

SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION – EXPERIENCES OF FEMALE OFFENDERS IN
FLORIDA

By

JENNIFER L. KLEIN

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

© 2011 Jennifer L. Klein

To my parents – Albert and Beverly Klein – Thank You

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis could not have been completed if it weren't for the hard work of so many different individuals. First, I have to thank my committee members – especially my chair, Dr. Lon Lanza-Kaduce. He was influential in putting together the survey instrument and the development of this project. His guidance on this project and throughout my academic career has been phenomenal. Secondly, I have to thank Dr. Ron Akers who was one of my main reasons for completing this specific project. Taking his graduate seminar in Criminological Theory was instrumental to this project and really developed my love of theory and theory competition. I also have to thank Dr. Lora Levitt for her guidance in the selection of my committee and in her honesty and encouragement. Her push for me to acknowledge my accomplishments in this project was very encouraging and very needed. This project would not have been as good without their help through every stage of development.

My thanks have to go to the members of my cohort who provided a sounding board for me throughout the entire project – particularly the beginning stages when I was trying to figure out how to complete something of this magnitude. I particularly want to thank Danielle Tolson for the many nights of open ears and strong advice, for the social pressure to finish this project and for her help in the final stages. I have enjoyed every conversation and every struggle and frustration we have endured to get these projects completed. Thank you to Katheryn Zambrana, who stayed up with me many nights discussing this project. I could not have done any of this without her pushing me along and encouraging me to produce the best project I was physically capable of producing. Thank you to Joe Rukus who has been most supportive in the paper writing process and throughout the defense of this project.

I have to thank some former colleagues of mine from a summer job, who provided me with a giant stack of journals that go back a few years. Thank to you Tad Parks for finding all the journals for me and thanks to my mom for delivering them all. Free literature is always appreciated and I was able to use a majority of it.

Thank you to several research assistants who helped make this project possible. Thank you to Nicholas Smith and Anastasia Velikorostova for their initial help in the selection of eligible participants and criminal history research. Sara Hutton, Amanda Blakely and Ariana Paz were very helpful in entering data, researching address information and weeding through all of the qualitative data. Without these research assistants I would not have been able to get everything done as fast as I did. Finally, thank you to Olivia Sangermano who was stuck with an unfortunate task of managing many pages of criminal history information. She was quick and efficient with the work and made that element of the project very manageable.

Finally, I have to thank my parents for all of their help and encouragement. While my parents might not always understand what it is that I am trying to accomplish or why I am studying sexual offenders, I always know that they are behind me one hundred percent. I owe everything about me to them and everything I do is in attempt to make them proud of me. I like to think that I have accomplished that goal, but I'll complete a Ph.D. just to make sure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	8
ABSTRACT	10
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	19
Demographics of Female Sexual Offenders and Offending Styles	19
Past Research on Female Sex Offenders.....	22
Other Research on Female Sex Offenders.....	25
Sex Offender Registration.....	28
Tier System.....	31
Time Dimensionality	32
Reintegrative Shaming Theory	35
Defiance Theory	37
General Strain Theory.....	41
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	46
Research Hypotheses.....	46
Harassing Behaviors and Negative Experiences.....	47
Reintegrative Shame Theory	47
General Strain Theory	47
Defiance Theory	47
Research Design	48
Research Sample	50
Survey Design	52
Protection of Human Subjects	54
Official Records	55
Operationalization.....	56
Dependent Variables.....	56
Societal ramifications	56
Perception of shame	57
Perceptions of stress and strain.....	58
Defiance theory.....	59
Independent variable: duration spent on the sex offender registry.....	61
Demographic and Control Variables.....	62
Qualitative Variables	63
Data Analysis Plan.....	64

4	RESULTS	73
	Participant Demographics.....	73
	Quantitative Data Analysis.....	76
	Hypothesis Testing and Qualitative Findings	78
	Model 1: Societal Ramifications	79
	Model 2: Reintegrative Shaming Theory	84
	Model 3: General Strain Theory	87
	Model 4: Defiance Theory	90
	Other Qualitative Data	100
	Criminal Histories.....	101
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	104
	Discussion	104
	Policy Implications	110
APPENDIX		
A	INSTRUMENT	113
B	CODING MANUAL	125
C	REFERENCE TABLES	147
D	QUALITATIVE DATA	150
E	SURVEY COMMENTS	219
F	INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	237
	LIST OF REFERENCES	241
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	248

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
2-1 Negative Experiences as a Result of Registration Status.....	23
2-2 Negative Experiences Resulting from Registration Above and Below Median Sample Time on Registry	24
2-3 Mean Responses to Attitudinal Items	25
2-4 Sex Offender Tier Criteria (National Conference of State Legislature, 2008)	32
3-1 Housing Information for Non-Participants.....	51
3-2 Common Themes Developed From Qualitative Data	65
3-3 Model 1: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Societal Ramifications	69
3-4 Model 2: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Shame	70
3-5 Model 3: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Strain	71
3-6 Model 4: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Defiant Behaviors	72
4-1 Participant Demographics: Offender Status, Race, Age, Marital Status (S) and Number of Children	74
4-2 Participant Demographics: Sexual Offenses as Listed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry	75
4-3 Frequency Data for Addresses of Participants	76
4-4 Distribution of Registration Time Requirements	78
4-5 Distribution of Time Requirement Ratios	79
4-6 Descriptive Statistics for Model 1 Dependent Variable Questions.....	80
4-7 Model 1: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Societal Ramifications.....	82
4-8 Model 1: Qualitative Data Analysis for Societal Ramifications.....	83
4-9 Descriptive Statistics for Model 2 Dependent Variable Questions.....	84
4-10 Model 2: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Shame.....	85
4-11 Model 2: Qualitative Data Analysis for Shame.....	86

4-12	Descriptive Statistics for Model 3 Dependent Variable Questions.....	88
4-13	Model 3: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Strain.....	89
4-14	Model 3: Qualitative Data Analysis for Strain.....	90
4-15	Descriptive Statistics for Model 4A Dependent Variable Questions.....	91
4-16	Model 4A: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Unfair Sanctions.....	92
4-17	Descriptive Statistics for Model 4B Dependent Variable.....	93
4-18	Model 4B: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Poor Bonds.....	94
4-19	Descriptive Statistics for Model 4C Dependent Variable Questions	95
4-20	Model 4C: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Stigmatization of the Offender.....	96
4-21	Descriptive Statistics for Model 4D Dependent Variable Questions	97
4-22	Model 4D: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Refusal to Acknowledge Shame.....	99
4-23	Model 4: Qualitative Data Analysis for Defiant Behaviors.....	99
4-24	Qualitative Data for Registry Views	101
4-25	Returned Survey Participant vs. Non-Participant Criminal Histories.....	103

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION – EXPERIENCES OF FEMALE OFFENDERS IN
FLORIDA

By

Jennifer L. Klein

May 2011

Chair: Lon Lanza-Kaduce
Major: Criminology, Law and Society

Research conducted on sexual offenders up until now has primarily focused on males. The research on their female counterparts is very limited and focuses mainly on the perpetration of the sexual offenses. Even less research has focused on the mandatory registration on a sex offender registry that accompanies nearly every sex offense conviction. The current research builds on the limited previous research and examines the perceptions of those women who are on the Florida Sex Offender Registry. A mail-out survey was sent to every eligible female sex offender residing in Florida as of March, 2010. Questions were asked testing strain, reintegrative shaming and defiance theories. The proposed hypotheses predict that the longer a female sex offender remains on the registry, levels of strain will increase, the amount of shame felt will increase and levels of defiance felt will also increase.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In roughly the past 15 years, a virtual panic has swept the nation over the possibility that sexual offenders could be living in our neighborhoods, making parents fearful for their children's safety. Based on the number of sex offenders that are currently incarcerated – more than 234,000 – it seems as though law enforcement has also perceived sexual offenders as a threat to society (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004; Holmes and Holmes, 2009). Because of the growing panic and due to several high profile child abductions, the sex offender registry was created to manage and supervise those who had been convicted of sexual offenses. The first act passed in 1994, The Jacob Wetterling Act, created the national registry for these convicted sex offenders (Michigan State Police, 2006). However, it took twelve years until the current sex offender registry was enacted. The Adam Walsh Act of 2006 would push the national sex offender registry to where it is today, but not without creating a variety of problems that will be discussed in detail later on (Calley, 2008; NCSL, 2008).

Due to some of the high profile abductions of minors such as Jacob Wetterling, Adam Walsh, Megan Kanka and others, states were anxious to adopt the registries across the nation. However, protection was not the only incentive for the state legislatures. Federal funding was at risk for those states who did not adopt the nationwide registries (Scott & Gerbasi, 2003). However, even though the states were financially encouraged to adopt the registries, they were also encouraged to modify them based on individual state laws (Jacob Wetterling Act, 1996; Scott & Gerbasi, 2003).

Traditionally, the sex offender registry was thought to protect the community from the violent offenders similar to those who were involved in the previously mentioned high profile abductions. Typically, these violent offenders tend to be male (Bunting, 2006; Fromuth & Conn, 1997; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2006). Female sex offenders have been overlooked and rarely researched as a result of their low numbers on the registries (Beech, Parrett, Ward & Fisher, 2009). In fact, female sex offenders are estimated to make up only roughly 4-5 % of the total sex offender populations (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010; Cortoni & Hanson, 2005; Bunting, 2006; Fromuth & Conn, 1997; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2006). Because of the small amount of research dedicated to female sexual offenders, this paper aims to fill in some of the gaps that are present in the literature. There is a large arena of information that could be found from a less publicized type of sexual offender and perhaps with the data collected here, some of that information will come to light.

This study is a replication and extension of a 2004 study in which Richard Tewksbury examined female sex offenders registered on the Indiana and Kentucky Sex Offender Registries (Tewksbury, 2004). In the Tewksbury study, survey instruments were sent out to female offenders to examine the experiences these women faced while required to register on the registries (Tewksbury, 2004). The results of that study showed that the longer the women stayed on the registry, the more shame they felt and the more harassed they became. Often the women would lose jobs, lose places to live and face ridicule from the public as a result of being on the registry (Tewksbury, 2004). These responses were based on the law that was in place in 2004.

Two years later, one major change to sex offender registration took place. The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 increased the amount of time that sex offenders must register and added crimes that were worthy of registration (NCSL, 2008). The current study will look at Florida female sex offenders – a state that has more female offenders than Kentucky and Indiana combined (the originally studied states) – and the conditions of the registry after the Adam Walsh Act was enacted (Tewksbury, 2004; FDLE, 2010).

Although this study is indeed a replication of the Tewksbury study, the survey instrument developed for this study significantly extends what Tewksbury asked in his study. Shame is still a focus of this study (Braithwaite, 1989), but additional variables are taken into account. Reintegrative Shaming Theory states that offenders can be brought back into a community through the process of reintegrative shaming or can be ostracized from the community through disintegrative shaming measures (Braithwaite, 1989; Akers and Sellers, 2009) – such as publicly known sex offender registries (Tewksbury, 2004). Another focus introduced into this study is strain and stress, which results from the registration status and harassing behaviors experienced due to registration status. Robert Agnew's General Strain Theory looks at the hardships and adversity that causes stress and strain in life (Agnew, 1985; 2001b, 2006a, 2006b; Akers and Sellers, 2009). As a result of that stress and strain, individuals may act out in a criminal manner as a way of coping with that strain (Agnew, 1985; 2001b, 2006a, 2006b; Akers and Sellers, 2009). Another focus is the issue of defiant behaviors that result from the imposed sentence of required registration (Sherman, 1993; 2006). Finally, this study also examines the sexual offenders' own perception of the sex

offender registry. Do the sex offenders support the registry? Do they want to see things changed with the registry? This study adds to the literature because it examines more than just shame associated with the registry.

The current study examines factors that explain (1) sexual offenders' attitudes towards the registry, (2) the shame present because of the required registration, (3) the stress and strain that is associated with required registration, (4) the defiant attitudes that result from the required registration, and (5) experiences associated with the registry such as harassment and other negative events. Because of the limited amount of research conducted on female sexual offenders, this study contributes to the sexual offender, female offender and theoretical literature by examining the link between (1) amount of time spent on the registry and the amount of harassing behaviors experienced, (2) amount of time spent on the registry and the related amount of shame present in an individual's life, and (3) amount of time spent on the registry and the related stress and strain present in an individual's life and (4) amount of time spent on the registry and the related defiant attitudes present in an individual's life.

To explain these objectives, criminological theory will be incorporated in order to make the connection clear. The first objective, "explaining sexual offenders' attitudes towards the registry", can be pursued by looking at how the participating sexual offenders feel about the registry. These attitudes are measured qualitatively within the survey itself by analyzing the participants' personal feelings regarding the registry. Themes were analyzed from the phone calls, emails and notes that the participants provided. Do the women think that it is good to have a sex offender registry? Do they feel that it is necessary to make modifications to the registry? Should it be abolished

completely? The second objective, “examining the shame present because of the required registration”, can be pursued by looking at the individual’s perceptions of shame and how they feel that their personal shame has affected their lives. Questions will be asked regarding how ashamed participants are of being on the registry and how ashamed participants are for having committed a sexual offense. Also included will be questions regarding fear of being recognized as a sexual offender.

