

Sex Offender Residential Mobility and Relegation: The Collateral Consequences Continue

Richard Tewksbury¹ ·
Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine² · Shawn Rolfe¹

Received: 27 January 2016 / Accepted: 25 February 2016
© Southern Criminal Justice Association 2016

Abstract Prior research (see American Journal of Criminal Justice 30 (2), 177–192, 2006a) examined the residential locations and mobility of registered sex offenders and showed a common movement into increasingly socially disorganized neighborhoods after 5 years of registration. The present study examines whether or not this downward spiral continues for these sex offenders 10 years later. We examined 212 registrants from the original study and found that since their original arrest 38 % of the registrants have moved into a more socially disorganized neighborhood than their previous address. The only variable found to influence the likelihood of move to a more socially disorganized neighborhood is race, with minority sex offenders most affected. The findings suggest that the collateral consequences of sex offender policies have long-term deleterious effects on housing for sex offenders.

Keywords Sex offenders · Residential mobility · Socially disorganized neighborhoods

Collateral consequences of sex offender registration and notification are well established in the research literature, and together with attempts to evaluate the efficacy of such laws, have been a primary focus of scholars. As unintended outcomes of individuals being publicly labeled and advertised to the community (via notification procedures, including listing on the internet-based sex offender registry) the types of issues experienced as collateral consequences range from mere discomfort at knowing that one's status is known to others, to stigmatization to prohibitions on individuals accessing services, opportunities and relationships. Among the most well-known collateral consequences for registered sex offenders

✉ Richard Tewksbury
tewks@louisville.edu

¹ University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

² University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA

are losses of relationships, denial of jobs and/or educational opportunities, public harassment, violence and obstacles to housing.

Research addressing housing for registered sex offenders has shown that while registered sex offenders can be found in nearly all communities, there is a shortage of legally, economically and politically/socially available housing in most communities. While typically focused on urban communities, so too do housing difficulties affect rural sex offenders (Tewksbury, Mustaine, and Stengel 2007). While for sex offenders housing is often an especially dire circumstance, interestingly housing issues are not considered an especially serious obstacle for most other convicted felons (Dodge and Pogrebin, 2001; Harding, 2003). However, for registered sex offenders the housing issue may be an especially difficult obstacle (Burchfield and Mingus, 2008; Gordon, 2013; Huebner, Kras, Rydberg, Bynum, Grommon, & Pleggenkuhle 2014; Mustaine, Tewksbury, and Stengel 2006a, b; Tewksbury, 2004, 2005; Tewksbury and Lees, 2006). While it is true that nearly all ex-offenders may face difficulties finding and obtaining (especially renting) housing, the situation is worst for sex offenders (Evans and Porter, 2015). Some scholars go so far as to argue that avoiding homelessness is a near constant battle for sex offenders (Burchfield and Mingus, 2008; Levenson and D'Amora, 2007). When housing is difficult to come by, whether due to social factors or legal factors such as residence restrictions, the limited housing available to registered sex offenders is likely to be in the least desirable areas, where social disorganization and its components—poverty, lack of social capital, poor quality housing stock and crime – are most prevalent. As such, registered sex offenders are relegated to the most disorganized and highest crime areas of communities (Gordon, 2013; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2011). Interestingly, one scholar has suggested that the presence of registered sex offenders in a neighborhood is itself an indicator of social disorganization (Gordon, 2013). And, while recognizing that individual sex offenders experience collateral consequences differently, sex offenders with the most, and most severe, experiences of collateral consequences may be the most likely sex offenders to recidivate (Jennings, Zgoba, and Tewksbury 2012).

The collateral consequence of being unable to locate housing or being unwelcome in many housing locales due to legal restrictions is an especially important and far-reaching consequence. When residing in socially disorganized communities individuals have limited opportunities for employment, transportation, treatment and social support (Hipp, Turner, & Jannetta 2010; Levenson, 2008; Mustaine, 2014; Socia and Stamatel, 2010). In the extreme, registered sex offenders may be faced either with the choice of having essentially no locations in which they can reside legally or they may be homeless (Rydberg, Grommon, Huebner, & Bynum 2014; Socia, Levenson, Ackerman, and Harris 2015). When homeless such individuals must then confront the fact that many homeless shelters prohibit registered sex offenders (Rolfe, 2015). Such a situation is ripe for breeding isolation, substance use/abuse and recidivism. One study of the effects of collateral consequences on registered sex offenders demonstrated that the collateral consequences that accompany sex offenders subject to registration and community notification are more severe than the collateral consequences experienced by sex offenders prior to the implementation of registration and community notification (Tewksbury, Jennings, and Zgoba 2012).

