to potentially supportive family, friends, landlords, and employers, who may find themselves on the receiving end of adverse public reaction in trying to help the offender reintegrate (Burchfield & Mingus, 2014; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009).

Researchers and scholars argue the importance of studying and gleaning a more thorough understanding of collateral consequences, as these barriers to prosocial reintegration are linked to a greater likelihood for recidivism (Robbers, 2009; Tewksbury & Jennings, 2010). In addition to understanding the role of collateral consequences in criminal recidivism, it has been recognized that collateral consequences have increased in number, scope, and severity in the past few decades, and the number of individuals exiting U.S. correctional facilities continues to be significant (Chin, 2017; Pinard, 2010). Criminal records are becoming increasingly available and transparent via computer databases, particularly via public registries, making collateral consequences all the more enforceable by both law enforcement and the general public (Chin, 2017; Love, 2017). Thus, research has attempted to document and categorize the various collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders beyond the sentencing and punishment phase in order to better contextualize what is known about pathways to reoffending. The following sections describe the major collateral consequences faced by registered sexual offenders in particular, as designated by current research and scholarship.

Collateral Consequences as Vehicles for Labeling

With any criminal conviction there is an inherent likelihood for unintended and deleterious social and psychological consequences for the offender. Research, however, indicates that these consequences are more severe for individuals convicted of sexual offenses compared to those convicted of non-sexual offenses (Lester, 2007; Tewksbury, 2005). General offenders face numerous barriers while trying to reintegrate into society, yet this endeavor appears far more formidable for sexual offenders due to the public registry (Rolfe, 2017). Few would argue against sanctions restricting access to children for those convicted of sexually assaulting an

underage victim, yet collateral consequences appear to be applied indiscriminately across all sexual offender subgroups (Uggen & Stewart, 2014).

While any criminal conviction can carry with it a stigma that persists well after the punishment phase, these collateral consequences are a stronghold of sexual offense convictions. For sexual offenders, collateral consequences extend not only from conviction, but also his or her status on the national sex offender registry and subjection to community notification laws, as the public is more frequently made aware of the sexual offender's denigrated place in society (Tewksbury, 2005). Collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, as defined in the current study, include socially-imposed (rather than court-sanctioned) barriers to employment, housing, and financial opportunities, as well as social exclusion, psychological turmoil, isolation, and interpersonal and romantic difficulties (Levenson, 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Collateral consequences also encompass victimization of family members of individuals convicted of a sexual offense, who may experience secondary housing and employment difficulties, or harassment related to their relative's membership on the registry (Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Collateral consequences among sexual offenders have been widely-studied and are often cited in arguments for registry reform (Barnes, 2011). Yet it is difficult to provide a comprehensive review of the range of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, due to the enormous scope and reach of such sanctions (Uggen & Stewart, 2014). The following sections will provide an inventory of the most salient of both formal and informal collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, as identified in the literature. Importantly, while formal collateral consequences will be reviewed in the following section, the current study emphasizes *informal* collateral consequences as they 1) are less likely to be conflated with direct

punishment, 2) more appropriately suit the essence and definition of a *collateral* consequence of direct conviction, and 3) are predominantly psychosocial in nature.

Formal Collateral Consequences. As a result of criminal conviction, the first wave of collateral consequences is implemented in the form of legal mandates, or formal consequences. Formal collateral consequences are most proximal to the sentenced punishment, or the direct consequences resulting from the criminal conviction (Logan, 2013). Formal collateral consequences, particularly for sexual offenders, may first arise during the community supervision phase, when restrictions placed upon offenders most heavily impact daily life (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Individuals who have been convicted but are not incarcerated are typically under some type of community supervision, that is, probation or parole (Uggen et al., 2006). Community supervision for sexual offenders includes both probation/parole requirements as well as compliance with more managerial monitoring and publicization of offender status, all of which may be considered collateral consequences of a criminal conviction. For example, sexual offenders may experience the “deprivation of liberty” identified by Logan (2013) most directly through periodic registration and community notification requirements, mandated weekly treatment, mandated reporting of all potential violations of probation/parole to probation/parole officers and subsequent polygraph testing, and the monetary costs for each, the burden of which falls on the sexual offender.

Community supervision is designed to divert those bound for incarceration to a noncustodial supervision option in the offender’s home community and is typically the most attractive option for low-level offenders (Phelps, 2013). While supervised release is often touted as a vehicle for reducing the prison population as well as lowering recidivism rates (Pew, 2009), probation and parole remain court-ordered sanctions handed down in lieu of incarceration rather

than to support community reintegration. Indeed, research has described probation as expanding the net of formal social control by subjecting increasing numbers of low risk offenders to community supervision, as well as placing these individuals at increased risk to be incarcerated in the future due to tight monitoring and restrictions (Phelps, 2013). Researchers (Phelps, 2013; Uggen & Stewart, 2014) have posed the question: To what extent does community supervision enhance opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration, or impede positive outcomes by pushing individuals deeper into the criminal justice system?

Wheelock (2005) categorizes formal collateral consequences as occurring within the areas of 1) civic restrictions, or restrictions that impede, infringe, or deny civic duties and responsibilities afforded to other adult citizens, 2) service and aid, or restrictions that prohibit offenders from receiving grants, welfare, public housing, military benefits, and other forms of public assistance, 3) employment, and 4) occupational restrictions. The most widely-cited formal collateral consequences, in addition to registration and community notification for sexual offenders, include loss of civil status, loss of right to vote, deportation or ineligibility to naturalize, ineligibility for public benefits, legally-mandated employment and residence restrictions, ineligibility for work permits, licenses, or forfeiture of a pension, and legally-mandated restricted travel (including local travel, inter-county and interstate travel, and international travel; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005; Wheelock, 2005).

A lesser-known formal collateral consequence unique to sexual offenders is restrictions affecting travel. For registrants wishing to travel either for business or pleasure, these trips must be approved by the state during the probation/parole phase of punishment. Registrants may freely travel afterwards but are required in 47 states to register with the state which they are visiting after a certain period of time. Days allotted prior to registering range from two (Nevada) to 30

(California; Rolfe, 2017). Nonresident registration requirements include, at minimum, verification of valid identification, criminal background check, completion of sexual offender registry forms, fingerprinting, verification of address where the registrant will be staying, picture taken, and, in some states, DNA submission, and payment of an administrative fee. Rolfe (2017) found that 30 states place visiting registrants' information on their state's sexual offender registry website, alongside permanent residents of that state. Of the 30 states, 22 never remove the registrant's information once they have left the state and returned to their state of residence. Interestingly, the majority of states did not employ a specific statute addressing visiting registrants, and instead enforced permanent resident registration policies (Rolfe, 2017).

Thus, travel restrictions, while legally mandated, are more cogently described as a formal collateral consequence of a sexual offense conviction. First, they are publicized and enforced with minimal regulation, as are the majority of collateral consequences, particularly those affecting sexual offenders (Chin, 2017). For example, sexual offender registration requirements have not been subjected to the same *ex post facto* laws that would theoretically prohibit the retroactive implementation of punishment beyond the sentencing phase (Love, 2017). Despite this, some community supervision tactics for sexual offenders have been deemed so restrictive as to constitute punishment themselves (e.g., chemical castration, penile plethysmograph; Love, 2017). Thus, the laws surrounding travel restrictions, while protected by state statute and the interpretation of state officials, extend and confabulate the punishment phase for sexual offenders. This type of restriction embodies the definition of formal collateral consequence as an indefinite continuation of punishment, selectively enforced from the fringe of the criminal justice institution (Chin, 2017). This type of collateral consequence also presents ample opportunity for

the offender to gather inaccurate information regarding the state's visiting policies, thus risking further arrest and incarceration by failing to register – a felony offense in many states.

While the aforementioned formal collateral consequences present impediments at certain points in the former offender's life, restrictions placed on housing and employment create significant barriers to social reintegration. Employment restrictions may be enforced by a subset of law, licensure restrictions, or zoning restrictions wherein sexual offenders are prohibited from working in or near a site where children congregate, or by the employer's discretion (Brown et al., 2007; Carpenter & Beverlin, 2011; Farkas & Miller, 2007; Lester, 2007). Registered offenders report significant challenges to employment as a result of sexual offender legislation, and studies have found that the majority of their samples have reported some type of employment difficulty stemming from conviction. These include being denied a job outright, losing a job due to being "found out," being denied a promotion, or being forced to take a pay cut (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Levenson et al., 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Tewksbury, 2005; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Employment restrictions proffer the message that sexual offenders have little hope for redemption (Farmer et al., 2015), and hardships related to employment have been postulated to facilitate recidivism (Colorado Department of Public Safety, 2004; Lees & Tewksbury, 2006). Stable employment, on the other hand, is essential for reintegration and has been shown to be a strong predictor of desistance from crime (Center for Sex Offender Management, 2002; Kruttschnitt et al., 2000; Winters et al., 2017).

Researchers have postulated that residence restriction laws that govern where a convicted sexual offender can and cannot reside, however, create the greatest barriers for registered offenders (Rolfe, 2017). Residence restrictions are defined as exclusion zones barring sexual offenders from living within a certain radius of areas where children congregate, such as schools,

parks, or daycare centers (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009). Thirty states have implemented some form of residence restriction (Mancini, 2009; Meloy et al., 2008), and many more individual cities have independently enacted residence restrictions within their jurisdictions.

Residence restrictions present a particularly repressive formal consequence that holds significance when considering an individual's ability to reintegrate. Due to residence restrictions, many sexual offenders are all at once unable to return to their previous home, secure new housing, and/or live with supportive family members or friends (Jeglic et al., 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Research has demonstrated a clear link between housing instability and reduced capacity for desistance from reoffending (Meredith et al., 2003; Schulenberg, 2007; Williams et al., 2000). In the case of sexual offenders, housing instability reflects the difficulty in locating and securing affordable housing. Most state laws formally prohibit convicted felons from acquiring subsidized housing, for example (Travis, 2005). Likewise, sexual offenders are more likely to be relegated to socially disorganized neighborhoods as a result of residence restriction laws (Hughes & Kadleck, 2008; Mustaine et al., 2006a; 2006b; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2008). According to social disorganization theory (Shaw & McKay, 1942), these neighborhoods are characterized by instability, highly mobile residents, and low levels of social cohesion, all of which are risk factors for increased crime rates within the area (Barnes et al., 2009; Pope, 2008). Residence restrictions have thus been linked to a potential for increased recidivism, as repeated exposure to environments with a high incidence of crime can weaken an offender's capacity to desist from reoffending (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a).

Labeling Theory offers an explanation for this phenomenon, stating that labeling operates by inciting social-structural consequences (e.g., residence restrictions) that trigger processes leading to movement into deviant groups (Bernburg et al., 2006). Criminal labeling theories

further state that when interactions are limited, when restrictions are placed on environments, when there are limited individuals with which to interact, and when there exist limited identities for the individual to play out, the relevance of messages received by others hold much heavier weight in forming an individual's identity (Asencio & Burke, 2011). For sexual offenders sequestered to high-crime neighborhoods, the deviant identity is most salient (Levenson & Hern, 2007). A counterpoint to this, however, has been established in that sexual offenders who are able to maintain social bonds to communities through positive interpersonal relationships, civic engagement, and steady employment can achieve lower recidivism rates (Kruttschnitt et al., 2000). Further, housing stability is a basic need in promoting successful reintegration into prosocial society for sexual offenders. Bradley et al. (2001) eloquently outline this point: "Housing is the linchpin that holds the reintegration process together. Without a stable residence, continuity in substance abuse and mental health treatment is compromised... in the end, a policy that does not concern itself with the housing needs of returning prisoners finds that it has done so at the expense of its own public safety" (in Zgoba et al., 2009).

Formal sanctions dictating where a sexual offender can and cannot reside can similarly precipitate a litany of informal collateral consequences, particularly related to interpersonal harmony and psychological well-being. Researchers have repeatedly demonstrated a link between residence restrictions and emotional distress, hopelessness, and stress (Jeglic et al., 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Levenson & Hern, 2007). Researchers also suggest that the negative effects of sexual offender residence restrictions are longstanding. Tewksbury et al. (2016) found that after 15 years on the registry, sexual offenders continued to experience downward mobility to more socially disorganized neighborhoods. These findings are amplified for registrants of color, as nonwhite sexual offenders are significantly more likely to have moved

to a socially disorganized neighborhood than white offenders (Tewksbury et al., 2016). Further, the challenge to secure stable housing is compounded by the fact that stable housing is linked to sustained employment, as well as strong familial and social ties (Tewksbury, 2007), both of which are difficult to foster within socially disorganized communities (Mustaine et al., 2006a).

Informal Collateral Consequences. Apart from formal sanctions, a sexual offense conviction brings extensive social and psychological consequences. These consequences are deemed informal collateral consequences and arise as a byproduct of the conviction itself rather than a result of direct legal sanction (Logan, 2013; Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Couched in Labeling Theory, the deviant label is initially adhered to the individual through formal consequences of conviction, such as residence and employment restrictions. Informal collateral consequences, on the other hand, are the vehicles by which the deviant label is solidified (Kruttschnitt et al., 2000). In the pathway from criminal labeling to stigmatization, and later inhibited social reintegration, formal collateral consequences appear to be most proximal to the initial criminal labeling process (Tewksbury, 2012). Informal collateral consequences, on the other hand, are most proximal to the stigmatization process, and function as agents of inhibited social reintegration. Further, informal consequences appear most proximal to facilitating reoffense (Chiricos et al., 2007; Sampson & Laub, 1997). The most common informal collateral consequences include threats to safety, relationship difficulties, avoidance and self-isolation, and psychological consequences (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Logan, 2013; Mingus & Burchfield, 2008; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009; Uggen & Stewart, 2014), each of which will be discussed further.

Informal consequences are primarily enforced by members of the community in an effort to obstruct the offender from participating in society, and, theoretically, protect their community.

Thus, for offenders, the *deviant* label is something to be hidden in an effort to maintain ties to society and avoid suffering collateral consequences (Evans & Cubellis, 2015). Due to the accessibility of offender information through the public registry and community notification, however, anonymity is near impossible. Offenders commonly report both fear of and actual threats to safety by those who discovered their status on the registry (Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006). These informal consequences include feelings of vulnerability as a result of the offender's personal information being publicized online, including his or her address and phone numbers (Levenson et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2005). The most commonly reported threats to physical safety include property damage, and harassment, threats, and physical assault against the offender's families, friends/acquaintances, pets, and the offender himself (Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Robbers, 2009; Zevitz et al., 2000). Though less frequent, sexual offenders also report being the target of vigilante attacks by community members who are made aware of the offender's whereabouts through community notification (Lasher & McGrath, 2012). Further, family members and cohabitants have experienced harassment, threats, and physical confrontations within neighborhood, school, and workplace settings alongside the offender (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009). As a result, offenders have commonly reported fearing for their family's safety, pressure to protect their families from harm, feelings of guilt and shame as a result of the circumstances, and increased drive to isolate from supportive others (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009).

Indeed, informal collateral consequences for sexual offenders may bring the greatest destruction to the offender's relationships. Post-incarceration, registered sexual offenders have reported challenges to and loss of familial as well as romantic relationships (Tewksbury, 2005;

Tewksbury, 2007; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Winters et al., 2017). Relationships may be lost at the moment a friend or romantic partner finds out about the offender's registration status (Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006), or due to the stress and pressure faced by friends and partners in being forced to meld to the offender's social restrictions (Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). Research has demonstrated that the most frequent relationship losses occur within the offender's immediate family, as close and extended family members, along with significant others, are most often the ones to terminate relationships with the offender (Pinard, 2010; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006).

If those associated with the offender choose to maintain contact, the negative consequences they may experience alongside the offender are both overwhelming and demoralizing (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Levenson et al., 2007; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). In addition to experiencing threats and harassment, family members also experience financial and housing instability alongside the offender (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009). Last, family members, particularly the children of sexual offenders, have reported experiencing emotional consequences such as anger, depression, anxiety, fear, and isolation, in dealing with the sanctions affecting their loved one (Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009). Goffman (1963) termed this effect "courtesy stigma." This courtesy stigma, or "stigma by association," can cause former friends, partners, and family members to withdraw from the relationship and subsequently relinquish efforts to help the offender reintegrate. Resulting social isolation, paired with a dearth of reintegrative support, has been linked to higher rates of recidivism among sexual offenders (Harris & Cudmore, 2015). Perhaps most concerning when considering public safety, lack of intimacy and loneliness among sexual offenders has been

linked to various indicators of violence such as hostility toward women, domestic violence, and anger (Seidman et al., 1994; Tharp et al., 2012).

The collateral consequences that family members can anticipate with the release of their loved one from prison may cause apprehension and resentment, rather than relief that the offender will be rejoining the family (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). Family support, however, is an essential component to rehabilitation and preventing reoffense. Particularly for sexual offenders who must meet compliance with an array of supervisory conditions, families are valuable resources to assist in the transition from prison, encourage the offender to attend treatment, and generally deter recidivism (Farkas & Miller, 2007, Levenson & Cotter, 2005b). Placing undue stress on spouses, parents, siblings, and children of sexual offenders may then increase risk for reoffense, essentially stripping away a layer of support that would normally serve as a buffer of protection between the community and offender (Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009).

In dealing with negative consequences of registration and community notification policies, a common coping mechanism among sexual offenders tends to be avoidance and self-isolation (Higgins & Rolfe, 2017). Researchers have linked the collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders as a type of social and civil death, wherein feelings of imprisonment are maintained due to fear, shame, or apathy by part of the offender (Higgins & Rolfe, 2017). Sexual offenders may engage in secondary avoidance by limiting their movement time to avoid the possibility of violating a probation stipulation, as well as to avoid conflict with their probation officers (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008). Individuals may also feel apathy as a consequence of the barriers imposed by formal consequences and may choose to avoid engaging with the community rather than risk confronting informal consequences (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008).

Though reactionary in nature, behavioral avoidance and social withdrawal present additional informal collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders.

Further, the offender may knowingly seclude himself from supportive others as a way to both punish himself and manage the fears of causing further harm to others (Jeglic et al., 2012; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006). For example, registered offenders tend to avoid seeking romantic relationships due to the belief that their status on the registry will preclude them from developing an intimate relationship (Tewksbury & Lees, 2006). Qualitative information extracted from Brown et al. (2007) revealed that offenders felt ashamed, nervous, and embarrassed at the prospect of disclosing their criminal histories to potential employers and felt the nature of their offense would adversely affect their chances of securing employment. Thus, these offenders were more likely to avoid seeking more stable employment (Brown et al., 2007). In addition to avoiding settings where they may be confronted, sexual offenders may go to great lengths to avoid divulging their offense for fear of being discriminated against (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). In addition to significant public safety concerns regarding reluctance to disclose offender status, this constant vigilance surrounding when and in which settings to reveal one's identity has negative physical and psychological health outcomes (Pachankis, 2007; Smart & Wegner, 2000).

Last, offenders report experiencing psychological deterioration as a result of secondary punishment maintained through informal collateral consequences (Higgins & Rolfe, 2017). The psychological consequences experienced by registered offenders include hopelessness and despair as a result of social ostracism and isolation (Zevitz et al., 2000). Loneliness, shame, embarrassment, fear, and thoughts of suicide have similarly been indicated as informal collateral consequences of registration (Edwards & Hensley, 2001; Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Robbers, 2009). Sexual offenders tend to have higher rates of depression than the

general population (Jeglic et al., 2012). Further, Jeglic et al. (2012) found that sexual offenders who experience more negative collateral consequences such as residence restrictions, harassment, and employment restrictions, reported greater levels of depression and hopelessness than offenders who reported few to no negative consequences.

Another common psychological collateral consequence of registration is the stress that results from impediments to the acquisition of stable housing, employment, and relationships (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009). Low self-esteem and other psychological consequences resulting from incarceration have been established as barriers to employment for sexual offenders (Brown et al., 2007). Financial problems associated with difficulty securing employment, barriers to receiving government assistance, and the costs associated with registration and probation/parole contribute to increased stress among registered offenders. Increased stress among offenders has been similarly linked to juggling the many facets of registration, probation/parole, and treatment (Edwards & Hensley, 2001), and the fear of being found to be noncompliant in the aforementioned areas. Last, offenders also report stress resulting from the sheer fact of being publicly presented as a sexual offender, and the stigma that accompanies the label (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000).

Many would agree that psychological stressors are deserved for sexual offenders. When these stressors are chronic and enduring, however, and are solidified through public sanctions, the offender's investment in a society imposing such punishments appears to wane (Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009). In fact, social disengagement is a common indicator of depression and is particularly prevalent among offender populations (Jeglic et al., 2012; Palmer & Binks, 2008). The stigma felt by sexual offenders and the resulting negative affect may inhibit one's motivation to participate in prosocial activities and relationships (Travis, 2005). This in turn

negatively affects the offender's ability to rehabilitate and reintegrate, and, as with other collateral consequences, may increase likelihood for recidivism (Jeglic et al., 2012; Ward & Hudson, 1998).

Indeed, as postulated under labeling theories, the informal consequences that affect registered sexual offenders likely play a role in an individual's ability to desist from future offending (Chiricos et al., 2007). As documented above, offenders are discriminated against socially as community members respond to the highly visible *sexual offender* label. Registered offenders experience rude treatment, harassment, physical and verbal threats, as their deviant status is made known through both official labeling and other formal consequences that disseminate personal offender information throughout general society (Moore et al., 2016).

Modified Labeling Theory, as it applies to sexual offenders, compounds the relationship between official labeling and deviant outcomes by accounting for the individual's response to anticipated threats, which tends to take the form of self-isolation (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Moore et al., 2013). Thus, in addition to direct social discrimination, social withdrawal is wielded as a coping mechanism against expected social rejection and exclusion (Edwards & Hensley, 2001; Higgins & Rolfe, 2017). Ensuing negative mental health ramifications may affect sexual offenders throughout the labeling process (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). Yet it has been demonstrated that the more an individual perceives that his group is devalued by society, the more they experience negative mental health outcomes such as depression (Corrigan et al., 2006; Pyne et al., 2004). Psychological symptoms are similarly thought to be magnified as the number of positive psychological outlets are reduced both via formal sanctions, as well as offender withdrawal.

Informal collateral consequences are primarily social in nature (Logan, 2013). Social consequences of a sexual conviction, as they relate to future desistance from crime, are further

elucidated as a function of Reintegrative Shaming Theory. The imposition of informal barriers to reintegration, namely efforts to socially exclude sexual offenders from participating in prosocial activities, constitutes disintegrative shaming (Braithwaite, 1989). Shaming, when perceived as stigmatizing, or disintegrative, has permanent detrimental effects on self-concept and social well-being (Katz, 2002), decreasing the likelihood that the offender will continue to fight for a place within prosocial society. Informal collateral consequences, both internal (self-exclusion) and external (other exclusion), lead to loss of social capital (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008). Key factors in preventing recidivism, however, include civic engagement, civic identity, community involvement, and self-esteem (Bazemore & Stinchcomb, 2004; Robbers, 2009; Travis, 2005). While formal collateral consequences hinder offender reintegration through physically barring offenders from entering certain spaces (e.g., educational, occupational), informal consequences appear to solidify the impression that offenders are irreversibly undeserving of community and other social support. Offenders who are cognizant of this stigmatizing message may be more likely to experience psychological stress, feel that their social options are limited, and may be more inclined to resign themselves to deviant subcultures and, consequently, reoffend (Schaible & Hughes, 2011).