The third objective, “examining the stress and strain that is associated with required registration”, can be pursued through looking at the individual’s perception of stress and how the participants cope with that strain. Questions will be asked that examine how stressed an individual is for having to register on the sex offender registry. Based on the reported stress levels, participants will also be asked to report how they cope with the stress. Coping mechanisms include the use of alcohol, illegal substances and violent actions.

The fourth objective, “examining the defiant attitudes that result from the required registration”, will be evaluated by examining what retaliatory actions the participant engages in as a result of being on the sex offender registry. This objective will be measured using Sherman’s Defiance Theory as a theoretical structure, so questions will be asked concerning the four elements of defiance theory – unfair sanctioning, poor bonding strength, stigmatizing the offender not the offense and refusal to acknowledge shame (Sherman, 2006).

Finally the fifth objective, “examining experiences associated with the registry such as harassment and other negative events”, will be pursued by asking ten questions grouped together as Societal Ramifications [originally called attitudinal measures in the

Tewksbury study (2004) – meaning which behaviors the participants are experiencing as a result of their sex offender status. For example, have the participants experienced job loss since registering? Have the participants lost housing or been forced to move since registering? How many times have the participants been assaulted or attacked since registering?

These five objectives are important for the purposes of this study because they were not fully examined within the Tewksbury study conducted in 2004 - hence the large expansion that takes place with this project. Some aspects of the study were used in the original study such as shame, the participants' feelings regarding the registry and the ten questions listed in this study as Societal Ramifications. Because Tewksbury did not go into great depth concerning these three aspects, the current study both replicates and elaborates on the foundation that the Tewksbury study provides. In addition, new elements were used in the extension of the Tewksbury study. The use of Defiance Theory and Strain Theory are new additions but tie well into the study of female sexual offenders due to the potentially high amounts of stress being felt by the participants as well as the defiant behaviors that may be exhibited by the participants. Since this study is an extension of the Tewksbury study, the study takes on more of an exploratory element than a predictive one. This means that the study will investigate the behaviors and views of the registered female sex offenders instead of predicting their criminal behaviors and the sex offenses in general. With the lack of research on female sex offenders and the limitations provided by the Tewksbury study, this study is looking for information that has not been provided in the past. More questions were asked of the registrants than Tewksbury used in his project and qualitative data was

also obtained - something that Tewksbury's study never had. Therefore this project extends the findings in his study but on a larger scale than he was able to accomplish.

The sexual offenders eligible for this study were asked questions relating to their personal attitudes towards the registry, their experiences with harassing behaviors and other negative events post-conviction, the amount of shame present in an individual's life and the current amount of stress and strain that results from the required sex offender registration. In order to explain the reasons for choosing these specific questions, this paper will first provide a review of the literature on (1) female sexual offenders, including previous research, (2) sex offender registration, (3) Reintegrative Shaming Theory, (4) Defiance Theory and (5) General Strain Theory. After the review of the literature, the research methodology is explained. Next, Chapter 4 present the analyses examining the (1) sex offender attitudes towards the registry, (2) shame variables, (3) stress and strain variables, (4) defiance variables and (5) harassing behaviors. Finally, the conclusion will summarize the results, explain policy implications and offer suggestions for future research. At the end of the conclusion, an appendix includes the approval from the University of Florida Institutional Review Board, the survey instrument that was sent to the female sex offenders, the informed consent, a letter of invitation to participate in the study and a follow-up letter reminding the participants that the survey was mailed to them.

This project adds to the current literature because it will show the connection between the registration laws and the societal reality associated with the registration lists. The registration laws are in effect to keep track of sex offenders, to let the community know about who is living in their neighborhoods and what sexual crimes

these offenders committed. When created, the sex offender registry laws were meant as a supervision tool to keep track of convicted sex offenders, but there have been some unexpected side effects of the legislation. Some of the most harmful side effects include the very limited areas available for sex offenders to reside in (residency restrictions), job loss, loss of professional licensing and threats of violence. This project examines how much the current state of registration hinders the registered offender from reentering society completely and tries to learn about any obstacles they may face as a result of the required registration.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Demographics of Female Sexual Offenders and Offending Styles

When someone thinks of the sex offender registry or of sex offenders in general, traditionally a violent male offender comes to mind (Bunting, 2006; Fromuth & Conn, 1997; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2006). While males compose a majority of the sex offender population, there is a small population of females who have been convicted for sexual offenses (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010; Cortoni & Hanson, 2005; Bunting, 2006; Fromuth & Conn, 1997; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2006). Female sex offenders typically make up a small proportion of the total population of sex offenders in a state. In Hawaii, female offenders make up 0.8% of the all registered offenders in the state (Tewksbury, 2004; Szymkowiak & Fraser, 2002). Of all the registered sex offenders in the state of Iowa, only 3% of them are female, in Arkansas 2.4% are female, in Kansas 2.7% are females and 2% are female (Tewksbury, 2004). In Florida, there are 569 registered females that have an address listed with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE, 2010a). This number does not include those female sex offenders who are incarcerated, have been deported, who have absconded or who have moved out of state. The 569 females make up only 1.4% of the total number (40,522 total) of registered sex offenders in Florida (FDLE, 2010b).

Even though the numbers associated with female sex offenders are small, they are still a group of offenders worth researching. Their motivations, victim characteristics and offense characteristics are often different from those of male offenders. In some countries, females may be convicted as a sexual offender because they are engaging in prostitution. In countries like the Netherlands, where prostitution is legal, women can be

arrested if they engage in sexual acts in public or without a working permit, but not because they are engaging in prostitution (Zaitch & Staring, 2007; Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010).

For sex crimes that are not prostitution related, the female offenders are coercive like males but their methods of coercion are different. Men tend to use physical coercion or deception, taking their time to “befriend” or “groom” their victims (Payne & DeMichele, 2008; English, Pullen & Jones, 1997). Male offenders also tend to prefer strangers or acquaintance victims – a victim who is not very close to the offender (Banning, 1989; Beech, Parrett, Ward & Fisher, 2009, Rudin, Zalewski, & Bodmer-Turner, 1995). However, female offenders use their position as an authority figure or a caretaker, to teach their victims how to engage in sexual activities (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010). Females use sexual activities as a teaching mechanism for their victims – the female offender serves as the more experienced individual and the victim is typically more the innocent partner who could learn from the female’s experience (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010; Mayer, 1992; Nathan & Ward, 2002; Sarrel & Masters, 1982; Syed & Williams, 1996; Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). A classic example of the authority driven relationship is the high school teacher engaging in a sexual relationship with a student (Johnson, 2010; Olsen, 1999). There are many of these teacher/student relationships, but none are more famous than that of Mary Kay Letourneau, who was convicted of statutory rape against her 13 year old student Vili Fualaau. While in prison for the rape of Fualaau, she gave birth to two of his children, but the couple eventually married in 2005 and are still together (Johnson, 2010).

In general, the chosen victims are also likely to have a relationship with the offender before the offense takes place. Previous research has found that victims are likely to be related to their female perpetrator. One study found that out of 67 female sex offenders, only 13% chose victims who were strangers to them (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Mathews et al., 1997). Another study found that 68% of perpetrators were related to the victim (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Fromuth & Conn, 1997). Further research conducted in a clinical setting discovered that of the 85% of female sex offenders are mothers, 55% committed sexual offenses against her own children and 30% committed sexual offenses against her own children and someone else's children (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Faller, 1995). A comparison study was conducted looking at both male and female sexual offenders. In this study, the results showed that 70% of females compared to 30% of males were related to their victims (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Miccio-Fonseca, 2000).

Female offenders do not often work alone in committing sexual offenses; more often than male sex offenders, females work with a co-perpetrator (Beech, Parrett, Ward & Fisher, 2009; Kaufman, Wallace, Johnson & Reeder, 1995). When there is a co-perpetrator, most often it is a male co-perpetrator (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Grayston and De Luca 1999; Wakefield and Underwagner 1991). However, male sex offenders more often prefer to work alone (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Finkelhor and Williams 1988; Solomon 1992). Research shows that female sex offenders choose female victims more often than male victims, but males still get victimized too (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Grayston and DeLuca, 1999). Based on the offenses committed and victim characteristics, it cannot be said with

certainty that female offenders prefer to victimize one gender over the other, only that there is a slight preference for female victims when the perpetrator is also female (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009). However, if there are multiple victims, those victims are likely to be of both genders (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). Based on behaviors shown through prior research, there is speculation that female sex offenders feel more remorse and guilt over their offenses than male offenders (Beech, Parrett, Ward & Fisher, 2009; Ford, 2006; Saradjian, 1996). However, male sex offenders are more likely to admit their guilt in court than female sexual offenders (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Allen, 1991; Faller, 1995).

Female sexual offenders also are likely to have histories of sexual victimization, similar to male offenders (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009). However, female sex offenders tend to experience sexual and physical non-sexual abuse at higher rates than male sex offenders. This may be due to the fact that females are overall more often victims of sexual abuse throughout societies (regardless of their own future offending behaviors) (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Adshead et al. 1994; Allen 1991; Fromuth and Conn 1997; Grayston and De Luca 1999; Higgs et al. 1992; Hislop 2001; Kaplan and Green 1995; Kubik et al. 2002; Lewis and Stanley 2000; Lloyd 1987; Mathews et al. 1997; Miccio-Fonseca 2000; Nathan and Ward 2002; Vick et al. 2002). Despite the evidence that females constitute a small proportion of all sex offenders compared to male sex offenders, we know relatively little about female sex offenders.

Past Research on Female Sex Offenders

The amount of research on female sex offenders is quite small compared with the amount of research conducted on their male counterparts. In 2004, Tewksbury directed his research questions towards the required registration as well as the effects that occur

due to the registration status (Tewksbury, 2004). In the Tewksbury study, more questions have been asked to examine the experiences that the females experienced while on the registry but questions were also asked to examine their feelings about the registry itself, registry related stressors and re-entry issues. Tewksbury used a mail survey, which the current study also used as its survey methodology. Female sex offenders were surveyed in Kentucky and Indiana with an eligible sample of 227. Of that 227, 40 surveys were returned and completed enough to use for data analysis (Tewksbury, 2004). The females were asked about individual experiences such as job loss, denial of promotion at work, loss of residence, rude treatment in a public place, whether they were asked to leave a business, whether they lost a friend because of registration status, were harassed in person, were assaulted, received threatening telephone calls or received threatening mail (Tewksbury, 2004). Table 2-1 shows the prevalence of females who experienced the previous behaviors. The total percentage exceeds 100%, because respondents reported experiencing multiple negative experiences.

Table 2-1. Negative Experiences as a Result of Registration Status

Experience	(n=40) Total Percentage
Loss of Job	42.1
Denial of Promotion at Work	10.5
Loss of Residence	31.6
Rude Treatment in a Public Place	31.6
Asked to Leave a Business	2.6
Lost a Friend because of Registration Status	39.5
Harassed in Person	34.2
Assaulted	10.5
Received Threatening Phone Calls	10.5
Received Threatening Mail	15.8

Tewksbury also looked at the prevalence of these experiences based on the amount of time spent on the registry (Table 2-2). He broke up the offenders into two

groups, the first group was required to register for 32 months or less and the second groups was required to register for more than 32 months. Thirty-two months was the average amount of time spent on the registry (Tewksbury, 2004). Across all of the above actions, females who were required to register for more than 32 months reported experiencing these behaviors (sometimes at a percentage almost three times) more often than those who were required to register for less than 32 months (Tewksbury, 2004). Again, the percentages exceed 100% because so participants reported more than one negative experience. The same kind of percentage extended to the questions that asked for attitudinal responses concerning the registry.

Table 2-2. Negative Experiences Resulting from Registration Above and Below Median Sample Time on Registry

Experience	(n=40)	32 Months or Less Time on Registry (Percent)	More than 32 Months on Registry (Percent)
Loss of job		38.9	45.0
Denial of promotion at work		0	20.0
Loss/Denial of place to live		27.8	35.0
Treated rudely in a public place		22.2	40.0
Asked to leave a business		0	5.0
Lost a friend who found out about registration		27.8	50.0
Harassed in person		22.2	45.0
Assaulted		5.6	15.0
Received harassing/threatening telephone		5.6	15.0
Received harassing/threatening mail		5.6	25.0

Tewksbury’s study also examined what he called “attitudinal measures”, looking at the sex offenders’ perceptions of the sex offender registry (Tewksbury, 2004). Like the questions asking about negative experiences that the females have encountered, Tewksbury’s results showed that as the women stayed on the registry longer, the amount of shame also increased. Table 2-3 shows five attitudinal measures surrounding the registry. The questions were measured on a 10-point scale ranging from 1 – Disagree Completely to 10 – Agree Completely, and the means are reported.