Not surprisingly, collateral consequences of sex offender registration and notification have been shown to have an especially deleterious effect on sex offenders of

minority races. As with many/most criminal justice processes, minorities, especially African-Americans, are disproportionately likely to suffer negative outcomes (e.g. collateral consequences) (Mauer and Chesney-Lind, 2002; Wheelock, 2005). Among the ways that African Americans are disproportionately affected by criminal justice processes are civic participation, services and public aid, employment and other/personalized consequences (parental custody, deportation, etc.) (Wheelock, 2005). In regards to housing, neighborhoods (e.g. census tracts) where African-American registered sex offenders reside are generally more socially disorganized than those neighborhoods housing white registered sex offenders (Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2008). Furthermore, neighborhoods with large concentrations of registered sex offenders in residence are likely to have proportionately larger African-American populations and higher concentrations of poverty. To illustrate, one study demonstrated that the nine census tracts in Chicago with the greatest concentration of registered sex offenders in residence all had at least 97 % of their population comprised of African-Americans (Suresh, Mustaine, Tewksbury, & Higgins 2010).

The residential locations of registered sex offenders typically differ from the location (and quality of neighborhood) where such offenders resided at the time of their offenses (Hipp et al., 2010; Turley and Hutzler, 2001; Mustaine et al., 2006a, b). Perhaps most interesting and important here is that when registered sex offenders relocate they frequently move to more socially disorganized (e.g. less socially desirable) neighborhoods. This phenomenon has been explored previously looking at the residential locations of registered sex offenders 5 years following their listing on a publically available sex offender registry (Mustaine et al., 2006a). Sex offenders' residential locations at the five-year mark showed that those offenders originally residing in highly socially disorganized neighborhoods were less likely than their counterparts in "nicer" neighborhoods to experience a move to a more socially disorganized neighborhood. However, more striking is the fact that non-white registered sex offenders are those most likely to experience a decline in neighborhood quality 5 years into registration.

While the literature has well established that housing is a major problem for registered sex offenders (and when housing is problematic so too are other negative consequences—including recidivism—more likely to be experienced), the evidence is almost all from one-time, cross-sectional examinations. Or, as discussed above, the one available study to track registrants' housing over time does so for only 5 years. This begs the question of whether collateral consequences, namely housing difficulties, persist or even exacerbate over time. This is the focus of the present study.

The Present Study

The present study builds upon previous research examining residential location and mobility of registered sex offenders. This time, we continue following a group of RSOs 15-years since initial registration to see if their housing reflects ongoing relegation to socially disorganized neighborhoods. Using a cohort of registered sex offenders in one metropolitan community the present study compares the degree of social disorganization in the neighborhoods of residence for offenders 15 years following their initial listing on the sex offender registry. This study builds on the results shown for residential relocations of sex offenders at 5 years

following registration by examining the characteristics of the same cohort's offenders after an additional ten years of registration.

Methods

Registered Sex Offender Population

In order to assess the long-term collateral consequences to housing that registered sex offenders may experience, we revisit the 271 offenders originally examined in 2005 (Mustaine et al., 2006a). So, for the present study, we again use these same RSOs' addresses at the time of their arrests (this time placing these addresses in their associated block group) and compare their current neighborhoods to their housing situations 15 years later.¹ In the 10 years that has passed since the previous research, some offenders have dropped out of the population for analysis. This reduction occurred for several reasons: 1) because we changed our data collection unit from Census Tract to Block Group, we had to remove 37 offenders because data were not available at the block group level for their previous (at time of arrest) address; 2) we also removed the 2 female RSOs for consistency; 3) some previously included RSOs had time expire for their registration requirement so they were no longer on the registry, and some registrants had moved out of Kentucky ($N=20$). This reduced the current final population by 59 offenders for a final population of 212 offenders.²

Data Collection

As noted, after finalizing the list at 212 registered sex offenders, data were collected at both the individual- and community-levels. At the individual level, we obtained demographic information for each RSO from the sex offender registry. These variables include age, sex, race, how long they have been on the registry, and whether or not they have a lifetime registration requirement.

