

# Types of Employment and Factors that Predict Employment Among Registered Sex Offenders

COREY CALL

Virginia Social Science Journal | Volume 53 | 2019 | Pages 25 – 36

**ABSTRACT** The majority of incarcerated offenders will eventually return to their communities and must re-establish themselves by finding employment. Employment provides stability and serves as an incentive against recidivism, however, offenders often face barriers that prevent them from gaining employment. These barriers may be exacerbated when their criminal history involves a conviction for a sex offense. The present study examines the employment characteristics of all registered sex offenders in Richmond, Virginia (n=1,079) using sex offender registry data. Results revealed that slightly more than one out of every four sex offenders are currently unemployed. Several characteristics were also discovered that influenced the likelihood of employment including age, race, length of time on the sex offender registry, and number of failure to register convictions

*Keywords: sex offenders, sex offender registration, employment, recidivism*

**AUTHOR COREY CALL** Longwood University

## INTRODUCTION

Following several decades of stability, the incarceration rate in the United States (U.S.) began increasing dramatically in the mid-1970s (National Research Council, 2014). This incarceration boom has resulted in the U.S. having the largest incarcerated population in the world (Walmsley, 2015). Despite the trend of increased levels of incarceration, the fact remains that at least 95% of prisoners will be released at some point (Hughes & Wilson, 2002). Thus, as the number of incarcerated individuals has grown, so has the number of individuals being released from incarceration back into the community. While there were approximately 2.1 million incarcerated individuals in 2015 (Kaeble & Glaze, 2016), there were over 640,100 individuals released from federal and state prisons that same year (Carson & Anderson, 2016).

The over one-half million individuals being released from incarceration annually need to re-establish themselves as productive members of society. Released offenders have an immediate need to obtain housing, but will also need to secure employment. The value of employment for a released offender is immense, as employment provides a legitimate revenue of income, stability in the form of a daily routine, and an attachment to their community; all of which provides the individual with incentives not to recidivate. Indeed, employment has often been pointed to theoretically and empirically as a major component for successful reintegration (Berg & Huebner,

2011; Kruttschnitt, Uggen, & Shelton, 2000; Nally, Lockwood, Ho, & Knutson, 2014; Ramakers, Nieuwbeerta, Van Wilsem, & Dirkzwager, 2017; van den Berg, Biglevel, Henriks, & Mooi-Reci, 2014). While employment has been shown to be valuable for re-entry, offenders face numerous barriers to securing employment due to their offender status (Albright & Denq, 1996; Bushway, Stoll, & Weiman, 2007; Graffam, Shrinkfield, & Hardcastle, 2008; Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll, 2006; Pager, 2003; Visher, Debus, & Yahner, 2011).

One group of offenders that may face increased challenges in their pursuit of employment is sex offenders. Sex offenders face informal and formal barriers to employment that are unique. Informally, sex offenders are highly stigmatized due to the sexual nature of their offenses. For instance, in a study of employer attitudes toward hiring offenders, Albright and Denq (1996) found that offenders who had been convicted of sexual assault or a sex offense against a child were the least likely to be considered for employment. Sex offenders are stigmatized even amongst other offenders. Within prison communities, for example, sex offenders are ostracized by other inmates and viewed as being on the bottom of the offender hierarchy (Tewksbury, 2012). Formally, sex offenders are subject to stringent community management policies. With the passage of Megan's Law in 1996, all convicted sex offenders are required to register with local law enforcement and have that information made publicly accessible (Welchan, 2005). Sex offenders, across multiple stud-

ies, have maintained that sex offender registration and notification has negatively impacted various aspects of their re-entry (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Frenzel, Bowen, Spraitz, Bowers, & Phaneuf, 2014; Levenson, D'Amora, & Hern, 2007; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009).