As Table 2-3 shows the longer the women spent on the registry, the more their responses to the shaming question increased, meaning they felt more shame the longer they were on the registry (Tewksbury, 2004). The same thing happened for the avoidance measure and the perception measure that the registry is a good thing.

Table 2-3. Mean Responses to Attitudinal Items

Items	(n=40)	Total Sample*	Shorter than Median Time*	Longer than Median Time*
"I feel ashamed that I am on the Kentucky Sex Offender Registry"		8.20	7.74	8.62
"I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Sex Offender Registry"		7.50	7.74	7.29
"In understand why people want there to be a Sex Offender Registry"		7.53	8.16	6.95
"People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Sex Offender Registry"		5.28	4.95	5.57
"I think that the Sex Offender Registry is a good thing"		6.45	6.21	6.67

Items measured on a 10 point scale ranging from 1 (Disagree Completely) to 10 (Agree Completely)

**None of the measures were found to be statistically significant.

Other Research on Female Sex Offenders

In other research on female sex offenders, one study compared 93 female sexual offenders against 20,597 female non-sexual offenders in Sweden (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010). This is a large difference in sample sizes between female sexual and non-sexual offenders. The researchers found that over the time period studied, 36.6% of female sexual offenders were admitted to a psychiatric hospital and 7.5% were discharged from a mental institution with a diagnosis of a psychotic disorder. However, sexual offenders were no more likely to suffer from mental disorders and enter mental institutions than non-sexual offenders (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010). Because of these findings, the researchers determined that female sex offenders do not have a higher prevalence of mental illness, but instead the

researchers suggest that more mental health screening take place before conviction, when the cases are still at the trial level (Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann & Langstrom; 2010).

In another study on child molestation, researchers in the United Kingdom aimed to find out whether or not the female child molesters made the same mental link between children and sex as male child molesters do (Gannon, Rose & Williams; 2009). Using the Implicit Association Test, or IAT, the researchers tested 17 convicted female child molesters to find out if they made the mental association linking children with sex. The Implicit Association Test is a visually presented word association test that ties these words to pleasant or unpleasant associations. In this test they used the child-sex pairing as an experimental test of the association for female sex offenders and the flower-insect pairing as a control group. Using the control IAT as an example, if the word presented was an insect or a flower, then the participant would be expected to place the image in the pleasant or unpleasant category using a computer (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009). The researchers used the “seven-phrase methodological protocol” using the flower-insect IAT as the control and the sexualization of children as the experimental IAT (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009: 57). The IAT has been shown to work best with groups of sex offenders not exceeding more than ten individuals to a group. Research has also shown good results among adult male child molesters – that these men “show an implicit association between children and sexual concepts,” (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009; Gray, Brown, MacCulloch, Smith & Snowden, 2005; Mihailides, Devilly & Ward, 2004; Nunes, Firestone & Baldwin, 2007).

In the Gannon, Rose & Williams study, the researchers looked at both female child molesters and convicted female offenders who were not convicted of sexual crimes but

who served as the control (2009). The female child molesters on average had victims who were younger than 16 and also committed the molestation with a male co-perpetrator. Given the characteristics of the participants, the researchers then adapted the IAT test to a sexual scale. As stated before, there were two categories of words - insect-flower and the sexualization of children – that would be associated to the pleasant and unpleasant categories. To mirror these categories, the researchers created four new categories (adult, child, sex and non-sex), which were linked up to the previously stated ones (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009). Therefore, the categories were tested as adult/insect, child/flower, sex/pleasant and non-sex/unpleasant (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009). The researchers established that the adult-sex pleasant associations would represent the unusual category and the child-non-sex unpleasant associations would represent the usual category. Although the research set out to distinguish a similarity between male and female child molesters, the results of the IAT were unable to show that female child molesters made the mental association between sex and children. Interestingly however, the IAT was also unable to make a distinction between the female child molesters and the non-sexual offending females (Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009). Gannon, Rose & Williams suggest based on their results that for female child molesters, there is no real sexual interest linked to children, unlike their male counterparts (2009). However, they recognize that other researchers suggest the exact opposite – that there is a sexual interest linked to children for the female child molesters (Beech et al., 2009; Gannon, Rose & Williams, 2009).

Overall, the literature surrounding female sex offenders is quite limited. They are a group of offenders that are small in number and extremely rare compared with male

sexual offenders. Most studies conducted on female sex offenders do not have large sample sizes (sample sizes range from two participants to 112 participants) and are limited in the types of questions asked (Tewksbury, 2004; Peluso and Putnam, 1996; Rosencrans, 1997). This study will attempt to fill in some of the gaps in the literature concerning female sex offenders and will add to the research by increasing the number of participants surveyed beyond what has been sampled in the past.

Sex Offender Registration

Sex offender registration was initially proposed to keep a record of all adult sex offenders throughout the United States; recording offender addresses, their occupations and offenses and making the information available to the public. In 1994, The Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Registration Act (The Jacob Wetterling Act) was the first federal registration act passed into law, setting up the national registry for all convicted sex offenders. It applied to those offenders convicted of specific offenses against children and juveniles as well as those convicted of sexually violent offenses (Michigan State Police, 2006). Two years later Megan's Law was passed, allowing for community notification. Also in 1996, The Pam Lychner Sexual Offender Tracking and Identification Act was passed, which established more requirements, including lifetime registration, for severe and repeat sex offenders. In 1998, the Appropriations Act for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary of 1998 passed, making sex offender registration contingent on individual state laws for specific offenses. These offenses must be "comparable to or exceed the range of offenses described in the Jacob Wetterling Act," (Michigan State Police, 2006). The Jeanne Clery Disclose of Campus Security Police and Campus Crime Act of 2000 made it mandatory for college campus to alert students and families about registered

sex offenders residing on campus and attending classes (Michigan State Police, 2006). As early as 1994, individual states were passing sex offender registration acts which required juveniles convicted of certain acts to register along with the adult offenders. For example, in Michigan, juveniles were required to register with local law enforcement if they committed an offense on or before October 1, 1995 (Michigan State Police, 2006). Nationally, juvenile sex offenders were not required to register until 2006, when the latest act was passed into law (the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006). The Adam Walsh Act created a better, more efficient system of registration and required juvenile sex offenders who were 14 years old or older to register, provided that their sexual offense was “comparable to or more severe than aggravated sexual abuse”¹ (Calley, 2008). However, from the start adult men and women were required to register for their sexual offenses.

The passage of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (The Act) provided an opportunity to create a national, cohesive and more systematic form of sex offender registration. Under this act, all states are required to create a sex offender registry that is compatible to the national database registry (NCSL, 2008). The creation of this law in effect, eliminated the statute of limitations for most sex offenses.

Therefore, convicted sex offenders who would not have to register in the past were now required to register, even though they never had to before (NCSL, 2008). The offenses included under the elimination of the statute of limitations are sexual abuse, sexual exploitation and other abuse of children, transportation for illegal sexual activity and

¹ Aggravated sexual abuse is defined as, “knowingly causes another person to engage in a sexual act by (1) by using force against that other person; or (2) by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping (Cornell Law School, 2010)

related crimes, kidnapping a minor and sex trafficking, in various degrees (NCSL, 2008; Baron-Evans & Noonan, 2006).

The Act also includes new provisions that increased the restrictions on possession and distribution of child pornography, increased the conditions of pre-trial release, allowed the government more freedom to access DNA from adjudicated sex offenders and added a new rule of civil commitment for “sexually dangerous persons” (Baron-Evans & Noonan, 2006). The civil commitment rule was upheld recently by the United States Supreme Court in *United States v. Comstock* (2010), defining a sex offender eligible for civil commitment when “any person who has been convicted of or charged with a crime of sexual violence and who suffers from a mental abnormality or personality disorder which makes the person likely to engage in predatory acts of sexual violence if not confined in a secure facility” (Department of Corrections Washington State, 2010).

The law, in application, requires new sex offenders to start the registration process prior to release from imprisonment and further affects sex offenders in other ways. Sex offenders are required to start the registration process before release or within three days after release from imprisonment. Each sex offender must provide following the information: Social Security Number, all addresses that the offender may reside at, employer and business address, students must provide the school that the offender is attending (whether a secondary school or a university) and the school’s address, license plate number if he/she owns a vehicle and description of that vehicle or any other vehicle that the offender may use, and any and all additional information that the attorney general may require (NCLS, 2008). Law enforcement must also supply

information on the offender's general appearance characteristics, criminal history, DNA, driver's license and other required items (NCLS, 2008).

Tier System

The law also defines three types of sexual offender, with varying mandatory registration sentences for all three types. Tier I offenders are described as offenders who are not Tier II or Tier III. They are required to register for 15 years and must show up in person to local law enforcement on a yearly basis (NCLS, 2008). Tier II offenders are those who have committed a sexual offense that is punishable by an incarceration sentence of more than one year and that is comparable to or more severe than several federal offenses, all of which involve a minor. Tier II offenders are required to register for 25 years and must report to law enforcement, in person, every six months (NCLS, 2008). Tier III offenders are considered the most severe sexual offenders. They have committed offenses that are subject to more than one year of incarceration and that are comparable to or more severe than several federal offenses (Table 2-4). Tier III offenders are required to register for life and report in person to local law enforcement every three months. Individual states are also allowed to classify sex offenders how they wish. In Florida, there is no mention of a tier distinction. The only distinction made classifies sex registrants as either a sexual offender or a sexual predator (FDLE, 2010b)².

One of the major ways in which the Adam Walsh Act affects registered sex offenders is in the area of the time requirement (NCSL, 2008). Now under the act, some registrants are eligible for lifetime registration - meaning that for the rest of their

² See Appendix C for definitions of sexual offender and sexual predator

natural life, these individuals are required to have their name and personal information posted on their state’s sex offender registry. This increased time requirement will serve as a starting point for this paper, asking how does this increased time requirement effect those individuals on the registry?

Table 2-4. Sex Offender Tier Criteria (National Conference of State Legislature, 2008)

Tier I	All sex offenders who are not a Type II or Type III offender Must register for 15 years Must report in person to law enforcement every year
Tier II	All offenders other than a Tier I, with an offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. The offense must be comparable to or more severe than the following offenses involving a minor: Sex trafficking ³ Coercion and enticement Transportation with intent to engage in criminal sexual activity Abusive sexual contact ⁴ Offenses that involve use of a minor in a sexual performance Solicitation of a minor to practice prostitution Production or distribution of child pornography Must register for 25 years Must report in person to law enforcement every six months
Tier III	Sex offenses punishable by imprisonment for more than one year The offense must be comparable to or more severe than the following federal offenses: Sexual abuse ⁵ or aggravated sexual abuse ⁶ Abusive sexual contact against a minor less than 13 years old Offense involving the kidnapping of a minor (parent or guardian excepted) Any offense that occurs after one had been designated a Tier II offender Must register for Life. Must report in person to law enforcement every three months

Tier System established as a result of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006.

Time Dimensionality

As explained earlier in the review of the Tewksbury project (2004), the amount of time spent on the sex offender registry can affect how the registrants are perceived by the public and how the registrants also view themselves. The effects that time have on the registered sex offender’s feelings and perceptions of the registry can be linked to

³ Sex trafficking is defined as “Whoever knowingly in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, or maintains by any means a person knowing, or in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act” (Cornell Law School, 2010).

⁴ Abusive Sexual Contact is defined as “knowingly engages in or causes sexual contact with or by another person, if so to do would violate subsection (a) or (b) of section 2241 (aggravated sexual abuse) of this title, section 2242 (sexual abuse) of this title, subsection (a) of section 2243 (sexual abuse of a minor or ward) of this title (Cornell Law School, 2010).

⁵ Sexual Abuse is defined as “causes another person to engage in a sexual act by threatening or placing that other person in fear, or engages in a sexual act with another person if that other person is incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or physically incapable of declining participation in, or communicating unwillingness to engage in, that sexual act (Cornell Law School, 2010).

⁶ Aggravated sexual abuse is defined as, “knowingly causes another person to engage in a sexual act by (1) by using force against that other person; or (2) by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping (Cornell Law School, 2010)

the research completed by Donald Clemmer concerning the behavior modifications that take place when an individual is in prison. While registered sex offenders may or may not have experienced long-term incarceration, a behavioral comparison can be made between the “prisonization” effects that inmates feel during incarceration and the events experienced while on the sex offender registry (Clemmer, 1940).