At the level of the community, we obtained data for both the previous (at the time of his arrest) and current block group in which each sex offender resided. We chose to use block group level data this time rather than the census tract data (that we used in the previous study) because block group is the smallest unit available for the variables within this study. Block group level data consist of 250 to 550 housing units, and typically follows visible and non-visible features, as well as any governmental unit boundaries (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). We acknowledge that census tract level data has been used extensively over the years by numerous researchers (e.g., Lauritsen & White, 2001; Martin, 2002; Nielsen & Martinez, 2003; Ouimet, 2000; Peterson, Krivo

¹ We obtained the RSOs' current 2015 addresses to place them in their associated Block Group. But we use data from 2013 to describe these Block Groups.

² To test whether or not the 37 offenders we lost due to the change in unit of analysis are significantly different than those who remained in the analysis, we compared the means between their individual characteristics (age, race, registration length, and registration requirement—life or not). There were no significant differences between the offenders in the analysis and the offenders who were dropped. Unfortunately we have no information on the offenders who moved or were no longer on the SOR, so that group of offenders ($N=20$) were not in the differences in means analysis.

& Harris, 2000; Schmid, 1960) to examine crime, victimization and corollary consequences. Here, we are able to use a smaller unit for the data collection and believe it will provide a more accurate reflection of the spaces where RSOs were previously and are now currently residing.

Continuing, we collected community-level descriptive data about the RSOs' previous and current block groups of residence. Data on RSOs' previous addresses were collected online from the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Data on RSOs' current addresses were obtained from the 2013 American Community Survey (5-year aggregate data). To make clear, then, all variables measuring community/block group characteristics were collected for the RSOs' previous (2000) and current (2015) addresses. These measures include demographic, economic, and housing characteristics.³

After obtaining all relevant community-level characteristics, we attached the previous and current neighborhood measures to the individuals/RSOs so that movement from one census tract to another could be gauged. As such, the unit of analysis for the present study is individuals.

Variables

Demographic Neighborhood Characteristics

Based on the importance this particular demographic item has shown to be in previous research (Mauer and Chesney-Lind, 2002; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2008; Suresh, et al., 2010; Wheelock, 2005), the following characteristic of each block group was considered: the percent of the population that is white. Here, we reverse the direction of the variable so that as the variable's value increases, the proportion of the population that is Nonwhite increases.

Economic Neighborhood Characteristics

We also collect and consider economic neighborhood characteristics. Here we include the percent of the population of the block group that is unemployed, the percent of the households who are headed by a single parent, and the percent of families that live below the poverty line in the analysis.

Neighborhood Housing Characteristics

Data regarding housing and households in the block groups where RSOs reside was collected. Based on the traditions of social disorganization theory (Bursik and Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2001; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earles 1997) and previous research (Hipp, et al., 2010; Evans and Porter, 2015; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2008, 2011), the following characteristics were

³ To clarify, for the present study we compare the offender's previous (at time of arrest) address to their current address with the unit of analysis being block group. In the previous study we reference, we compared the offender's previous (at time of arrest) address to their (then) current address with the unit of analysis being census tract. We only compare the findings of these 2 studies theoretically, not statistically, so the change in unit of analysis is not substantive.

collected and included: the percent of residential units in the neighborhood that are occupied, the proportion of the population who are homeowners, the median household income (in dollars), and the median housing value (in dollars) in the group. Finally, we obtained the average length of residence (in years).

Construction of Dependent Variable

Out of these community characteristics, we created a series of summary and dichotomous variables that assessed the quality of the RSOs' pre and post residential block groups via the social disorganization variables. First, for each neighborhood characteristic, we created a variable that measured the difference between that variable's value in the RSO's previous neighborhood and his current one. Therefore, for each community-level measure we subtracted the current neighborhood value from the previous neighborhood value. If this newly calculated variable was a positive number, then the RSO's current neighborhood had a lower value than the value of the previous neighborhood. If the new variable had a negative value, the current neighborhood's value was larger than the previous neighborhood's value.

Next, we recoded these new variables into dichotomous variables with values of "1" if the changes between the previous and current neighborhoods were toward greater social disorganization and "0" if the changes between the previous and current neighborhoods were toward equal or less social disorganization. At this point, we had nine indicators of change to better or worse for each block group. In other words, these measured whether the RSO's current neighborhood of residence was more socially disorganized based on that particular neighborhood characteristic or not. If that particular measure suggested more social disorganization than previously, the value was "1". If that particular measure suggested less or equal social disorganization than previously, the value was "0".