Aside from studies highlighting possible employment difficulties stemming from sex offender management policies, little is known about the employment of sex offenders. The present study aims to fill this gap in the literature by describing the employment characteristics of all registered sex offenders in Richmond, Virginia. Specifically, the present research will describe the types of employers registered sex offenders are employed by and identify the impact of various demographic characteristics and sex offender characteristics on employment.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Employment as a Turning Point*

Laub and Sampson (1993) assert that delinquents can be re-directed toward a non-criminal lifestyle during their transition to adulthood through certain institutions of social control that create "turning points" for the individual to desist from criminality. Empirical evidence supports the notion that employment can be a turning point away from criminality (Berg & Huebner, 2011; Kruttschnitt et al., 2000; Nalley et al., 2014; Ramakers et al., 2017; van den Berg & Huebner, 2011). For instance, Berg and Huebner (2011) found that being employed significantly reduced the chances of males failing on parole and failing as quickly on parole than unemployed males in one mid-western state. In another study of over 6,000 inmates released from the Indiana Department of Corrections, Nally and colleagues (2014) discovered that, over a five-year follow-up period, a lack of post-release employment was the largest predictor of recidivism regardless of offender classification (violent offender, non-violent offender, sex offender, or drug offender). The link between employment and reduced recidivism is not just limited to U.S. samples. In a more recent study of Dutch ex-prisoners, Ramakers et al. (2017), found higher percentages of re-arrest within the first six months of release for offenders who were unemployed compared to offenders who had attained employment.

Few studies have specifically examined the impact of employment on the offending trajectories of sex offenders, but those limited studies also show support for employment as a turning point. As previously mentioned, Nally and colleagues (2014) observed that employment

was a predictor of recidivism regardless of offender type in Indiana. Specifically, among the subsample of sex offenders, those who did not recidivate were most likely to be older, more educated, and employed. Kruttschnitt et al. (2000) found that job stability significantly reduced recidivism rates of convicted sex offenders in Minnesota. The evidence specifically examining employment as a turning point for sex offenders is also not limited to U.S. samples as van den Berg and colleagues (2014) found similar results in a Dutch sample of juvenile sex offenders with employment being associated with a decrease in recidivism.

### *Employment Among Offenders*

Due to their status as offenders, those returning to their communities from periods of incarceration face the obstacle of finding and maintaining steady employment. For some ex-offenders, this obstacle is insurmountable. Examining employment among former male prisoners in three states, Visher, Debus-Sherrill, and Yahner (2011) discovered that only 65% of former inmates had been employed at some point eight months post-release with nearly half (48%) of respondents relying on family and friends for financial support as well as informal or temporary work opportunities (47%). In a more recent and nationally representative study, Couloute and Kopf (2018) found that formerly incarcerated individuals are unemployed at a rate of over 27%. The unemployment rate for those returning from incarceration is five times higher than the overall unemployment rate in the U.S. and higher than the overall unemployment at any point in U.S. history (Couloute & Kopf, 2018).

Having a criminal record has been shown to be a significant barrier in obtaining employment (Albright & Denq, 1996; Bushway et al., 2007; Graffam et al., 2008; Holzer et al., 2006; Pager, 2003; Visher et al., 2011). A study by Pager (2003) illustrates the hurdle that a criminal record presents for securing employment. In this study, a matched pair of white individuals and a matched pair of black individuals applied for the same jobs advertised in the classified section of a local newspaper and on a state-sponsored Internet job site. The only notable difference between the individuals in each pair was that one was given a criminal record. The member of each pair who was assigned the criminal record alternated weekly over the course of the experiment. In each application, it was made clear that the applicant had a criminal record either by answering a direct question about being convicted of a crime in the past, listing work experience gained while being incarcerated, or listing a parole officer as a job reference. Having a criminal record made it one-

half to one-third less likely that the individual received a call back from the employer. Additionally, black applicants were less than half as likely to receive a call back as the white applicants with even the non-offending black applicant being less likely to be considered for employment than the white applicant with the criminal record.

Despite barriers, there are offenders who secure steady employment, however, the types of employment secured are often low-paying. Lichtenberger (2006) examined both hiring and earning records of offenders released from correctional facilities in Virginia and found that the three highest employment fields for offenders were construction, food services, and administrative support services. The author notes that, based on average quarterly earnings, these are three of the lowest paying fields of employment in the state. Further, using 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth data, Jung (2015) discovered that incarceration at a young age significantly influenced earnings later in life. Specifically, being incarcerated during one's 20s was related to lower income by age 40 while incarceration in a youth correctional facility was related to both lower wages and lower number of weeks worked by age 40.