Clemmer’s research states that, when an inmate first enters prison, he/she is in the beginning stages of their prison career (1940). The inmate must assimilate to the prison lifestyle and learn how to survive and how to function within the prison environment (Clemmer, 1940). Within the prison system, the inmates are not referred to as people but rather as numbers and as property of the state that is responsible for incarceration. In other words, a new identity must be adopted in order to survive (Clemmer, 1940). As the mid-career approaches and the incarcerated inmate serves more of his/her sentence, the views toward the prison are different from when the inmate was initially incarcerated. The inmate knows how the prison is run and what is expected of him/her as an inmate. By the end of the incarceration sentence, the inmate knows how to function well within the prison system (Clemmer, 1940; Palermo, 2005). In the development of the prisonization process, Clemmer argues that the longer an inmate is incarcerated, the more developed the role as a prisoner becomes (1940). The most prisonized inmates are those who are serving life sentences (Clemmer, 1940). The inmate identity is well formed; however the transition back into society creates a new set of problems for the inmate. How does an inmate live as a free citizen after the extended period of time spent incarcerated? Now the inmate must learn to erase the inmate identity and renew his/her identity as a free citizen.

Drawing the parallel to sexual offenders who reside in the community, the first days of registration serve similarly to the first days of incarceration. The registered sexual offender must make the necessary adjustments to being publicly registered and must learn how to function under this new role. Similarly, the sexual offender is not seen as a person but only as a registered sexual offender – someone who is potentially dangerous to society and who may recidivate very easily. By mid-career as a registered sexual offender, the registrant knows what to expect from the community and has developed an identity as a registered sexual offender. To function in society, the sex offender knows how to behave, knows who to avoid and to remain as inconspicuous and he/she can to avoid the public stigmatization involved with the registration status. But in the sex offender's later career as a registrant approaches, the sex offender anticipates how to adapt to a life where registration is not a requirement. After years of being publicly identified as a sexual offender, how does the registrant learn to alter her identify as a sexual offender and see herself as a free citizen?

The time dimensionality element of the research ultimately serves as an attempt to predict the three theories that are next presented. As time spent on the registry increases, the behaviors, attitudes and feelings associated with Reintegrative Shame, Strain and Defiance Theories should also increase. The theories in turn will be used to explain the reactions of the registrants that occur at given times during their registration requirement. Duration spent on the sex offender registry was used as the independent variable because of the likelihood that certain events and behaviors increase, the longer that an individual remained on the registry. A more detailed explanation of the independent variable is given in the methodology portion of the paper, but it is

necessary to explain its use briefly to better explain the theories used. The theories therefore become the dependent variables serving as an explanation for the variation in registrant behaviors. There is also the question whether sex offenders feel a certain way at a certain point during their registration. In other words, is there a peak time during the registration process where negative feelings about the registry are at their highest? To find out where this peak time may occur, a time ratio is calculated by dividing the time spent on the registry by the amount of time required to register. Again, the process behind the time ratio will be further explained in the methodology portion of the paper. Because a parallel can be drawn from the prisonization process that incarcerated inmates face to the similar process that registered sex offenders go through, the time requirements make for a good independent variable for this study. Since there are essentially three stages to both a prison and registration career – early career, mid-career and later career – the present study will be able to show how the viewpoints of the offenders and the events and behaviors they encounter will fluctuate depending on which stage of the registration career an individual is currently in. The three theories to be used will next be explained in detail. They serve as ways to explore the variation in the participants' behaviors that may result from the time ratio.

Reintegrative Shaming Theory

In 1989, John Braithwaite proposed a theory that expounded on the tenants of labeling theory to include the stigmatizing effect that labels have on the offender that is labeled, leading to continued deviance (Braithwaite, 1989). Braithwaite's adaptation of labeling theory centers on the questions: when does the applied label lead to further deviance and when does the application lead to deterring crime (Kubrin et al., 2009; Braithwaite, 1989). These questions lead to the formation of what is now known as

“shaming” – where the social disapproval is felt by the offender. This disapproval has the “intention or effect of invoking remorse in the person being shamed and/or condemnation by others who become aware of the shaming” (Braithwaite, 1989: 100; Akers and Sellers, 2009, Kubrin et al., 2009). To separate this from the stigmatization that is included in Lemert’s Labeling Theory, Braithwaite expanded this definition to include what he calls “stigmatization for disintegrative shaming” and “reintegrative shaming” (Akers and Sellers, 2009; 162).

Braithwaite argues that disintegrative shaming is somewhat counter productive. Humiliation and villainizing the offender (not the offense), and allowing the offender status to take over as the master status are all examples of how disintegrative shaming is used by the community (Braithwaite 1989; Makkai & Braithwaite, 1994; Akers & Sellers, 2009). Disintegrative shaming is thought to backfire and increase the likelihood for future deviance – rather than act to minimize future deviance (Braithwaite, 1989; Akers & Sellers, 2009; Kubrin et al., 2009). Beyond the deviant behavior, another point proposed by Braithwaite is the idea that eventually the stigma involved with shaming will not work on the person being shamed. Eventually, shaming will stop working and instead deviance will continue (Kubrin et. al., 2009).

In contrast, reintegrative shaming serves to reincorporate the offender back into society and forgive the offenses committed. Compared with disintegrative shaming, reintegrative focuses more on the offense rather than the offender (Akers & Sellers, 2009; Braithwaite, 1989; Kubrin et. al., 2009). The main focus of reintegrative shaming involves the collective approval of the community in forgiving or absolving the offender of the crime. The guilt associated with reintegrated shaming is used as a method to get

the offender to seek out the forgiveness of the victim. Through social gestures, a public act or a private meeting, the offender and victim reconcile and the offender is given the opportunity to escape the deviant role (Braithwaite, 1989; Kubrin et. al., 2009).

For the purposes of this study, elements of reintegrative shaming theory were used to account for the experiences of female sex offenders who are required to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry based on the sexual offense they committed. Items derived from reintegrative shaming theory will be used as a dependent variable to support the variations in behavior. The public element of the registry creates a second punishment – one separate from the incarceration period or sentence imposed by the courts. As the theory states, the sex offender registry makes the shame public and treats the offenders as “sex offenders” only, thus making that label their master status and not allowing them to be anything else but sexual offenders. An additional component to the shaming research in this project will extend to shame associated with the crime itself. Does committing a sexual offense result in a certain level of shame in the sex offender? Reintegrative shaming theory will be used to distinguish the shame involved with public registration from the offense itself and will serve as a tool to show how publicly stigmatizing the registry really is.

Defiance Theory

The issue of punishing offenders has long been debated among legal scholars. What level of punishment is enough to stop an offender from recidivating? What level of punishment is considered too much punishment for a given crime? Lawrence Sherman’s Defiance Theory sets out to answer the question of when crime will increase after a specific punishment is given to an individual. Sherman’s arguments in developing the theory center around the recently increasing crime rates and the idea

that at a certain level, “punishment can backfire” (Sherman, 2006). The backfire comes from a sense of injustice associated with the given punishment and as a result, the individual increases his or her level of criminal activity (Freeman, Liossis, and David, 2006; Sherman, 1993). Sherman formally defines defiance as “the net increase in the prevalence, incidence or seriousness of future offending against a sanctioning community caused by a proud, shameless reaction to the administration of a criminal sanction” (Sherman, 2006: 289). In other words, defiant behaviors – the increased likelihood of further criminal behavior – occur as a result of the offender being proud of the original crime committed and feels that the punishment was unjust. However, the perceived injustice of the punishing sanction is just one element that Sherman proposes to be at work.

Much like deterrence theory, Sherman delineates the differences between specific/individual defiance and general defiance. Specific or individual defiance is the defiant action or actions that an individual person takes part in, in response to his or her own punishment (Sherman, 1993; Sherman, 2006). However, general defiance speaks of the collective group response to the punishment given to an individual within the group or to the entire group (Sherman, 1993; Sherman, 2006). So, an individual can react to his or her own punishment but there can also be a collective response to punishments. Sherman also makes the distinction between direct and indirect defiance. Direct defiance is “a crime committed against a sanctioning agent” where as indirect defiance a crime committed not against the sanctioning agent but against someone or something that represents the sanctioning agent (Sherman, 1993; Sherman 2006).

Altogether, there are four elements that must be present for an individual to be defiant and increase his/her criminal activity as a result of the received sanction. The first is, “the offender defines a criminal sanction as unfair,” meaning that the given punishment was unwarranted given the crime that was committed (Sherman, 2006). Previous research has shown that when punishment is perceived to be fair – enough punishment given to a crime, but not too much to make it seem like an undeserved amount – then obedience to the law and that punishment is maintained (Freeman, Liopsis, and David, 2006; Homel, 1988; Sherman, 1993). But if the punishment is deemed too excessive for the offense, then that obedience to the law is less likely to occur (Freeman, Liopsis, and David, 2006; Homel, 1988; Sherman, 1993). The second is, “the offender is poorly bonded to or alienated from the sanctioning agent or the community the agent represents,” meaning that the offender does not feel united with the community because of the sanctioning agent’s role in punishing the offender and therefore alienating him or her from his surroundings (Scheff and Retzinger, 1991; Sherman, 2006). This element is an extension of the social bonds that are explained in Hirschi’s Social Bond Theory (Hirschi, 1969), focusing on bonds to the community (Sherman, 1993).

The third element is, “the offender defines the sanction as stigmatizing and rejecting a person, not a lawbreaking act.” This means that the offender feels labeled by the offense that he or she committed – that he or she as a person is being demonized, not the act that was committed (Sherman, 2006). The fourth and final element necessary for defiance to occur is, “the offender denies or refuses to acknowledge the shame the sanction has actually caused him to suffer,” meaning that

the offender denies the shame associated with the offense and instead feels a sense of pride for what has occurred (Sherman, 1993; Sherman 2006). This element is an extension of the shaming principles that Braithwaite explains in Reintegrative Shaming theory (Braithwaite, 1989; Sherman 1993, Sherman 2006). In the reintegrative shaming approach, practitioners try to shame the act committed and try to bring the offender back into the community (Braithwaite, 1989; Freeman, Liopsis, and David, 2006). However, sometimes the offender refuses to acknowledge the shame involved with the offense – something that is critical to the Braithwaite proposed shaming plans (Freeman, Liopsis, and David, 2006). In order for defiant behaviors to occur, Sherman argues that all four of these elements must be in place (Sherman, 2006).

For the purposes of this study, elements of defiance theory were used to account for the experiences of female sex offenders who are required to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry based on the sexual offense they committed. Items derived from defiance theory were used as a dependent variable to support the variations in behavior. Just like with Reintegrative Shaming Theory, the variables derived from Defiance Theory were used as a dependent variable to support variations in the behavior caused by the time ratio variable. Defiance theory will be used to explain experiences with the Florida registry: Is it deemed unfair by those who are registered? Is it a device that alienates those who register? Does it label the sexual offenders as deviant? Is it unfair punishment? In addition, the study will determine whether the women feel shame for their offenses. Since the conviction, do the women feel alienated from their communities, families and friends? Because of their registry status, will people see them as anything other than a sex offender? Do the women feel ashamed

of their sex offenses and of their registry status? Defiance theory directs our attention to the potential for defiant attitudes involved with public registration and with the offense itself and will serve as a tool to show how backfiring the registry really can be.

General Strain Theory

Traditional anomie theories took a macro level approach to explaining crime. This approach was able to explain crime rates on a large group level; using anomie to explain the variation in criminal activities among neighborhoods, communities and countries. In traditional or classic strain theory, people commit crime as a result of stress or strain that is placed upon them (Kubrin et al., 2009). These strains can come from a variety of sources – economic deprivation or unstable family relationships are two examples. Most strains come from an inability to achieve legitimate goals through the proper channels (Agnew, 1985, Akers & Sellers, 2009). Robert Agnew's addition to anomie/strain theory instead proposed a new micro level version of strain theory that could explain variations across individuals (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009; Kubrin et al., 2009). His revisions stated that strain was a result of more than just economic deprivations (Agnew, 1985; Cullen and Wright, 1997; Kubrin et al., 2009). However, Agnew does state that monetary success and middle-class status may not be as important to adolescents as previously assumed (Agnew, 1985). Instead, those goals do not become important until the adolescent is older. So by this argument, there must be other sources of strain that cause juveniles to engage in criminal behavior at a young age.

The main focus of Agnew's General Strain Theory centers around three elements. The first, Failure to Achieve Positively Valued Goals refers in general to the stresses and strains that ultimately lead to criminal behavior. Specifically, this element

is broken down into three subtypes. The first subtype of failure proposes the traditional concept of strain as the “disjuncture between aspirations and expectations” (Agnew, 1985; Akers and Sellers, 2009: 199). This includes the inability to achieve an economic goal – such as a high paying career, the inability to pay off debts or to purchase high status items. However, Agnew argues that this element can extend to noneconomic strains as well (Kubrin et. al., 2009). The second type of failure rests with the disjuncture between expectations and actual achievements (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009). The third subtype comes from an individual’s perception of what is fair and the actual outcome. If something is perceived as unjust but reality differs from that perception, then criminal activity becomes more likely (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009).