Labeling Theory and each of its interpretations emphasize the inevitable route from lack of conventional social ties and settings, to further sequestration to and acceptance of deviant groups and labels, and eventually, weakened ability to desist from future offending (Bernburg et al., 2006; Sampson & Laub, 1997). Poor mental health and negative coping mechanisms appear to both magnify and hasten the labeling process (Moore et al., 2013, 2016). While this and other important links between formal and informal collateral consequences and desistance have been widely referenced in the literature (see Lasher & McGrath, 2012), they have yet to be empirically

demonstrated through sound measurement. In fact, deficiencies in the measurement of collateral consequences have constrained the literature on collateral consequences to purely theoretical and/or descriptive examinations. Challenges in measuring collateral consequences will be discussed in the following section.

Measuring Collateral Consequences

The collateral consequences associated with sexual offender registration and community notification have been thoroughly documented in the literature (Levenson et al., 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Mercado et al., 2008; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Despite this, there has been a lack of empirical examination of collateral consequences as a measurable construct. Studies have primarily gathered descriptive data using dichotomous items targeting the most commonly endorsed collateral consequences, particularly those affecting housing (e.g., “I had to move out of a home I owned”; Levenson, 2008) and employment difficulties (e.g., “I lost a job because my boss or coworkers found out I am a sex offender”; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a), interpersonal problems (e.g., “I lost a friend who found out about registration”; Tewksbury, 2005), and psychological consequences (e.g., “I feel alone and isolated because of Megan’s Law; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Items used in previous studies to assess collateral consequences are presented in Table 1. In addition, a significant portion of the current literature emphasizes one specific dimension of collateral consequences, most frequently presenting in-depth examinations into housing and neighborhood restrictions for sexual offenders (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Levenson, 2008, 2009; Levenson et al., 2007; Meloy et al., 2008; Mustaine et al., 2006; Tewksbury, 2007; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009; Zgoba et al., 2009). Housing and zoning restrictions have been examined in the psychological literature using a variety of methodologies including qualitative interviews, census tract

mapping, and Geographic Information System (GIS) analyses (Levenson, 2008; Mustaine et al., 2006a; Zgoba et al., 2009), and the constitutional foundations these restrictions have been thoroughly dissected by law experts (Barnes, 2011; Barnes et al., 2009; Moghaddam, 2010). While both descriptive and unidimensional studies of collateral consequences are informative, there appears to be a lack of nuanced yet holistic examination of the impact of collateral consequences at the offender level.

Further, what is currently known about collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders has overwhelmingly been gleaned from qualitative approaches. This branch of research has uncovered predominant categories of collateral consequences (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Tewksbury, 2005; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). For example, in their study of sexual offenders across the U.S., Tewksbury and Lees (2006) identified four primary areas in which participants were affected: employment difficulties, relationship difficulties, harassment, and feelings of vulnerability and stigmatization. In one of the first studies to assess collateral consequences among sexual offenders specifically, Tewksbury (2005) administered 10 dichotomous (yes/no) questions to his sample addressing employment difficulties, housing instability, rude/unfair treatment, loss of relationships, harassment, and assault. Paired with Zevitz & Farkas' (2000) earlier qualitative work which revealed themes related to humiliation, ostracism, harassment, loss of employment, and residence restrictions, the vast majority of research published since has replicated questions asked and themes uncovered by these and other seminal works (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Zevitz et al., 2000). Despite the significant body of literature addressing collateral consequences for sexual offenders, and the relative agreement between researchers regarding the most commonly endorsed collateral consequences, there has yet to be the development of an empirically validated scale measuring these concepts. Neither has there been a sufficiently

nuanced exploration into collateral consequences that offenders may experience in daily life, but which have yet to garner significant attention in the literature (e.g., other experiences of social exclusion or exploitation). Thus, the purpose of this study was to develop and validate a measure of collateral consequences that captured the range of sexual offender experiences reported in the extant theoretical and empirical literature.

Within the literature, there appears to be no structured discussion as to why a measure of collateral consequences has not yet been developed, however the nature of the study of collateral consequences may offer an explanation. First, many of the examinations into collateral consequences are conducted within a law or policy rather than psychological framework. As a result, it appears that researchers have been interested in demonstrating collateral consequences in terms sheer numbers (i.e., frequency of experienced collateral consequences), with the goal of using the research to advocate for policy reform (e.g., Frenzel et al., 2014; Levenson and Cotter, 2005a). Second, and relatedly, collateral consequences have thus far been predominantly conceptualized as discrete experiences, rather than a psychological construct. As a result, item sets with dichotomous response options, rather than empirically-validated measures developed through factor analysis, have sufficed as means to capture the experiences of registered sexual offenders. Though not a reason behind the lack of a validated measure of collateral consequences, definitional challenges also exist that may serve to impede scale development. For example, definitions of collateral consequences that emphasize formal consequences and/or aspects of direct punishment (e.g., whether or not the offender is subject to probation, registration, and/or community notification) may see reduced variability among respondents, as many sexual offenders experience these challenges as a result of conviction. Definitions that emphasize informal collateral consequences, conversely, may garner data indicative of the

subjective experiences of sexual offenders, consequential to formal sanctions and/or punishments.

In the only study to collect reliability information on a measure of collateral consequences of registration and community notification, Harris et al. (2015) examined collateral consequences among a sample of treatment providers who work with juvenile sexual offenders. The authors included questions that addressed four domains of collateral consequences: Mental Health (11 items), Harassment and Unfair Treatment (7 items), School Problems (6 items), and Living Instability (4 items). The authors also included two items addressing risk for reoffending. Treatment providers were asked to respond to the items according to perceptions of collateral consequences experienced by their juvenile clients. Responses were coded dichotomously. Cronbach's alphas indicated adequate to good internal consistency for each subscale: .85 to .91 for the Mental Health subscale, .77 to .87 for the Harassment and Unfair Treatment subscale, .80 to .83 for the School Problems subscale, and .76 to .85 for the Living Instability subscale (Harris et al., 2015). Despite these promising findings implying strong reliability for a measure of collateral consequences, there was no evidence of validity provided. Further, respondents included treatment providers rather than registered sexual offenders. Last, this measure specifically targeted collateral consequences faced by a juvenile sexual offender population, which undoubtedly diverge from the experiences of adult sexual offenders.

In sum, much of the extant research either 1) reports a variety of collateral consequences endorsed by sexual offenders in frequency alone, without more sophisticated statistical analysis, or 2) examines a unidimensional aspect of collateral consequences, without considering the interplay between different collateral consequences as they affect an outcome of interest, most commonly desistance from reoffending. Thus, in either approach, breadth or depth is sacrificed.

It can also be argued that efforts to accurately assess the breadth of collateral consequences have been insufficient. For example, common items in current collateral consequences measures often include an item asking the registrant if he or she has “lost a place to live” (See Table 1). While this item provides some useful information, it neglects to identify if the registrant has suffered this consequence as a result of formal (legal sanction) or informal (landlord/neighbor involvement) consequences, or whether the registrant has simply avoided seeking out housing for fear of rejection. Similarly, current measures have lacked differentiation between collateral consequences as a result of imposed barriers, versus collateral consequences as a result of individual avoidance (i.e., due to shame or embarrassment; Moore et al., 2016).

A challenge to researching collateral consequences is organizing collateral consequences into a more holistic construct in order to more meaningfully associate collateral consequences to other psychosocial outcomes such as social reintegration, agency for desistance, and depression, for example. A handful of studies have attempted to collate collateral consequences into distinct thematic categories for this purpose (Frenzel et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2015; Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Wheelock, 2005). However, many definitions treat collateral consequences categorically, and measure the most frequently endorsed sanctions as individual silos rather than an interwoven framework of consequences (see Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Yet collateral consequences appear to represent diverse yet interrelated experiences, and, taken together, exert a more formidable impact on offender outcomes than when considered individually (Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Perhaps the most comprehensive definition of collateral consequences that has been applied to sexual offenders in particular, is that mentioned by Burchfield and Mingus (2014). The researchers defined collateral consequences along a continuum of primary (formal) and secondary (informal) consequences. Primary collateral consequences were defined as those that

directly impede reintegration efforts, such as employment and residence restrictions. Secondary collateral consequences, in contrast, included interpersonal and psychological consequences, and result from negative social response to sexual offenders as a group of individuals (Burchfield & Mingus, 2014; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). This conceptualization of primary (i.e., formal) and secondary (i.e., informal) consequences was used as an organizational framework by which to guide development of items on the current proposed measure of collateral consequences. As mentioned previously, while formal consequences may be considered as separate from direct punishment, for purposes of the current study they were not included under the definition of collateral consequences. This is due to the fact that formal consequences are often conflated with direct punishment, as they tend to be expressed under policy or law, are implemented as a direct consequence of conviction, and are generally made known to offenders during the sentencing and/or punishment phase. Informal consequences represent a fairly understudied aspect of collateral consequences though may be most proximal to negative social and psychological outcomes for sexual offenders (Harris et al., 2015), therefore warranting targeted exploration. Thus, experiences reflective of informal consequences were exclusively included to guide item development on the current measure.

Developing a systematic way to measure the sexual offender's experience with collateral consequences is essential to accurately assess the impact of these consequences on important outcomes: for example, social integration. One challenge to studying the impact of collateral consequences on social reintegration for sexual offenders is that the two are often confounded in the research, so that less frequent subjection to collateral consequences tends to be equated with more successful reintegration by part of the offender (Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Petersilia, 2001). Social reintegration has often been defined in physical terms –

that is, by the acquisition of stable housing and movement away from neighborhoods deemed “socially disorganized” (Baldry et al., 2003; Mustaine et al., 2006; Tewksbury, 2007). Yet, while reintegration is often referenced in the sexual offender literature, it appears to be overwhelmingly lacking a unifying definition, or is simply not defined at all. For example, reintegration has been defined in such terms as “a dynamic process experienced by offender during their release from prison or jail” (Valera et al., 2017), and “the process of transitioning from incarceration to the community, adjusting to life outside of prison or jail, and attempting to maintain a crime-free lifestyle” (Davis et al., 2012). Researchers contend, however, that reintegration is complex and lengthy, and that there is much to be learned about the process (Davis et al., 2012; Maruna, 2001; Petersilia, 2005). As it stands, reintegration appears to indicate the absence of collateral consequences (Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a), and ignores the psychological aspects of belongingness, investment in society, and a general sense of social well-being. As successful reintegration has been repeatedly linked to desistance from future offending (Kruttschnitt et al., 2000; Maruna, 2004; Robbers, 2009), certainly an absence of collateral consequences – that is, the presence of stable housing, employment, and supportive relationships – in conjunction with positive attitudes toward one’s place in prosocial society are both necessary requisites for desistance.

In addition to reintegration, collateral consequences have been linked in the theoretical literature to other important factors related to recidivism, such as perceived stigma and hopelessness (Jeglic et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2013, 2016). Perceived stigma has been predictive of increased risk for recidivism among offenders (Moore et al., 2016), yet the influence of experienced collateral consequences on perceived stigma for sexual offenders has yet to be examined. Labeling Theory in the context of the sexual offender experience dictates that labeling

events (i.e., collateral consequences) incite a powerful social stigma that facilitates internalization of the deviant identity and, eventually, a return to crime (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). Thus, it is important to investigate the nature of the relationship between collateral consequences and perceived stigma. Relatedly, negative emotional responses to social exclusion may facilitate recidivism, according to Labeling Theory and Reintegrative Shaming Theory (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). Specifically, hopelessness and shame appear the most closely linked to failed desistance from crime (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012; Tangney et al., 2011; Tewksbury, 2012). A parallel hypothesis is that chronic labeling experiences increase one's risk of feelings of severe shame and hopelessness, which drive an individual further into deviant subcultures and, consequently, closer to recidivism (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012). Investigating the relationship between collateral consequences and negative emotions such as shame and hopelessness has important implications for understanding pathways to recidivism among sexual offenders.

Last, and perhaps most importantly, collateral consequences have important implications when considering one's perceived ability to desist from crime. The pathway between collateral consequences and agency for desistance has been frequently postulated, though not empirically demonstrated (Lloyd & Serin, 2012; Maruna, 2001, 2004). Agency for desistance has been defined as involving offenders' desire to change, the ability to change, and ready access to change mechanisms (O'Connell et al., 2007). Agency for desistance is said to be a product of contextual factors – that is, the external environment within which an offender operates can either facilitate or hinder an individual's ability to choose alternative behaviors (Lloyd & Serin, 2012). It is thus theorized that experience with collateral consequences may negatively impact agency for desistance.

The Current Study

The current study aimed to develop a measure of collateral consequences faced by registered sexual offenders. The vast majority of literature has incorporated some verbiage to differentiate between consequences that arise as a result of direct legal interference (e.g., formal, primary, and intended consequences), and those that arise as a byproduct of direct legal sanctions (e.g., informal, secondary, and unintended consequences; Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Logan, 2013; Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Based on existing definitions of collateral consequences, the current measure included items assessing the informal, or secondary, consequences associated with a sexual offender conviction with a particular emphasis on negative social and psychological experiences. Assessing respondents' psychosocial experiences more soundly lends itself to factor analysis as an underlying latent factor structure can be postulated and a certain level of variability among responses can be anticipated. Though the current study was exploratory in nature, it was hypothesized that items would load onto two factors assessing separate but interrelated aspects of informal collateral consequences: social (i.e., negative public experiences including harassment, discrimination, denial of social participation, and rude treatment) and psychological (i.e., shame, depression, avoidance, and hopelessness as a result of one's sexual offense conviction) consequences.

Other variables associated with collateral consequences have long been postulated in the literature, yet some of these links have yet to be empirically tested. Similarly, there has been a lack of attention toward the psychological correlates of collateral consequences in particular, and how these may relate to one's propensity for reoffense. In developing the measure of collateral consequences, the relationship between collateral consequences and relevant psychological outcome variables were assessed. Labeling Theory highlights various psychological constructs in

defining the relationship between labeling events and reoffense. These include perceived stigma, shame, hopelessness, social integration, perceived family and social support, and agency for desistance (Mingus & Burchfield, 2012; Moore et al., 2013, 2016; Tangney et al., 2011). Due to lack of adequate measurement, however, it has yet to be determined whether experience with formal and informal collateral consequences indeed relate to the aforementioned psychological and social variables.

Preliminarily, the goal of the current study was to develop and psychometrically test a valid and reliable measure of collateral consequences experienced among sexual offenders. Additionally, and with empirical representation of participants' experience with collateral consequences, this research examined psychological and social correlates of collateral consequences, such as shame, hopelessness, social support, and social integration. The final purpose of this study was to examine the link between collateral consequences and offender-reported ability to desist from future crimes.

Research Question One: How will items assessing the construct of collateral consequences meaningfully load onto separate factors based on participant responses?

(H1)A: The construct of collateral consequences describes an array of diverse yet interrelated experiences (Wheelock, 2005; Wheelock & Uggen, 2005). Extant research has conceptualized the experience of collateral consequences along one dimension: formal versus informal consequences (Burchfield & Mingus, 2014; Logan, 2013; Pinard & Thompson, 2005; Roberts, 2008; Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Of note, some studies have conflated direct consequences stemming from conviction with the formal collateral consequences experienced secondarily to direct punishment and policy (Kirk & Wakefield, 2018; Logan, 2013). Indeed, prior definitions of formal collateral consequences are inconsistent (Kirk & Wakefield, 2018).

For the purposes of the current study, nomenclature of *social* versus *psychological* consequences were used to better differentiate between direct and collateral consequences in general. Operating from the definition of collateral consequences as a form of social control secondary to punishment, social collateral consequences were predicted to include discrete experiences of social, economic, or spatial barriers (e.g., barriers to employment and housing, entering public or commercial spaces, joining groups and/or social events). Conversely, psychological collateral consequences were predicted to include items assessing negative affect surrounding social exclusion and/or victimization. In sum, it was expected that a meaningful exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the collateral consequences item pool would produce two distinct but interrelated factors: *social* or external experiences of discrimination and harassment stemming from the sexual offender status, and negative *psychological* or internal experiences associated with the sexual offender status.

Research Question Two: How will psychosocial variables of social well-being, perceived stigma, shame, hopelessness, social inclusion, and perceived social support correlate with experience of collateral consequences?

(H2) A: With consideration of the hypothesized two-factor measure structure of social and psychological collateral consequences, it was hypothesized that the included psychological and social measures would disparately relate to each factor. For example, given the social and exclusionary nature of formal collateral consequences, it was hypothesized that experience with social collateral consequences would correlate strongly with social well-being, perceived stigma, social inclusion, and perceived social support. Conversely, it was hypothesized that psychological consequences, which tend to be conceptualized as more psychological in nature, would correlate strongly with included psychological measures of shame and hopelessness.

Research Question Three: How will measures of desistance, including offender-perceived agency for desistance and offender-reported reoffense, correlate with experience of collateral consequences?

(H3) A: According to Labeling and Disintegrative Shaming Theories, individuals who are reminded of their denigrated social status through public shaming may be more likely to internalize a criminal identity and develop a negative affect surrounding such identity (Bernburg et al., 2006; Sampson & Laub, 1997). As a result, the pathway to reoffense may be more streamlined for offenders experiencing this type of social and intrapsychic labeling. Thus, it was hypothesized that experience with both social and psychological collateral consequences would relate negatively to agency for desistance. Further, previous research has demonstrated that for sexual offenders in particular, hindering opportunities for personal stability post-offense can limit an individual's ability to re-enter into prosocial society, and could potentially facilitate reoffending (Bernburg & Krohn, 2003; Bernburg et al., 2006). It was hypothesized that experience with both social and psychological collateral consequences would positively correlate with general and sexual reoffending, as well as receiving probation violations, parole violations, or failure to register convictions post-index offense.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Participants

Participants were 218 sexual offenders registered in the state of Texas. All participants were male, and they ranged in age from 19 to 81 (M age = 49.18, SD = 13.92). Participants were predominantly Caucasian (69.4%), 13% identifying as Hispanic/Latino and 10.4% identifying as African American or Black. The sample was fairly diverse in terms of educational background; 7.8% reported completing less than high school, 34.8% reported obtaining a high school degree or equivalent, 17.6% endorsed some college, 20.7% reported a college degree (Bachelors and/or Associates), and 11.4% reported obtaining a graduate degree. In terms of marital status, 28.5% were single, never married, 37.8% were married or in a domestic partnership, 23.3% were divorced, 4.7% were separated, and 3.6% were widowed (See Table 2 for comprehensive sample-specific demographic information).

With regard to employment, 67.4% of the sample reported that they were currently employed full-time, 11.4% reported part-time employment, and 21.2% reported unemployment at time of assessment. Participants were asked to identify their household income prior to and post-conviction. On average, participant mean household income declined by nearly \$20,000 following conviction of a sexual offense, as participants reported a mean household income prior to conviction of \$68,440, and a post-conviction mean household income of \$48,806.

In terms of offense-specific demographic information of the current sample, a range of index offense types were represented. The most commonly reported offense type was Possession of Child Pornography (23.3%), followed by Indecency with a Child by Contact (15.0%). The majority of the sample reported being assigned low risk by the state of Texas (49.2%), though a sizable portion reported either never receiving an assigned level of risk or being unsure of their

risk level (12.4%). With regard to length of time registered, participants reported a range from one month to 30 years, with an average length of registration as 7.96 years ($SD = 7.14$). The majority of the sample (68%) reported currently participating in a sexual offender treatment program, while the remainder of the sample reported successful completion of treatment. Last, similar if not lower sexual offender reoffense rates were demonstrated in current sample in comparison with previous research (Langan et al., 2003; Sample & Bray, 2003), as 23.8% of the sample reported having been arrested since their index offense (the offense for which they are currently registering), 3.6% of the sample reported having been rearrested for a sexual-specific offense, and 26.4% of the sample reported being arrested or charged with a probation violation, parole violation, or failure to register (See Table 3 for comprehensive sample-specific offense information).

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire

Participant demographic data were elicited regarding age, race/ethnicity, years of education, employment status, current and past homeownership, marital status, cohabitants, current and past family income, offense name/description, date of offense, assigned level of risk, number of years spent on the registry, whether or not the participant was subject to community notification, what type (flyers, neighborhood meetings, door-to-door notification) and for how many years (See Appendix A).

Collateral Consequences

An item pool assessing collateral consequences was developed for psychometric testing in the current study. DeVellis (2003) recommended a sequence of steps in developing a new instrument: 1) Determine clearly what is to be measured, 2) generate an item pool, 3) determine

the format of the measure, 4) have experts review the initial item pool, 5) consider inclusion of validation items, 6) administer items to a pilot sample, 7) evaluate the items, and 8) optimize scale length. Steps one through six were addressed prior to proposing the current study, and the initial items were piloted with a sample of 38 sexual offenders from May to August 2018. Steps seven and eight occurred after factor analysis was complete (DeVellis, 2003).

The definition of collateral consequences that guided scale development included four primary elements, that collateral consequences 1) are denied opportunities afforded to the typical citizen, 2) are no longer afforded to those convicted of an offense, with emphasis on those convicted of a sexual offense, 3) are opportunities associated with social participation and well-being, and 4) are not expressly handed down by law and/or sentencing (thus eliminating formal consequences from inclusion; Pinard, 2010; Tewksbury, 2005; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a). Items for the current measure were gathered in three primary ways. First, this researcher conducted a thorough review of existing collateral consequences questionnaires used within a sexual offender population (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; 2005b; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Tewksbury, 2005). Items were adapted for use in the current item pool. The psychometric properties of these items had yet to be empirically determined, therefore the dichotomous scaling of the items was modified from previous surveys to Likert-type response options to allow for more nuance. I similarly conducted a thorough review of the theoretical and law literature addressing collateral consequences, and from this review developed a number of items thought to be linked to the experiences of registered sexual offenders. At this stage of development, the questionnaire consisted of 40 items. Second, I piloted the items on a sample of 38 sexual offenders, at the same time gathering qualitative information regarding particular experiences with collateral consequences. Qualitative interviews can help the investigator understand the vocabulary and

opinions of the target group, and discover topics raised by respondents (DeWalt et al., 2007).

Last, I consulted with experts in the field of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, Dr. Jill Levenson and Dr. Matthew Ferrara. The pilot study, as well as consultation with experts, resulted in an additional 24 items thought to be representative of the common sexual offender experience. The final item pool consisted of 66 items that addressed both formal and informal collateral consequences.

Quality items are clear, unambiguous, contain a single idea, and are not excessively wordy. Reading difficulty level should reflect a level appropriate to the target population (DeVellis, 2003; Spector, 1992). It is also recommended that the researcher decide whether to include negatively-worded items, as validation items. Measures consisting of all positively-worded items run the risk of acquiescence or agreement bias. Negatively-worded items were included in the current measure when they made clear sense and reflected the construct in way than was better than a positively-worded item. Last, it is recommended that the researcher decide whether to include redundant items. Redundancy has both benefits and drawbacks. Redundant items can verify consistent responding. Irrelevant redundancies should be avoided, particularly when considering striking an appropriate balance in measure length (i.e., considering participant fatigue; DeVellis, 2003). While irrelevant redundancy was avoided in the current item pool, certain items were worded similarly to capture the source of the experience (e.g., “Have you avoided traveling for work or for pleasure because of the threat of violating travel restrictions?” versus “Have you wanted to travel for business or pleasure but were unable because of travel restrictions?”).

This 66-item measure was used to assess participants’ experiences with collateral consequences. Example items included, “Have you lost a place to live because a neighbor or

landlord found out you were on the registry?”, “Have you avoided things you used to enjoy because you feel ashamed or embarrassed for being on the registry?”, “Have you lost a job or given up a career because of probation requirements/employment restrictions/child safety zones?”, and “Has your family member or cohabitant been treated rudely, or harassed because you are on the registry?” (See Appendix C for full survey).