### ***Employment Difficulties as a Collateral Consequence of Sex Offender Policies***

Critics of current sex offender management policies have pointed out that several unintended consequences stem from these policies (Jeglic, Mercado, & Levenson, 2012; Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson, 2008; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009; Tewksbury & Zgoba, 2010). One of the most frequently reported collateral consequences is difficulty finding and maintaining employment once placed on the sex offender registry (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Frenzel et al., 2014; Levenson et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009). In a survey of sex offenders across Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin, Frenzel and colleagues (2014) discovered that 50% of respondents conveyed losing a job since becoming a registered sex offender. The results of several additional quantitative studies highlight the difficulties faced by sex offenders in maintaining employment with 43% of sex offenders in Kentucky (Tewksbury, 2005), 35% of sex offenders in Oklahoma and Kansas (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009), 27% of sex offenders in Florida (Levenson & Cotter, 2005), and 21% of sex offenders in Connecticut and Indiana (Levenson et al., 2007) reported the loss of a job once their sex offender status was discovered. Additionally, of those sex offenders maintaining employment, between 23% (Tewksbury, 2005) and 25% (Frenzel et al.,

2014) assert that their sex offender status has resulted in them being denied promotion or advancement.

Qualitative studies of the experiences of sex offenders provides greater insight into the difficulties faced in securing employment (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006). In interviews with 22 offenders on Kentucky's sex offender registry, Tewksbury and Lees (2006) found that few of the interviewed offenders reported being able to maintain their pre-registration employment following their placement on the sex offender registry. One offender described moving from his small town to a big city in hopes of increasing his employment opportunities, but was told by his parole officer that while some places will hire ex-cons, most will not hire ones who are sex offenders. Those offenders who did find employment were often relegated to low-paying, menial jobs, as was the case with another offender who reported being an electrician before his registration, but had been unable to secure the same line of work since registering as a sex offender.

While sex offenders experience employment difficulties, the impact of employment difficulties extends beyond the sex offenders themselves and may also impact the families of sex offenders who are living with or dependent on the sex offender (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). For instance, Levenson and Tewksbury (2009) surveyed a purposive sample of 584 family members of registered sex offenders. A majority of respondents (82%) reported facing financial hardships due to the sex offender in the household not being able to secure employment.

### ***The Present Study***

A review of the literature reveals that employment is an important aspect of re-entry that may reduce the chances of recidivism. That said, securing employment is a challenge for those with a criminal record for a sex offense. Other than this increased difficulty, little is known about the employment experiences of sex offenders. The present study aims to address this limitation by exploring the types of employment held and characteristics that impact employment of sex offenders.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### ***Data Collection***

The dataset used in this study was compiled during August 2017 from the Virginia sex offender registry. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC)

reports that there were 22,776 registered sex offenders residing in Virginia during this period (NCMEC, 2017). Every offender convicted of a registerable offense is required to register within three days of release from confinement or of suspension of sentence if there is no period of confinement. The Virginia sex offender registry can be searched by zip code, address, name, county or city. The registry was searched using the city option to locate all sex offenders registered in Richmond, Virginia, (n=1,079) and not currently incarcerated. The data was manually gathered and coded by the researcher from each individual sex offender profile included in the sample.

### **Employment Search and Categorization**

On the Virginia sex offender registry, if an offender is unemployed, that offender is listed as “not employed.” If an offender is listed as employed or self-employed, the address of their workplace is included. If an offender held multiple jobs, the addresses for each place of employment are listed. Each offender who had an address listed for their employment, that address was searched on the Internet in order to determine what business was associated with that address. For 4% of the employment addresses, a business could not be matched with the address provided on the sex offender registry. The employers associated with the addresses registered to the offenders were then categorized based upon type of business. Type of business was determined in one of two ways. First, if the business had a website, the website was consulted in order to determine the type of business. If the business did not have its own website, the business was searched on business information database websites including the Better Business Bureau (BBB), Manta, and Buzzfile to determine the category that business would fall under.