The second element proposed in General Strain Theory, Removal of Positively Valued Stimuli refers to an affirmative aspect on an individual’s life that is removed, resulting in strain (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009; Kubrin et al., 2009). This could include the end of a romantic relationship, a death in the family, or school suspension (Akers & Sellers, 2009). The third and final element, Confrontation with Negative Stimuli, refers to experiencing negative actions that cause strain (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009, Kubrin et al., 2009). Negative stimuli could include threatening or harassing behaviors, physical or emotional abuse, and victimization (Agnew, 1985; Akers & Sellers, 2009; Kubrin et al., 2009). In experiencing strain as a result of any or all three elements proposed by Agnew, an individual may choose criminal behavior as an outlet in dealing with the strain. When an individual cannot escape the strain, anger is a common emotion. When bad events occur in an individual’s life, anger is the logical

response to those events (Kubrin et al., 2009). Criminal behavior becomes more likely when individuals becomes angry over the strain placed on them (Akers & Sellers, 2009). This anger is most often directed at the societal and legal systems but is not directed at oneself (Akers & Sellers, 2009; Bernard, 1990).

When individuals encounter strains in life, there are various ways that they can handle the strain. One way would be through healthy, productive coping mechanisms such as therapy, or support groups. The alternative would result in the individuals committing criminal or delinquent acts as a coping mechanism to deal with the strain (Agnew, 1985; 2001a; 2001b; 2006; Akers & Sellers, 2009). The anger, depression, guilt and frustration that is associated with strain results in an inability to cope with the situations they are involved in (Agnew, 2006a; 2006b; Akers & Sellers, 2009).

Research testing the elements of general strain theory concludes that delinquent acts serve as a coping mechanism to deal with strain (Brezina, 1996; Kubrin et al., 2009; Simons, Chen, Steward & Brody, 2003). Delinquent or criminal acts acting as a coping mechanism can result in many types of crime, including property or personal crime and violent crime.

For the purposes of this project, elements of Agnew's General Strain Theory were used an explanatory variable in accounting for the connection between the Florida Sex Offender Registry and the strains that registration causes on the offender. Just like the other two theories, variables derived from Strain Theory were used as a dependent variable to account for variations in the registrants' behaviors rather caused by the time ratio. The law in its original form, states the sex offenders have to mandatorily register based on the offense committed. However, the law does not provide any remedy to the

sex offenders who experience strains as a result of the mandatory registration. Such strains would include job loss and loss of residence – both of which would be examples of removal of positively removed stimuli. Physical and emotional abuse, threatening letter or phone calls and public ridicule also serve as additional strains placed on the sex offenders – these serve as examples of confrontation with negative stimuli. In general, mandatory registration may cause additional economic strains due to the job loss. There may be economic strains associated with restitution or with court fees that are also causing stress on the sex offender. Overall, Agnew's General Strain Theory will direct attention to how the sex offender registry might cause stress and strain to the registered sex offenders. It sensitizes us to difficulties faced by a registered sex offender.

From the previous studies, variables were drawn out to used as dependent variables. In the methodology portion of the paper, the logistics of the variables are explained, however elements from the theories were used to explain the variation in the participants' reactions to being on the registry. Instead of using the behavior to predict the theories, this study used elements from the theory to predict the behavior based on the time dimensionality aspect of the registry requirement. This is somewhat of a backward usage of the theories compared to traditional theory testing, however it is important to use them in this manner because time spent on the registry serves as the predictive variable for project.

It is important for this project to use all three of previously mentioned theories. Individually, each theory may be adequate to explain the variations in the behaviors, however for the amount of variation present in sexual offending, it would not do this

project justice to only use one of the three theories. In the original Tewksbury study, the survey instrument only briefly touched on some of the theoretical elements. Elements of reintegrative shaming theory, general strain and defiance theories are interwoven so theoretically it is logical to include all three theories. For example, one element of general strain theory addresses anger and the coping mechanisms used to deal with that anger. Since the instrument addresses this anger element, defiance theory must also be addressed since the four elements of defiance theory use emotions such as anger to justify why individuals feel that a sanction may be unjust. The emotional element involved with sex offender registration makes it necessary to use as much theoretical explanation as possible. What people are feeling and experiencing as a result of their registration status cannot be contained to only one portion of their lives. This status carries over into all avenues of life – personal relationships, work environments, living situations and even how the registrants interact with the general public. Since their lives are now so broadly influenced by the registration status, there are multiple theoretical rationales for how these individuals are feeling. Therefore, because the three theories are so interwoven, it is necessary to use all three to support the variation in offending behaviors and participant responses.

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Hypotheses

Based on the literature and previous research – specifically the 2004 Tewksbury study – four research hypotheses were developed. All four hypotheses were developed keeping the amount of time spent on the registry in mind as an independent variable. This was the independent variable that was used in the Tewksbury study. However, this independent variable was varied slightly from the one used in the Tewksbury study. The first hypothesis will address the associations between the hardships and adversity experienced and the requirement to register on the list. The second hypothesis will specifically address the association between the offenders' shame and being required to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry. The third hypothesis will address the association between the stresses and strains present in the registrants' lives and the mandatory registration requirement. The fourth hypothesis will address association between the level of defiance that the participants feel based on the four elements proposed in defiance theory and the requirement to register. It must be noted that these hypotheses address an association rather than a direct relationship between variables based on the theoretical ideas presented in the literature review. The project is not using the three theories (shame, strain and defiance theories) to predict the behaviors experienced by the female sex offenders. Instead it is using the theories to identify, understand and relate these experiences to the "career phase" of registrants. Because of this move away from traditional theory testing, the hypotheses can only at best examine an association between the behaviors and the theories, especially since the research is cross-sectional in design.

Harassing Behaviors and Negative Experiences

- (1) How many harassing behaviors and how much adversity will the participants experience in proportion to their time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?
- Hypothesis 1: Experiencing adversity and harassing behaviors as a result of mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the duration of registration increases.
- Independent Variable: Time Ratio; Dependent Variable: Number of times the participant experienced the harassing behaviors and negative experiences

Reintegrative Shame Theory

- (2) What level of shame will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?
- Hypothesis 2: Shame associated with mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the duration of registration increases.
- Independent Variable: Time Ratio; Dependent Variable: Amount of shame experienced by the participant

General Strain Theory

- (3) What levels of strain and stress will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?
- Hypothesis 3: Stress and strain associated with mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the duration of registration increases.
- Independent Variable: Time Ratio; Dependent Variable: Amount of strain experienced by the participant

Defiance Theory

- (4) What level of defiance will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?
- Hypothesis 4: Defiant attitudes will increase as the duration of mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry also increases.
- Independent Variable: Time Ratio; Dependent Variable: Amount of defiance felt by the participant

The shaming questions will look separately at the shame felt for being required to register and at the shame felt as a result of committing the sexual offense in question. Other shaming questions will look at feelings of ostracism/exile from the community and recognition from members of the community. The stress and strain questions will look at behaviors experienced as a result of being required. In other words, because the females are forced to register, they have experienced behaviors that they might not have encountered if they did not have to register. These behaviors make it difficult for the registered offender to live life in a normal manner. The questions asking about hardships and harassments will look at things that the female offenders may have encountered in life since the start of their mandatory registration. Questions will include job loss, denial of promotion, housing loss, rude treatment, public harassment, harassing phone calls and harassing letters, mail and notes.

Research Design

The purpose of this study is to examine how female sex offenders view the mandatory registration that comes with a conviction of a sexual offense. As stated earlier, this study is meant to be an extension of the 2004 study tested by Richard Tewksbury. That study used self-report responses from 40 female offenders in Kentucky and Indiana (out of a possible 227). Female offenders will again be used as the sample, but participants will come from the listing of female sex offenders in the state of Florida. As Tewksbury states in the article published about this study, little research has been conducted on female sex offenders and that achieving a large sample is difficult because so little of the total registered offenders are female (Tewksbury, 2004; Peluso & Putnam, 1996; Rosencrans, 1997). The goal of this study is to try to at least reach the sample size collected in Tewksbury's 2004 study, but

surveys submitted through the mail do not generally have high response rates.

Research has suggested that surveys administered through the mail have between a 9% and a 20% response rate (Collwell, L.H., Miller, H.A., Miller, R.S & Lyons, Jr., P.M, 2006). However, if a follow-up letter is sent out after the survey is mailed, the survey response rate increases to between 20 and 40% (Wyatt-Nichol & Franks, 2009). In the current research, a follow-up letter was sent out roughly one week after the survey was sent to the female offenders.

Based on the registration list that was provided by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the contact information of 983 female offenders was made available. After removing all of the females who lived out of state, who were currently incarcerated, who had absconded, were deported and who had been civilly committed as a result of their sex offender status, an eligible group of 569 women were left for participation. Within the group of 569, groups of offenders were created to keep track of the surveys. The survey was sent out in five waves to groups of offenders – four groups consisted of 114 randomly selected female sex offenders, but the fifth wave consists of 113 females. The waves were labeled A-E. Beginning at the start of the compiled sex offender list the first offender selected was assigned to group A. The next offender selected was number 10. The selection process continued this way – with every 10th offender selected until 114 females have been assigned to the first wave. After wave A was completed, the process continued, only the offenders were assigned to wave B. This process continued until every offender had been selected and assigned to one of the waves. Then based on the order they were selected, each offender was assigned a personal identification number. These numbers ranged from 1-114 for waves A-D and

1-113 for wave E. For example, the identification numbers would be assigned as A61 or C37. These offenders all had a current Florida address and were registered under the Florida Sex Offender Registry, regardless of whether the offense took place in the state. The eligible offenders were then sent a handwritten envelope addressed to them. The envelope contained a survey with a handwritten participant code written in red in the top right-hand corner, an initial letter inviting the woman to participate that was personally signed and a copy of the informed consent. After two weeks a second, handwritten addressed envelope was sent to the women, which contained a hand signed invitation to participate in the survey. There were 106 surveys returned out of the 569 surveys sent out, giving the study a response rate of 18.62%.

Research Sample

Participants chosen for this study came from the Florida Sex Offender Registration lists. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement provided the current list of female sex offenders who are currently living in the state, who at one time lived in the state, those who are currently incarcerated, who have absconded, and who have been deported. All of the participants on the Registry were eligible to participate in the study, provided that there was a current Florida address, so therefore the participants ranged across the various offenses committed – no one particular offense is being analyzed. There were some offenders that were only required to register 15 years (Tier I offenders), 25 years (Tier II offenders) and some that were required to register for life (Tier III offenders), according to the national guidelines established in the Adam Walsh Act of 2006 (Baron-Evans & Noonan, 2006; NCSL, 2008). However, depending on the time and the state in which the offense was committed, registration time requirements varied.

The sample may be questioned for generalizability issues to see if the sample collected really can represent all of the offenders that were eligible for the survey. Table 3-1 shows the housing information that was collected at the start of the project. This information shows that non-participants are living similar lives as the participants in terms of housing costs, socio-economic status and homeowner status. There are only slight differences found between the two groups. The results for those who participated in the project will be explained in the results section of the paper.

For the non-participating registrants the data shows the average price of housing is \$116,762 - which is lower than those registrants who chose to participate. This average also places them between the \$100,001 - \$150,000 price range and identifies them somewhere between the first and second classes (there are four total). For the non-participants, their average socio-economic status places them closer to the first class than to the second class (1.56, 1=Class One, 2=Class Two). Like the participating registrants, the non-participating registrants are not likely to own the homes that they are living in (0.093, 0=Not a homeowner, 1=Homeowner) but rather, ownership belongs to someone outside of the family or to someone who does not share the same last name as the non-registered participant.

Table 3-1. Housing Information for Non-Participants.

(n = 73)	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Coding Structure
Cost of Housing	\$116,762	\$12,000	\$294,000	
Price Range for Housing	2.84	\$0	\$300,000	
Socio-Economic Status Level	1.56	\$0	\$400,000	1 = Class One 3 = Class Three
Home Ownership	0.093	0	1	0 = No 1 = Yes

Coding for the average price range: 1 (\$0-\$50,000) to 13 (\$600,001-\$650,000)

Coding for the socio-economic status: 1 (\$0-\$100,000) to 4 (\$400,001-\$650,000)

Survey Design

The survey sent to all registered female sex offenders extends the Tewksbury survey used in the 2004 study on registered females in Kentucky and Indiana. Although it is a replication study, I have increased and expanded the instrument to widen the range of issues covered. The survey (Appendix A) has been adapted to fit the Florida offenders and to fit the new registration guidelines of the Adam Walsh Act of 2006. All questions ask about the offender's perceptions of the registration guidelines and their experiences while required to register. There are no questions asked specifically about the act committed but there will be questions asked about the demographics of the victim (if there was a direct, physical victim). Questions also address if there was a co-perpetrator; meaning was there someone else who helped these women commit their sexual offenses? If there was a co-perpetrator, who was it that helped commit the offense? What were the co-perpetrators demographics? There are questions asked about the number of people who are aware of the registered sex offender's status, recognition by the public and amount of contact with law enforcement. Questions also ask about the shame associated with being required to register, their perceptions of the sex offender registry itself and how they are treated in society as known sex offenders. There are questions asked about the harassing behaviors and hardships associated with being on the registry, such as loss of job, loss of living space, public harassment, assault and attack, and harassing behaviors through phone calls, mail and notes. There are also questions concerning levels of defiance felt as a result of outside treatment of the participants as sex offenders. Finally, demographic questions are asked about the sex offenders themselves – questions about age, race, marital status,

how many children the offenders have and whether or not these women have custody of their children.