Responses were rated along a 5-point Likert-type scale, with 1 = *Never/0 times*, 2 = *Rarely/1-3 times*, 3 = *Sometimes/4-6 times*, 4 = *Often/7-9 times*, and 5 = *Always/10+ times*. This response scale was chosen 1) based on pilot data and the frequency with which individuals reported experiencing collateral consequences, 2) based on conferring with experts in offender re-entry, 3) based on the hypothesized sample timeframe of years spent post-incarceration and on the registry, 4) based on response scales used in development studies of similar scales (e.g., assessing discrimination experiences; Nadal, 2011), and 5) in order to provide enough responses to be able to capture a range of frequency responses (5 to 9 being optimal; Spector, 1992), and lead to meaningful and precise information regarding one’s experience with collateral consequences.

Social Well-Being

Social integration in the context of offenders is defined as “formal and informal social interactions that engender a sense of belonging” (Zevitz, 2004). Collateral consequences represent the formal and informal social interactions that influence social integration among sexual offenders. The psychological aspect of social integration, belongingness, was assessed using a measure of perceived social well-being. The 15-item Social Well-Being Scale (SWBS; Keyes, 1998) measured five dimensions of social wellness: 1) Social Integration, or the positive evaluation of one’s place in society (3 items; e.g., “I don’t feel I belong to anything I’d call a

community”), 2) Social Acceptance, or the positive evaluation of the character and qualities of individuals who comprise society as a whole (3 items; e.g., “People do not care about other people’s problems”), 3) Social Contribution, or the evaluation of one’s social value (3 items; e.g., “I have something valuable to give to the world”), 4) Social Actualization, the evaluation of the potential and trajectory of society (3 items; e.g., “Society isn’t improving for people like me”), and 5) Social Coherence, or the perception of a logical and predictable social world (3 items; e.g., “The world is too complex for me”). Responses were rated along a 7-point scale, with 1 = *Strongly disagree*, and 7 = *Strongly agree*. See Appendix D for the full measure.

Certain items within the SWBS were reverse-coded, and items were summed to create subscales, with higher scores indicated greater social well-being. The five-factor structure was revealed through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and has been demonstrated in subsequent studies. The scale has demonstrated high internal consistency (the majority of subscales from $\alpha = .64$ to $.73$). Convergent validity has been demonstrated among the subscales, particularly between social contribution and the construct of generativity, social coherence and perceived constraints, and social integration and perceived neighborhood health (Keyes, 1998). Discriminant validity was demonstrated via null associations between the scales and constructs of optimism, dysphoria, and physical health (Keyes, 1998). Cronbach’s alpha was $.75$ for the Social Integration subscale, $.50$ for the Social Acceptance subscale, $.57$ for the Social Contribution subscale, $.61$ for the Social Actualization subscale, and $.45$ for the Social Coherence subscale. These reliabilities resemble those found in previous studies (Geisler et al., 2013; Keyes, 1998), and highlight the fact that each subscale is comprised of only three items. Scales with a greater number of items tend to inflate internal consistency; the alphas obtained in

the current study were considered adequate relative to the low number of items in each SWBS subscale, and what is generally acceptable for the scale based on use in previous research.

Desistance

Desistance was operationalized by both actual desistance and anticipated desistance. Actual desistance was assessed with three distinct items; first, “Have you been arrested since your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?”, second, “If so, was the arrest for a sexual offense? (e.g., if you were arrested since your index offense, was the rearrest for another sexual offense?)”, and third, “Were you EVER arrested for OR charged with a probation violation, parole violation, or failure to register, associated with your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?” Participant responses were dichotomous (yes/no). Requesting information from participants that may be perceived as intrusive or risky requires a delicate approach. Thus, the desistance items were intentionally kept parsimonious and direct. Items were worded to both elicit minimal divulgence from participants and maximize response rates. See Appendix E for the actual desistance measure.

Anticipated desistance was measured using the Agency for Desistance Questionnaire (ADQ; Lloyd & Serin, 2012). The ADQ is a unidimensional 16-item measure assessing perceived sense of agency for desistance, and it was developed using qualitative findings from narrative research on crime desistance (Maruna, 2001). Sample items included “Even when things are tough, I will still find a way to stay crime-free” and “I’m in charge of whether I stop doing crime.” Responses were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 7 = *Strongly agree*. Certain items were reverse-coded, and total scores were calculated by summing the individual items. Higher scores indicated stronger perceived agency for crime desistance. The ADQ has demonstrated good internal consistency within an offender sample (α

= .77; Lloyd & Serin, 2012). The ADQ has similarly demonstrated concurrent validity with measures of hope and general agency, and construct validity in its inverse relationship to related constructs of antisocial attitudes and criminal associations (Lloyd & Serin, 2012). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .79. See Appendix F for the full ADQ measure.

Stigma

Offender-perceived stigma was measured using the Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma measure (IPES; Moore et al., 2013). The IPES was originally developed with a sample of incarcerated offenders and assesses offender opinions regarding how people in society feel about “criminals.” The IPES consists of 8 items assessing perceived stigma of civilians toward criminals (e.g., “People on the outside think all criminals are the same”), and four items assessing the individual offender's anticipated stigma upon release from incarceration. Responses were rated along a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *Totally disagree* and 7 = *Totally agree*. Higher scores reflect more perceived stigma. For use with the current population, only the Perceived Stigma subscale was included, and items were modified slightly so that “sex offender” replaced “criminal.” This subscale has demonstrated high internal consistency among an offender sample (Moore et al., 2013). Cronbach's alpha for the perceived stigma scale was .84. The IPES – Perceived Stigma Subscale can be found in Appendix G.

Hopelessness

The Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS; Beck et al., 1974) is a 20-item self-report measure that assesses negative expectancies about one's future. Responses were scored in a true/false format, with a total score ranging from 0 to 20. Higher scores indicated a greater degree of hopelessness, with score of 9 – 14 indicating moderate hopelessness, and scores greater than 15 indicating severe hopelessness. Half of the scale items were negatively-worded (e.g., “I might as

well give up because I can't make things better for myself"), while half are positively-worded, and reverse-coded (e.g., "I look forward to the future with hope and enthusiasm"). This measure has demonstrated excellent content validity, concurrent validity with other measures of negative attitudes, construct validity, and internal consistency in both clinical and non-clinical samples (Beck et al., 1974; Steed, 2001). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .93. See Appendix H for the full BHS measure.

Social Support

Perceived social support was measured using the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Zimet et al., 1988). The MSPSS is a 12-item scale that measures an individual's perceived support from three sources: Family (4 items; e.g., "I get the emotional help and support I need from my family"), Friends (4 items; e.g., "I can count on my friends when things go wrong"), and his or her Significant Other (4 items; e.g., "There is a special person who is around when I am in need"). Items were rated along a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = *Very strongly disagree* and 7 = *Very strongly agree*. Higher scores indicated greater perceived support from that particular source. The MSPSS has demonstrated strong internal and test-retest reliability, concurrent validity, and construct validity among a variety of populations, including offenders (Kazarian & McCabe, 1991; Singer et al., 1995). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .96 for the Significant Other subscale, .94 for the Friends subscale, and .93 for the Family subscale. See Appendix I for the full MSPSS measure.

General Discrimination

A brief measure of discrimination was included for the purpose of assessing convergent validity with the collateral consequences measure. The 9-item Experiences of Discrimination scale (EOD; Krieger et al., 2005) measures self-reported experiences with discrimination.

Participants were asked to indicate whether they have ever experienced discrimination in nine domains (e.g., getting hired or getting a job, getting housing). Responses were rated along a 4-point scale, where 0 = *Never*, 1 = *Once*, 2 = *Two or three times*, and 3 = *Four or more times*. Both a frequency and situational score were computed. The EOD has demonstrated good internal consistency across populations, as well as high test-retest reliability, and construct and concurrent validity (Krieger et al., 2005). The EOD references discrimination due to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, as well as social class. The instructions in the current study asked participants to complete the items based on experiences of discrimination due to their status on the sexual offender registry. Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .81. See Appendix J for the full EOD measure.

Positive Impression Management

A measure of impression management was included to assess discriminant validity with the collateral consequences measure. Measures of social desirability have been included as measures of discriminant validity in forensic scale development research (Casey et al., 2007). The 9-item Positive Impression Management (PIM) scale of the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI; Morey, 2003) assesses response bias, wherein high scores may represent either intentional overstatement of positive characteristics or a lack of insight into personal shortcomings. In the initial validation of the PAI, PIM was highly correlated with social desirability (Morey, 1991). The PIM as a standalone scale has been used in research with corrections populations (Edens & Ruiz, 2006), and has been shown to have high internal reliability (e.g., $\alpha = .79$; Malouf et al., 2013). Items were first summed to compute a raw score, and raw scores were used to obtain the standardized T score for the PIM scale. For research purposes, it is recommended to convert raw PIM scores to T scores using the census-matched

standardization sample, thus, this conversion table was used to compute T scores for the current sample. See Appendix K for the full PIM subscale.

Social Inclusion

A measure of social inclusion was administered to participants for the purpose of assessing convergent validity with the collateral consequences measure. The Social Inclusion Scale (SIS; Secker et al., 2009) is a 22-item measure that assesses perceived social inclusion across three domains: Social Isolation, Social Relations, and Social Acceptance. The 5-item Social Isolation subscale assesses the amount of contact an individual has with people and society (e.g., “I have felt terribly alone and isolated”). The 5-item Social Acceptance subscale measures the individual’s sense of acceptance within social contexts (e.g., “I have felt accepted by my neighbors”). Last, the 9-item Social Relations subscale assesses the individual’s relative place in society and involvement in social activities (e.g., “I have been to new places”). Three individual items are included in the scale that do not meaningfully load onto a single factor (e.g., “I have felt insecure about where I live,” “I have done a sport, game or physical activity,” “I have helped out at a charity or local group”), but are included when calculating the total scale score. The SIS has been used with diverse populations including individuals with psychiatric diagnoses and students (Secker et al., 2009; Wilson & Secker, 2015). Responses were rated along a 4-point scale, where 1 = *Not at all*, 2 = *Not particularly*, 3 = *Yes a bit*, and 4 = *Yes definitely*. Mean scores were calculated for the full scale and subscales, with certain items reverse-coded, so that higher scores indicate greater perceived social inclusion. The full-scale SIS and its subscales have demonstrated good internal consistency, construct validity, predictive validity, and has been shown to be responsive to change over time (i.e., in intervention studies (Margrove et al., 2013; Secker et al., 2009). For use in the proposed study, items were modified

slightly to reference sexual offenders rather than psychiatric patients (e.g., “I have felt some people look down on me because of my mental health needs” was changed to “I have felt some people look down on me because of my sexual offender status”). Cronbach’s alpha was .73 for the Social Isolation subscale, .66 for the Social Acceptance subscale, and .78 for the Social Relations subscale. Cronbach’s alpha for the total scale was .89. See Appendix L for the full SIS measure.

Shame

Shame was measured using the Test of Self-Conscious Affect – Socially Deviant Version (TOSCA-SD; Hanson & Tangney, 1996). The TOSCA-SD is a measure consisting of 13 brief scenarios, followed by four responses rated on a 5-point scale, measuring an individual’s shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and externalization (i.e., attributing blame to others) reactions. Unlike other versions of the TOSCA which examine regularly-encountered shame experiences within the general population (Tangney & Dearing, 2002), the TOSCA-SD was developed for use with incarcerated populations as well as other groups considered “socially-deviant.” The TOSCA-SD is comprised of five subscales to represent disparate shame responses: Constructive Guilt (13 response items), Externalization (13 response items), Detachment (13 response items), Shame – Negative Self-Appraisal (5 response items), and Shame – Behavioral Avoidance (8 response items). An example scenario from the TOSCA-SD reads “You go out on a date with a woman/man and have sex. Afterwards she/he says that she/he felt forced into it.” The four response options include, “You would think: ‘She/he will soon get over it’,” “You would think: ‘I am a disgusting person’,” “You would try to understand what you did to hurt him or her,” and “You would think that she/he really enjoyed it and is just trying to get back at you,” with rating scales for each response ranging from 1 = *Not likely* to 5 = *Very likely*. This version has been

shown to correlate strongly to previous versions of the TOSCA, and has adequate reliability and validity among incarcerated sexual offenders (Cripps, 1997; Hanson, 1996; Tangney et al., 2011). The TOSCA-SD has demonstrated criterion validity among offender populations in its relationship to recidivism (Tangney et al., 2014). Cronbach's alpha was .81 for the Constructive Guilt subscale, .81 for the Externalization subscale, .76 for the Detachment subscale, .54 for the Shame – NA subscale, and .67 for the Shame – BA subscale. These reliabilities (particularly lowered reliabilities in the Shame – NA and Shame – BA subscales) parallel those encountered by Tangney et al. (2011). See Appendix M for the full TOSCA-SD measure.

Procedure

First, the initial six steps in instrument development outlined by DeVellis (2003) were undertaken, and a 66-item measure of collateral consequences was created for later factor analysis. Approval for preliminary data collection was secured (IRB Protocol No. 2017-02-0013), which allowed for pilot testing of collateral consequences items as well as the collection of qualitative data related to other experienced collateral consequences of registration. IRB approval for the current study was granted by the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board in February 2019 (IRB Protocol No. 2018-11-0092).

Participants for the current study were recruited through two different avenues. First, the survey was shared with the executive director of Texas Voices, a sexual offender support and advocacy group in Texas, who disseminated the online Qualtrics survey to members and affiliates via a listserv. Second, the survey was shared with sexual offender treatment providers around the Austin area to share with sexual offenders currently undergoing treatment. Because many of these latter offenders were newly on probation/parole and have restricted access to the

internet, surveys were administered using paper-and-pencil, were collected and stored in accordance with IRB requirements, and were later entered into data software for analysis.

This researcher's contact information (telephone number and email address), along with a copy of the consent form explaining the risks and benefits of participation (See Appendix A), was provided to all participants. I created for the purposes of participant recruitment a Gmail and Google Voice account that participants were instructed to contact if they had any questions about participation. I did not actively contact individuals to participate in order to uphold confidentiality of participation (given the sensitive nature of the survey content).

Participants completing the questionnaire online and in-person were first asked to review the consent form and consent to participate. They were then presented with the survey which requested participant responses to: 1) several demographic questions, 2) the collateral consequences items, 3) the SWBS, 4) the actual desistance items, 5) the ADQ, 6) the IPES, 7) the BHS, 8) the MSPSS, 9) the EOD, 10) the PIM, 11) the SIS, and 12) the TOSCA-SD. Alternate forms were used with both recruited groups; two distinct forms were used wherein scales were presented in a particular order to protect against threats to reliability/fatigue effects. Participants were randomly presented with either form. At the end of the survey, participants were presented with a debriefing script and a list of community mental health resources (should they experience any negative emotion as a result of questions asked in the current study) and were finally thanked for their time.

Chapter Four: Results

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted in order to scan the dataset for input errors, missing data, outliers, and normality. Prior to assessing for normality, one collateral consequences item was removed from the dataset due to a large amount of missing data (32.1%; item 42, “I have been denied housing due to my status on the registry”). Thus, normality and missing data analyses were conducted with the remaining 65 items, rather than the initial 66.

Missing data was dealt with using listwise deletion and available item analysis (AIA). The initial sample consisted of $N = 218$ participants. Listwise deletion was first carried out, by removing from the dataset 14 cases missing more than 50% of overall data. Cases were then deleted that did not meet minimum requirements for participation; three cases were removed from the dataset, as these participants indicated they were not currently registering in Texas.

With the resulting $N = 201$ dataset, cases were inspected for high rates of missing data on both the outcome measures and collateral consequences items. Parent (2013) recommends available item analysis (AIA), also termed pairwise deletion and/or pairwise inclusion, when considering missing data in counseling psychology research. AIA has been shown to perform similarly to multiple imputation and mean substitution, among datasets with low-level, item-level missingness. Parent (2013) argues that imputation methods may not be necessary with item-level missing data on multi-item scales and outlines a number of recommendations for using AIA. First, missing data must not be missing not at random (MNAR) and must exist at relatively low levels (no more than 10% for all data on each scale). Other assumptions must be met, such as adequate sample size and scale reliabilities. Second, a level of tolerance of missing data should be identified. The level of tolerance for the current data was set at 20%. However,

because each subscale of the Social Well-Being Scale is three items, individuals were permitted one missing item on each of these scales – that is, individual cases were only deleted if two or more items were missing on the three-item subscale. Parent (2013) states that the level of tolerance may be “mindfully” set, such that scales with fewer items may tolerate a greater percentage of missingness to include more cases/preserve sample size. Using the aforementioned guidelines, eight cases were deleted due to missing more than 20% of data on any one particular scale.

AIA was used solely with the remaining $N = 193$ participants. The level of missing data for the collateral consequences items was minimal. Missing data for each collateral consequences item ranged from 0 – 1.0% (see Table 4). Among the 65 items, 16 total data points (of 12,545) across 13 separate participants were missing, with no item was missing more than two data points. This author then assessed for the nature of missingness (missing not at random [MNAR], missing at random [MAR], missing completely at random [MCAR]) using Little’s MCAR test. Missing data among the collateral consequences items were judged to be missing at random according to Little’s test ($\chi^2 = 771.00, p = .432$). Nevertheless, listwise deletion was selected during EFA in SPSS.

A higher rate of missingness was detected among the nine included measures. Among the ADQ, a total of 15 missing data points out of 3,088 were observed, with no participants missing more than 3 data points. Within the SWBS, a total of 16 missing data points out of 2,895 were observed, with no participant missing more than one data point on each of the five subscales. Among the SIS, a total of 19 missing data points out of 3,667 were observed, with no participant missing more than one data point on each of the three subscales. Among the BHS, a total of 16 missing data points out of 3,860 were observed, with no participants missing more than four data

points. Within the PIM, a total of three missing data points out of 1,737 were observed, with no participants missing more than a single data point. Within the TOSCA-SD, a total of 19 missing data points out of 10,036 were observed, with no participant missing more than one data point on each of the five subscales. Among the EOD, a total of four missing data points out of 1,737 were observed, with no participants missing more than a single data point. Within the MSPSS, a total of four missing data points out of 2,316 were observed, with no participant missing more than one data point on each of the three subscales. Last, among the IPES, a single missing data point out of 1,544 was observed.

Little's MCAR test was then conducted among the nine included measures. The majority of the measures demonstrated non-significant chi-square tests, though the SWBS – Social Actualization subscale, the BHS, and the TOSCA – SD Constructive Guilt subscales suggested a pattern to the missing data ($p = .03$). In addition to examining results from Little's MCAR test, data on the three potentially MNAR scales were manually inspected for obvious patterns of missing data, such as abnormally high rates of missing data on a few select items. Though Little's test lends support as to whether data are MAR/MCAR, data may also be assumed/treated as missing at random if there is no clear pattern to the missingness (e.g., one item missing an overwhelmingly large number of missing values; Parent, 2013). No clear bias in the missingness was apparent. Within the 3-item SWBS – Social Actualization subscale, one item was missing three data points while the other two items comprising the subscale were missing no data. While this may indicate a pattern, it is also probable that this minute level of missing data (1.6%) may alert the software to biased responding solely as a function of few items comprising the scale. Among the 20-item BHS, the missingness appeared to be evenly distributed; five items were missing one data point, four items were missing two data points, and one item was missing three

data points. Last, among the 13-item TOSCA – SD Constructive Guilt subscale, two items were missing one data point and one item was missing three data points. Again, this pattern indicates no abnormally high level of missingness on a particular item, with the greatest proportion of missingness being 1.6% on a single item. Thus, the data were assumed missing at random, and were judged appropriate for further analysis.

Normality

In order to test for normality within the dataset, three methods were used. First, the data were examined for skewness and kurtosis via descriptive statistics. Second, the Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted for each of the established measures used in the current study. Last, means and medians were compared to one another to check for adequate approximation, indicating a normal distribution.

Skewness and kurtosis were first examined for the 65 collateral consequences items. Several of the items (item 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 40, and 43) demonstrated elevated skewness, kurtosis, or both (greater than ± 3.29). Interestingly, each of these items addressed discrimination or harassment experiences (e.g., “I have been assaulted or attacked because someone found out I am a sex offender”). All Shapiro-Wilk tests for the 65 items were significant (See Table 5). Six items possessed skewness and kurtosis levels well above the recommended cut-off level of ± 3.29 (items 24, 27, 28, 30, 40, and 43; Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012), and these items were removed from analysis. The remaining four items (items 31, 33, 37, and 38) showed moderate elevation (less than ± 5.50) and were thus retained at this stage of item retention/deletion, though flagged for further examination/evidence of fit during factor analysis (see Table 5).

Skewness and kurtosis were then examined for the nine included measures. The TOSCA – SD Constructive Guilt subscale demonstrated elevated kurtosis (greater than ± 3.29 ; See Table 6). Each of the remaining scales and subscales were within normal limits. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that all scales were non-normally distributed ($p < .05$) except two (the TOSCA-SD Detachment subscale and the Social Acceptance subscale of the SIS).

Flexibility regarding non-normality was acceptable for a few reasons. First, statistical tests for normality may be too sensitive when used with larger sample sizes (greater than $N = 100$), thus skewness and kurtosis levels were examined independently (values falling outside the ± 3.29 range indicating high levels of skewness/kurtosis) along with visual methods (histograms and Normal Q-Q plots) and mean-median comparisons (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012; Kim, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Data for all scales approximated a normal distribution, and judgment was used in determining not to transform the data for the TOSCA – SD Constructive Guilt subscale, the only scale with moderately elevated kurtosis. Further, low levels of non-normality can be tolerated with larger sample sizes due to increased number of observations more closely approximating a normal distribution, and robustness of statistical tests with a large sample. Non-normality can also be considered in the context of the data (anticipated skewed/kurtotic data) rather than treated as absolute violation of assumptions (Shuster, 2005; Wells & Hintze, 2007).

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the factor structure of the collateral consequences items. EFA assumes that underlying or latent constructs exist within the data, that, through a number of statistical rotation techniques, give rise to manifest factors. EFA was selected against Principle Components Analysis (PCA), as it more formally prepares the

data for subsequent Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and thus allows for further empirical examinations into the initial factor structure extracted through EFA. Within EFA are several factor extraction techniques, including Unweighted Least Squares, Generalized Least Squares, Maximum Likelihood (ML), and Principal Axis Factoring (PAF).

In conducting EFA, Osborne (2015) recommends five steps after data are cleaned: 1) choosing a factor extraction method, 2) deciding how many factors to retain, 3) deciding on a method of rotation, 4) interpretation of results, and 5) replication/evaluation of robustness. Principal axis factoring (PAF) was chosen as the factor extraction method for use with the current data. Comparisons of PAF and other extraction methods such as Maximum Likelihood (ML), found that PAF generally produces similar results to other extraction methods, may perform best with non-normal data, provides reliable factor results, and is generally recommended (along with ML) when conducting EFA (Osborne, 2015).

First, in order to ensure that the data were suitable for EFA, sampling adequacy was tested via three means: Bartlett's (1950) test of sphericity, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy, and by examining item intercorrelations. Bartlett's test of sphericity provides a measure of scale factorability and is used to estimate the probability that the matrix correlations are zero. A p -value less than .05 indicates that the correlation matrix is significantly different than the identity matrix, and that the data are suitable for exploratory factor analysis. This test is recommended for use when there are fewer than five cases per variable (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Bartlett's test indicated the data were suitable for reduction ($\chi^2 = 8591.93, p < .001$).