### **Sample**

Descriptive characteristics of the registered sex offenders in the sample are presented in Table 1. The sample is overwhelmingly male (92.2%). The majority of offenders are white (58.1%) with black offenders making up a sizeable minority (41.5%). The sample ranges in age from 19-years-old to 93-years-old with an average age of 48-years-old. The sample also ranges in years spent on the sex offender registry from under one year on the registry up to 23 years spent on the registry with an average of 12 years spent on the registry. Slightly over one-quarter of the offenders (27.2%) are currently on probation while the remainder are under no other community supervision other than the sex offender registry.

Over three-quarters (77.4%) of the sample are classified as violent sex offenders. Virginia categorizes its sex offenders as either sex offenders or violent sex offenders. The difference between the two classifications involves the severity of the offense(s) for which the offender was convicted and the requirements of their subsequent registration. Offenders classified as violent sex offenders have been convicted of violent sex offenses or sex offenses against more vulnerable populations such as minors, the physically helpless, and the mentally incapacitated. Offenders classified as violent sex offenders are also required to re-register every 90 days and must remain on the sex offender registry for life compared to offenders classified as sex offenders who must re-register annually and can petition to be removed from the sex offender registry after 15 years. The majority of the offenders (65.9%) had only one listed conviction for a sex offense while slightly over one-fifth of the offenders (20.5%) had two listed convictions, and 13.6% of the offenders had three or more sex offense convictions.

Slightly less than one-third (32.9%) of the offenders had at least one failure to register (FTR) conviction. All registered sex offenders are required to update their registry information at set intervals or when any change to said information occurs. In the case of employment, for example, a registered sex offender in Virginia must update their information within three days of any change in employment (such as unemployment, change of job, attaining additional employment, or retirement). If an offender fails to register, re-register, update their registry information, or provides false information, the offender may be charged with FTR, which is punished as a misdemeanor for a first conviction and a felony for subsequent convictions.

## **RESULTS**

The employment information for the registered sex offenders is displayed in Table 2. Overall, 71.6% of the sex offenders are currently employed while over one-quarter of the offenders (26.5%) are unemployed and a small percentage (1.9%) are retired. Of those sex offenders who are employed, slightly under one-quarter of those offenders (23.9%) had more than one place of employment listed on their registry page.

The largest category of employer for the sex offenders are the sex offenders themselves as 17.6% of the sex offenders are self-employed. Employment agencies were the next largest category of employer as they employed 12.7% of the sex offenders. This indicates that these sex offenders have not gained steady employment, but are

employed on a temporary basis. The largest category of employment for sex offenders working for someone else and on a steady basis is in food services (10.7%) with construction or contracting (10.6%) very close behind. The remainder of the employer categories all held less than 10% of the registered sex offenders each.

Logistic regression was used to determine factors associated with employment among the sex offenders. Logistic regression is used to predict the chances of an event occurring when the dependent variable is binary. In the present study, the dependent variable was employment (0=not employed; 1=employed). The small number of retired sex offenders (n=19) were excluded from the logistic regression. Six independent variables were used in the analysis. Specifically, race (0=non-white; 1=white), current age, number of years as a registered sex offender, classification as a sex offender (0=non-violent; 1=violent), number of sex offense convictions, and number of FTR convictions were included in the regression analysis. In regard to the race variable, the small number of offenders whose race was unknown (n=3) were excluded from the logistic regression.

The results of the logistic regression examining factors impacting sex offender employment are presented in Model 1 in Table 3. The model was found to explain 13% (Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup>) of the variance in employment and correctly classified 75% of the cases. There was no significant relationship between employment and being classified as a violent sex offender nor number of sex offense convictions. Race, age, number of years as a registered sex offender, and number of FTR convictions had significant effects on employment. The odds ratio for race indicates that, when holding all other variables constant, white sex offenders have 70% higher odds (p<.001) of being employed. Age had a negative effect on likelihood of employment as older sex offenders were less likely to be employed (p<.001), however, longer amounts of time spent on the sex offender registry was a significant predictor (p<.001) of being employed. Finally, FTR convictions had a negative effects on employment as the odds of being employed decreased by 12% (p<.05) for every FTR conviction.

As the largest categories of sex offender employment were either self-employment (17.6%) or with a temporary employment agency (12.7%), the model was re-run with these cases removed in order to determine if the significant variables remained the same when solely focusing on sex offenders employed by someone else and in a permanent position. The results of this subsequent logistic regression are presented in Model 2 of Table 3.