These intermediate dichotomous variables were summed together to create a composite index of residential change to the worse (or more socially disorganized). The resulting variable had values that ranged from 1–8. This suggests that some of the RSOs' current residences were better on some measures than their previous neighborhoods, but none had a current residence that was better on all counts. Conversely, some RSOs had current residences that were much worse than their previous residences (5–8 of the measures had values indicating the current residence was more socially disorganized than the previous one).

Next, this composite index of residential change was dichotomized further into a variable that indicated whether the current block group of residence was more disorganized than the previous block group of residence or not. The value for this variable was assigned by recoding RSOs whose current residences had five or more (out of 9) individual variables suggesting more social disorganization than their previous addresses as "1". And, if the RSOs' current neighborhoods had only 4 or fewer variables (out of 9) that suggested more social disorganization than their previous addresses as "0". This variable (More socially disorganized), is the Dependent Variable for the logistic regression section of the analysis. The reduction of values for the move to a more or less socially disorganized neighborhood is intentional. Here we are not interested in the subtle nuances of whether the RSOs moved to slightly less socially disorganized neighborhoods, neighborhoods that are barely disorganized at all, slightly

more socially disorganized areas or tremendously more socially disorganized areas. Instead, we sought to assess whether or not the RSO moved to a more socially disorganized neighborhood or not, hence the need for a dichotomous dependent variable.

Independent Variables

Individual-Level Variables

As noted, we also included some individual level variables as predictors of whether or not an RSO moved to a more socially disorganized neighborhood 15 years after his arrest. These variables include Age (in years), Sex, and Race. Age is a continuous variable, and is included as-is. Sex measures males and females; however, as noted above, of the total RSOs in the group, only two are women. As such, we drop these women (and this variable) and continue with an all-male group of RSOs. Finally, Race is a nominal variable with the categories of White, Black, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian. We dichotomize this variable to measure Nonwhite=1; and White=0.

Two additional individual-level variables relate to the RSOs' registration situation. One measures whether the RSO is required to maintain his information on the sex offender registry for his lifetime (lifetime=1) or for a shorter amount of time (not lifetime=0). The second registry variable is the length of time in years the RSO has been on the registry since his arrest.

Community-Level

We used the above previous neighborhood characteristics to construct an additional community-level independent variable for the logistic regression model. This variable conceptualizes the quality of life in the RSO's previous neighborhood compared to the county in which the previous neighborhood was located. For this variable, we collected the county averages across all neighborhood characteristics from the U S. Census (2000). Given that all block groups in this analysis are in Jefferson County, Kentucky, we collected the average values for the neighborhood characteristics for Jefferson County, KY. We then compared each block group against the County average across each characteristic. Similar to the variable constructions noted above, this variable was created by subtracting the census value for the county from the corresponding pre-arrest block group of residence value for all neighborhood characteristics. These interim variables were summed together to create a composite index measuring the level of social disorganization in the block group as compared to the County averages. These subsequent ordinal variables were then dichotomized just like above: if they had five or more variables indicating more social disorganization, they were assigned a "1", if they had four or less variables indicating more social disorganization they were assigned a value of "0". In the logistic regression model, this variable provides a sense of the type of neighborhood from whence the RSO came. If the value on this variable was "1", the RSO came from an area that had a majority of measures suggesting greater social disorganization than the County. If the value on this variable was "0", the RSO came from an area that had a majority of measures suggesting equal or less social disorganization.

Data Analysis

To examine the comparative levels of social disorganization in these registered sex offenders' previous and current addresses, it is necessary to utilize measures of central tendency such as frequencies, means, and ranges. In order to determine the predictors for why some RSOs move to more socially disorganized neighborhoods and some do not, we utilize logistic regression. This type of regression is the appropriate type to use because the dependent variable is dichotomous: whether the RSO moved into a more socially disorganized neighborhood since his original arrest or not.

Results

Univariate Findings

Two hundred twelve registered sex offenders (RSOs) made up the population of study for this analysis. Most of these RSOs were White (70 %) and male (99 %).⁴ Their ages ranged from 28 to 89 years old, with an average age of 53 years. They had spent an average of 12 ½ years on the registry (with a range of 10–19 years because they spent differing amounts of time in prison), and 76 % of them were required to register for life. Regarding their housing situations, of the 212 included RSOs, about 38 % had moved into more socially disorganized neighborhoods than their addresses of 15 years earlier, and nearly 62 % had no change in their residential locations. Nevertheless, over half of the sample (58 %) lived in more socially disorganized neighborhoods than average (as compared to the county averages). Moreover, not a single RSO had moved to a less socially disorganized neighborhood since being arrested for their sex offense(s). Table 1 highlights these descriptions and their community characteristics, statistically.