As stated earlier, study participants were mailed the survey instrument – with sections replicated from the Tewksbury study and sections created specifically for the Florida female offenders. A four page survey, an informed consent and a postage-paid return envelope were sent in a survey packet to all female offenders listed on the Florida Sex Offender Registration list (Appendix A). Not all of the females on the compiled Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) sex offender list still live in Florida or even in the community. All of the participants are eligible to receive these survey packets, provided that they are living in Florida residences and are no longer incarcerated. However, even though there are addresses listed on the registry, there may be problems with response rates and mailing the surveys to the correct addresses. Despite the fact that the law requires registered sex offenders to continuously update their address information, it does mean that all of the sex offenders are currently living at the address provided. Fifty-nine letters returned to sender meaning that only 10.3% of the sample did not have a proper address listed.

In addition to the mail-out surveys, a second set of data was collected but was initiated by those participants who chose to make contact with me after the surveys were mailed out. Participants chose to call, email or write letters to me explaining their situations and the circumstances surrounding their convictions. I was not anticipating direct communication with the participants, but for those who chose to call I wrote notes during the phone calls and later transcribed the conversations. Email correspondence between myself and any participants was included verbatim into the compilation of

qualitative data. The same goes for any letters or notes that participants included within their returned surveys.

Protection of Human Subjects

This research was approved by the University of Florida's Institutional Review Board (Protocol # U-520-2010) (Appendix F). Within the mail out survey, an informed consent form was included and participants were instructed to read before participating, but were not instructed to return the informed consent (Appendix F). Also included in the survey packet was an initial letter that invited the participants to take part in the survey that was mailed to them (Appendix F). The informed consent summarized that participation in the study was completely voluntary and that nothing would happen to them if they chose not to participant. Also, it was expressed that nothing could be gained from participating. Participants were told that they could choose not to answer specific questions and that they were allowed to stop taking the survey before they finished if so desired. All answers would remain confidential to the extent provided by law, and that law enforcement and court officials would have no knowledge of the answers provided by the participants. After the survey was returned, the participant's identity would be destroyed therefore eliminating any possible link between the answers provided and a specific participant.

Participants were told of the minor risk involved in the study concerning those who were currently on probation when the study was conducted. This risk involved the potential for an individual's probation status to be revealed. To resolve this risk those who were currently on probation were asked not to participate. As stated earlier, the identity of all participants would be destroyed so there would be no way to identify those who were currently on probation at the time. By completing the survey and returning it

in the pre-paid envelope, participants provided their informed consent for research participation.

Official Records

Even though the Florida Department of Law Enforcement provided the sexual offenses that are listed on the sex offender registry, it was necessary to find the official records for all of the participants. Therefore, official records were found for the 106 participants who returned surveys. One hundred four sexual offenders who did not return surveys were randomly chosen to be a comparison group. These official records have all of the offenses for which a conviction was made or for which a citation was issued, meaning that this includes traffic violations as well. The purpose of obtaining the official records was to compare participants against non-participants to see how similar the two groups are in the sexual offenses committed. Are the participating sexual offenders more likely to respond to the survey because they have committed less serious offenses? Are the non-participants not returning surveys because they feel their offenses are too severe to be researched? What are the differences between the participants and the non-participants?

The official records were coded into categories of offenses ranging from sexual offenses to traffic offenses. In total there are twelve categories of offenses - the twelfth category is called "other offenses", meaning that everything that could not fit within the other eleven categories is featured within the other category. These offenses include obstruction of justice, resisting arrest, becoming a fugitive from justice and fleeing from the police. There were 68 criminal histories found for the non-participating registered sex offenders and 98 of the 106 participant criminal histories were also found. A full coding list is included in the appendix of the paper.

Operationalization

The study proposal attempts to examine several relationships, which will be explained through the statistical models that will be explained in detail later. The following will explain how the measures will be operationalized.

Dependent Variables

The following measures will be used as quantitative dependent variables in this study.

Societal ramifications

Originally called “attitudinal measures” by Tewksbury (2004), the following measures represent the Societal Ramifications that are a result of the public knowing about the sex offender status of the participants. The behavior ramifications were operationalized by asking ten questions: 1) “How many times have you lost a job?”, 2) “How many times have you been denied a promotion at work?”, 3) “How many times have you lost (or been denied) a place to live?”, 4) “How many times have you been treated rudely in a public place?”, 5) “How many times have you been asked to leave a business or restaurant?”, 6) “How many times have you lost a friend because of your registration status?”, 7) “How many times have you been harassed, in person?”, 8) “How many times have you been assaulted or attacked?”, 9) “How many times have you received harassing or threatening telephone calls?”, 10) “How many times have you received harassing or threatening mail, flyers or notes?” Response options provided ranges from “0” to “4+” times, meaning that the behavior happened zero times all the way to more than four times. These measures were taken from the Tewksbury study conducted in 2004. In the replication aspect of the study, these measures were asked as one of the several dependent variables. These items examine what harassing

behaviors that sexual offenders may be encountering due to their publicly known statuses as sexual offenders. These ramifications are a secondary result of the registration status. Because they were not intended consequences of the sexual offender registration laws, it is essential to determine how often registered sex offenders are experiencing harassing behaviors. Part of the study's purpose is to understand the experiences of female sexual offenders. Therefore, I will explore whether these ramifications can be scaled or indexed to best analyze the data.

Perception of shame

Participant's perception of shame was operationalized by asking the following questions: 1) "I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry." (question #9, Tewksbury, 2004), 2) "I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense." (question #30, original to the study), 3) "I am less likely to leave the house because I am afraid that someone might recognize me as a sex offender." (question #31, original to the study), 4) "I avoid certain public places because I am afraid of being recognized as a sex offender." (question #32, original to the study). All four questions were organized in the same way. They were measured on a scale from 1-10, with 1 listed as "Disagree Completely", 5 listed as "Unsure/Undecided" and 10 listed as "Agree Completely." These items measuring shame among the female sex offenders will serve as another set of dependent variables to be tested against the independent variable of length of time spent of the registry. Shame is a salient variable for this study because there is a good chance that a participant may face ridicule from society due to the stigma associated with sex offenses. The duality of the shaming variable – shame for the offense and shame for the registration – allows for the offenders to express their feelings for the registry and for the offense separately. This duality is important since

many of the participants express that they were not responsible for the sexual offense that they were convicted of.

Perceptions of stress and strain

Participants' perceptions of strain and stress are operationalized through the following questions: 1) "Do you feel that being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has caused unnecessary stress in your life?" (question #50, original to the study), 2) "Because of this stress, do you feel that you act out in an unhealthy way?" (question #51, original to the study), 3) "Because of this stress, do you consume alcohol more than you did in the past?" (question #52, original to the study), 4) "Because of this stress, do you use any illegal substances more than you did in the past?" (question #53, original to the study), 5) "Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt yourself?" (question #54, original to the study), 6) "Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt someone else?" (question #55, original to the study). All of these questions are measured through YES and NO answers. The aspect of the dependent variables will address stress and strain associated with registration in relation to the amount of time spent on the sex offender registry. This aspect of the study was not included in the 2004 Tewksbury study, but the questions asked have been developed from the tenants of Agnew's General Strain Theory. Because the female sex offenders are required to register, a certain amount of strain may result. The registry is made available to the public which implies that at any time there could be an attack or retaliation against the sexual offender. Even if there are no retaliations, simply the knowledge that the entirety of the community knows your status as a sexual offender can place a large amount of strain on an individual. This strain will be tested asking about coping mechanisms and stress in daily life as described in the previously listed questions. The coping

mechanisms are important to research because some of them are illegal behaviors and some of them may be violent in nature. It is essential that these behaviors be researched so we have a better understanding about what avenues sex offenders turn to when they experience these strains.

Defiance theory

The four elements of defiance theory were operationalized through the following questions. The first element, “the offender defines a criminal sanction as unfair,” (Sherman, 2006) is operationalized through three questions: 1) “I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry” (question # 13, Tewksbury, 2004), 2) “I believe that having my picture on the Florida Sex Offender Registry is going too far” (question # 14, Tewksbury, 2004), 3) “I feel that the Florida Sex Offender Registry has unfairly characterized me as a sex offender” (question # 20, Tewksbury, 2004). These three questions were measured on a scale from 1-10, with 1 listed as “Disagree Completely”, 5 listed as “Unsure/Undecided” and 10 listed as “Agree Completely.” The higher the answered score, the more the participant feels that she is being unfairly punished because of the sex offense committed.

The second element, “the offender is poorly bonded to or alienated from the sanctioning agent or the community the agent represents,” (Sherman, 2006) is operationalized through three questions: 1) “People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry” (question #12, Tewksbury, 2004), 2) “I feel that since I have registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I have been ostracized from my community” (question # 25, original to the study), 3) “I no longer feel a part of my community because I am required to register as a sexual offender” (question #27, original to the study). These three questions were measured

on a scale from 1-10, with 1 listed as “Disagree Completely”, 5 listed as “Unsure/Undecided” and 10 listed as “Agree Completely.” The higher the score answered, the more isolated and alienated the participant feels from her community.

The third element, “the offender defines the sanction as stigmatizing and rejecting a person, not a lawbreaking act” (Sherman, 2006), is operationalized through three questions: 1) “Because I am registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I will never be seen as anything other than a sexual offender” (question # 22, original to the study), 2) “People do not treat me with respect once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender” (question # 28, original to the study), 3) “I feel that community members do not treat me fairly once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender” (question #29, original to the study). These three questions were measured on a scale from 1-10, with 1 listed as “Disagree Completely”, 5 listed as “Unsure/Undecided” and 10 listed as “Agree Completely.” The higher the score answered, the more the participant feels in agreement with the idea that she as a person is being stigmatized as a sex offender – not that the sex offender itself is being demonized.

The fourth and final element, “the offender denies or refuses to acknowledge the shame the sanction has actually caused him to suffer” (Sherman, 2006), is operationalized through two questions: 1) “I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry”, (question # 9, Tewksbury, 2004), 2) “I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense” (question # 30, original to the study). These two questions were measured on a scale from 1-10, with 1 listed as “Disagree Completely”, 5 listed as “Unsure/Undecided” and 10 listed as “Agree Completely.” The lower the score

answered, the less accepting the participant is of the shame that was experienced as a result of the sexual offense committed. To measure defiance theory, all four elements must be examined independently because the theory states that all four elements must be present in order for the participant to feel truly defiant. The individual elements are also important to analyze because even though there may not be identification with the complete defiance theory, there may be feelings associated with some of the elements. Feeling that the registration is an unfair sanction, that the registrant is alienated from society and that the offender (not the offense) is being stigmatized may occur if the sex offender registry has a stigma attached to it and it effectively creates a barrier between the offender and the rest of society. The final element, not acknowledging the shame, might not have as much support as the other three since in the prior sections it is predicted that the participants will experience shame. Despite the fact that shame may not have support in the defiance theory variables, the separate elements are still important to look at for this study.

Independent variable: duration spent on the sex offender registry

The following measure will be used as a quantitative independent variable in the present study.

Duration of time spent on the sex offender registry will be operationalized through two questions: 1) “When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?” (question #1, Tewksbury, 2004), 2) “How long are you required to register?” (question #2, Tewksbury, 2004, adapted to the current study). The first question is measured in an open ended response, since everyone’s starting date differs. The second question is measured through three answers – fifteen years, twenty-five years or lifetime registration. These answers were taken from the national registry requirements enacted

under the 2006 Adam Walsh Act (NCSL, 2008). However, as responses were given for this question it was discovered that the participants were required to register for various amounts of time. Some participants were sentenced outside the state of Florida, where registration requirements are different. Therefore, the question of “How long are you required to register?” (question # 2) was measured as an open ended response, but still keeps the fifteen, twenty-five years or lifetime requirements as response options. The independent variable used is explained in the results section, however the two questions described above will be combined to create a time ratio variable that will be used to examine if there is a peak time when the behaviors are experienced most often.

Because of this relationship, the longer a sex offender has been registered it is hypothesized that the amount of harassment and ridicule experienced should increase accordingly. Levels of shame and levels of stress and strain are also hypothesized to increase as the amount of time on the registry also increases. The reasons behind using the time requirement as the independent variable were discussed in the literature review of the paper. Again the time requirement is used to predict the behaviors of the registrants that are associated with Reintegrative Shame, Strain and Defiance Theory. The time requirement is not trying to predict the theories themselves, just the behaviors of the participants. The theories in turn are used to identify the behaviors that should be relevant.