This model was found to explain 17% (Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup>) of the variance in employment and correctly classified 73% of the cases. The significant variables in this model were the same as those in the previous model (race, age, number of years as a registered sex offender, and number of FTR convictions) and in the same directions, however, all of the significant variables were stronger predictors in this model. For example, in this model, the odds of white sex offenders being employed increased from 70% to 84% (p<.001).

## DISCUSSION

The present study contributes to the extant literature in several ways. First, excluding those sex offenders who were listed as retired, slightly more than one out of every four (27%) sex offenders in the sample are currently unemployed. This finding is in line with that of Couloute and Kopf (2018), who found an overall national unemployment rate of 27.3% for those returning from prison, indicating that the unemployment rate for sex offenders may not be significantly different than offenders overall.

It should be recognized, however, that among those sex offenders who have secured employment in the present study (71.6%), the largest categories of employers are the sex offenders themselves (17.6%) and temporary employment agencies (12.7%). Therefore, the most commonly employed sex offender is one who has not needed to secure outside employment followed by one who is employed temporarily. When taking this into consideration, while 71.6% of sex offenders are labeled as employed on the sex offender registry, fewer have secured steady employment with an outside employer.

Second, of the registered sex offenders who have secured stable employment with an outside employer, the largest categories of employers are food services (10.7%) and construction (10.6%). Both of these categories of employers may be more open to hiring a registered sex offender for several reasons. While it is unknown what specific positions were held by the registered sex offenders in the present study, food services and construction are both fields where an employed sex offender may not need to interact directly with customers. It could be theorized that in fields of employment with high levels of interaction between employees and the public, employers may be more hesitant to have a sex offender interact with customers. Additionally, construction and food services are often low-paying fields (Lichtenberger, 2006), thus a sex offender with limited skills who is willing to work for a low wage may be attractive to an employer.

The findings of the present study indicate that the types of employment obtained by sex offenders are similar to those of offenders in general. The second-largest employment category in the present study was temporary employment agencies. Nally, Lockwood, and Ho (2011) found that temporary help services were the largest employers of offenders released each year in Indiana from 2006 to 2009. The findings of the present study also mirror that of Lichtenberger (2006) who discovered that the largest categories of employment for offenders released from Virginia correction institutions were manufacturing (21.7%), construction (19.9%) and food services (16.6%). Thus, despite the stricter policies placed on sex offenders in the community than other offenders, it would appear that the “offender” label is as significant a detriment to employment opportunities as the more specific “sex offender” label.

Finally, the present study revealed several variables that had a significant influence on employment for sex offenders, including age, time on the sex offender registry, race, and number of FTR convictions. The results of the multivariate analyses showed that younger sex offenders are more likely to be employed. This finding is notable as prior research has established that employment may only be a turning point for older offenders. Uggen (2000) found that employment affected the rate of self-reported recidivism, but for those aged 27 or older. This finding is troubling as the mean age of registered sex offenders in the U.S. is over 40 years old (Ackerman et al., 2011). Perhaps employers may be more willing to extend an offer of employment to a younger sex offender due to a belief that a younger offender is more likely to have made a mistake with their offending or still has time to turn their life around. Alternatively, as the two most frequent types of steady outside employers are also generally the lowest paying (Lichtenberger, 2006), younger sex offenders may be more willing to accept a lower-paying position.

While being younger increased the chances of employment among sex offenders in the present study, being on the sex offender registry for longer also significantly increased the likelihood of employment. It would be understandable that an employer would have trepidations about hiring any offender due to stability issues. With a sex offender’s information available on the sex offender registry, potential employers would easily be able to see their sex offense conviction history. Therefore, if an employer could see that an offender who is a potential employee has not been convicted for any subsequent sex offenses over time, this may increase their attractiveness as an employee.

Race was also a statistically significant predictor of employment as being white significantly increased the odds of employment. This finding is in-line with prior research which has consistently shown that being non-white lowers the likelihood of employment for offenders (Coulete & Kopf, 2018; Pager, 2003; Visher et al., 2011).