RSOs' Previous Addresses

In order to gauge the RSOs' current housing situations, we analyzed the levels of social disorganization for their previous and current neighborhoods. Their previous residences/addresses were the neighborhoods where they lived upon arrest for the sex offense that led to their registration. Their current residences/addresses are those that were their most up-to-date on the sex offender registry. Examination of the same set of characteristics for both of these locations/neighborhoods allows a comparison across the typically used measures of social disorganization.

To elaborate, we first examine the characteristics of RSOs' addresses at the time of their arrest. The demographic averages of the neighborhoods were 60.3 % White, with an average unemployment rate of 8.3 %, and poverty rate of 20.5 % across the block groups of their previous addresses. Regarding their previous neighborhoods' housing circumstances, there was an average of 91.5 % occupancy of housing units. However, despite occupancy being over 90 %, homeownership was only slightly over half (58.1 %), and the average length of residency was 15.59 years with a range of 2–

⁴ Since there were only 2 women in the group there are nowhere near enough cases for variation, we excluded them and look only at males.

Table 1 Variable descriptions

| Variables | Mean |
|--|--------------------------|
| Socially disorganized (0 = did not move to a more disorganized neighborhood; 1 = did move to a more disorganized neighborhood) | 37.7 % |
| Previous address | |
| Registration Requirements (0 = less than life; 1 = life) | 75.9 % |
| Total years to date on registry | 2.67 years |
| Percentage of population (white) | 60.3 % |
| Percentage of unemployment | 8.3 % |
| Percentage of poverty | 20.5 % |
| Percentage of occupied units | 91.5 % |
| Percentage of homeowners | 58.1 % |
| Percentage of single parent headed-household | 26.8 % |
| Average length of residency | 15.59 years |
| Median household income | \$29,949.35 |
| Median home value | \$71,849.53 |
| Current address | |
| Registration Requirements (0 = less than life; 1 = life) | 75.9 % |
| Total years to date on registry | 12.48 years |
| Percentage of population (white) | 63.7 % |
| Percentage of unemployment | 15.2 % |
| Percentage of poverty | 25.3 % |
| Percentage of occupied units | 86.7 % |
| Percentage of homeowners | 56.7 % |
| Percentage of single parent headed-household | 26.8 % |
| Average length of residency | 10.48 years |
| Median household income | \$38,094.13 |
| Median home value | \$104,093.4 |
| Individual characteristics | |
| Race: White | 69.9 % |
| NonWhite | 30.1 % |
| Average age | 53 (range 28–89) years |
| Male | 99.2 % |
| Average time on the registry | 12.4 (range 10–19) years |
| Lifetime registration? Yes | 76.3 % |
| No | 23.7 % |

N = 212

50 years. The average proportion of single-parent headed-households across the RSOs' previous addresses was 26.8 %. Continuing, the average median household income was \$29,949 with a range of \$5417 to \$87,371. Lastly, the average median home value within the block groups was \$71,849 with a low value of \$26,300 and a high value of \$173,400.

RSOs' Current Addresses

Moving on to RSOs' current residential locations we find similarly deprived economic and housing arrangements. Currently, RSOs lived in neighborhoods with approximately 64 % of the population being White, 15 % unemployment, and 23 % of the population living below the poverty line. Regarding the housing characteristics of their current neighborhoods, RSOs had addresses in communities that had 87 % of the total housing units occupied, 57 % of the population were homeowners, and a single parent headed 27 % of the households. Further, the average length of residence for their neighborhoods was 10.5 years. Finally, the median household income and home value for the RSOs' current neighborhoods were \$38,094 and \$104,093, respectively.

Comparison Between Previous and Current Addresses

Fifteen years after their arrests, it is interesting to find that more RSOs currently lived in neighborhoods with greater proportions of White residents than they did originally (from 60 % to 64 %). Regarding economic measures, RSOs previously lived in areas with 8.3 % unemployment as compared to 15.2 % in their current neighborhoods. Poverty had also gotten worse as RSOs previously lived in neighborhoods with 20.5 % of the population living below the poverty line as compared to a rate of 25.3 % in their current neighborhoods.