Demographic and Control Variables

Questions were asked about the demographic characteristics of the participants. These demographic variables served as the control variables. Age, race, marital status and number of children were included in the analysis. Age was measured a continuous variable and the information was obtained from the survey. The races of the

participants were provided as public record by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and were coded as (0) black and (1) white. There is no information provided about ethnicity. Marital status was measured in the survey by asking “What is your relationship status?” with response options of (1) married, (2) single, (3) unmarried but living with a partner, (4) dating, (5) divorced, (6) widow.

Initially the crime that was used for registration was going to be used as a control, but there was no way to determine which crimes the registrant was initially convicted of. Many of the registrants had multiple offenses. It would be possible to categorize these offenses but even if that was done the issue of the tier system comes into play. Based on the information provided by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the official records that were researched on each participant, it is impossible to place each participant within the proper tier. Therefore, the offender status (offender or predator) could be used as a control variable. Offender was coded as (1) and predator was coded as (0).

Qualitative Variables

This study began solely as a quantitative study using a mail-out survey to collect data from the female sex offender registered in the state of Florida. However, besides the surveys, I received a useful amount of qualitative data that the sex offenders voluntarily provided. Therefore, since I was not anticipating the collection of qualitative data, my study has taken on a new avenue to explore. Not much has been done with qualitative data collection with female sexual offenders. Therefore, the study has taken on an exploratory element. There was no set method to how the qualitative data were collected, however themes were developed after the data were collected. Because I did not set out to collect qualitative data, I have looked for themes in the data that can be

tied into the theoretical constructs developed in the quantitative survey. For example, are there any harassing behaviors that the participant reports? Does the participant engage in substance abuse as a coping mechanism in dealing with strain? Does the participant feel that the required registration is too harsh a punishment after their initial sentence?

Qualitative data have been collected through participant emails, phone calls and letters/notes that were included in the returned surveys. A total of 38 independent qualitative data pieces that can be used for analysis. These items provide a more in-depth perspective about the issues researched in the survey, specifically perceptions of the registry, personal experiences and harassing behaviors. As the women would call or email me, I would let them speak and only ask questions to keep the conversation moving. The information is stored without identifiers. There is no set structure to the conversations, nor do the women answer questions I designed for them to answer. A content analysis was conducted to analyze these participant conversations. Two research assistants and I went through the qualitative passages separately to look for the themes that were common throughout the passages. Based on the three-person examination, the following themes were developed to find commonalities in the data. Following each quantitative model a subsequent qualitative discussion is offered to keep the data organized. Direct quotations were used to illustrate the themes that the women volunteered. Table 3-2 shows the questions and themes that were developed.

Data Analysis Plan

The research conducted for this study has both quantitative and qualitative elements. The quantitative element uses the mail-out survey responses for data purposes. The qualitative element uses phone calls and emails from the female sex

Table 3-2. Common Themes Developed From Qualitative Data

1. What is the registry listed offense?	See offense coding sheet in Appendix B
2. Does the participant describe the offense committed?	(0) NO (1) YES
3. Are the words – “framed”, “set-up”, “falsely accused”, “I didn’t do it”, “not guilty”, etc... present in the passage?	(0) NO (1) YES
4. Is there mention of a co-perpetrator?	(0) NO (1) YES
5. Is there mention of a custody battle?	(0) NO (1) YES
6. Is there mention of a divorce?	(0) NO (1) YES
7. Is there mention of abuse history against the participant (participant is a victim)?	(0) NO (1) YES
8. Is there mention of the sexual activity being consensual with the victim?	(0) NO (1) YES
9. Is there mention of a student/teacher relationship?	(0) NO (1) YES
10. Is there mention of the victim’s current age?	(0) NO (1) YES
11. Is there mention of the victim’s age at the time of the offense?	(0) NO (1) YES
12. Does the participant mention her own children?	(0) NO (1) YES
13. Does the participant have custody of her children?	(0) NO (1) YES
14. Does the participant mention anything about their views of the registry?	(0) NO (1) YES
15. Does the participant agree with the registry?	(0) NO (1) YES
16. Does the participant adamantly oppose the registry?	(0) NO (1) YES
17. Does the participant offer suggestions for modifying the registry?	(0) NO (1) YES
18. Is there mention of harassing behaviors (signs, fliers, etc...)?	(0) NO (1) YES
19. Does the participant mention if her employer knows about her sex offender status?	(0) NO (1) YES
20. Is there mention of employment?	(0) NO (1) YES
21. Is there mention of mandatory group therapy sessions?	(0) NO (1) YES

Table 3-2. Continued

22. Does the participant know any other sex offenders?	(0) NO (1) YES
23. Does the participant mention Halloween at all?	(0) NO (1) YES
24. Did the offense take place in a state other than Florida?	(0) NO (1) YES
25. Does the participant mention having to move repeatedly?	(0) NO (1) YES
26. Is the participant in the process or intending to appeal?	(0) NO (1) YES
27. Did the participant take a plea bargain?	(0) NO (1) YES
28. Does the participant have any prior arrests or conviction?	(0) NO (1) YES
29. Is there a differentiation made between a high and low risk offender?	(0) NO (1) YES
30. Is there presence of a psychiatric illness in the woman?	(0) NO (1) YES
31. Has media attention interfered with her life?	(0) NO (1) YES
32. Does the participant mention engaging in illegal drug use?	(0) NO (1) YES
33. Does the participant feel the registration requirement is too severe?	(0) NO (1) YES
34. Does the participant feel ashamed of being on the registry?	(0) NO (1) YES
35. Does the participant mention that she tries to hide her sex offender status from people?	(0) NO (1) YES
36. Does the participant mention trying to hurt herself?	(0) NO (1) YES
37. Does the participant mention any alienation from family members or friends?	(0) NO (1) YES

offenders. Descriptive statistics are also performed to analyze the female sex offenders' individual characteristics. To analyze the quantitative surveys, I use OLS regression, since I only have one independent variable, as identified in the hypotheses – duration of time spent on the registry. The demographic variables of age, race, marital status and number of children are used as the controlling variables in the OLS regression. There are multiple dependent variables within the study, so four models

have been developed in order to test each dependent variable against the independent variable. The first model (Table 3-3) tests the relationship between the registration time requirements against the Societal Ramifications that result from the participants known status as a sexual offender. The amount of time spent on the registry is used to predict variations in the Societal Ramifications that the participants face (ten items, loss of a job, denial of promotion, loss/denial of a place to live, harassment in public, assault or attack and harassing behaviors through the use of telephone calls, mail, flyers and notes). The items are scaled or indexed. The model is listed at the end of Chapter 3.

The second model (Table 3-4) will be used to predict the relationship between the required registration time and the amount of shame felt by participants. The questions encompass feeling shame for being on the registry and for committing the offense. These questions are scaled. Also included are fears about being recognized as a sexual offender in public places. The model is listed at the end of Chapter 3.

The third model (Table 3-5) uses the required time for registration to predict the amount of strain that will be present in a sexual offender's life. Questions are asked to determine if there is strain in a person's life. Then questions cover the coping mechanisms that an individual may use to deal with the strain such as drug use, alcohol use and violent actions. The items were scaled, so OLS regression will be used. The model is listed at the end of Chapter 3.

The fourth and final model (Table 3-6) uses the registration time requirement to predict defiant behaviors and attitudes. Using defiance theory as the theoretical basis, four types of questions were asked: perceived unfair sanctions, poor bonds or alienation to the community, stigmatization of the offender but not the offense and the participant's

refusal to acknowledge shame. These items were scaled or indexed. The model is listed at the end of Chapter 3.

To analyze the phone calls and emails, a content analysis of 38 data pieces was conducted using information that the women have provided me with. Some of the women chose to email me the stories surrounding their conviction and the events that took place post-conviction. These emails were edited to make sure all the information provided remained confidential. None of the facts were changed or edited beyond the steps taken to ensure confidentiality of the participants. Their statements were taken verbatim from their emails, again while protecting for confidentiality. Other women chose to talk to me directly on the phone. For those women, I wrote notes as I went along and directly after the conversation, I wrote up a transcript of the phone conversations. Most everything is written based on the notes that were taken during the conversations. The quotations came directly from the participant but were included into the transcript by myself.

Table 3-3. Model 1: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Societal Ramifications

Research Question	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analytic Plan
How many harassing behaviors and how much adversity will the participants experience in proportion to their time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?	<p>Time spent on the registry:</p> <p>“When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Response <p>“How long are you required to register?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15 years - 25 years - Lifetime - Open Response <p>Time will be measured in a ratio of time spent on the registry to time required to register.</p>	<p>Societal Ramifications:</p> <p>(1) “How many times have you lost a job?”</p> <p>(2) “How many times have you been denied a promotion at work?”</p> <p>(3) “How many times have you lost (or been denied) a place to live?”</p> <p>(4) “How many times have you been treated rudely in a public place?”</p> <p>(5) “How many times have you been asked to leave a business or restaurant?”</p> <p>(6) “How many times have you lost a friend because of your registration status?”</p> <p>(7) “How many times have you been harassed, in person?”</p> <p>(8) “How many times have you been assaulted or attacked?”</p> <p>(9) “How many times have you received harassing or threatening telephone calls?”</p> <p>(10) “How many times have you received harassing or threatening mail, flyers or notes?”</p> <p>Response Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 times - 1 time - 2 times - 3 times - 4+ times 	- OLS Regression
Qualitative Variables			
Is there mention of harassing behaviors?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant mention having to move repeatedly?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant mention anything about their views of the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant agree with the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant adamantly oppose the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant offer suggestions for modifying the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES

Table 3-4. Model 2: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Shame

Research Question	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analytic Plan
What level of shame will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?	<p>Time spent on the registry:</p> <p>“When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Response <p>“How long are you required to register?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15 years - 25 years - Lifetime - Open Response <p>Time will be measured in a ratio of time spent on the registry to time required to register.</p>	<p>Perceptions of Shame:</p> <p>(1) “I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.”</p> <p>(2) “I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense.”</p> <p>(3) “I am less likely to leave the house because I am afraid that someone might recognize me as a sex offender.”</p> <p>(4) “I avoid certain public places because I am afraid of being recognized as a sex offender.”</p> <p>All four questions were measured on a 1-10 scale.</p> <p>(1) “Disagree Completely”</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>(3)</p> <p>(4)</p> <p>(5) “Unsure/Undecided”</p> <p>(6)</p> <p>(7)</p> <p>(8)</p> <p>(9)</p> <p>(10) “Agree Completely”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale the dependent variables. - OLS Regression
Qualitative Variables			
Does the participant feel ashamed of being on the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant mention that she tries to hide her sex offender status from people?			(0) NO, (1) YES

Table 3-5. Model 3: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Strain

Research Question	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analytic Plan
What level of strain and stress will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?	<p>Time spent on the registry:</p> <p>“When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Response <p>“How long are you required to register?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15 years - 25 years - Lifetime - Open Response <p>Time will be measured in a ratio of time spent on the registry to time required to register.</p>	<p>Perceptions of Strain:</p> <p>(1) “Do you feel that being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has caused unnecessary stress in your life?”</p> <p>(2) “Because of this stress, do you feel that you act out in an unhealthy way?”</p> <p>(3) “Because of this stress, do you consume alcohol more than you did in the past?”</p> <p>(4) “Because of this stress, do you use any illegal substances more than you did in the past?”</p> <p>(5) “Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt yourself?”</p> <p>(6) “Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt someone else?”</p> <p>All six questions were measured using yes/no answers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (0) NO - (1) YES 	- OLS Regression
Qualitative Variables			
Does the participant mention engaging in illegal drug use?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant mention trying to hurt herself?			(0) NO, (1) YES

Table 3-6. Model 4: Registration Time Requirement Predicting Defiant Behaviors

Research Question	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Analytic Plan
What level of defiance registry will participants feel in relation to the amount of time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?	Time spent on the Florida Sex Offender Registry? - Open Response "How long are you required to register?" - 15 years - 25 years - Lifetime - Open Response Time will be measured in a ratio of time spent on the registry to time required to register.	Defiance Theory: Unfair Sanctions: (1) "I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry" (2) "I believe that having my picture on the Florida Sex Offender Registry is going too far" (3) "I feel that the Florida Sex Offender Registry has unfairly characterized me as a sex offender" Poor bonds/alienation: (1) "People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry" (2) "I feel that since I have registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I have been ostracized from my community" (3) "I no longer feel a part of my community because I am required to register as a sexual offender" Stigmatizing of the offender, not the offense: (1) "Because I am registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I will never be seen as anything other than a sexual offender" (2) "People do not treat me with respect once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender" (3) "I feel that community members do not treat me fairly once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender" Refusal to Acknowledge Shame: (1) I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry" (2) "I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense" All eleven questions were measured on a 1-10 scale. (1) "Disagree Completely" (2) (3) (4) (5) "Unsure/Undecided" (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) "Agree Completely"	- Scale the dependent variables. - OLS Regression
Qualitative Variables			
Does the participant mention any alienation from family members or friends?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant feel the registration requirement is too severe?			(0) NO, (1) YES
Does the participant feel ashamed to be on the registry?			(0) NO, (1) YES

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The quantitative and qualitative data collected from the mail-out survey and from the voluntary phone calls, letters and notes were analyzed according the data analysis plan described in Chapter 3. The following sections will detail the four proposed analytical models and will discuss the findings derived from the data.