The KMO measure of sampling adequacy is an indication of the extent to which the correlation matrix between a subset of variables contains factors versus chance correlations.

KMO values of .60 or higher indicate good factorability (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The KMO value obtained with the current data was .89, indicating sampling adequacy.

Last, the item correlation matrix was then examined to ensure that each of the items correlated with at least one other item; it is suggested that items that do not moderately correlate ($\geq .3$) with any other item included in the factor analysis may not represent well the latent construct being measured (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). All 59 items correlated with at least one other item at .3 or above.

Once the data were found suitable for reduction, PAF was performed with the remaining 59 collateral consequences items to determine the number of meaningful factors to retain. Four methods were used to determine factor selection: eigenvalues, scree test, parallel analysis, and the proportion of variance accounted for by each factor. It is generally best to use multiple factor selection criteria to support decision-making in EFA, as the process in itself is subjective by nature (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Important to achieving sound results through EFA is intentional decision-making by part of the researcher, though few absolute guidelines are offered (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004). Researchers have recommended, however, that all rationale and decisions made during EFA are clearly documented and supported for the purpose of transparency, particularly for the benefit of research reviewers and consumers (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Thus, this researcher clearly outlined decisions regarding item deletion, rotation, and factor retention in the following paragraphs.

Initial eigenvalues were examined prior to rotation. Potential factors are indicated by eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Kaiser's rule; Kaiser, 1960), though it is highly suggested that multiple methods are used for factor selection (e.g., scree test, variance thresholds). Gorsuch

(1983) posited that selecting factors solely based on eigenvalues may misrepresent the true factor structure, and often results in too many factors being retained. The initial model suggested 13 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, explaining 71.76% of the total variance.

Next, a scree plot was inspected (scree test; Cattell, 1966), particularly the point of inflection where eigenvalues “drop off,” indicating the number of ideal factors to retain (the point at which variance accounted for by each factor loading becomes negligible). The scree plot indicated a plateau effect after Factor 3, suggesting a parsimonious three-factor solution. A shortcoming to relying on scree tests in factor retention decisions is its ambiguity and subjectivity, particularly with smaller sample sizes and a low variable to factor ratio (Gorsuch, 1983; Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Further, scree tests, like Kaiser’s rule, tend to overestimate the number of factors to extract (Henson & Roberts, 2006).

Parallel analysis is touted as one of the more accurate methods in determining the number of factors to retain, though is often underreported in the literature (Henson & Roberts, 2006; Zwick & Velicer, 1986). Parallel analysis was conducted in SPSS to reveal an optimal factor solution (O’Connor, 2000), however results from parallel analysis supported a 7-factor model. Parallel analysis, similar to other selection methods, and when conducted with principal axis factoring, tends to overextract factors (Buja & Eyuboglu, 1992). O’Connor (2000) suggests considering the results of parallel analysis in conjunction with other factor selection methods, including interpretability, to trim trivial factors.

Last, variance accounted for by each factor was examined. It has been recommended that the proportion of variance accounted for by the factor be at least 5% to 10% to justify retention (Suhr, 2006). Prior to rotation, Factor 1 accounted for 32.41% of the variance, Factor 2 accounted for 7.80% of the variance, and Factor 3 accounted for 4.70% of the variance. Using

the lower threshold suggested by Suhr (2006), factors accounting for greater than 5% of the variance were retained. Because 1) eigenvalue analysis, scree tests, and parallel analysis tend to overestimate the number of factors to be extracted, and 2) the central tenet of factor analysis is to explain the greatest amount of variance in the construct with the fewest number of factors possible, it was decided that the lower estimate of a two-factor model would be most parsimonious. To examine the interpretability the two-factor model as compared to other solutions, two-, three-, four-, five-, six- and seven-factor models were forced in SPSS. Items and their correspondence to potential constructs were examined, and it the two-factor model was retained as the most conceptually-sound and parsimonious model.

Once a two-factor model was selected, a factor rotation method was chosen. Orthogonal rotation approaches (e.g., equamax, orthomax, quartimax, and varimax) are most appropriate when the resulting factors are thought to be uncorrelated, while oblique rotation methods (e.g., direct oblimin and promax) assume that the factors are correlated. While there is some evidence that one will achieve similar results regardless of the rotation method chosen (Finch, 2006), there are recommendations for ultimately selecting the most appropriate method based on the data. In choosing whether to use an orthogonal versus oblique rotation, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommended to first run an oblique rotation to examine the correlations among the resulting factors. If the correlations between factors exceed .32, an oblique rotation is most appropriate for the data. If the correlations do not exceed .32, the solution is orthogonal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Correlations between the factors exceeded .32, and an oblique rotation was chosen. An oblique was similarly chosen due to hypothesized as an overlap in the variance among factors given the nature of the construct of collateral consequences (a constellation of discrimination and disenfranchisement experiences associated with negative behavioral and psychological

consequences; Henson & Roberts, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Promax was chosen as the specific oblique rotation method; researchers generally recommend rotating with promax if using an oblique rotation method (Gorusch, 1983; Kim & Mueller, 1978).

Item-specific data (i.e., communalities, loadings, and cross-loadings) were then examined to determine need for deletion. Item communalities were examined to ensure that each item a) was related to the other items, and b) did not represent an ill-fitting factor that should not be explored (Costello & Osborne, 2005). It is suggested that items possessing communalities less than .40 be considered for deletion, particularly in social sciences research (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Four items were deleted during EFA due to communalities less than .40 (items 36, 37, 54, and 58).

Factor loadings, or correlations between the variable and factor, were then analyzed. It is suggested that variables with loadings greater than 0.32 are suitable for retention (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). All items in the two-factor model demonstrated loadings greater than 0.32; no items were removed due to low factor loadings.

Cross-loadings were also examined to ensure that factors did not share items that cross-load too highly on more than one factor. It is recommended that an item be considered for deletion if it has a cross-loading of .32 on two or more factors (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Two items were removed from analysis during EFA for demonstrating high cross-loadings on multiple factors (items 64 and 61).

Last, interpretability was considered when deciding whether to retain or remove variables from a factor, that is, whether or not the item was meaningful and made conceptual sense as part of the factor. Factors achieve interpretability if four criteria are met (Suhr, 2006), 1) the factor possesses at least three items with significant loadings ($>.45$), 2) the variables that load on a

factor share conceptual meaning, 3) the variables that load on different factors seem to measure different constructs, and 4) the rotated factor pattern demonstrates simple structure (relatively high loadings on one factor, and low loadings on other factors). In interpreting the factors, Factor 1 appeared to represent psychological consequences of sex offender registration, such as hopelessness, avoidance, and perceived isolation. Factor 2 appeared to represent distinct incidences of discrimination and harassment as a result of sex offender registration.

A two-factor, promax-rotated solution with 20 items was ultimately chosen. The two-factor model explained the greatest amount of variance (41.99%) with the fewest items. Factor 1 was labeled *Psychological Consequences* (13 items), and Factor 2 was labeled *Social Consequences* (7 items). See Table 7 for the pattern and structure coefficients, communality estimates, and alpha coefficients for the two-factor oblique model.

Reliability and Validity

Once the final factor solution was achieved, Cronbach's alphas for each subscale were calculated as a measure of internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha was .94 for the Psychological Consequences subscale, .90 for the Social Consequences subscale, and .94 for the total Sex Offender Collateral Consequences Measure (SOCCM).

Content validity for the proposed measure was preliminarily established via consulting experts in the field of collateral consequences experienced by sexual offenders, Dr. Jill Levenson and Dr. Matthew Ferrara, on the initial item pool. A pilot study was also conducted to assess relevance of the items, and to gather qualitative information from registered sexual offenders regarding common experiences with collateral consequences. As mentioned, adjustments to the final item pool were made based on expert and offender consultation, and the resulting questionnaire was disseminated to participants.

Construct validity of the SOCCM was similarly assessed. Construct validity requires an assessment of both convergent and discriminant validity. A scale demonstrates convergent validity if it is related to alternative measures of the same construct, while discriminant validity is demonstrated when a measure is unrelated to measures of conceptually dissimilar constructs. A variety of measures were included that are thought to relate to both the Social Consequences and Psychological Consequences subscales of the collateral consequences measure. The Social Consequences subscale was strongly, positively correlated with both the situation ($r = .69, p < .001$) and frequency ($r = .73, p < .001$) scores of the Experiences of Discrimination (EOD) scale. The Psychological Consequences subscale was significantly correlated with the Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS; $r = .46, p < .001$) and the Social Isolation subscale of the Social Inclusion Scale ($r = -.50, p < .001$). Subscales of the TOSCA – SD were used to demonstrate discriminant validity, as certain expressions of shame (e.g., detachment, externalization) were thought to be conceptually dissimilar from collateral consequences. The Social Consequences and Psychological Consequences subscales were not significantly related to the Detachment subscale of the TOSCA – SD ($r = -.01, p = .89$ and $r = -.01, p = .93$, respectively), and as well as the Externalization subscale of the TOSCA – SD ($r = .06, p = .41$ and $r = .11, p = .20$, respectively). The PIM ($r = -.02, p = .79$) was also unrelated to the Social Consequences subscale, further evidencing discriminant validity.

Criterion validity indicates the extent to which a measure is related to a particular outcome and is represented through a combination of concurrent and predictive validity. Concurrent validity is a measure of how well a particular measure correlates with a previously validated measure of the same construct. Concurrent validity for the Social Consequences subscale (measuring discrimination experiences) was demonstrated via the robust, positive

correlation with the EOD frequency and situation subscales. Concurrent validity for the Psychological Consequences subscale (measuring psychological distress in relation to an individual's sexual offense) was demonstrated via a robust, positive correlation with the BHS. Because the sample was assessed at one time-point, only concurrent validity was established.

Correlational Results

In order to address the second research question regarding psychological and social correlates of collateral consequences, a series of zero-order correlations were calculated. Of note, results from certain correlational analyses were reported above as indicators of validity, however results are also reported in the current section. Bivariate correlations between all measured variables are provided in Table 8. The Social and Psychological Consequences subscales were considered distinct factors, thus SOCCM total scale scores were not included in the correlational analyses.

First, bivariate correlations were performed using the Social Consequences subscale of the SOCCM and psychosocial variables of interest. The Social Consequences subscale was significantly, positively correlated with perceived stigma ($r = .31, p < .001$), hopelessness ($r = .18, p = .012$), and the negative self-appraisal aspect of shame ($r = .17, p = .016$). Experience with social collateral consequences was significantly, negatively correlated with several indicators of social well-being, including perceived social integration ($r = -.28, p < .001$), perceived social acceptance ($r = -.46, p = .043$ for the Social Well-Being Scale subscale of social acceptance; $r = -.37, p < .001$ for the Social Inclusion Scale subscale of social acceptance), perceived social actualization ($r = -.29, p < .001$), perceived social coherence ($r = -.16, p = .025$), perceived social isolation ($r = -.18, p = .013$), perceived social relations ($r = -.48, p = .008$).

Bivariate correlations were then performed to examine relationships between the Psychological Consequences subscale of the SOCCM and relevant psychosocial variables. The Psychological Consequences subscale was significantly, positively correlated with perceived stigma ($r = .52, p < .001$), the constructive guilt aspect of shame ($r = .24, p = .001$), the negative self-appraisal aspect of shame ($r = .26, p < .001$), and hopelessness ($r = .46, p < .001$). Experience with psychological collateral consequences was significantly, negatively correlated with several indicators of social well-being, including perceived social integration ($r = -.53, p < .001$), perceived social acceptance ($r = -.22, p = .002$ for the Social Well-Being Scale subscale of social acceptance; $r = -.53, p < .001$ for the Social Inclusion Scale subscale of social acceptance), perceived social coherence ($r = -.34, p < .001$), perceived social isolation ($r = -.50, p < .001$), perceived social actualization ($r = -.49, p < .001$), and perceived social relations ($r = -.48, p < .001$). Psychological collateral consequences were also significantly, negatively correlated with perceived family support ($r = -.19, p = .009$), perceived friend support ($r = -.26, p < .001$), and perceived support from a significant other ($r = -.25, p < .001$).

In order to address the third research question regarding the relationship between collateral consequences and perceived (agency for) desistance and reported (actual) desistance from offending, zero-order correlations were calculated. First, bivariate correlations revealed that agency for desistance (total score ADQ) did not significantly correlate with both external and internal collateral consequences ($r = .07, p = .33$ and $r = .10, p = .16$, respectively).

Additionally, three dichotomous items were included that assessed actual desistance. The first item assessed general reoffense, “Have you been arrested since your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?”, the second addressed sexual reoffense, “If so, was the arrest for a sexual offense? (e.g., if you were arrested since your index offense, was the rearrest

for another sexual offense?)”, and the third addressed reoffending through parole violations, probation violations, and/or failure to register, “Were you EVER arrested for OR charged with a probation violation, parole violation, or failure to register, associated with your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?”. In order to calculate correlations between dichotomous items and continuous data, point-biserial correlations were calculated. Experience with social collateral consequences were significantly, positively correlated with both general reoffense ($r = .17, p = .025$) and reoffending through parole violations/probation violations/failure to register ($r = .24, p = .001$). There were no statistically significant relationships between psychological collateral consequences and items assessing desistance.

Chapter Five: Discussion

The Two-Dimensional Construct of Collateral Consequences

Investigation into the factor structure of a measure of collateral consequences revealed a two-factor solution representing social (i.e., discrete experiences of harassment and discrimination related to one's sexual offender status) and psychological (i.e., internal experiences of psychological distress related to one's sexual offender status) collateral consequences. Results from the current study build upon previous literature which has typically defined collateral consequences bidimensionally (i.e., formal versus informal, direct versus indirect, primary versus secondary). In contrast to previous research, however, items assessing experience of formal collateral consequences, such as subjection to registration, community notification, and probation stipulations, were not included due to their likeness to direct punishment arising from the fact of conviction rather than collaterally. Rather, measurement of informal collateral consequences was prioritized.

Results from the current study suggest that collateral consequences may be best understood as social and psychological in nature. These results parallel thematic findings of Lasher and McGrath (2012), who categorized the predominant areas of reintegration impacted by sexual offender policies as social (e.g., loss of social supports and social safety) and psychological (e.g., stress, shame, hopelessness). Several other studies similarly emphasize the social and psychological aspects of collateral consequences (Brannon, Levenson, Fortney, & Baker, 2007; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Levenson et al., 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Robbers, 2009; Tewksbury, 2005; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000b). As mentioned in the current study's hypothesis, though previous literature has tended toward terms of *formal* versus *informal* collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders, this researcher chose to represent the factors

as *social* versus *psychological* collateral consequences to better reflect the items included in the final measure. Thus, while the current study's hypothesis was framed around bidimensional conceptualizations of formal and informal collateral consequences, as hypothesized, the specific language of social and psychological collateral consequences both 1) accurately captured the essence of collateral versus direct consequences, and 2) fit the data best.

As predicted, the social and psychological collateral consequences factors correlated strongly with one another, so that greater reported discrimination and harassment experiences were related to greater psychological distress surrounding one's sexual offender status. These findings parallel those of Jeglic et al. (2012), who found that sexual offenders who experienced more harassment experiences also reported greater levels of depression and hopelessness than offenders who reported few to no negative experiences. Though directionality cannot be established from the current results, the association between social and psychological collateral consequences highlights the cruciality of discrete social exclusion experiences on psychological well-being in relation to one's offender status. Preliminarily, this finding provides foundational information regarding the relationship between collateral consequences and other psychological and social indicators included in the current study.

Perhaps expectedly, items retained in the current collateral consequences measure mapped on adequately with predominant themes from prior research. For example, included in the Social Consequences subscale were items assessing personal harassment, harassment of family members and cohabitants, poor treatment, and whether or not the participant had been asked to leave an establishment, each of which were highlighted in previous qualitative and descriptive research addressing collateral consequences among sexual offenders (Frenzel et al., 2014; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009). Though collateral consequences have not previously been

represented by a validated measure, it appears that typical experiences with external consequences of discrimination and harassment, have been accurately represented in descriptive studies. Interestingly, items assessing housing (e.g., “I lost a place to live because a landlord or neighbor found out I was on the registry”) and employment (e.g., “I have been denied employment due to my status on the registry”) difficulties did not load strongly on either factor, contrary to prior research identifying housing and employment restrictions as the foremost collateral consequences experienced by sexual offenders (Lester, 2007; Tewksbury, 2007). This may be due to these items being perceived by respondents as proxies for formal residence and employment restrictions, and participants reporting low levels of such restrictions. Residence restrictions in Texas, for example, are generally determined by the probation/parole board as a condition of supervision on a case-by-case basis or enacted by city ordinance. It may be that the majority of participants have had little experience with housing restrictions due to the absence of statewide mandates, thus minimizing the significance of these experiences as part of the collateral consequences construct. If state-specific mandates indeed influenced participant responses to the current items, generalizability of the current findings to the national population of sexual offenders should be considered with caution. Given the purpose of the current study, however, to include items reflective of a traditional definition of collateral consequences as 1) separate from direct or court-ordered sanction, 2) unintended, and 3) psychosocial in nature, it is reasonable that items potentially interpreted by respondents as direct sanctions would load poorly onto the remaining items.

In contrast, the Psychological Consequences subscale included items addressing fear, shame, behavioral and psychological avoidance, isolation, stagnancy, and helplessness in relation to sexual offender status. While psychological consequences associated with a sexual offense

have been broached in the literature, seminal research has typically focused on discrete experiences of discrimination and harassment, particularly surrounding employment and housing (Frenzel et al., 2014; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009; Zevitz & Farkas, 2000). Current findings emphasizing a negative psychological component to collateral consequences both parallel and build upon previous research. Studies have shown that individuals subjected to sexual offender policies report greater negative mental health outcomes (Edwards & Hensley, 2001; Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Robbers, 2009). Prior measures of collateral consequences, however, have typically included one or two items assessing shame, hopelessness, and fear in particular (Harris et al., 2015; Levenson, 2008; Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Robbers, 2009).

In addition to assessing the aforementioned aspects of negative affect, a contribution of the current study was the inclusion of items assessing behavioral and psychological avoidance in response to the sexual offender status (e.g., “I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go,” “I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me”). Another concept highlighted in the current subscale that has been relatively underrepresented in previous research is the perceived ability to create meaning in one’s life (e.g., “I have felt unable to create meaning in my life because of my status on the registry,” “I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense”). Thus, certain intrapsychic experiences appear to represent an empirically novel aspect of collateral consequences and may help explain the relationship between collateral consequences and important social and psychological factors implicated in sexual offender rehabilitation and reintegration.

The Relationship between Collateral Consequences and Psychosocial Variables

The second aim of the current investigation was to examine the relationships between collateral consequences and relevant psychosocial variables referenced in prior research. Because the current study was exploratory in nature, the SOCCM subscales were correlated with a range of measures theorized in the literature to be related to the experience of collateral consequences. As expected, individuals who reported greater experience with social collateral consequences (i.e., harassment and discrimination experiences) reported decreased social well-being, specifically, lower levels of perceived social integration, social acceptance, social actualization, social coherence, and social relations. These findings parallel previous research that highlighted the significance of discrete labeling experiences in hindering social well-being and reintegration among offender populations (Link et al., 1989; Moore et al., 2013, 2016). In addition, individuals who reported greater experience with social collateral consequences reported greater perceived public stigma, higher levels of shame in the form of negative self-appraisal (e.g., critical self-talk in relation to shame experiences), and increased hopelessness. These findings highlight theories postulated in previous research, that stigmatization events incite higher levels of perceived (and often distorted) stigma in offender populations (Moore et al., 2013). Further, discrimination and harassment because of one's offender status has been linked to increased self-criticism, shame, and a bleak outlook toward the future (Moore et al., 2016; Robbers, 2009; Tangney et al., 2011). When considering how demoralization and the internalization of a "deviant" label may impact future negative behavior, as postulated by (Modified) Labeling and Reintegrative Shaming theories, the issue of collateral consequences evolves from a humanistic to public safety concern.

Like social collateral consequences, individuals who reported greater experience with psychological collateral consequences reported decreased social well-being, specifically, lower levels of perceived social integration, social acceptance, social coherence, social isolation, social actualization, and social relations. In addition, this study found that individuals who reported greater psychological collateral consequences (i.e., negative affect in relation to one's sexual offense conviction) reported greater perceived stigma, higher levels of shame in the form of negative self-appraisal (e.g., critical self-talk in relation to shame experiences), higher levels of constructive guilt (e.g., proactive and relationship-enhancing guilt experiences), and increased hopelessness. These findings suggest that experiencing negative affect in relation to one's sexual offense is related to generalized indicators of mental health, such as critical self-talk and hopelessness toward the future. While an association between psychological collateral consequences and reduced mental health was expected, a surprising finding emerged as psychological consequences and constructive guilt were also positively linked. This suggests that individuals who experienced increased negative affect surrounding their sexual offense were also more likely to respond to guilt-inducing situations proactively, by attempting to salvage the situation and repair the relationship. Prior studies have supported this finding. Specifically, as a result of registration and community notification policies, sexual offenders have endorsed greater motivation to avoid negative behavior and "prove they are not bad people" to law abiding society (Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Mercado et al., 2008). It may be that this finding highlights the theorized dichotomy of both antisocial and prosocial responses to collateral consequences (Lasher & McGrath, 2012).

In contrast with social collateral consequences, individuals who reported increased psychological consequences also endorsed lower levels of perceived support from family

members, friends, and significant others. Prior research has consistently referenced the challenges sexual offenders face in maintaining close relationships post-conviction (Pinard, 2010; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006, Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). Hypothetically, it may be that the isolation and avoidance aspects of psychological collateral consequences (e.g., “I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender,” “I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety”) inhibit one’s ability to foster and maintain positive relationships. Another potential explanation behind this finding is that individuals who are without a buffer of support from family members, friends, and romantic partners, may be more likely internalize the sexual offender identity and experience negative affect in relation to that identity. Indeed, certain studies have proposed social support as a necessary buffer in mitigating negative outcomes for sexual offenders (Farkas & Miller, 2007, Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009). Regardless, these preliminary findings lay the groundwork for future research in determining the predictive and/or mediating power of social support on outcomes for sexual offenders.

Contrary to what was hypothesized in the current study, social and psychological collateral consequences were not significantly linked to agency for desistance, or one’s perceived ability to refrain from reoffending. While the relationship between collateral consequences and agency for desistance has been referenced in the literature (Lloyd & Serin, 2012; Maruna, 2001, 2004), the current findings suggest that experience with social and psychological collateral consequences are not related to perceived ability to desist from crime. This finding is notable given the significant correlation between social collateral consequences and offender self-reported desistance (i.e., reoffense), which is discussed in the following section. Among the current sample, there may be a disconnect between the experience of negative social and

psychological events and the recognition that one possesses the resources and capacity to desist from reoffending. Other psychosocial outcomes, however, were significantly linked to agency for desistance, including constructive guilt, social acceptance, and perceived social support from a significant other, suggesting that apart from the study of collateral consequences, the role of agency for desistance in sexual offender rehabilitation and reintegration is worthy of future exploration.

Collateral Consequences and Desistance

With regard to the relationship between collateral consequences and desistance from reoffending, notable findings emerged from the data. Neither social nor psychological collateral consequences significantly related to agency for desistance, or the extent to which an offender believed he would be able to desist from crime. Notably, however, the Agency for Desistance Questionnaire (ADQ) data were fairly negatively skewed, with the majority of patients obtaining high scores on the measure (indicating higher levels of agency for desistance). The nature of the questioning may have contributed to this particular response style, as the items required respondents to essentially divulge 1) whether or not they believed they had the capacity to refrain from committing offenses, and 2) whether or not they were presently considering reoffending. It is possible that respondents were motivated to portray themselves as possessing strong agency for desistance, particularly if they were currently enrolled in a sexual offender treatment program.