Turning to housing indicators, when examining the average proportions of occupied units and homeowners for their current neighborhoods, we find an occupancy rate of 86.7 % of the total housing units, and approximately the same proportion of homeowners in their current and previous neighborhoods (58 % compared to 57 %). This suggests that the proportion of occupied rental properties was diminishing from their previous to their current residences. When compared to RSOs' previous addresses, the average length of residency for members of the RSOs' current neighborhoods was substantially shorter (10 years compared to 16 years). Interestingly, the average proportion of single-parent headed-households in the RSOs' current neighborhoods was identical to that of their previous residences (26.8 %).

Continuing, in spite of the fact that most measures of social disorganization for the RSOs' current neighborhoods indicated worse social disorganization, the median household income and home values were higher. Here, RSOs were currently living in neighborhoods with higher median incomes (\$38,094.13 compared to \$29,949.35) and median home values (\$104,093.40 compared to \$71,849.53) than previously.⁵ In sum, it is apparent that RSOs continued to spiral downward regarding their residences as (all of) the RSOs who did move moved into more disorganized and deprived neighborhoods.

Bivariate/Multivariate Findings

The univariate findings suggest that RSOs continue to experience the collateral consequences associated with sex offender registration a full 15 years following their arrests.

⁵ However, these values have not been standardized for inflation, housing bubbles, or economic recession.

We now ask, what influences this continued trend in residential relegation? First, we can compare the sex offender residents across socially organized and socially disorganized communities. Here, we use the constructed variable measuring whether or not the RSOs currently live in more socially disorganized neighborhoods than they did previously and the same individual characteristics used in the previous study upon which we build. As shown in Table 2, we use crosstabs to assess whether movement to a more socially disorganized neighborhood is associated with the dichotomous variables of race and whether registration is for life or shorter. Results show that race is significantly related, as nonwhite registrants are more likely to have moved to an more socially disorganized neighborhood. Additionally, Table 3 show that t-tests of differences in means for age and number of years on the registry by moving to a more socially disorganized neighborhood or not reveal that neither variable is statistically related to whether or not one currently resides in a more socially disorganized neighborhood than previously.

Next, Table 4 presents the results of this logistic regression using the independent variables of Age, Race, Years on the Registry, Whether registration is for life or shorter, and Whether their previous address was in a block group that was more socially disorganized on average than the County in which it was located. We used variable tolerances to check for collinearity and found no indications of such in the model.

As shown in Table 4, we find that the model of five independent variables is not significant as a whole ($\chi^2=6.557$; significance=.256). This suggests that those five variables do not provide a significant contribution to the explanation for why some RSOs moved to more socially disorganized neighborhoods and why some did not. Nevertheless, as with the ANOVA results there is one significant variable in the equation: Race. Here we find that Nonwhite RSOs have 15 % greater odds of moving to more socially disorganized neighborhoods than White RSOs.

Discussion

In an effort to add to the literature regarding the consequences, both intended and unintended, this study examined the residential locations of a cohort of registered sex offenders 15 years following their arrest for a sex offense(s). Whereas initial examination of this cohort 5 years following their arrest showed that more than one-third of the cohort moved to a more socially disorganized neighborhood than where they had lived at the time of arrest, so too does the present study report a significant minority of offenders moving to more socially

Table 2 Crosstabs of race and registration status by moved to a more socially disorganized neighborhood or did not

| Variables | Chi-square* [@] |
|--|--------------------------|
| Race (Nonwhite = 1; White = 0) | 4.469* |
| Registration Status: (20 years = 1; 10 years = 0)) | 1.442 |

* $P < .05$; $df = 1$

[@]Pearson Chi-Square Value

Table 3 Independent samples comparison of means test of race and registration status by moved (or did not) to a more socially disorganized neighborhood

| Variable included | Mean** | Std. dev. | Std. error of mean |
|--|--------|-----------|--------------------|
| Age (in years)/did not move to more socially disorganized neighborhood | 53.39 | 11.80 | 1.027 |
| Age (in years)/moved to a more socially disorganized neighborhood | 52.92 | 10.17 | 1.137 |
| Total years to date on registry/did not move | 12.37 | 1.98 | .173 |
| Total years on registry/moved to more disorganized | 12.65 | 2.093 | .234 |