Lastly, for every FTR conviction, the odds of being employed significantly decreased. This finding should not be surprising since receiving a conviction for FTR carries with it the possibility of incarceration. Thus, a sex offender may lose a job gained since his or her initial registration and a sex offender who was already unsuccessful in finding employment has become even less attractive to potential employers due to continued involvement with the criminal justice system.

Although several variables were revealed to make a significant impact on employment prospects, it is important to note that not every potential variable of interest was able to be included in the analysis due to the data source used for this study. Utilizing sex offender registry data is advantageous as it provides official data on sex offender employment as opposed to self-report data commonly found in studies examining employment as a collateral consequence of sex offender policies (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Frenzel et al., 2014; Levenson et al., 2007; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009), but the sex offender registry is also limited in the information that it provides.

Most notably, the educational level of the sex offenders could not be ascertained from the sex offender registry. The exclusion of this variable is problematic for two reasons. First, educational attainment is linked to employability as labor force participation rises along with education level and the largest percentage of the labor force is college-educated (Brundage, 2017). In 2016, 50% of the national labor force held some type of college degree (Brundage, 2017). In Nally and colleagues’ (2014) study of offenders released from the Indiana Department of Corrections, only 6.2% of sex offenders were college educated. It is theoretically likely that educational attainment would have been a significant predictor of employability in the present study. Second, the absence of an education variable increases the chances of spuriousness as educational attainment may be related to other variables that are statistically significant in the regression models. In the present study, race is related to employment as white sex offenders are more likely to be employed than non-white sex offenders, however, there is also a link between race and education. Whites in the labor force are more likely to have obtained at least a bachelor’s degree (43%) com-

pared to blacks (28%) and Hispanics (20%) (Brundage, 2017). Additionally, in the present study, FTR convictions significantly decreased the likelihood of employment, however, there is also a link between FTR convictions and education. Lower levels of education are associated with a greater likelihood of FTR offenses (Duwe & Dunnay 2010).

Years of work experience is another variable that was unable to be ascertained from the sex offender registry, but would have likely had an influence on the results of the regression models. Greater amounts of work experience have been shown to significantly increase the likelihood of employment for offenders (Duwe & Clark, 2017; Uggen, 1999; Visher et al., 2011). The inclusion of the age variable in the models may have served as a proxy for a work experience variable as work experience is likely to increase with age. However, as stated previously, older sex offenders were significantly less likely to secure employment.

The inability to include other variables associated with employment is not the only limitation of the study. While the Virginia sex offender registry is in the minority of states that provides employer addresses for registered sex offenders (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2013), only the type of employer could be determined from registry information. Other employment information of interest such as type of position held and length of employment with their current employer could not be ascertained. Additionally, the present study only examines employment characteristics of registered sex offenders in one locale, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings. States vary in the restrictiveness of their sex offender management policies and the information that is made visible on their sex offender registries (Mancini, Barnes, & Mears, 2013; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2013), therefore the potential impact of sex offender registration on employment may differ state to state. In the same vein, the area utilized for the present study is an urban area. The experiences of rural sex offenders is understudied (Tewksbury, Mustaine, & Stengel, 2007) and employment experiences of registered sex offenders may differ between urban and rural environments.

Despite these limitations, the present study fills a gap in the literature by examining the employment experiences of registered sex offenders. Registered sex offenders are a unique sub-population of offenders due to the stigma attached to their offenses and the policies in place to manage them in the community. Prior research has explored the employment experiences of offenders as a whole, but the experiences of this specific sub-population of offenders has may serve to further reduce the likelihood

of employment for this stigmatized population struggling to reintegrate into society. remained largely unexamined except for the idea that the aforementioned policies make their re-entry efforts more difficult. The present study reveals that a notable percentage of registered sex offenders are unemployed and fewer have gained steady employment with an outside employer. The label of “sex offender” is a strong inhibitor of gainful employment and certain characteristics may serve to further reduce the likelihood of employment for this stigmatized population struggling to reintegrate into society.