The relationship between collateral consequences and recidivism (rearrest following the sexual offense for which the participant is registering) was similarly assessed. Interestingly, only social collateral consequences were significantly, positively related to items assessing recidivism, specifically the offender's reported general reoffense and reoffending related to

parole violations/probation violations/failure to register. That is, the more likely a respondent was to endorse experiencing social collateral consequences, the more likely he was to endorse a general rearrest (arrest for a non-sexual offense) as well as an arrest for a parole violation/probation violation/failure to register. Psychological consequences were statistically unrelated to desistance items, in that those who endorsed experiencing psychological consequences associated with a sexual offense were not more likely to endorse reoffense. Further, neither social nor psychological consequences were linked to whether or not an individual was rearrested for a sexual offense.

Based on the current findings, it appears that discrete experiences of harassment and discrimination are most strongly related to general (non-sexual) reoffending. Similarly, experiences of discrimination and harassment were related to greater incidences of rearrest for parole/probation violations/revocations and failure to register violations. This is consistent with previous research that has cited the experience of collateral consequences as detrimental to one's ability to adhere to sexual offender-specific probation stipulations and registry requirements (Tewksbury, 2007; Uggen & Stewart, 2014). Further, one of the most robust arguments against current sexual offender policies holds that the collateral punishments, or the ensuing social denigration of such policies, effectively impede both social and reformative success for sexual offenders, causing further entrenchment in the legal system. The current findings are of critical importance in bolstering this argument, particularly that the pathway from social collateral consequences to probationary failures was empirically evidenced.

The importance of social collateral consequences above psychological consequences as they relate to reoffense may also be explained by Braithwaite's (1989) theory of disintegrative shaming. In accordance with disintegrative shaming, negative public treatment creates a group of

social outsiders who, without prosocial outlets, may become increasingly entrenched in an offending lifestyle. Previous research conducted by Tittle et al. (2003) supported Braithwaite's theory by demonstrating that incidences of disintegrative shaming increased the likelihood of future deviance. Thus, while Braithwaite's (1989) theory was not directly tested in the current study, it offers a reasonable explanation for the significant relationship between shaming experiences (social collateral consequences) and reoffending. Conversely, the non-significant findings between psychological consequences and reoffense contrast hypotheses of previous research (Jeglic et al., 2012; Lasher & McGrath, 2012; Ward & Hudson, 1998). It may be that while social collateral consequences more robustly impact behavioral acting-out among sexual offenders, psychological consequences correspond to greater negative affect and internalizing symptoms. Regardless, the mechanisms underlying these disparate relationships warrant further investigation.

Study Limitations and Future Directions

Findings from the current study should be interpreted in light of a few notable limitations. First, the current study was exploratory in nature. Primarily, the study purpose was to develop a reliable and valid measure that could empirically explain the structure of collateral consequences as they impact registered sexual offenders. Therefore, while the current study evidenced a preliminary organizational framework for collateral consequences, substantive conclusions regarding the factors underlying collateral consequences should not be drawn. Future research would benefit from executing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to more systematically test hypotheses with the use of inferential statistical techniques. Further, correlations were secondarily conducted to provide greater context of the impact of collateral consequences on important psychosocial variables. While informative, the directionality of these relationships was

not established. Future research would expand upon the current findings by employing regression analyses to better elucidate the predictors (e.g., household income, social support) and outcomes (e.g., desistance) related to collateral consequences.

Second, the robustness of the current findings was weakened due to 1) a moderate to small sample size and, 2) lower explained variance. While the sample size utilized in the current study was adequate for exploratory analyses based on guidelines provided by some researchers (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995), other researchers have argued that larger sample sizes help to better determine the validity of factor structure and individual items (Costello & Osborne, 2005). As noted by Worthington and Navarro (2003), however, populations from which there are constraints on participant recruitment, or groups that represent a unique subpopulation wherein variance may be lower compared to a general representative sample, analyses may have to progress with an adequate though non-ideal sample size. Further, with regard to explained variance, lower variance is typically expected within research conducted in the social sciences and humanities (Hair et al., 1995; Williams, Brown, & Onsmann, 2012). Related, low internal consistencies of the included measures, specifically the Social Well-Being Scale, may have further affected the robustness of the correlational findings in particular.

Third, participant responses to the collateral consequences items were likely heavily influenced by the city, state, or otherwise jurisdictional mandates surrounding housing and other restrictions. Items assessing social collateral consequences in particular are more sensitive to jurisdictional differences, which implicates generalizability of the current findings to the broader sexual offender population. This complicating factor speaks to a general problem in drawing conclusions surrounding the experiences of sexual offenders as a homogenous unit. For example, city- and state-imposed restrictions tend to be poorly documented and may, at times, contradict

one another (Monjeau, 2011). In response, to capture the confusion often reported by sexual offenders regarding enforceable social restrictions (e.g., residence restrictions, buffer zones, accessibility of public spaces), as well as to prioritize informal versus formal consequences, proxy items were included in the current study to instead assess *avoidance* of situations and events (due to fear of repercussions such as violating sexual offender-specific policy stipulations). In addition, efforts were made to construct items that were nonspecific enough so as to capture common offender-specific experiences of harassment, discrimination, and distress across domains and settings. Even so, threats to the widespread applicability of the current measure exist. Region- and sample-specific representations of collateral consequences may require further statistical exploration and investigation which may result in distinct factor structures.

Last, a primary intent of the current study was to investigate the relationship between collateral consequences and desistance among sexual offenders. A limitation of the current study was the parsimonious manner in which desistance was operationalized and measured among participants, as participants were asked to simply indicate whether or not they had been rearrested for a general, sexual, or parole/probation violation offense. Detailed data regarding the rearrest, such as the timeline of the rearrest in relation to the index offense, and whether or not the rearrest resulted in a criminal charge, were not gathered. This lack of data potentially impacts the extent to which relationships between collateral consequences and desistance may be extrapolated and interpreted. Further, desistance items relied on participant self-report rather than official police and/or court records. However, as the current study relied on offender report rather than rearrest records, questions were intentionally made vague enough to elicit more truthful responses from participants who may have been motivated, for a variety of reasons, to

underreport reoffending. Although research has bolstered the use of self-report in eliciting accurate and reliable information from offenders (Kroner & Loza, 2001; Mills et al., 2003; Pham et al., 2016), self-report nevertheless presents the problem of bias.

Despite these limitations, results from this study are encouraging and pave the way for future confirmatory factor analyses and multivariate studies. The current study was the first of its kind to develop and validate a measure of the most salient collateral consequences experienced by sexual offenders, though this topic has been fairly longstanding in the literature. These findings have applications to several areas of research, including but not limited to, counseling psychology, clinical psychology, criminology, correctional psychology, forensic psychology, social psychology, sociology, and public policy. Further, the potential uses of the SOCCM in research and treatment efforts are anticipated to be widespread. Overall, results from this study emphasize the importance of psychosocial indicators of well-being in promoting positive cognitions and behaviors, with an overarching goal of informing effective public safety efforts. Future research may not only utilize the SOCCM to provide valid and reliable evidence toward proposing modifications to public safety efforts or addressing policy reform, but in a clinical sense may also use results to inform future treatment targets and rehabilitative strategies.

Practical Implications

In developing and validating the current measure of collateral consequences, it is hoped that research in the area of sexual offender outcomes will advance. The majority of sexual offender research seeks to uncover individual characteristics that contribute to reoffense, with a comprehensive aim to inform and increase public safety (Levenson et al., 2007; Levenson, Sandler, & Freeman, 2012). While actuarial and dynamic risk measures continue to make advancements for use with sexual offenders (Harris & Hanson, 2010), instruments gauging the

subjective offender experience have lagged in comparison. In developing the current measure, examinations into the collateral consequences faced by sexual offenders can transition from purely theoretical and descriptive to an evidence-based approach. Particularly, theorized outcomes associated with the experience of collateral consequences may presumably gain further empirical support through use of the SOCCM. Ideally, the current measure may help bolster major arguments made in the extant literature surrounding collateral consequences, particularly in the areas of treatment considerations and registry reform.

In considering sexual offender stigma in the current social context, practical implications of the current study are of particular significance. Collateral consequences in the age of information are becoming increasingly consequential. Criminal records are now readily available on the internet, whereas accessing someone's background used to require a visit to the local courthouse. Neighbors, friends, landlords, and potential dating partners are increasingly accessing this information (Uggen & Stewart, 2014). This expansion of criminal record information has given forth an entire enterprise devoted to the circulation of offender information, regardless of whether the charges brought forth were eventually dismissed, or whether the offender was relieved of his registration obligations. Various third-party registry websites and neighborhood watch forums, for example, continue to publicize offender information, oftentimes for commercial purposes. The convenience with which one can access and gather offense and offender details only serves to broaden the depth and scope of collateral consequences affecting sexual offenders. Thus, empirically examining collateral consequences and their influence on important psychosocial and risk outcomes is critical and will only become more so. The development and validation of the SOCCM leaves an important imprint on the field of offender rehabilitation and reintegration.

Considering collateral consequences in the context of labeling and shaming theories may be instrumental in promoting rehabilitation and guiding treatment targets for sexual offender clients. For example, labeling and social stigmatization as operationalized through the experience of collateral consequences may undermine an individual's motivation to desist from crime. The development of a psychometrically sound measure of collateral consequences can be used by treatment providers and parole/probation officers to better inform their work with offender clients. Scores on the collateral consequences measure may provide valuable information as an indicator for treatment engagement, motivation to change, and other indices that may influence treatment success. Further, administration of an instrument that includes pointed statements surrounding collateral consequences may highlight environmental and contextual stressors that would otherwise go unspoken in treatment or probation meetings. Scores may thus reveal important treatment targets, for example, targeting social avoidance, or important issues to be resolved with the help of a probation officer, for example, addressing barriers to successful supervision completion.

With regard to registry reform, researchers have generally cited collateral consequences as a key argument against the current mode of registration and community notification for sexual offenders (Levenson, 2018; Levenson, Grady, & Leibowitz, 2016). The goal of registration and community notification policies is first and foremost public safety. Yet research has overwhelmingly found that these policies do not increase public safety and may in fact increase recidivism as a function of social sanctions, namely, collateral consequences (Letourneau & Armstrong, 2008; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011; Sandler et al., 2008; Schram & Milloy, 1995; Wakefield, 2006; Zevitz, 2006). While this association has been referenced across the sexual offender literature, it had yet to be subjected to stringent empirical examination. Of late,

researchers have called for increased evidence-based tools and recommendations, in addition to structured risk assessments, to advocate for policy reform (Levenson, 2018). The social and psychological hardship evidenced through correlating SOCCM scores to negative social and psychological variables provides support for humanistic arguments against current sexual offender policies. Additionally, the current study demonstrated an empirical relationship between the experience of collateral consequences and reoffense, strengthening justifications for policy reform on the basis of public safety. In future research, associating experience of collateral consequences with recidivism rates via an examination of criminal records, offender level of risk (tiered, actuarial, and dynamic risk), and subjugation to registration and community notification or registration alone, would provide useful information in further establishing the predictive relationship between collateral consequences and recidivism. It is hoped that the development of the SOCCM measure will provide a foundation for future research to continue addressing psychosocial arguments for policy reform and the maintenance of an effective registry. Research could then anticipate greater strides toward registry reform, as well as more effective public safety efforts.

Last, implications of the current findings can be considered in the context of healing for survivors of sexual violence. Given that social collateral consequences were found to be linked with recidivism in the current study, it is important for community partners to work with sexual offender rehabilitation programs to create safe reintegration into communities first and foremost for victims, as well as for offenders. Indeed, researchers and activists have recently called for greater community accountability in creating programming that fosters healing from sexual violence, for both survivors and offenders (McAlinden, 2007). For example, the implementation of restorative justice conferences offers an opportunity for reintegrative healing, where offenders

may have a chance to witness the personal consequences of their behavior and, in a certain manner, aid survivors in the healing process. Researchers have also promoted the use of restorative justice as a tool to decrease reoffense (Ward et al., 2014). Thus, the current findings may be used to support the implementation of reintegration-based community programs as an alternative to more punitive sexual offender policies.

Conclusion

Though of increasing interest among mental health professionals, law experts, policymakers, and in the popular press, there is a gap in the literature regarding the empirical relationship between sexual offender collateral consequences and important psychological, social, and public safety outcomes. The current study attended to this gap by first examining through factor analysis the underlying theoretical structure of collateral consequences experienced by sexual offenders. Though descriptive examinations have been offered, the current study expanded upon previous research by establishing a reliable and valid measure demonstrating both the social and psychological facets of collateral consequences. Overall, findings from this study suggest that sexual offenders experience ongoing consequences, attached to their conviction, in both the social domain through discrete experiences of discrimination and harassment, and the psychological domain through ongoing negative affect and poor self-appraisal. Subsequently, these findings suggest a two-dimensional structure underlying the often ambiguously-defined term of *collateral consequences*, offering a guiding framework for future studies.

In addition, this research provides a foundation for incorporating collateral consequences into future multivariate analyses. Given the multiple demonstrated significant relationships with important indicators of well-being, it is apparent that collateral consequences exert an adverse

and complex influence on the psychosocial functioning of sexual offenders. Further, a striking finding from the current study is the link between the social aspect of collateral consequences and an individual's future offending. Findings from the current study suggest that as sexual offenders are subjected to increasing labeling events, social and psychological well-being suffer; however, the exact manner in which recidivism is implicated should continue to be explored in future research.

Topics of registry reform and offender reentry have been gaining critical mass across legal, correctional, and rehabilitative disciplines. Several arguments have been postulated in the literature regarding legislative reform, including the fiscal and civil costs to maintaining current sexual offender policies. The current study lays empirical groundwork in support of the humanistic argument against current sexual offender policies, with an emphasis on demonstrating how social and psychological collateral consequences may further disenfranchisement among offenders, families, and the public. However, negative psychosocial functioning is not the only outcome affected by collateral consequences, as important links between collateral consequences and recidivism were captured in the current study. Regardless of ideological camp, few researchers, policymakers, or legal professionals would argue the importance of promoting desistance among sexual offenders with one overarching goal – to prevent future victims.

Table 1*Items Assessing Collateral Consequences in the Literature*

<p>Frenzel, Bowen, Spraitz, Bowers, & Phaneuf, 2014 (adapted from Tewksbury, 2005)</p>	<p>Lost a job Been denied a promotion at work Been denied a bank account or loan Lost a place to live Been treated rudely in public Been asked to leave a business or restaurant Lost a friend Lost a spouse/dating partner Been harassed in person Been assaulted/attacked Received harassing telephone calls Received harassing mail/flyers/notes Been denied entrance to higher education Been denied housing on campus Have had complications obtaining higher education</p>
<p>Levenson, 2008 (also used in Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson, 2008)</p>	<p>I had to move out of a home that I owned. I had to move out of a home that I rented. When released from jail or prison, I was unable to return to my home. I am unable to live with supportive family members. I am unable to live with family members who depend on me. My family members have been forced to move. I have become homeless. A landlord refused to rent to me. A landlord refused to renew my existing lease. I have found it difficult to find a place to live. I was considered in violation of probation due to a residence restriction. I spent time in jail due to a residence violation. I have suffered financially due to residence restrictions. I have suffered emotionally due to residence restrictions. I live farther away from employment opportunities. I live farther away from social services and mental health treatment. I live farther away from public transportation, no car. I live farther away from family support. I worry that if I ever have to move I will be unable to find a place to live.</p>

Table 1 (continued)

<p>Levenson & Cotter, 2005a (also used in Levenson, D'Amora, & Hern, 2007; Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson, 2008)</p>	<p>Lost a job because my boss or coworkers found out I am a SO. Had to move from a home/apartment because landlord found out I am a SO. Had to move from a home or apartment because neighbors complained that I was a SO. Been threatened or harassed by neighbors. Been physically assaulted or injured by someone who found out I was a SO. My property has been damaged by someone who found out I was a SO. A person who lived with me has been threatened, harassed, assaulted, injured, or suffered property damage because I am a sex offender. Interferes with my recovery by causing me more stress in my life. Feel alone and isolated because of Megan's Law. Lost friends or a close relationship because of Megan's Law. Afraid for my safety because of Megan's Law. Shame and embarrassment due to Megan's Law keep me from engaging in activities. Less hope for the future now that I will be a registered sex offender for life. Sometimes Megan's Law makes me feel hopeless; "No one believes I can change so why even try?"</p>
<p>Robbers, 2009</p>	<p>Loss of home Threatened/harassed by neighbors Assaulted by neighbors Pet assaulted/threatened/tormented by neighbors Housemate/partner threatened or harassed by neighbors Community target Negative public treatment Loss of job Lying to employer Lying to coworkers Threatened/harassed at work Employment below qualifications/skill level Loss of or slow career advancement Inability to reside close to or with family members Loss of contact with relatives with children Family embarrassment/shame Feelings of isolation Feelings of despair/hopelessness Suicidal thoughts Feelings of persecution Fear for own children's safety Fear of children's response to sex offender status Difficulties in intimate relationships Fear of being attacked/assaulted Fear of being humiliated in public Mistaken arrest</p>

Table 1 (continued)

<p>Tewksbury, 2005</p>	<p>Loss of job Denial of promotion at work Loss/denial of a place to live Treated rudely in a public place Asked to leave a business Lost a friend who found out about registration Harassed in person Assaulted Received harassing/threatening telephone calls Received harassing/threatening mail</p>
<p>Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009</p>	<p>Felt uncomfortable due to others staring/pointing/etc. Lost a job Denied work promotion Harassed by co-worker Harassed by customer/client Forced to move due to legal restrictions Forced to move due to social/community pressure Forced to move due to financial issues/cost Noticed people recognized me as a sex offender Treated rudely in public Asked to leave a restaurant/business Lost a friend who found out about sex offender registry listing Denied contact with children/family members Harassed in person Assaulted/attacked Harassing/threatening phone calls Harassing/threatening mail/flyers/notes</p>
<p>Zevitz & Farkas, 2000</p>	<p>Loss of employment Exclusion from residence Breakup of personal relationships Humiliated in daily lives Ostracized by neighbors and lifetime acquaintances Harassed or threatened by nearby residents or strangers Unfavorably affected lives of family members Added pressure from probation/parole agent Vigilante attack Pressure from the public and the media</p>

Table 2*Description of Sample*

	<i>N</i>	Percent	Valid Percent
Total sample	193		
Paper-and-pencil participation	131	68%	68%
Online participation	62	32%	32%
Age			
Mean (years)	49.18		
Standard Deviation	13.92		
Race/Ethnicity (n = 190)			
Caucasian	134	69.4%	70.5%
Black/African American	20	10.4%	10.5%
Hispanic/Latino	25	13.0%	13.2%
Other	11	5.7%	5.9%
Educational level (n = 178)			
Less than high school	15	7.8%	8.4%
High school or equivalent	67	34.8%	37%
Some college	34	17.6%	19.1%
College degree (Bachelors and Associates)	40	20.7%	22.5%
Graduate degree	22	11.4%	12.4%
Marital status			
Single, never married	55	28.5%	28.9%
Married or in domestic partnership	73	37.8%	38.4%
Divorced	45	23.3%	23.7%
Widowed	7	3.6%	3.7%
Separated	9	4.7%	4.7%
Mean household income (dollars)			
Prior to conviction	\$68,440		
Post-conviction	\$48,806		

Table 3*Offense-Specific Characteristics of Sample*

	<i>N</i>	Percent	Valid Percent
Index Offense Type (n = 179)			
Sexual Assault of a Child	12	6.2%	6.7%
Continuous Sexual Abuse of a Child	1	0.5%	0.6%
Aggravated Sexual Assault of a Child	16	8.3%	8.9%
Online Solicitation of a Minor	7	3.6%	3.9%
Indecency with a Child by Contact	29	15.0%	16.2%
Indecency with a Child by Exposure	6	3.1%	3.4%
Invasive Visual Recording/Improper Photography	1	0.5%	0.6%
Indecent Exposure	3	1.6%	1.7%
Sexual Assault	16	8.3%	8.9%
Aggravated Sexual Assault	18	9.3%	10.1%
Possession of Child Pornography	45	23.3%	25.1%
Distribution of Child Pornography	5	2.6%	2.8%
Two or more distinct offenses	13	6.7%	7.3%
Other	7	3.6%	3.9%
Assigned Level of Risk (n = 180)			
Low	95	49.2%	52.8%
Moderate	56	29.0%	31.1%
High	5	2.6%	2.8%
Never assigned/Unsure	24	12.4%	13.3%
Time elapsed on registry			
Mean (years)	7.96		
Standard Deviation	7.14		
Sex offender treatment status			
In-treatment	131	68%	68%
Completed treatment	62	32%	32%
Reoffense (n = 180)			
Arrested since index offense	46	23.8%	25.6%
Arrested for sexual offense since index offense	7	3.6%	
Arrested or charged with probation/parole violation	51	26.4%	28.3%

Table 4*Percent Missing Values on Retained 65 Items*

	Missing		Valid N
	N	Percent	
8. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	2	1.0%	191
2. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	1	0.5%	192
4. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	1	0.5%	192
6. I have wanted to move up in my career but have avoided putting myself out there.	1	0.5%	192
13. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	1	0.5%	192
14. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	1	0.5%	192
26. My family member or cohabitant was treated rudely/harassed because I am on the registry.	1	0.5%	192
27. My family member or cohabitant was assaulted because I am on the registry.	1	0.5%	192
40. I have applied for vocational licensure but was denied because I am on the registry.	1	0.5%	192
46. I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go.	1	0.5%	192
51. I have felt that I had to hide parts of myself in order to not be judged or rejected by others.	1	0.5%	192
52. I have felt that people have accepted me, despite my sex offense.	1	0.5%	192
55. I feel that community members (e.g., employers, church members, neighbors) have been gracious in giving me a second chance.	1	0.5%	192
61. I have experienced difficulty in my romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	1	0.5%	192
62. I have experienced difficulty in my platonic/non-romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	1	0.5%	192
1. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	0	0.0%	193
3. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	0	0.0%	193
5. I have wanted to move to a more desirable home/neighborhood but have avoided doing so.	0	0.0%	193
7. I have avoided traveling for work or for pleasure.	0	0.0%	193
9. I have wanted to pursue higher education but have avoided doing so.	0	0.0%	193
10. I have had to give up a job, career, or promotion.	0	0.0%	193
11. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	0	0.0%	193
12. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	0	0.0%	193
15. I have avoided moving to a more desirable house/neighborhood.	0	0.0%	193

Table 4 (Continued)

16. I have avoided traveling for business or for pleasure.	0	0.0%	193
17. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	0	0.0%	193
18. I have avoided pursuing higher education.	0	0.0%	193
19. I have avoided staying with or visiting supportive family members or friends.	0	0.0%	193
20. I have avoided participating in activities with my family.	0	0.0%	193
21. I have avoided participating in community activities (e.g., community watch, neighborhood meetings, volunteer work).	0	0.0%	193
22. I have been treated rudely or snubbed because someone found out I am a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
23. I have been harassed in person because someone found out I am a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
24. I have been assaulted or attacked because someone found out I am a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
25. I have received harassing telephone calls/mail/flyers/notes because someone found out I am a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
28. I was a victim of vigilante justice (i.e., a civilian took it upon themselves to punish me in a certain way).	0	0.0%	193
29. Neighbors have treated me poorly or expressed concern about me because I am on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
30. My property was damaged by someone who found out I was on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
31. I was taken advantage of financially by someone who found out I was on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
32. I was exploited by someone who found out I was on the registry, but felt I had no recourse or leverage because of my offense.	0	0.0%	193
33. I have been asked to leave a business, restaurant, or public place because I am on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
34. I lost a job because someone found out I was on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
35. I lost a place to live because a landlord or neighbor found out I was on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
36. I wanted to attend church or a religious service but was prevented from doing so because I am on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
37. I have been denied government assistance that I needed, like food stamps, public housing, grants, benefits, etc. because of my offense.	0	0.0%	193
38. I have been called out in public because someone recognized me as a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
39. I have ended a close relationship (e.g., family, friend, spouse, dating partner), for fear of being judged for my offense.	0	0.0%	193
41. I have been denied employment due to my status on the registry	0	0.0%	193
42. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	0	0.0%	193

Table 4 (continued)

43. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
44. I have avoided social situations for fear of my family's safety.	0	0.0%	193
45. I have avoided things I used to enjoy because I feel ashamed or embarrassed being on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
47. I have felt helpless, like "no one believes I can change so why even try?"	0	0.0%	193
48. I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me.	0	0.0%	193
49. I have felt like an outcast, like I'm not a part of a community or society at large.	0	0.0%	193
50. I have felt unable to create meaning in my life, because of my status on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
53. I have felt more motivated to prove my character to society because of the registry.	0	0.0%	193
54. I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense.	0	0.0%	193
56. I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety.	0	0.0%	193
57. I have felt like my sexual offense conviction has brought me closer to loved ones.	0	0.0%	193
58. I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender.	0	0.0%	193
59. I have experienced significant financial problems as a result of being on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
60. I have been unable to fully take part in family responsibilities because I am on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
63. I have been stigmatized by others due to my status on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
64. I am constantly afraid someone will find out I am on the registry.	0	0.0%	193
65. I feel shame due to my status on the registry.	0	0.0%	193

Note. Maximum number of variables shown: 65. Minimum percentage of missing values for variable to be included: 0.0%.