* $P < .05$; $df = 210$

#T-Statistic for Independent Samples Comparison of Means Test

disorganized neighborhoods. Additionally, at the five year point of registration it was evident that African American/Black sex offenders were the most likely to see a decline in the quality of their neighborhood of residence, and individuals from the least socially disorganized neighborhoods were the most likely to see a decline in quality of neighborhood in which they lived. The present study also shows that African Americans are more likely to experience this collateral consequence. The present study echoes the findings and conclusion of both our earlier study of the same cohort, and studies in other communities, showing a common decrease in neighborhood quality for sex offenders, especially minorities. "Clearly, race is related to the characteristics of neighborhoods where Black and White registered sex offenders live. While both groups of RSOs experience the collateral consequence of living in more socially disorganized and

Table 4 Odds of registrant currently living in a more socially disorganized neighborhood than at time of arrest

| Previous addresses | Coefficient | Standard error | Odds ratio | Tolerance |
|--|-------------|----------------|------------|-----------|
| Constant | -.596 | 1.254 | .551 | |
| Age | -.001 | .013 | .999 | .966 |
| White | .617* | .310 | 1.853 | .981 |
| Total years on the registry | .052 | .071 | 1.053 | .984 |
| Lifetime registration | -.203 | .341 | .816 | .945 |
| Greater social disorganization than county | -.099 | .097 | .906 | .981 |

* $p < .05$ $df = 5$ $\chi^2 = 6.557$ $-2 LL = 274.451$ Cox and Snell $R^2 = .03$ Naglekerke $R^2 = .041$

disadvantaged neighborhoods, Black RSOs experience this more deeply” (Mustaine and Tewksbury, 2008, p. 79).

What we see is that 15 years following arrest, many registered sex offenders have in fact moved to less desirable neighborhoods. Some realized this collateral consequence quickly, and for others it did not appear until after five or more years of registration. While in many ways not surprising considering the stigma attached to registered sex offenders (see Tewksbury, 2012), this downward spiral of residential change is likely problematic for the successful reintegration of RSOs back into the community. One of the core ideas of social disorganization theory is that residence in socially disorganized communities is a major contributor to (continuing) criminality. As such, policies that lead to the relegation of registered sex offenders to such neighborhoods may actually be placing offenders into contexts that facilitate or encourage criminal offending.

Therefore, the placement (or, relegation) of registered sex offenders in poor, low social capital, and often crime-ridden communities may actually be working counter to the justifications for sex offender registration and community notification. If community members are to be assisted in avoiding sexual offenders by knowing where they live and who they are, the residents of the communities into which sex offenders are relegated are perhaps the least likely to have the opportunity, resources or knowledge to know how to access and use such information. In this way we can see how long term registration and relegation of registered sex offenders to highly socially disorganized communities imposes long-term consequences for both sex offenders and poor communities. Rather simply, the stigma does not “wear off” or “die down” for sex offenders. They continue to remain in circumstances of deprivation and disgrace.

The current analysis suggests that there are similar forces at work when we examine the determinants of the level of disorganization in the RSOs’ communities. Although we do not find that the degree of social disorganization of the sex offenders’ residential location at the time of arrest continues to be important for residential location 15 years post arrest, we do find that offenders’ race is a primary determinant.

As with all research there are limitations to the present study. First, while following a cohort of sex offenders many could not be followed due to a lack of address for some at the time of their arrest. By necessity these individuals are not included in the analysis. Second, the present study examines community characteristics at the block group level, whereas the previous analysis used census tract level data so we cannot do a direct comparison. Third, we are unable to account for the number of times that individuals have moved; for some they may have moved only once since their arrest, but others undoubtedly have experienced several moves. For these individuals we are only able to examine their neighborhoods at the time of their arrest and now 15 years later. Finally, the data in the present study come from only one community, and should therefore be generalized with caution.

This study has examined a cohort of registered sex offenders 15 years following arrest with a focus on whether these offenders have moved, and if they have moved do they now live in a more or less socially disorganized neighborhood. In line with a well developed body of literature regarding the collateral consequences of sex offender registration and community notification, we find that housing issues remain a serious and common collateral consequence that has ongoing,

long-term effects. In response to our questions of 10 years earlier (Mustaine et al., 2006a, p. 182):

1. Do RSOs reside in different locations currently then they did at the time of their arrest?
2. For RSOs who change residential locations, are their current residences located in more or less socially disorganized locations than their residences at the time of their arrests?
3. For RSOs who have changed residential locations, what are the factors associated with moving to a more or less socially disorganized locations?

We can safely and unequivocally say that RSOs often have moved, they commonly move to more socially disorganized neighborhoods, and the only variable identified as influential on this move is race.