**Table 1: Characteristics of registered sex offenders**

	% (n)
<i>Sex</i> (n=1,079)	
Male	98.2 (1,060)
Female	1.8 (19)
<i>Race</i> (n=1,079)	
White	58.1 (627)
Black	41.5 (448)
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.1 (1)
Unknown	0.3 (3)
<i>Age</i> (n=1,079)	Min.=19; Max.=93 Mean=48.28; S.D.=12.87
<i>Years on Registry</i> (n=1,079)	Min.=0; Max.=23 Mean=11.83; S.D.=6.27
<i>On Probation</i> (n=1,079)	
No	72.8 (786)
Yes	27.2 (293)
<i>Violent Classification</i> (n=1,079)	
No	22.6 (244)
Yes	77.4 (835)
<i>Number of Sex Offense Convictions</i> (n=1,079)	
1	65.9 (711)
2	20.5 (221)
3 or more	13.6 (147)
<i>Number of Failure to Register Convictions</i> (n=1,079)	
0	67.1 (724)
1	16.5 (179)
2	8.2 (88)
3 or more	8.2 (88)

**Table 2: Employment characteristics of sex offenders**

	% (n)
<i>Employed (n=1,021)</i>	
No	26.5 (271)
Yes	71.6 (731)
Retired	1.9 (19)
 <i>Number of Jobs (n=731)</i>	
1	76.0 (556)
2	18.7 (137)
3 or more	5.2 (38)
 <i>Employment Categories (n=952)</i>	
Auto Dealership or Repairs	3.4 (32)
Beauty Services	1.2 (11)
Business Services	2.1 (20)
Cleaning or Sanitation Services	4.3 (41)
Construction or Contracting	10.6 (101)
Employment Agencies	12.7 (121)
Entertainment Venues	1.2 (11)
Food Services	10.7 (102)
Hotels	1.3 (12)
Lawn Care Services	1.9 (18)
Manufacturing or Distribution	8.2 (78)
Medical Services	1.2 (11)
Miscellaneous	2.0 (19)
Non-profit Organizations	1.6 (15)
Printing or Publishing Services	1.4 (13)
Self-employed	17.6 (168)
Shipping or Moving Services	2.7 (26)
Stores	7.7 (73)
Trade Fields	2.9 (28)
Transportation Services	1.5 (14)
Unavailable	4.0 (38)

**Table 3: Logistic regression for predictors of sex offender employment**

<i>Independent variables</i>	<i>Model 1</i>			<i>Model 2</i>		
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>	<i>Wald</i>
Race	.53 (.16)	1.70	10.69***	.61 (.17)	1.84	12.67***
Age	-.06 (.01)	.94	79.05***	-.07 (.01)	.95	83.63***
Years on registry	.05 (.01)	1.05	11.50***	.05 (.02)	1.05	12.33***
Violent classification	.17 (.20)	1.18	.72	.13 (.21)	1.13	.37
Number of sex offense convictions	-.02 (.05)	.71	.14	-.01 (.06)	.99	.02
Number of FTR convictions	-.12 (.06)	.89	4.11*	-.16 (.06)	.93	6.68**
Constant	-3.90 (.40)			-3.97 (.42)		
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001	Nagel Kerke R <sup>2</sup> = .13			Nagel Kerke R <sup>2</sup> = .17		