Table 5*Tests of Normality on 65 Collateral Consequences Items*

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro- Wilk Statistic	df	Sig.
1. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	-.387	-.353	.900	180	.000
2. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	-.789	.232	.854	180	.000
3. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	-.875	.287	.846	180	.000
4. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	-.329	-1.313	.860	180	.000
5. I have wanted to move to a more desirable home/neighborhood but have avoided doing so.	-.099	-1.406	.871	180	.000
6. I have wanted to move up in my career but have avoided putting myself out there.	-.215	-1.401	.861	180	.000
7. I have avoided traveling for work or for pleasure.	-.538	-.839	.862	180	.000
8. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	-.596	-.506	.878	180	.000
9. I have wanted to pursue higher education but have avoided doing so.	.086	-1.538	.847	180	.000
10. I have had to give up a job, career, or promotion.	.024	-1.437	.859	180	.000
11. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	-.564	-.294	.888	180	.000
12. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	-.716	-.057	.870	180	.000
13. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	-.903	-.086	.832	180	.000
14. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	-.314	-1.357	.853	180	.000
15. I have avoided moving to a more desirable house/neighborhood.	-.150	-1.421	.862	180	.000
16. I have avoided traveling for business or for pleasure.	-.435	-.932	.874	180	.000
17. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	-.469	-.924	.872	180	.000
18. I have avoided pursuing higher education.	-.002	-1.588	.831	180	.000
19. I have avoided staying with or visiting supportive family members or friends.	-.072	-1.193	.897	180	.000

Table 5 (continued)

20. I have avoided participating in activities with my family.	-.176	-.877	.912	180	.000
21. I have avoided participating in community activities (e.g., community watch, neighborhood meetings, volunteer work).	-1.082	.118	.780	180	.000
22. I have been treated rudely or snubbed because someone found out I am a sex offender.	.244	-.987	.902	180	.000
23. I have been harassed in person because someone found out I am a sex offender.	.884	-.339	.827	180	.000
24. I have been assaulted or attacked because someone found out I am a sex offender.	2.880	8.747	.481	180	.000
25. I have received harassing telephone calls/mail/flyers/notes because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1.888	2.608	.620	180	.000
26. My family member or cohabitant was treated rudely/harassed because I am on the registry.	1.396	1.223	.749	180	.000
27. My family member or cohabitant was assaulted because I am on the registry.	5.323	30.609	.240	180	.000
28. I was a victim of vigilante justice (i.e., a civilian took it upon themselves to punish me in a certain way).	4.204	24.020	.437	180	.000
29. Neighbors have treated me poorly or expressed concern about me because I am on the registry.	1.290	.842	.752	180	.000
30. My property was damaged by someone who found out I was on the registry.	3.287	12.730	.466	180	.000
31. I was taken advantage of financially by someone who found out I was on the registry.	2.314	4.638	.552	180	.000
32. I was exploited by someone who found out I was on the registry, but felt I had no recourse or leverage because of my offense.	1.835	2.862	.666	180	.000
33. I have been asked to leave a business, restaurant, or public place because I am on the registry.	2.362	5.163	.541	180	.000
34. I lost a job because someone found out I was on the registry.	1.317	.573	.727	180	.000
35. I lost a place to live because a landlord or neighbor found out I was on the registry.	1.910	2.853	.611	180	.000
36. I wanted to attend church or a religious service but was prevented from doing so because I am on the registry.	1.453	.745	.666	180	.000
37. I have been denied government assistance that I needed, like food stamps, public housing, grants, benefits, etc. because of my offense.	2.227	3.858	.532	180	.000

Table 5 (continued)

38. I have been called out in public because someone recognized me as a sex offender.	2.336	5.170	.588	180	.000
39. I have ended a close relationship (e.g., family, friend, spouse, dating partner), for fear of being judged for my offense.	.873	-.522	.799	180	.000
40. I have applied for vocational licensure but was denied because I am on the registry.	2.978	8.643	.458	180	.000
41. I have been denied employment due to my status on the registry	.355	-1.354	.844	180	.000
42. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	3.066	9.148	.435	180	.000
43. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	.417	-1.351	.828	180	.000
44. I have avoided social situations for fear of my family's safety.	.604	-.868	.842	180	.000
45. I have avoided things I used to enjoy because I feel ashamed or embarrassed being on the registry.	-.424	-1.081	.866	180	.000
46. I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go.	-.389	-1.030	.875	180	.000
47. I have felt helpless, like "no one believes I can change so why even try?"	.230	-1.280	.862	180	.000
48. I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me.	-.276	-1.102	.888	180	.000
49. I have felt like an outcast, like I'm not a part of a community or society at large.	-.703	-.859	.816	180	.000
50. I have felt unable to create meaning in my life, because of my status on the registry.	-.247	-1.272	.873	180	.000
51. I have felt that I had to hide parts of myself in order to not be judged or rejected by others.	-.493	-1.063	.851	180	.000
52. I have felt that people have accepted me, despite my sex offense.	.092	-.684	.916	180	.000
53. I have felt more motivated to prove my character to society because of the registry.	-.218	-1.269	.876	180	.000
54. I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense.	-.548	-.938	.853	180	.000

Table 5 (continued)

55. I feel that community members (e.g., employers, church members, neighbors) have been gracious in giving me a second chance.	.006	-.917	.915	180	.000
56. I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety.	.458	-.895	.877	180	.000
57. I have felt like my sexual offense conviction has brought me closer to loved ones.	.453	-1.021	.867	180	.000
58. I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender.	-.239	-.904	.902	180	.000
59. I have experienced significant financial problems as a result of being on the registry.	-.339	-1.313	.849	180	.000
60. I have been unable to fully take part in family responsibilities because I am on the registry.	-.325	-1.220	.863	180	.000
61. I have experienced difficulty in my romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	-.129	-1.536	.844	180	.000
62. I have experienced difficulty in my platonic/non-romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	.001	-1.156	.899	180	.000
63. I have been stigmatized by others due to my status on the registry.	.033	-1.257	.893	180	.000
64. I am constantly afraid someone will find out I am on the registry.	-.612	-1.051	.809	180	.000
65. I feel shame due to my status on the registry.	-1.176	.097	.721	180	.000

Table 6*Tests of Normality on Included Measures*

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro - Wilk		
			Statistic	df	Sig.
SWBS					
Integration	.333	-.555	.969	193	.000
Acceptance	-.425	.323	.973	193	.001
Contribution	-.748	.439	.949	193	.000
Actualization	.307	-.188	.980	193	.008
Coherence	-.423	.680	.976	193	.002
ADQ	-1.362	2.833	.906	193	.000
IPES	-.985	.702	.906	193	.000
TOSCA – SD					
Constructive Guilt	-2.077	6.653	.815	193	.000
Externalization	.626	-.312	.951	193	.000
Detachment	.097	-.339	.993	193	.439
Shame – Negative Self Appraisal	-.232	-.550	.978	193	.003
Shame – Behavioral Avoidance	.676	.477	.958	193	.000
BHS	.913	-.251	.874	193	.000
SIS					
Social Isolation	.085	-.534	.986	193	.045
Social Relations	-.182	-.163	.984	193	.026
Social Acceptance	-.012	-.144	.996	193	.940
EOD					
Frequency	.953	.573	.913	193	.000
Situation	.460	-.383	.941	193	.000
MSPSS					
Significant Other	-1.247	.448	.983	193	.019
Friends	-.598	-.575	.767	193	.000
Family	-1.354	1.173	.920	193	.000
PIM	-.226	-.503	.817	193	.000

Note. SWBS=Social Well-Being Scale; ADQ=Agency for Desistance Questionnaire; IPES=Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma; TOSCA-SD=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Socially Deviant; BHS=Beck Hopelessness Scale; SIS=Social Inclusion Scale; EOD=Experiences of Discrimination; MSPSS=Multidimensional Scale of Social Support; PIM=Positive Impression Management

Table 7

Pattern and Structure Coefficients, Community Estimates, and Alpha Coefficients for the Two-Factor Oblique EFA

	Pattern coefficient		Structure coefficient		h^2
	F1	F2	F1	F2	
20 items ($\alpha = .94$)					
Factor 1: Psychological Consequences					
(13 items; $\alpha = .94$, 33.47% variance)					
65. I am constantly afraid someone will find out I am on the registry.	1.068	-.111	.815	.363	.742
66. I feel shame due to my status on the registry.	.887	-.053	.599	.238	.496
55. I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense.	.827	-.086	.707	.351	.567
47. I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go.	.766	-.042	.816	.423	.717
46. I have avoided things I used to enjoy because I feel ashamed or embarrassed being on the registry.	.747	.026	.804	.446	.692
50. I have felt like an outcast, like I'm not a part of a community or society at large.	.716	.003	.835	.467	.736
52. I have felt that I had to hide parts of myself in order to not be rejected by others.	.713	-.047	.752	.399	.656
49. I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me.	.620	.085	.799	.528	.690
59. I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender.	.598	-.013	.769	.401	.688
51. I have felt unable to create meaning in my life, because of my status on the registry.	.585	-.070	.740	.391	.656
57. I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety.	.452	.149	.613	.478	.523
45. I have avoided social situations for fear of my family's safety.	.450	.168	.679	.545	.641
48. I have felt helpless like, "no one believes I can change so why even try?"	.389	-.033	.599	.378	.497
Factor 2: Social Consequences (7 items; $\alpha = .90$, 8.22% variance)					
26. My family member or cohabitant was treated rudely/harassed because I am on the registry.	.021	.876	.436	.801	.654
38. I was called out in public because someone recognized me as a sex offender.	-.127	.861	.298	.694	.524
25. I received harassing telephone calls/mail/flyers/notes because someone found out I am a sex offender.	-.005	.839	.320	.747	.637
23. I was harassed in person because someone found out I am a sex offender.	.004	.806	.432	.817	.716
22. I was treated rudely or snubbed because someone found out I am a sex offender.	.030	.771	.513	.808	.730
29. Neighbors treated me poorly or expressed concern about me because I am on the registry.	-.123	.709	.354	.742	.605
33. I was asked to leave a business, restaurant, or public place because I am on the registry.	-.165	.580	.257	.587	.430

Note. h^2 = communality estimates

Table 8*Scale Intercorrelations*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. CC - Psych														
2. CC - Social	.48**													
3. SWBS – Int	-.53**	-.28**												
4. SWBS – Acc	-.22**	-.15*	.34**											
5. SWBS – Con	-.09	.10	.25**	.20**										
6. SWBS – Act	-.49**	-.29**	.50**	.40**	.15*									
7. SWBS – Coh	-.34**	-.16*	.32**	.26**	.30**	.20**								
8. ADQ	.10	.07	.09	.28**	.26**	.04	.23**							
9. IPES	.52**	.31**	-.45**	-.12	-.04	-.36**	-.05	.11						
10. TOSCA-CG	.24**	.12	-.06	.19**	.17*	-.10	.15*	.39**	.32**					
11. TOSCA-E	.06	.11	.04	-.24**	-.03	-.02	-.23**	-.12	-.23**	-.42**				
12. TOSCA-D	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.12	-.12	-.05	-.28**	-.12	-.26**	-.35**	.67**			
13. TOSCA-NS	.26**	.17*	-.10	-.10	.01	-.02	-.10	.03	.16*	.23**	.05	-.14		
14. TOSCA-BA	.03	.09	-.05	-.21**	-.25**	-.02	-.31**	-.25**	-.10	-.42**	.54**	.42**	.33**	
15. BHS	.46**	.18*	-.49**	-.34**	-.31**	-.43**	-.28**	-.27**	.30**	-.09	.14	.12	.18*	.23**
16. SIS-SI	-.50**	-.18*	.51**	.29**	.25**	.31**	.20**	-.01	-.39**	-.07	-.05	.02	-.14	-.09
17. SIS-SR	-.48**	-.19**	.55**	.32**	.38**	.31**	.21**	.05	-.31**	-.04	-.05	.01	-.10	-.09
18. SIS-SA	-.53**	-.37**	.45**	.32**	.09	.37**	.26**	.15*	-.42**	-.04	-.03	.07	-.22**	-.05
19. EOD-F	.53**	.73**	-.35**	-.15*	.11	-.38**	-.17*	-.05	.35**	.17*	.08	-.02	.27**	.05
20. EOD-S	.54**	.69**	-.31**	-.15*	.15*	-.36**	-.17*	-.07	.32**	.14*	.07	-.01	.26**	.06
21. MSPSS-SO	-.25**	-.10	.29**	.18*	.03	.19*	.12	.20**	-.14	.03	-.19	-.08	-.03	-.07
22. MSPSS – Fr	-.26**	-.13	.30**	.30**	.16*	.19**	.11	.10	-.17*	-.04	-.08	-.01	-.11	-.08
23. MSPSS – Fa	-.19**	-.12	.16*	.23**	.02	.11**	.06	.15*	-.15*	-.08	-.05	-.05	-.18*	-.0
24. PIM	-.18*	-.02	.24**	.21**	.21**	.15*	.40**	.17*	-.09	.22**	-.21**	-.20**	-.02	-.32**

Note. CC-Psych=Psychological Collateral Consequences; CC-Social=Social Collateral Consequences; SWBS-Int=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Integration; SWBS-Acc=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Acceptance; SWBS-Con=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Contribution; SWBS-Act=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Actualization; SWBS-Coh=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Coherence; ADQ=Agency for Desistance Questionnaire; IPES=Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma; TOSCA-CG=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Constructive Guilt; TOSCA-E=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Externalization; TOSCA-D=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Detachment; TOSCA-NS=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Negative Self-Appraisal; TOSCA-BA=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Behavioral Avoidance; BHS=Beck Hopelessness Scale; SIS-SI=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Isolation; SIS-SR=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Relations; SIS-SA=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Acceptance; EOD-F=Experiences of Discrimination-Frequency; EOD-S=Experiences of Discrimination-Situation; MSPSS-SO=Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Significant Other; MSPSS-Fr= Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Friends; MSPSS-Fa=Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Family; PIM=Positive Impression Management

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 8 (continued)

	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. CC - Psychological										
2. CC - Social										
3. SWBS – Int										
4. SWBS – Acc										
5. SWBS – Con										
6. SWBS – Act										
7. SWBS – Coh										
8. ADQ										
9. IPES										
10. TOSCA – CG										
11. TOSCA – E										
12. TOSCA – D										
13. TOSCA – NS										
14. TOSCA – BA										
15. BHS										
16. SIS – SI	-.40**									
17. SIS – SR	-.47**	.69**								
18. SIS - SA	-.46**	.64**	.50**							
19. EOD – F	.32**	-.22**	-.16*	-.44**						
20. EOD – S	.28**	-.19**	-.14	-.40**	.92**					
21. MSPSS – SO	-.45**	.34**	.24**	.32**	-.20**	-.19**				
22. MSPSS – Fr	-.37**	.63**	.39**	.52**	-.16*	-.13	.56**			
23. MSPSS – Fa	-.27**	.26**	.11	.41**	-.22**	-.23**	.55**	.48**		
24. PIM	-.22**	.22**	.20**	.07	-.04	-.01	.21**	.10	.17*	

Note. CC-Psych=Psychological Collateral Consequences; CC-Social=Social Collateral Consequences; SWBS-Int=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Integration; SWBS-Acc=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Acceptance; SWBS-Con=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Contribution; SWBS-Act=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Actualization; SWBS-Coh=Social Well-Being Scale-Social Coherence; ADQ=Agency for Desistance Questionnaire; IPES=Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma; TOSCA-CG=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Constructive Guilt; TOSCA-E=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Externalization; TOSCA-D=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Detachment; TOSCA-NS=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Negative Self-Appraisal; TOSCA-BA=Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Behavioral Avoidance; BHS=Beck Hopelessness Scale; SIS-SI=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Isolation; SIS-SR=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Relations; SIS-SA=Social Inclusion Scale-Social Acceptance; EOD-F=Experiences of Discrimination-Frequency; EOD-S=Experiences of Discrimination-Situation; MSPSS-SO=Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Significant Other; MSPSS-Fr= Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Friends; MSPSS-Fa=Multidimensional Scale of Social Support-Family; PIM=Positive Impression Management

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Appendices

Appendix A. Informed Consent



UT Austin IRB Approved
Protocol Number: 2018-11-0092
Approved: 4 February 2019

Title of the Project: Collateral Consequences and Criminal Desistance among Sex Offenders
Principal Investigator: Emma Hamilton, M.A. The University of Texas at Austin
Faculty Advisor: Delida Sanchez, Ph.D., The University of Texas at Austin

Consent to Participate in Research

Invitation to be Part of a Research Study

You are invited to be part of a research study. This consent form will help you choose whether or not to participate in the study. Feel free to ask if anything is not clear in this consent form.

What is the study about and why are we doing it?

The purpose of this research study is to examine the experiences of individuals convicted of a sexual offense, particularly in the area of sanctions or restrictions felt after the punishment phase. These sanctions and punishments for sexual offenders have been linked to certain psychological and social outcomes, yet it is important to further understand these links. Your participation in the study will contribute to a better understanding of how consequences associated with a sexual offense conviction may impact social and psychological wellbeing.

What will happen if you take part in this study?

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey comprised of 11 separate questionnaires. These questionnaires are primarily made up of statements, and you will be asked to rate your agreement with the statements using multiple-choice responses. You can complete this online survey at any time, and in the comfort of your own home. You may also complete a paper version of the survey if you are currently on probation/parole and are being asked to participate in the study via your sex offender treatment group. You may take this survey at any time, although it is hoped that data collection will be completed by April 2019. This survey will take approximately one hour of your time.

Some of the questions you will be asked may be considered sensitive. Questions may ask you to identify offense-related information (e.g., your charges, any offenses you may have been charged with since your index offense, your attitudes around your charges), although no details will be requested. No identifying information will be collected and your name will not be linked to your responses in any way.

How long will you be in this study and how many people will be in the study?

Participation in this study will last one hour, and 200 participants total will be enrolled.

What risks and discomforts might you experience from being in this study?

There are some risks you might experience from being in this study. Potential risks include thinking about sensitive or emotionally distressing content that may cause you to feel uncomfortable, embarrassed, or sad. Participants may choose to skip any questions they do not

wish to answer. Should an emotional crisis arise as a result of the questions presented in the study, the number for the National Suicide Prevention Hotline is provided (1-800-273-8255), as well as a list of mental health resources, which will be provided at the end of the study.

The researchers will let you know about any significant new findings (such as additional risks or discomforts) that might make you change your mind about participating in this study.

How could you benefit from this study?

Although you will not directly benefit from being in this study, others might benefit because your responses may help further the understanding of negative consequences associated with sexual offender policies. It is hoped that results from this study may inform public policy.

What will happen to the samples and/or data we collect from you?

As part of this study we will collect your responses to a variety of questions. This information will be stored on a password-protected laptop in a locked filing cabinet. Only the PI will have access to this laptop and locked filing cabinet. If you are completing the survey in-person, your questionnaires will be secured during transportation by being stored in a locked suitcase and eventually stored in the locked filing cabinet. Once data collection is complete, results will be analyzed and published as part of the PI's dissertation. Data will be destroyed after three years of completion of the study, in accordance with university policy.

How will we protect your information?

We will protect your information by not collecting any identifying information that could link your responses back to you. Your name will not be associated with the information you provide. There will be no identifying information linking your name to your responses. All data collected will be identified by a unique identification number. Only the principal investigator will have access to the data during data collection and analysis. Data will be secured on a password-protected laptop and will be stored in a locked filing cabinet that only the PI has access to.

Your name and any other information that can directly identify you will not be collected. Communication over email or phone, in relation to your participation in the research, will not be linked to the research data in any way.

Information about you may be given to the following organizations:

- Representatives of UT Austin and the UT Austin Institutional Review Board

The data or samples that we will collect about you will not be shared with any other researchers.

We plan to publish the results of this study. To protect your privacy, we will not include any information that could directly identify you.

To help us protect your privacy we will apply for a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institutes of Health. With this Certificate, the researchers cannot be forced to disclose information that may identify you, even by a court subpoena, in any federal, state, or local civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceedings. The researchers will use the certificate to resist any demands for information that would identify you, except as explained below.

The certificate cannot be used to resist a demand for information from personnel of the United States Government that is used for auditing or evaluation of federally funded projects or for

information that must be disclosed in order to meet the requirements of the federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

A Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent you or a member of your family from voluntarily releasing information about yourself or your involvement in this research. If an insurer, employer, or other person obtains your written consent to receive research information, then the researchers may not use the Certificate to withhold that information.

What will happen to the information we collect about you after the study is over?

We will not keep your research data to use for future research. Your name and other information that can directly identify you will not be collected. Any communication that has occurred either over email or phone, in relation to participation in the research study, will be deleted.

How will we compensate you for being part of the study?

You will not receive any type of payment for your participation.

Your Participation in this Study is Voluntary

It is totally up to you to decide to be in this research study. Participating in this study is voluntary. Your decision to participate will not affect your relationship with The University of Texas at Austin, with Texas Voices, with Laura Ichon at Clinical and Forensic Counseling, or with Dr. Aaron Pierce at Clinical and Forensic Consulting Services, in any way. You will not lose any benefits or rights you already had if you decide not to participate. Even if you decide to be part of the study now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

If you decide to withdraw before this study is completed, your data will be deleted and will not be used in the final study.

Contact Information for the Study Team

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact:

Emma Hamilton

Phone: (201) 897-2282

Email: CCStudyUT@gmail.com

Contact Information for Questions about Your Rights as a Research Participant

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions, or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact the following:

The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board

Phone: 512-232-1543

Email: irb@austin.utexas.edu

Please reference study number **2018-11-0092**.