References

- Burchfield, K., & Mings, 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.
- Bursik, R. J., Jr., & Grasmick, H. G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Dodge, M., & Pogrebin, M. (2001). Collateral costs of imprisonment for women: Complications of reintegration. *Prison Journal*, 81(1), 42–54.
- Evans, D., & Porter, J. (2015). Criminal history and landlord rental decisions: A New York quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(1), 21–42.
- Gordon, K. E. (2013). The registered sex offender population as a marker of social disorganization. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 52(5), 527–542.
- Harding, D. J. (2003). Jean Valjean's dilemma: The management of ex-convict identity in the search for employment. *Deviant Behavior*, 24(6), 571–596.
- Hipp, J. R., Turner, S., & Jannetta, J. (2010). Are sex offenders moving into social disorganization? Analyzing the residential mobility of California parolees. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(4), 559–590.
- Huebner, B., Kras, K. R., Rydberg, J., Bynum, T. S., Grommon, E., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2014). The effect and implications of sex offender residence restrictions: Evidence from a two-stet evaluation. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 13, 139–168.
- Jennings, W. G., Zgoba, K. M., & Tewksbury, R. (2012). A comparative longitudinal analysis of recidivism trajectories and collateral consequences for sex and non-sex offenders released since the implementation of sex offender registration and community notification. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 35(3), 356–364.
- Levenson, J. S. (2008). Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21(2), 153–166.
- 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.
- Mauer, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). Introduction. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), *Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment* (pp. 1–12). New York: New Press.
- Mustaine, E. E. (2014). Sex offender residency restrictions: Successful integration of exclusion? *Criminology and Public Policy*, 13(1), 169–177.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2008). Registered sex offenders, residence and the influence of race. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 65–82.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2011). Residential relegation of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(1), 44–57.
- Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006a). Residential location and mobility of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 177–192.

- Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006b). Social disorganization and residential locations of registered sex offenders: Is this a collateral consequence? *Deviant Behavior*, 27(3), 329–350.
- Rolfe, S. (2015). *Another collateral consequence? Examining homeless shelters' policies on sex offenders across four states*. University of Louisville: Unpublished thesis.
- Rydberg, J., Grommon, E., Huebner, B. M., & Bynum, T. S. (2014). The effect of statewide residency restrictions on sex offenders' post-release housing mobility. *Justice Quarterly*, 31(2), 421–444.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2001). Assessing neighborhood effects: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 443–478.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earles, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A Multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 227, 918–924.
- Socia, K. M., Levenson, J. S., Ackerman, A. R., & Harris, A. J. (2015). 'Brothers under the bridge': Factors influencing the transience of registered sex offenders in Florida. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 27, 559–586.
- Socia, K. M., & Stamatel, J. P. (2010). Assumptions and evidence behind sex offender laws: Registration, community notification and residence restrictions. *Sociology Compass*, 4(1), 1–20.
- Suresh, G., Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2010). Social disorganization and registered sex offenders: An Exploratory Spatial Analysis. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7(2), 180–213.
- Tewksbury, R. (2004). Experiences and attitudes of registered female sex offenders. *Federal Probation*, 68, 30–33.
- Tewksbury, R. (2005). Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21(1), 67–81.
- Tewksbury, R. (2012). Stigmatization of sex offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, 33(8), 606–623.
- Tewksbury, R., Jennings, W. G., & Zgoba, K. M. (2012). *Sex offenders: Recidivism and collateral consequences*. Final grant report # 2009-IJ-CX-0203. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Tewksbury, R., & Lees, M. B. (2006). Perceptions of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum*, 26, 309–334.
- Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Stengel, K. M. (2007). Residential concentration of rural registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(2), 49–63.
- Turley, E., & Hutzell, L. (2001). *West Virginia sex offender study*. Charleston, WV: Division of Criminal Justice Services.
- Wheelock, D. (2005). Collateral consequences and racial inequality: Felon status restrictions as a system of disadvantage. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21, 82–90.

Richard Tewksbury is Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Louisville. He is editor of Criminal Justice Studies and a Past President of the Southern Criminal Justice Association.

Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine is Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology at the University of Central Florida. Her research focuses on sex offender policy and criminal victimization risks. She is a Past President of the Southern Criminal Justice Association.

Shawn Rolfe is a doctoral student in the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Louisville. His research focuses on sex offender policy and the consequences of SORN.