## REFERENCES

- Ackerman, A. R., Harris, A. J., Levenson, J. S., & Zgoba, K. (2011). Who are the people in your neighborhood? A descriptive analysis of individuals on public sex offender registries. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 34*, 149-159.
- Albright, S. & Denq, F. (1996). Employer attitudes toward hiring ex-offenders. *The Prison Journal, 76*(2), 118-137.
- Berg, M. T., & Huebner, B. M. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly, 28*, 382-410.
- Brundage, V. (2017). *Profile of the labor force by educational attainment*. Washington, D.C.:
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2017/educational-attainment-of-the-labor-force/pdf/educational-attainment-of-the-labor-force.pdf>.
- 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.
- Bushway, S., Stoll, M. A., & Weiman, D. F. (2007). Introduction. In S. Bushway, M. A. Stoll, & D. F. Weiman (Eds.), *Barriers to reentry? The labor market for released prisoners in post-industrial America* (pp. 1-25). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Carson, E. A. & Anderson, E. (2016). *Prisoners in 2015*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Duwe, G. & Clark, V. A. (2017). Nothing will work unless you did: The predictors of post-prison employment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(5), 657-677.
- Duwe, G. & Donnay, W. (2010). The effects of failure to register on sex offender recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(5), 520-536.
- 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.
- 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.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A. J., & Hardcastle, L. (2008). The perceived employability of ex-prisoners and offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*, 673-685.
- Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. (2006). Perceived criminality, criminal background checks and the racial hiring practices of employers. *Journal of Law and Economics, 49*, 451-480.
- Hughes, T. & Wilson, D.J. (2002). *Reentry Trends in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Jeglic, E., 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.
- Jung, H. (2015). The long-term impact of incarceration during the teens and 20s on the wages and employment of men. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 54*, 317-337.
- Kaeble, D. & Glaze, L. E. (2016). *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2015*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- 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), 61-88.
- Laub, J. H. & Sampson, R. J. (1993). Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology, 31*(3), 301-325.
- Levenson, J. S. & Cotter, L. P. (2005). The effect of Megan's Law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 49-66.
- Levenson, J. S., D'Amora, D., & Hern, A. (2007). Megan's Law and its impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 25*(4), 587-602.
- Levenson, J. S., & Tewksbury, R. (2009). Collateral damage: Family members of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(1) 54-68.
- Lichtenberger, E. (2006). Where do ex-offenders find jobs? An industrial profile of the employers of ex-offenders in Virginia. *The Journal of Correctional Education, 57*(4), 297-311.
- Mancini, C., Barnes, J. C., & Mears, D. P. (2013). It varies from state to state: An examination of sex crime laws nationally. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 24*(2), 166-198.
- Mercado, C. C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. S. (2008). The impact of specialized sex offender legislation on community re-entry. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research & Treatment, 20*(2), 188-205.
- Mustaine, E. E. & Tewksbury, R. (2013). What can be learned from an online sex offender registry site? An eight-year follow-up. *Journal of Community Corrections, 23*(1), 5-10.

- Nally, J. M., Lockwood, S. R., & Ho, T. (2011). Employment of ex-offenders during the recession. *Journal of Correctional Education, 62*(2), 117-131.
- Nally, J. M., Lockwood, S., Ho, T., & Knutson, K. (2014). Post-release recidivism and employment among different types of released offenders. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 9*(1), 16-34.
- National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (2017). Registered sex offenders in the United States. Retrieved 01/05/18, from [http://www.missingkids.com/content/dam/ncmec/en\\_US/documents/Sex\\_Offenders\\_Map.pdf](http://www.missingkids.com/content/dam/ncmec/en_US/documents/Sex_Offenders_Map.pdf).
- National Research Council (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(5), 937-975.
- Ramakers, A., Nieuwbeerta, P., Van Wilsem, J., & Dirkzwager, A. (2017). Not just any job will do: A study of employment characteristics and recidivism risks after release. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 61*(16), 1795-1818.
- Tewksbury, R. (2012). Stigmatization of sex offenders. *Deviant Behavior, 33*(8), 606-623.
- Tewksbury, R. (2005). Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 67-82.
- 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. S. (2009). Stress experiences of family members of registered sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 27*(4), 611-626.
- Tewksbury, R. & Mustaine, E. E. (2009). Stress and collateral consequences for registered sex offenders. *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy, 15*(2), 215-239.
- Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Stengel, K. M. (2007). Residential concentrations of rural registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*, 49-63.
- 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.
- Uggen, C. (2000). Work as a turning point in the life course of criminals: A duration model of age, employment, and recidivism. *American Sociological Review, 65*(4), 529-546.
- van den Berg, C., Bijleveld, C., Hendriks, J., & Mooi-Reci, I. (2014). The juvenile sex offender: The effect of employment on offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 145-152.
- Visher, C. A., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2011). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of former prisoners. *Justice Quarterly, 28*, 698-718.
- Walmsley, R. (2015). *World Prison Population List (11<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. London, England: Institute for Criminal Justice Policy Research.
- Welchan, S. (2005). Megan's Law: Evaluations of sex offender registries. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 16*(2), 123-140.

### SUGGESTED CITATION

Call, C. (2019). Examining the Influence of Religiosity and Spirituality on Shame among African American College Women. *Virginia Social Science Journal*, Vol. 53 pp. 82-89.