Your Consent

Before agreeing to be part of the research, please be sure that you understand what the study is about. We will give you a copy of this document for your records [or you can print a copy of the document for your records]. If you have any questions about the study later, you can contact the study team using the information provided above.

Appendix B. Demographic Questionnaire

Age: _____

Gender:

- Male
- Female
- Other

Race/Ethnicity:

- African American/Black
- Hispanic/Latino
- Caucasian/White
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Biracial
- Multiracial
- Other

Highest Degree Achieved:

- Less than high school
- High school diploma
- GED or high school alternative
- Some college
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree beyond Master's

Are you currently employed?

- Yes
- No

Zip Code: _____

Who do you live with currently? Please select all that apply.

- Alone
- Roommate
- Both or one parent
- Sibling(s)
- Significant Other
- Children
- Other, please specify: _____

During the time of your conviction, did you own a home or rent?

- Own

- Rent
- Lived with family (rent-free)
- Other, please specify: _____

Do you currently own a home or rent?

- Own
- Rent
- Lived with family (rent-free)
- Other, please specify: _____

What is your current marital status?

- Single, never married
- Married or in a domestic partnership (live with partner)
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Separated

What was your occupation prior to your offense? _____

What is your current occupation? _____

Past Household Income: Please state your approximate total YEARLY family income IN THE YEAR DURING WHICH YOUR CONVICTION OCCURED. Consider all sources of income, including earning, welfare cash assistance, child support alimonies, support from other members of your household who regularly contributed to your household, etc.: _____

Present Household Income: Please state your approximate total YEARLY family income DURING THE PAST YEAR. Consider all sources of income, including earning, welfare cash assistance, child support alimonies, support from other members of your household who regularly contributed to your household, etc.: _____

What was your original offense/charge (the charge for which you are registering)?

During which year did your offense occur? _____

For how many years have you been registering? _____

What was your assigned level of risk?

- Low
- Moderate
- High
- Never assigned/not sure

Were you required to undergo any type of community notification as part of conviction/registration?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If so, for how many years were you required to undergo community notification? _____

If so, what type of community notification was required? Please select all that apply.

- Door-to-door notification
- Attend community meetings
- Flyers/mailings
- Postings
- Other

Appendix C. Initial 66-Item Pool

I would like to ask you about things you may have experienced as a result of your sexual offense. Please follow the prompts at the beginning of the section to guide your responses to the questions.

Please answer the following items using the numbers 1 through 5, where 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5 = Always.

Due to the fear of violating restrictions associated with my sex offense, such as residence or employment restrictions, child safety zones, registration, and/or community notification...

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
1. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	1	2	3	4	5
4. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have wanted to move to a more desirable home/neighborhood but have avoided doing so.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have wanted to move up in my career but have avoided putting myself out there.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have avoided traveling for work or for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have wanted to pursue higher education but have avoided doing so.	1	2	3	4	5

Due to the fear of being found out as a sex offender...

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
10. I have had to give up a job, career, or promotion.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel I have little choice but to stay at home rather than participate in activities I enjoy.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I have avoided creating more positive relationships with people (friends, neighbors, dating).	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have avoided creating more positive ties to the community (e.g., join a group).	1	2	3	4	5
14. I have avoided attending church or religious services.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I have avoided moving to a more desirable house/neighborhood.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I have avoided traveling for business or for pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I have avoided attending family functions (e.g., reunions, picnics, school plays, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
18. I have avoided pursuing higher education.	1	2	3	4	5

19. I have avoided staying with or visiting supportive family members or friends.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I have avoided participating in activities with my family.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I have avoided participating in community activities (e.g., community watch, neighborhood meetings, volunteer work).	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer the following questions based on the number of times you have experienced the following situations. Please answer using the numbers 1 through 5, where 1 = Never or 0 times, 2 = Rarely or 1-4 times, 3 = Sometimes or 5-10 times, 4 = Often or 10+ times, and 5 = Always or more times than I can count.

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
22. I have been treated rudely or snubbed because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I have been harassed in person because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I have been assaulted or attacked because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have received harassing telephone calls/mail/flyers/notes because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My family member or cohabitant was treated rudely/harassed because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
27. My family member or cohabitant was assaulted because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I was a victim of vigilante justice (i.e., a civilian took it upon themselves to punish me in a certain way).	1	2	3	4	5
29. Neighbors have treated me poorly or expressed concern about me because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
30. My property was damaged by someone who found out I was on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I was taken advantage of financially by someone who found out I was on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I was exploited by someone who found out I was on the registry, but felt I had no recourse or leverage because of my offense.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I have been asked to leave a business, restaurant, or public place because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I lost a job because someone found out I was on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I lost a place to live because a landlord or neighbor found out I was on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5

36. I wanted to attend church or a religious service but was prevented from doing so because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I have been denied government assistance that I needed, like food stamps, public housing, grants, benefits, etc. because of my offense.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I have been called out in public because someone recognized me as a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I have ended a close relationship (e.g., family, friend, spouse, dating partner), for fear of being judged for my offense.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I have applied for vocational licensure but was denied because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I have been denied employment due to my status on the registry	1	2	3	4	5
42. I have been denied housing due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I have been denied services I needed, such as access to a homeless shelter, drug/alcohol residential treatment, medical or nursing home rehabilitation, due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer the following questions based on how true these statements are for you, or how often you have felt this way. Please answer using the numbers 1 through 5, where 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5 = Always.

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
45. I have avoided social situations for fear of my family's safety.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I have avoided things I used to enjoy because I feel ashamed or embarrassed being on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I have felt helpless, like "no one believes I can change so why even try?"	1	2	3	4	5
49. I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I have felt like an outcast, like I'm not a part of a community or society at large.	1	2	3	4	5

51. I have felt unable to create meaning in my life, because of my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
52. I have felt that I had to hide parts of myself in order to not be judged or rejected by others.	1	2	3	4	5
53. I have felt that people have accepted me, despite my sex offense.	1	2	3	4	5
54. I have felt more motivated to prove my character to society because of the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
55. I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense.	1	2	3	4	5
56. I feel that community members (e.g., employers, church members, neighbors) have been gracious in giving me a second chance.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I have felt like my sexual offense conviction has brought me closer to loved ones.	1	2	3	4	5
59. I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
60. I have experienced significant financial problems as a result of being on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
61. I have been unable to fully take part in family responsibilities because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
62. I have experienced difficulty in my romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
63. I have experienced difficulty in my platonic/non-romantic relationships because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I have been stigmatized by others due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
65. I am constantly afraid someone will find out I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
66. I feel shame due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D. Social Well-Being Scale (Keyes, 1998)

On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree, please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>				<i>Strongly Agree</i>		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. The world is too complex for me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I don't feel I belong to anything I'd call a community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. People who do a favor expect nothing in return.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I have something valuable to give to the world	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The world is becoming a better place for everyone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I feel close to other people in my community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. My daily activities do not produce anything worthwhile for my community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I cannot make sense of what's going on in the world	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Society has stopped making progress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. People do not care about other people's problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. My community is a source of comfort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I find it easy to predict what will happen next in society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Society isn't improving for people like me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I believe that people are kind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I have nothing important to contribute to society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix E. Desistance Measure

Remember that anything you say is completely confidential. You do not need to answer any question that you do not feel comfortable answering.

1. Have you been arrested since your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?
 - Yes
 - No

2. If so, was the arrest for a sexual offense? (e.g., if you were arrested since your index offense, was the rearrest for another sexual offense?)
 - Yes
 - No

3. Were you EVER arrested for OR charged with a probation violation, parole violation, or failure to register, associated with your index offense (the offense for which you are registering)?
 - Yes
 - No

Appendix F. Agency for Desistance Questionnaire (ADQ; Lloyd & Serin, 2012)

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please rate your answers on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>				<i>Strongly Agree</i>		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. No matter what I do to try to stop committing crimes, I doubt I can.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Things have been bad for me in the past, but I can turn things around if I really put my mind to it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Nothing can stop me from living a crime-free life if I want to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I feel helpless when I try to stop myself from committing crimes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. No matter what, something always forces me to keep going back to crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I'm in charge of whether I stop doing crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Recently, I have learned how to stay away from crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I have recently done things I never thought I'd be able to do that will help me stay away from crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. There are people in my life who respect me for the steps I've taken to keep myself away from crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. When I am involved with good people who keep me away from crime, I feel like I'm part of something powerful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. When I try to stop myself from doing crime, things always get in the way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I'm smart enough to be able to learn everything I need to help me live a crime-free life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I believe I can be good at going straight, just like I was good at getting what I wanted through crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I have always had the ability to stop myself from committing crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Even when things are tough, I will still find a way to stay crime-free.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I'm the only person who can stop me doing crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Appendix G. Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma
(IPES; Moore, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2013)**

I'd like you to think for a moment about people who live in the community and who do not commit crimes. We want to know what you think these people think about sex offenders in general. That is, what do people in the community think about sex offenders? How much do you agree or disagree with each statement?

	<i>Totally Disagree</i>				<i>Totally Agree</i>		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. People in the community think all sex offenders are the same.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. People in the community think that sex offenders can become better people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. People in the community think "once a sex offender, always a sex offender"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. People in the community are scared of anyone who has done time for a sex crime.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. People in the community believe sex offenders are bad people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. People in the community believe sex offenders are good people who do bad things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. People in the community think sex offenders are evil.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. People in the community think sex offenders have good reasons for committing certain crimes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix H. Beck Hopelessness Scale (Beck et al., 1974)

Please respond to the following items based on whether you feel they are true for you or not.

	True/False
1. I look forward to the future with hope and enthusiasm	T/F
2. I might as well give up because I can't make things better for myself.	T/F
3. When things are going badly, I am helped by knowing they can't stay that way forever.	T/F
4. I can't imagine what my life would be like in 10 years.	T/F
5. I have enough time to accomplish the things I most want to do.	T/F
6. In the future, I expect to succeed in what concerns me most.	T/F
7. My future seems dark to me.	T/F
8. I expect to get more of the good things in life than the average person.	T/F
9. I just don't get the breaks, and there's no reason to believe I will in the future.	T/F
10. My past experiences have prepared me well for my future.	T/F
11. All I can see ahead of me is unpleasantness rather than pleasantness.	T/F
12. I don't expect to get what I really want.	T/F
13. When I look ahead to the future, I expect I will be happier than I am now.	T/F
14. Things just won't work out the way I want them to.	T/F
15. I have great faith in the future.	T/F
16. I never get what I want so it's foolish to want anything.	T/F
17. It is very unlikely that I will get any real satisfaction in the future.	T/F
18. The future seems vague and uncertain to me.	T/F
19. I can look forward to more good times than bad times.	T/F
20. There's no use in really trying to get something I want because I probably won't get it.	T/F

**Appendix I. Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support
(MSPSS; Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988)**

Please respond to the following items based on how true they are for you, with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>			<i>Strongly Agree</i>	
1. There is a special person who is around when I am in need.	1	2	3	4	5
2. There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My family really tries to help me.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My friends really try to help me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I can talk about my problems with my family.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4	5
10. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My family is willing to help me make decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I can talk about my problems with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5

**Appendix J. Experiences of Discrimination Scale
(EOD; Krieger, Smith, Naishadham, Hartman, & Barbeau, 2005)**

This next section is going to ask about how you and others like you are treated. Have you ever experienced discrimination, been prevented from doing something, or been hassled or made to feel inferior in any of the following situations because of your status as a sexual offender?

0 = Never
1 = Once
2 = 2-3 Times
3 = 4+ times

1. At school?
2. Getting hired or getting a job?
3. At work?
4. Getting housing?
5. Getting medical care?
6. Getting service in a store or restaurant?
7. Getting credit, bank loans, or a mortgage?
8. On the street or in a public setting?
9. From the police or in the courts?

**Appendix K. Positive Impression Management Scale (PIM)
(PAI; Morey, 1991)**

Please answer the following questions according to how much they apply to you, from 1 = False/not true at all, 2 = Slightly true, 3 = Mainly true, and 4 = Very true.

	F	ST	MT	VT
1. Sometimes I let little things bother me too much.	0	1	2	3
2. Sometimes I'll avoid someone I really don't like.	0	1	2	3
3. Sometimes I complain too much.	0	1	2	3
4. Sometimes I'm too impatient.	0	1	2	3
5. I don't take criticism very well.	0	1	2	3
6. Sometimes I put things off until the last minute.	0	1	2	3
7. I sometimes make promises I can't keep.	0	1	2	3
8. There have been times when I could have been more thoughtful than I was.	0	1	2	3
9. I rarely get in a bad mood.	0	1	2	3

Appendix L. Social Inclusion Scale (Secker, Hacking, Kent, Shenton, & Spandler, 2009)

Please indicate the extent to which each statement has applied to you in general, or since you have been on the registry.

	<i>Not at All</i>	<i>Not particularly</i>	<i>Yes a bit</i>	<i>Yes Definitely</i>
1. I have felt terribly alone and isolated	1	2	3	4
2. I have felt accepted by my friends	1	2	3	4
3. I have been out socially with friends	1	2	3	4
4. I have felt I am playing a useful part in society	1	2	3	4
5. I have friends I see or talk to every week	1	2	3	4
6. I have felt I am playing a useful part in society	1	2	3	4
7. I have felt what I do is valued by others	1	2	3	4
8. My social life has been mainly related to sexual offenders (e.g., treatment group)	1	2	3	4
9. I have been to new places	1	2	3	4
10. I have learned something about other cultures	1	2	3	4
11. I have been involved in a group not just for sexual offender treatment	1	2	3	4
12. I have done some cultural activity	1	2	3	4
13. I have felt some people look down on me because of my sexual offender status	1	2	3	4
14. I have felt unsafe to walk alone in my neighborhood in daylight	1	2	3	4
15. I have felt accepted by neighbors	1	2	3	4
16. I have friends I see or talk to every week	1	2	3	4
17. I have felt accepted by my family	1	2	3	4
18. I have felt clear about my rights	1	2	3	4
19. I have felt free to express my beliefs	1	2	3	4
20. I have felt insecure about where I live	1	2	3	4
21. I have done a sport, game, or physical activity	1	2	3	4
22. I have helped out at a charity or local group	1	2	3	4

**Appendix M. Test of Self- Conscious Affect – Socially Deviant Version
(TOSCA-SD; Hanson & Tangney, 1996)**

Below are some situations, followed by some common reactions to these situations. As you read each scenario, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then indicate how likely you would be to react in each of the ways described. Please rate all responses since people may feel or react more than one way to the same situation, or they may react different ways at different times.

1. You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock, you realize you stood him up.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think: "I'm inconsiderate." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think: "Well, he'll understand." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would try to make it up to him as soon as possible. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think: "My boss distracted me just before lunch." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

2. You break something at work and then hide it.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think: "This is making me anxious.
I need to either fix it or talk to the manager." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would leave as quickly as you can. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would think: "A lot of things aren't made very well these days." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think: "It was only an accident." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

3. You make a mistake at work and find out a co-worker is blamed for the error.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think the company did not like the co-worker. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think: "Too bad, life is not fair". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

4. While playing around, you throw a ball, and it hits your friend in the face.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would feel inadequate that you can't even throw a ball. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would think: "It was just an accident". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

5. You are driving down the road and hit a small animal.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think the animal shouldn't have been on the road. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think: "I'm terrible". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would feel: "Well, it was an accident". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would probably think it over several times wondering if you could have avoided it. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

6. You make a big mistake on an important project at work. People were depending on you and your boss criticizes you.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think your boss should have been more clear about what was expected of you. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would feel like you wanted to hide. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would think: "I should have recognized the problem and done a better job." | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think: "Well, nobody's perfect". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

7. You borrow your friend's car and accidentally scratch it.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You think that they sure make cars cheaply these days. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think: "No big deal, his insurance will cover it". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would apologize and offer to repair it. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would never ask to borrow anything again. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

8. You go out on a date with a woman/man and have sex. Afterwards she/he says that she/he felt forced into it.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think: "She/he will soon get over it". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think: "I am a disgusting person". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would try to understand what you did to hurt him or her. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think that she/he really enjoyed it and is just trying to get back at you. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

9. You are working with several other people on a rush job. You don't do your part and the job is late.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You would think that the job wasn't that important anyhow. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would think that the others should have done more to help. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would be afraid of being criticized so you phone in sick. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would go to your boss and take responsibility for the job being late. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

10. A woman asks you for directions. After you have given her the directions, she hurries off. You then realize the directions were wrong.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You think that she will find her way anyway. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You would feel badly for having misled her. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You leave before she has a chance to realize that your directions were wrong. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You think that since she hurried off so fast, it is no wonder she gets lost. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

11. You want to buy some exercise equipment from your friend and he offers to let you pay next month. Once you get the equipment, you realize you will not be able to pay until next year.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You explain your situation and offer to return the equipment. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You keep the equipment, but feel so badly that you don't use it. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You think that it is your boss's fault for not giving you a raise. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would figure that he probably doesn't need the money, otherwise he would not have given you the equipment in the first place. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

12. You are telling loud jokes at a party and say something that hurts one of your friend's feelings.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You feel badly about offending your friend and think about how to avoid it in the future. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You immediately become silent and leave at the first opportunity. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would think it was only a joke and he will get over it. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think: "These guys have no sense of humor". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

13. You leave out rat poison that accidentally kills your neighbor's cat.

- | | not likely | very likely |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| a) You think that the cat was pretty stupid to eat rat poison. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| b) You go to your neighbor and apologize. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| c) You would feel small...like an idiot. | 1---2---3---4---5 | |
| d) You would think: "He can always get another cat". | 1---2---3---4---5 | |

Appendix N. Final 20-item Sex Offender Collateral Consequences Measure (SOCCM)

I would like to ask you about things you may have experienced as a result of your sexual offense. Please answer using the numbers 1 through 5, where 1 = Never/0 times, 2 = Rarely/1-4 times, 3 = Sometimes/5-10 times, 4 = Often/10+ times, and 5 = Always or more times than I can count.

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
1. I feel shame due to my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I was treated rudely or snubbed because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have avoided making plans for the future because I feel I will be stigmatized wherever I go.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My family member or cohabitant was treated rudely/harassed because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am constantly afraid someone will find out I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have isolated myself for fear of being found out as a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have felt unable to create meaning in my life, because of my status on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have felt that I had to hide parts of myself in order to not be judged or rejected by others.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I was harassed in person because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I have avoided participating in things I used to enjoy because I am tired of looking over my shoulder and worrying that someone will find out about me.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I have felt helpless, like “no one believes I can change so why even try?”	1	2	3	4	5
12. I was asked to leave a business, restaurant, or public place because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have avoided social situations for fear of my safety.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I have felt like an outcast, like I’m not a part of a community or society at large.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I have avoided social situations for fear of my family's safety.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I have felt it is difficult to move on with my life because being on the registry frequently reminds me of my offense.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Neighbors treated me poorly or expressed concern about me because I am on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I have avoided things I used to enjoy because I feel ashamed or embarrassed being on the registry.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I was called out in public because someone recognized me as a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I received harassing telephone calls/mail/flyers/notes because someone found out I am a sex offender.	1	2	3	4	5

References

- Adkins, G., Huff, D., & Stageberg, P. (2000). *The Iowa sex offender registry and recidivism*. Des Moines: Iowa Department of Human Rights.
- Asencio, E. K., & Burke, P. J. (2011). Does incarceration change the criminal identity? A synthesis of labeling and identity theory perspectives on identity change. *Sociological Perspectives, 54*(2), 163-182.
- Baldry, E., McDonnell, D., Maplestone, P., & Peeters, M. (2003). *Ex-prisoners and accommodation: What bearing do different forms of housing have on social reintegration?* Melbourne, Australia: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Barnes, J. C. (2011). Place a moratorium on the passage of sex offender residence restriction laws. *Criminology & Public Policy, 10*(2), 401-409.
- Barnes, J. C., Dukes, T., Tewksbury, R., & De Troye, T. M. (2009). Analyzing the impact of a statewide residence restriction law on South Carolina sex offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(1), 21-43.
- Barnoski, R. (2005). *Sex offender sentencing in Washington State: Has community notification reduced recidivism?* Olympia, WA: Washington Institute for Public Policy.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1950). Tests of significance in factor analysis. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology, 3*(2), 77-85.
- Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2005). Social exclusion impairs self-regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(4), 589-604.
- Bazemore, G., & Stinchcomb, J. (2004). A civic engagement model of reentry: Involving community through service and restorative justice. *Fed. Probation, 68*, 14-24.

- Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The Hopelessness Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(6), 861-865.
- Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Bernburg, J. G., & Krohn, M. D. (2003). Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology, 41*(4), 1287-1318.
- Bernburg, J. G., Krohn, M. D., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency: A longitudinal test of labeling theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 43*(1), 67-88.
- Bradley, K., Oliver, R. B., Richardson, N., & Slayter, E. (2001). *No place like home: Housing and the ex-prisoner*. Boston: Community Resources for Justice.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brannon, Y. N., Levenson, J. S., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. N. (2007). Attitudes about community notification: A comparison of sexual offenders and the non-offending public. *Sexual Abuse, 19*(4), 369-379.
- Brown, K., Spencer, J., & Deakin, J. (2007). The reintegration of sex offenders: Barriers and opportunities for employment. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice, 46*(1), 32-42.
- Buja, A., & Eyuboglu, N. (1992). Remarks on parallel analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 27*(4), 509-540.
- Burchfield, K. B., & Mingus, W. (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.

- Burchfield, K. B., & Mingus, W. (2014). Sex offender reintegration: Consequences of the local neighborhood context. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 109-124.
- Bursik Jr, R. J., & Grasmick, H. G. (1993). Economic deprivation and neighborhood crime rates, 1960-1980. *Law & Soc'y Rev.*, 27, 263-284.
- Carpenter, C. L., & Beverlin, A. E. (2011). The evolution of unconstitutionality in sex offender registration laws. *Hastings Law Journal*, 63, 1071-1134.
- Casey, S., Day, A., Howells, K., & Ward, T. (2007). Assessing suitability for offender rehabilitation: Development and validation of the Treatment Readiness Questionnaire. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(11), 1427-1440.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245-276.
- Center for Sex Offender Management. (2002). *Managing sex offenders in the community: A handbook to guide policymakers and practitioners through a planning and implementation process*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Chajewski, M., & Mercado, C. C. (2009). An evaluation of sex offender residency restriction functioning in town, county, and city-wide jurisdictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20(1), 44-61.
- Chin, G. J. (2017). Collateral consequences of criminal conviction. *Criminology, Crim. Just. L & Soc'y*, 18(3), 1-17.
- Chiricos, T., Barrick, K., Bales, W., & Bontrager, S. (2007). The labeling of convicted felons and its consequences for recidivism. *Criminology*, 45(3), 547-581.
- Colorado Department of Public Safety. (2004). *Report on safety issues raised by living*

- arrangements for and location of sex offenders in the community*. Denver, CO: Sex Offender Management Board.
- Corrigan, P. W., Watson, A. C., & Barr, L. (2006). The self-stigma of mental illness: Implications for self-esteem and self-efficacy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 25*(8), 875-884.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*, 1-9.
- Craun, S. W., & Bierie, D. M. (2014). Are the collateral consequences of being a registered sex offender as bad as we think: A methodological research note. *Fed. Probation, 78*, 28-31.
- Cripps, J. E. (1997). *The association between the neutralization of self-punishment, guilt, and psychopathy among extrafamilial child molesters*. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Davis, C., Bahr, S. J., & Ward, C. (2013). The process of offender reintegration: Perceptions of what helps prisoners reenter society. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 13*(4), 446-469.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeWalt, D. A., Rothrock, N., Yount, S., & Stone, A. A. (2007). Evaluation of item candidates: The PROMIS qualitative item review. *Medical Care, 45*(5 Suppl 1), S12-21.
- Edens, J. F., & Ruiz, M. A. (2006). On the validity of validity scales: The importance of defensive responding in the prediction of institutional misconduct. *Psychological Assessment, 18*(2), 220-224.

- Edwards, W., & Hensley, C. (2001). Contextualizing sex offender management legislation and policy: Evaluating the problem of latent consequences in community notification laws. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45(1), 83-101.
- Evans, D. N., & Cubellis, M. A. (2015). Coping with stigma: How registered sex offenders manage their public identities. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(3), 593-619.
- Ewald, A. C. (2002). Civil death: The ideological paradox of criminal disenfranchisement law in the United States. *Wis. L. Rev.*, 1045-1137.
- Farkas, M. A., & Miller, G. (2007). Reentry and reintegration: Challenges faced by the families of convicted sex offenders. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 20(2), 88-92.
- Farmer, M., McAlinden, A. M., & Maruna, S. (2015). Understanding desistance from sexual offending: A thematic review of research findings. *Probation Journal*, 62(4), 320-335.
- Finch, H. (2006). Comparison of the performance of varimax and promax rotations: Factor structure recovery for dichotomous items. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 43(1), 39-52.
- Finkelhor, D. & Jones, L. (2012). *Have sexual abuse and physical abuse declined since the 1990s?* Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center.
- Frenzel, E. D., Bowen, K. N., Spraitz, J. D., Bowers, J. H., & Phaneuf, S. (2014). Understanding collateral consequences of registry laws: An examination of the perceptions of sex offender registrants. *Justice Policy Journal*, 11(2), 1-22.
- Geisler, F. C., Kubiak, T., Siewert, K., & Weber, H. (2013). Cardiac vagal tone is associated with social engagement and self-regulation. *Biological Psychology*, 93(2), 279-286.

- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, *10*(2), 486-489.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of a spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gorusch, R.L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hanson, R. K. (1996, November). *Coping with culpability*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago.
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *36*(9), 865-891.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: a meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*(1), 1-21.
- Hanson, R. K., & Tangney, J. P. (1996). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect—Socially Deviant Populations (TOSCA-SD)*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Corrections Research.
- Harris, D. A., Cudmore, R. (2015). *Desistance from sexual offending*. In Oxford handbook of criminology and criminal justice. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2004). *Sex offender recidivism: A simple question* (Vol. 3). Ottawa, Ontario: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

- Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2010). Clinical, actuarial and dynamic risk assessment of sexual offenders: Why do things keep changing?. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*(3), 296-310.
- Harris, A. J., & Socia, K. M. (2016). What's in a name? Evaluating the effects of the "sex offender" label on public opinions and beliefs. *Sexual Abuse, 28*(7), 660-678.
- Harris, A. J., Walfield, S. M., Shields, R. T., & Letourneau, E. J. (2015). Collateral consequences of juvenile sex offender registration and notification: Results from a survey of treatment providers. *Sexual Abuse, 28*(8), 770-790.
- Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(2), 191-205.
- Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(3), 393-416.
- Higgins, E. M., & Rolfe, S. M. (2017). "The sleeping army": Necropolitics and the collateral consequences of being a sex offender. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(9), 975-990.
- Hughes, L. A., & Kadleck, C. (2008). Sex offender community notification and community stratification. *Justice Quarterly, 25*(3), 469-495.
- Jeglic, E. L., Mercado, C. C., & Levenson, J. S. (2012). The prevalence and correlates of depression and hopelessness among sex offenders subject to community notification and residence restriction legislation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(1), 46-59.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*(1), 141-151.

- Katz, R. S. (2002). Re-examining the integrative social capital theory of crime. *Western Criminology Review*, 4(1), 30-54.
- Kazarian, S. S., & McCabe, S. B. (1991). Dimensions of social support in the MSPSS: Factorial structure, reliability, and theoretical implications. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 19(2), 150-160.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 121-140.
- Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52-54.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kirk, D. S., & Wakefield, S. (2018). Collateral consequences of punishment: A critical review and path forward. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 1, 171-194.
- Krieger, N., Smith, K., Naishadham, D., Hartman, C., & Barbeau, E. M. (2005). Experiences of discrimination: Validity and reliability of a self-report measure for population health research on racism and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61(7), 1576-1596.
- Kroner, D. G., & Loza, W. (2001). Evidence for the efficacy of self-report in predicting nonviolent and violent criminal recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(2), 168-177.
- Kruttschnitt, C., Uggen, C., & Shelton, K. (2000). Predictors of desistance among sex offenders: The interaction of formal and informal social controls. *Justice Quarterly*, 17(1), 61-87.
- Lafollette, H. (2005). Collateral consequences of punishment: Civil penalties accompanying formal punishment. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 22(3), 241-261.

- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 15(1), 58-65.
- Langan, P., Schmitt, E., & Durose, M. (2003). *Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from Prison in 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- La Fond, J. Q. (2000). The future of involuntary civil commitment in the USA after *Kansas v. Hendricks*. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18(2-3), 153-167.
- Lasher, M. P., & McGrath, R. J. (2012). The impact of community notification on sex offender reintegration: A quantitative review of the research literature. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(1), 6-28.
- Lees, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2006). Understanding policy and programmatic issues regarding sex offender registries. *Corrections Today*, 68(1), 54-56.
- Lemert, E. (1951). *Social pathology: A systematic approach to the theory of sociopathic behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lemert, E. (1967). *Human deviance, social problems, and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lemert, E. (1974). Beyond mead: The societal reaction to deviance. *Social Problems*, 21(4), 457-468.
- Lester, J. L. (2007). Off to Elba: The legitimacy of sex offender residence and employment restrictions. *Akron L. Rev.*, 40, 1-37.
- Letourneau, E. J., & Armstrong, K. S. (2008). Recidivism rates for registered and nonregistered juvenile sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 20(4), 393-408.

- Letourneau, E. J., Levenson, J. S., Bandyopadhyay, D., Armstrong, K. S., & Sinha, D. (2010). Effects of South Carolina's sex offender registration and notification policy on deterrence of adult sex crimes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(5), 537-552.
- Letourneau, E. J., Levenson, J. S., Bandyopadhyay, D., Sinha, D., & Armstrong, K. S. (2010). Effects of South Carolina's sex offender registration and notification policy on adult recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 21*(4), 435-458.
- Levenson, J. S. (2008). Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies, 21*(2), 153-166.
- Levenson, J. S. (2009). Sex offender residence restrictions. In R. G. Wright (Ed.), *Sex offender laws: Failed policies, new directions* (pp. 267-290). New York: Springer.
- Levenson, J. S. (2018). Sex offender management policies and evidence-based recommendations for registry reform. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 20*(21), 1-7.
- Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005a). The effect of Megan's Law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 49-66.
- Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005b). 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'amora, D. A. (2007). Social policies designed to prevent sexual violence: The Emperor's New Clothes? *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 18*(2), 168-199.
- Levenson, J. S., D'Amora, D. A., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Megan's law and its impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25*(4), 587-602.

- Levenson, J. S., Grady, M. D., & Leibowitz, G. (2016). Grand challenges: Social justice and the need for evidence-based sex offender registry reform. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 43*, 3-38.
- Levenson, J. S., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Sex offender residence restrictions: Unintended consequences and community reentry. *Justice Research and Policy, 9*(1), 59-73.
- Levenson, J. S., Sandler, J. C., & Freeman, N. J. (2012). Failure-to-register laws and public safety: An examination of risk factors and sex offense recidivism. *Law and Human Behavior, 36*(6), 555-565.
- Levenson, J., & Tewksbury, R. (2009). Collateral damage: Family members of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(1-2), 54-68.
- Lewis, C. L. (1996). The Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act: An unconstitutional deprivation of the right to privacy and substantive due process. *Harv. CR-CLL Rev., 31*, 89-118.
- Linden, L., & Rockoff, J. (2006). There goes the neighborhood? Estimates of the impact of crime risk on property values from Megan's law. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Link, B. G., Cullen, F. T., Struening, E., Shrout, P. E., & Dohrenwend, B. P. (1989). A modified labeling theory approach to mental disorders: An empirical assessment. *American Sociological Review, 400-423*.
- Lloyd, C. D., & Serin, R. C. (2012). Agency and outcome expectancies for crime desistance: measuring offenders' personal beliefs about change. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 18*(6), 543-565.
- Logan, W. A. (2013). Informal collateral consequences. *Wash. L. Rev., 88*, 1103-1118.

- Logan, W. A. (2015). Database Infamia: Exit from the sex offender registries. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 219-246.
- Love, M. C. (2017). Restrictions on access to criminal records: A national survey. Retrieved from: <http://ccresourcecenter.org/2017/03/09/restrictions-on-access-to-criminal-records-a-national-survey/>
- Malouf, E. T., Schaefer, K. E., Witt, E. A., Moore, K. E., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. P. (2014). The brief self-control scale predicts jail inmates' recidivism, substance dependence, and post-release adjustment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(3), 334-347.
- Mancini, C. N. (2009). Sex crime in America: Examining the emergence and effectiveness of sex offender laws. *Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations*.
- Margrove, K. L., SE-SURG (South Essex Service User Research Group), Heydinrych, K., & Secker, J. (2013). Waiting list-controlled evaluation of a participatory arts course for people experiencing mental health problems. *Perspectives in Public Health*, 133(1), 28-35.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Maruna, S. (2004). Desistance from crime and explanatory style: A new direction in the psychology of reform. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 20(2), 184-200.
- McAlinden, A.M. (2007). *The shaming of sexual offenders: Risk, retribution and reintegration*. Portland, OR: Hart.
- Meloy, M. L., Miller, S. L., & Curtis, K. M. (2008). Making sense out of nonsense: The deconstruction of state-level sex offender residence restrictions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(2), 209-222.

- Mercado, C. C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. (2008). The impact of specialized sex offender legislation on community reentry. *Sexual Abuse, 20*(2), 188-205.
- Meredith, T., Speir, J., Johnson, S., & Hull, H. (2003). *Enhancing parole decision-making through the automation of risk assessment*. Atlanta, GA: Applied Research Services.
- Mills, J. F., Loza, W., & Kroner, D. G. (2003). Predictive validity despite social desirability: Evidence for the robustness of self-report among offenders. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 13*(2), 140-150.
- Mingus, W., & Burchfield, K. B. (2012). From prison to integration: Applying modified labeling theory to sex offenders. *Criminal Justice Studies, 25*(1), 97-109.
- Moghaddam, A. (2010). Popular politics and unintended consequences: The punitive effect of sex offender residency statutes from an empirical perspective. *Southwestern Law Review, 40*, 223-245.
- Monjeau, C. J. (2011). All politics is local: State preemption and municipal sex offender residency restrictions in New York state. *Boston University Law Review, 91*, 1569-1596.
- Moore, K., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. (2013). Jail inmates' perceived and anticipated stigma: Implications for post-release functioning. *Self and Identity, 12*(5), 527-547.
- Moore, K. E., Stuewig, J. B., & Tangney, J. P. (2016). The effect of stigma on criminal offenders' functioning: A longitudinal mediational model. *Deviant Behavior, 37*(2), 196-218.
- Morey, L. C. (1991). *Personality assessment inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Morey, L.C. (2003). *Essentials of PAI assessment*. New York: John Wiley.

- Motivans, M. (2015). *Federal justice statistics, 2011-2012*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006a). Social disorganization and residential locations of registered sex offenders: Is this a collateral consequence? *Deviant Behavior*, 27(3), 329-350.
- Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006b). Residential location and mobility of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 177-192.
- Nadal, K. L. (2011). The Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(4), 470-480.
- O'Connell, D. J., Enev, T. N., Martin, S. S., & Inciardi, J. A. (2007). Working toward recovery: The interplay of past treatment and economic status in long-term outcomes for drug-involved offenders. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 42(7), 1089-1107.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 32(3), 396-402.
- Osborne, J. W. (2015). What is rotating in exploratory factor analysis? *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 20(2). Available online: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=20&n=2>
- Pachankis, J. E. (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: a cognitive-affective-behavioral model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(2), 328-345.
- Palmer, E. J., & Binks, C. (2008). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory-II with incarcerated male offenders aged 18–21 years. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 18(4), 232-242.

- Parent, M. C. (2013). Handling item-level missing data: Simpler is just as good. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*(4), 568-600.
- Park, J. H., Bandyopadhyay, D., & Letourneau, E. (2014). Examining deterrence of adult sex crimes: A semi-parametric intervention time-series approach. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 69*, 198-207.
- Petersilia, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. *The Prison Journal, 81*(3), 360-375.
- Petersilia, J. (2005). Hard time: Ex-offenders returning home after prison. *Corrections Today, 67*(2), 66-71.
- Pett, M., Lackey, N. & Sullivan, J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pew Center on the States. (2009). *One in 31: The long reach of American corrections*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Pham, A. T., Nunes, K. L., & Maimone, S. (2016). Can researchers measure criminal history, sexual deviance, and risk of sexual recidivism from self-report information alone? *The Forum Newsletter, 28*(4).
- Phelps, M. S. (2013). The paradox of probation: Community supervision in the age of mass incarceration. *Law & Policy, 35*(1-2), 51-80.
- Pinard, M. (2006). An integrated perspective on the collateral consequences of criminal convictions and reentry issues faced by formerly incarcerated individuals. *BUL Rev., 86*, 623-690.
- Pinard, M. (2010). Collateral consequences of criminal convictions: Confronting issues of race and dignity. *NYUL Rev., 85*, 457-534.

- Pinard, M., & Thompson, A. C. (2005). Offender reentry and the collateral consequences of criminal convictions: An introduction. *NYU Rev. L. & Soc. Change*, 30, 585-620.
- Pope, J. C. (2008). Fear of crime and housing prices: Household reactions to sex offender registries. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 64(3), 601-614.
- Prescott, J. J. (2012). Do sex offender registries make us less safe? *University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository*, 35(2), 48-55.
- Prescott, J. J., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). Do sex offender registration and notification laws affect criminal behavior? *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 54(1), 161-206.
- Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2(1), 41-51.
- Pyne, J. M., Kuc, E. J., Schroeder, P. J., Fortney, J. C., Edlund, M., & Sullivan, G. (2004). Relationship between perceived stigma and depression severity. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 192(4), 278-283.
- Restivo, E. & Lanier, M. (2015). Measuring the contextual effects and mitigating factors of labeling theory. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(1), 116-141.
- Robbers, M. L. (2009). Lifers on the outside: Sex offenders and disintegrative shaming. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(1), 5-28.
- Roberts, J. (2008). Mythical divide between collateral and direct consequences of criminal convictions: Involuntary commitment of sexually violent predators. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 93, 670-740.
- Rolfe, S. M. (2017). When a sex offender comes to visit: A national assessment of travel restrictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 1-21.

- Rose, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (2003). Incarceration, reentry and social capital: Social networks in the balance. In J. Travis & M. Waul (Eds.), *Prisoners once removed* (pp. 314-342). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Sample, L. L., & Bray, T. M. (2003). Are sex offenders dangerous? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(1), 59-82.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1997). A life-course theory of cumulative disadvantage and the stability of delinquency. *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency*, 7, 133-161.
- Sandler, J. C., Freeman, N. J., & Socia, K. M. (2008). Does a watched pot boil? A time-series analysis of New York State's sex offender registration and notification law. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 14(4), 284-302.
- Schaible, L. M., & Hughes, L. A. (2011). Crime, shame, reintegration, and cross-national homicide: a partial test of reintegrative shaming theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(1), 104-131.
- Schram, D. D., & Milloy, C. D. (1995). *Community notification: A study of offender characteristics and recidivism*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Schulenberg, J. L. (2007). Predicting noncompliant behavior: Disparities in the social locations of male and female probationers. *Justice Research and Policy*, 9, 25-57.
- Secker, J., Hacking, S., Kent, L., Shenton, J., & Spandler, H. (2009). Development of a measure of social inclusion for arts and mental health project participants. *Journal of Mental Health*, 18(1), 65-72.

- Seidman, B. T., Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., & Robertson, P. J. (1994). An examination of intimacy and loneliness in sex offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9*(4), 518-534.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shuster, J. J. (2005). Diagnostics for assumptions in moderate to large simple clinical trials: Do they really help?. *Statistics in Medicine, 24*(16), 2431-2438.
- Singer, M. I., Bussey, J., Song, L. Y., & Lunghofer, L. (1995). The psychosocial issues of women serving time in jail. *Social Work, 40*(1), 103-113.
- Smart, L., & Wegner, D. M. (2000). The hidden costs of hidden stigma. In T. F. Heatherton & R. E. Kleck (Eds.), *Social psychology of stigma* (pp. 220 –242). New York: Guilford Press.
- Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Steed, L. (2001). Further validity and reliability evidence for Beck Hopelessness Scale scores in a nonclinical sample. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*(2), 303-316.
- Suhr, D. D. (2006, March). *Exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SAS Users Group International, San Francisco, CA.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 5). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Martinez, A. G. (2014). Two faces of shame: The roles of shame and guilt in predicting recidivism. *Psychological Science, 25*(3), 799-805.
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., Mashek, D., & Hastings, M. (2011). Assessing jail inmates' proneness to shame and guilt: Feeling bad about the behavior or the self? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38*(7), 710-734.
- Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and the community*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Tewksbury, R. (2005). Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 67-81.
- Tewksbury, R. (2007). Exile at home: The unintended collateral consequences of sex offender residency restrictions. *Harv. CR-CLL Rev., 42*, 531-540.
- Tewksbury, R. (2012). Stigmatization of sex offenders. *Deviant Behavior, 33*(8), 606-623.
- Tewksbury, R., & Jennings, W. G. (2010). Assessing the impact of sex offender registration and community notification on sex-offending trajectories. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(5), 570-582.
- Tewksbury, R., Jennings, W. G., & Zgoba, K. M. (2012). A longitudinal examination of sex offender recidivism prior to and following the implementation of SORN. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*(3), 308-328.
- Tewksbury, R., & Lees, M. (2006). Perceptions of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum, 26*(3), 309-334.
- Tewksbury, R., & Levenson, J. (2009). Stress experiences of family members of registered sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 27*(4), 611-626.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2008). Where registered sex offenders live: Community characteristics and proximity to possible victims. *Victims and Offenders, 3*(1), 86-98.

- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2009). Stress and collateral consequences for registered sex offenders. *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy, 15*(2), 215-239.
- Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Rolfe, S. (2016). Sex offender residential mobility and relegation: The collateral consequences continue. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*(4), 852-866.
- Tewksbury, R., & Zgoba, K. M. (2010). Perceptions and coping with punishment: How registered sex offenders respond to stress, internet restrictions, and the collateral consequences of registration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 54*(4), 537-551.
- Tharp, A. T., DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Brookmeyer, K. A., Massetti, G. M., & Matjasko, J. L. (2013). A systematic qualitative review of risk and protective factors for sexual violence perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 14*(2), 133-167.
- Tittle, C. R., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. G. (2003). A test of a micro-level application of shaming theory. *Social Problems, 50*(4), 592-617.
- Travis, J. (2002). Invisible punishment: An instrument of social exclusion. In *Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment*, ed. Marc Mauer and Meda Chesney-Lind, 15-36. New York: New Press.
- Travis, J. (2005). *But they all come back: Facing the challenges of prisoner reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Bartels, J. M. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 56-66.

- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(6), 1058-1069.
- Twenge, J. M., Catanese, K. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Social exclusion causes self-defeating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(3), 606-615.
- Uggen, C., Manza, J., & Thompson, M. (2006). Citizenship, democracy, and the civic reintegration of criminal offenders. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 605*(1), 281-310.
- Uggen, C., & Stewart, R. (2014). Piling on: Collateral consequences and community supervision. *Minn. L. Rev., 99*, 1871-1912.
- Valera, P., Brotzman, L., Wilson, W., & Reid, A. (2017). "It's hard to reenter when you've been locked out": Keys to offender reintegration. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 56*(6), 412-431.
- Vuolo, M. (2017). Situating the prediction problem within collateral consequences: Communicating risk to employers. *Criminology & Public Policy, 16*(3), 959-961.
- Wakefield, H. (2006). The vilification of sex offenders: Do laws targeting sex offenders increase recidivism and sexual violence. *Journal of Sexual Offender Civil Commitment: Science and the Law, 1*, 141-149.
- Ward, T., Fox, K. J., & Garber, M. (2014). Restorative justice, offender rehabilitation and desistance. *Restorative Justice, 2*(1), 24-42.
- Ward, T., & Hudson, S. M. (1998). The construction and development of theory in the sexual offending area: A metatheoretical framework. *Sexual Abuse, 10*(1), 47-63.

- Wells, C. S., & Hintze, J. M. (2007). Dealing with assumptions underlying statistical tests. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(5), 495-502.
- Wetterling, P., & Wright, R. G. (2009). The politics of sex offender policies: An interview with Patricia Wetterling. In R. G. Wright (Ed.), *Sex offender laws: Failed policies, new directions* (pp. 99-113). New York: Springer.
- Wheelock, D. (2005). Collateral consequences and racial inequality: Felon status restrictions as a system of disadvantage. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 82-90.
- Wheelock, D., & Uggen, C. (2005). Race, poverty and punishment: The impact of criminal sanctions on racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic inequality. *The Colors of Poverty: Why Racial and Ethnic Disparities Persist, 23-47*.
- Wilkins, K. B. (2002). Sex offender registration and community notification laws: Will these laws survive? *U. Rich. L. Rev., 37*, 1245-1278.
- Williams, F. P., McShane, M. D., & Dolny, M. H. (2000). Predicting parole absconders. *The Prison Journal, 80*, 24-38.
- Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Australasian Journal of Paramedicine, 8*(3), 1-13.
- Wilson, C., & Secker, J. (2015). Validation of the Social Inclusion Scale with students. *Social Inclusion, 3*(4), 52-62.
- Winters, G. M., Jeglic, E. L., Calkins, C., & Blasko, B. L. (2017). Sex offender legislation and social control: an examination of sex offenders' expectations prior to release. *Criminal Justice Studies, 30*(2), 202-222.
- Worrall, J. L., & Morris, R. G. (2011). Inmate custody levels and prison rule violations. *The Prison Journal, 91*(2), 131-157.

- Worthington, R. L., & Navarro, R. L. (2003). Pathways to the future: Analyzing the contents of a content analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*(1), 85-92.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 806-838.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 806-838.
- Wright, R. G. (2003). Sex offender registration and notification: Public attention, political emphasis, and fear. *Criminology & Public Policy, 3*(1), 97-104.
- Zevitz, R. G. (2004). Sex offender placement and neighborhood social integration: The making of a scarlet letter community. *Criminal Justice Studies, 17*(2), 203-222.
- Zevitz, R. G. (2006). Sex offender community notification: Its role in recidivism and offender reintegration. *Criminal Justice Studies, 19*(2), 193-208.
- Zevitz, R. G., Crim, D., & Farkas, M. A. (2000). Sex offender community notification: Managing high risk criminals or exacting further vengeance? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*, 375-391.
- Zevitz, R. G., & Farkas, M. A. (2000). *Sex offender community notification: Assessing the impact in Wisconsin*. Washington: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Zgoba, K. M., Levenson, J., & McKee, T. (2009). Examining the impact of sex offender residence restrictions on housing availability. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(1), 91-110.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30-41.

Zwick, W. & Velicer, W. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 432-442.