Participant Demographics

As previously discussed, 106 completed surveys were returned. The following tables illustrate the demographic features of those participants who returned surveys. In Table 4-1, the participant demographics show that over 95% of the participants are classified as sexual offenders rather than sexual predators. The sample of participants was predominately white (n = 98, 92.5%) and had a minor for a victim (n = 92, 86.8%). The participants also were married (n = 36, 34.0%), were unmarried but living with a partner (n = 19, 17.9%) or were divorced (n = 22, 20.8%). Also, the majority of the participants had children (n = 89, 84.0%) and were between the ages of 31-40 (n = 31, 29.3%) and 41-50 (n = 38, 35.8%). For the accomplice information, 58 participants (54.7%) stated that they committed the offense alone but 48 (45.3%) stated that they committed the offense with someone else. Of those 48 participants who did not commit the offense alone, everyone identified that their co-accomplice was male but the relationship to that male differed across participants. 17 participants (35.4%) identified their co-accomplice as a current or former spouse/partner, 6 participants (12.5%) identified their co-accomplice as a relative, 10 participants (20.8%) identified their co-accomplice as a friend and finally 15 participants (31.3%) identified their co-accomplice

as someone who was not a spouse/partner, relative or friend but rather someone who falls into the “Other” category.

Table 4-1. Participant Demographics: Offender Status, Race, Age, Marital Status (S) and Number of Children

Variable and Coding in Parentheses	Mean (n=106)	St. Deviation	Frequency (n=106), Percentages in Parentheses	
Status - Predator (0)			n = 5	(4.7%)
Status - Offender (1)	0.95	0.213	n = 101	(95.3%)
Race - Black (0)			n = 8	(7.5%)
Race - White (1)	0.92	0.265	n = 98	(92.5%)
Age: 20 - 30 (1)			n = 18	(17.0%)
Age: 31 - 40 (2)	2.61	1.109	n = 31	(29.3%)
Age: 41 - 50 (3)			n = 38	(35.8%)
Age: 51 - 60 (4)			n = 13	(12.3%)
Age: 61 - 70 (5)			n = 5	(4.7%)
Age: 71 - 80 (6)			n = 1	(0.9%)
Minor Victim - No (0)			n = 14	(13.2%)
Minor Victim - Yes (1)	0.87	0.340	n = 92	(86.8%)
MS: Married (1)			n = 36	(34.0%)
MS: Single (2)			n = 14	(13.2%)
MS: Unmarried but living with a partner (3)	3.24	4.646	n = 19	(17.9%)
MS: Dating (4)			n = 5	(4.7%)
MS: Divorced (5)			n = 22	(20.8%)
MS: Widowed (6)			n = 3	(2.8%)
MS: Other (7)			n = 5	(4.7%)
Children - No (1)			n = 16	(15.1%)
Children - Yes (0)	0.17	0.448	n = 89	(84.0%)
Commit the offense alone – Yes (0)			n = 58	(54.7%)
Commit the offense alone – No (1)	0.32	0.468	n = 48	(45.3%)
Gender of the co-accomplice	All answered male		n = 48	(100%)
Relationship to the co-accomplice – Spouse/Partner (1)			n = 17	(35.4%)
Relationship to the co-accomplice – Relative (2)			n = 6	(12.5%)
Relationship to the co-accomplice – Friend (3)			n = 10	(20.8%)
Relationship to the co-accomplice – Other (4)			n = 15	(31.3%)

Table 4-2 shows the offenses that are listed under the participants’ registry entries. However, these offenses are listed as public information on the Florida Sex

Offender Registry. The FDLE information data base listed 87 separate offenses. Of the 87 possible offenses, 32 offenses were committed by those who participated in the study. Of these 32 offenses, some highlighted offenses include failure to register with law enforcement (n = 9, 8.5%), lewd and lascivious battery against a victim under the age of 16 (n = 9, 8.5%), lewdly fondle on a person or in the presence of a person under 16 (n = 27, 25.5%), sexual activity with a minor (n = 9, 8.5%) and sexual activity with a person between the ages of 16-17 (n = 8, 7.5%).

Table 4-2. Participant Demographics: Sexual Offenses as Listed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry

Offense	Frequency
Sex Offense Against a child	n = 3 (2.8%)
Sexual Battery, minor under 16	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Battery, 12 or older, mental defects	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Battery, 12 or younger	n = 3 (2.8%)
Sexual Battery, 12 or younger, with harm	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Battery, injury to sexual organs, 12 or younger	n = 2 (1.9%)
Sexual Battery, no harm	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Battery, coercion by an adult	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Battery	n = 1 (0.9%)
Kidnapping	n = 1 (0.9%)
Failure to Register	n = 9 (8.5%)
Sexual Assault	n = 1 (0.9%)
Felonious Sexual Assault, age difference of 3 years	n = 1 (0.9%)
Lewd and Lascivious, minor less than 16	n = 3 (2.8%)
Lewd and Lascivious battery, victim 12-15	n = 9 (8.5%)
Lewd and Lascivious battery, victim under 16	n = 1 (0.9%)
Lewd and Lascivious molestation, victim 12-15	n = 3 (2.8%)
Lewdly fondle, under 16	n = 27 (25.5%)
Aggravated child molestation	n = 1 (0.9%)
Aggravated sexual assault, child	n = 1 (0.9%)
Criminal Sexual Conduct	n = 3 (2.8%)
Intentionally masturbating, lewd and lascivious, person under 16	n = 1 (0.9%)
Rape	n = 1 (0.9%)
Sexual Activity, with a minor	n = 9 (8.5%)
Sexual Activity, minor older than 15	n = 2 (1.9%)
Sexual Activity, 16-17	n = 8 (7.5%)
Unlawful sexual acts, minors	n = 3 (2.8%)
Obscene materials, minors	n = 2 (1.9%)
Possession child pornography	n = 2 (1.9%)
Sexual Exploitation, child pornography	n = 1 (0.9%)
Possession of representation of sexual conduct, child	n = 2 (1.9%)
Use of the internet for sex, child	n = 1 (0.9%)

Table 4-3 shows demographic results for the data found regarding the addresses that the surveys were sent to for both participants and those who did not return surveys; non-participants. These results showed that the average price of the home that the participants reside in is \$133,901. This average places them within the \$100,001 - \$150,000 average price range and also identifies them as somewhere between the first and second classes - however, they are more closely identified with the second class socio-economic status than they are with first class socio-economic status (1.71). Finally, the participants are not very likely to own their own homes (0.027) and that ownership belongs to someone outside the family or to someone who does not share the same last name as the registered participant. The non-participant address information is listed in Chapter 3. As a refresher, the differences between the two groups are minimal. This data shows that the participants are representative of the eligible sample

Table 4-3. Frequency Data for Addresses of Participants

(n = 65)	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Coding Structure
Cost of Housing	\$133,7901	\$21,240	\$558,000	
Price Range for Housing	3.18	\$100,001	\$150,000	
Socio-Economic Status Level	1.72	\$0	\$250,000	1 = Class One 2 = Class Two
Home Ownership	0.027	0	1	0 = No 1 = Yes

Coding for the average price range: 1 (\$0-\$50,000) to 13 (\$600,001-\$650,000)

Coding for the socio-economic status: 1 (\$0-\$100,000) to 4 (\$400,001-\$650,000)

**There are missing cases because of an inability to find the needed information about the homes of registered sex offenders.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Based on the hypotheses developed in the methodology section of the project, the following sets of data analysis were conducted. These analyses were completed based on the models described at the end Chapter 3. Each of the quantitative models uses a registration time requirement ratio as the independent variable. To create this

ratio, the amount of time already spent on the registry was calculated. For example, if a participant was first required to register in 1995, she would have spent 15 years on the registry as of 2010. This amount of time was then divided by the amount of time that a participant would be required to spend on the registry. The following formula shows exactly how the time ratio was created.

$$\text{Time Requirement Ratio} = \frac{\text{Amount of time spent on the registry as of 2010}}{\text{Time required to register on the FSOR}}$$

This ratio was created to see if there was a peak time when the hypothesized behaviors would be at their highest. Originally it was thought to only use the amount of time spent on the registry. However, using this time variable as the independent variable did not produce any statistically significant results for the analyzed models. More discussion about the use of the independent variable will be included in the results and discussion section. For the purposes of this paper and for the data analysis, the time ratio will be used as the independent variable.

The majority of women have lifetime registration requirements (n = 96, 90.6%), which was coded as 99 years which would decrease the ratio's value compared with someone who was required to register for only fifteen or twenty years. All ratios were between 0 and 1, meaning that for each participant a percentage of time has already been served - for example, 0.38 means that 38% of a participant's twenty-five year required registration has been completed. This means that as the ratio increases, then the participant has been on the registry for a longer proportion of time to be served.

Table 4-4 shows that there is a large amount of participants required to register for life. This requirement was assigned the code number of 99 to keep consistent with the

other code assignments, which represent the number of years required to register. The number 99 was chosen because of the length of time associated with the term lifetime. More than likely - based on the ages of the registrants - most of the participants will not live past a 99-year lifetime registration, hence the reason for assigning the number to the lifetime registration. The large amount of participants that are required to register for life skews the registration requirement. Therefore, the time ratio will also be skewed. Because of this bias, the following models were also run using only the amount of time that has already been served on the registry as an independent variable. Unfortunately, that analysis did not improve the results any, so the time ratio remains as the independent variable for the quantitative models. One other possible solution to correct the skewed distribution of the time ratio would be to create an alternative equation that takes the lifespan on the offender into account. This alternate equation was not used for the data analysis in this project, however the equation is explained in more detail in the future research portion of this paper. Table 4-5 shows the distribution of the time ratios based on amount of time required to register.

Table 4-4. Distribution of Registration Time Requirements

Amount of Time Required to Register	Frequency	
Five Years	n = 1	(0.9%)
Ten Years	n = 1	(0.9%)
Fifteen Years	n = 2	(1.9%)
Twenty Years	n = 1	(0.9%)
Twenty Years	n = 5	(4.75%)
Lifetime Registration	n = 99	(90.6%)

Hypothesis Testing and Qualitative Findings

The following tables show quantitative and qualitative data analysis conducted based on the models explained in the project proposal. Before each model is

explained, a descriptive table will be presented to show the distribution of the answers provided by participants. Each dependent variable is comprised of several questions that have been scaled together. The descriptive tables show the distribution of answers provided for each individual question.

Table 4-5. Distribution of Time Requirement Ratios

Amount of Time Required to Register	Time Ratio	Frequency	
Five Years	0.20	n = 1	(0.9%)
Ten Years	0.60	n = 1	(0.9%)
Fifteen Years	0.40	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.67	n = 1	(0.9%)
Twenty Years	0.25	n = 1	(0.9%)
Twenty Five Years	0.24	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.28	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.49	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.52	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.54	n = 1	(0.9%)
Lifetime Registration	0.01	n = 3	(2.8%)
	0.02	n = 13	(12.3%)
	0.03	n = 5	(4.7%)
	0.04	n = 6	(5.7%)
	0.05	n = 8	(7.5%)
	0.06	n = 9	(8.5%)
	0.07	n = 7	(6.6%)
	0.08	n = 4	(3.8%)
	0.09	n = 5	(4.7%)
	0.10	n = 8	(7.5%)
	0.11	n = 5	(4.7%)
	0.12	n = 2	(1.9%)
	0.13	n = 2	(1.9%)
	0.14	n = 5	(4.7%)
	0.15	n = 4	(3.8%)
	0.16	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.17	n = 4	(3.8%)
	0.18	n = 2	(1.9%)
	0.19	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.20	n = 1	(0.9%)
	0.35	n = 1	(0.9%)

Model 1: Societal Ramifications

Hypothesis: Experiencing adversity and harassing behaviors as a result of the mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the time ratio increases.

Table 4-6. Descriptive Statistics for Model 1 Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	St. Deviation	Frequency
How many times have you lost a job?			
0 times	1.47	1.520	n = 38 (35.8%)
1 time			n = 22 (20.8%)
2 times			n = 19 (17.9%)
3 times			n = 4 (3.7%)
4 + times			n = 19 (17.9%)
How many times have you been denied a promotion at work?			
0 times	1.06	1.527	n = 61 (57.5%)
1 time			n = 11 (10.4%)
2 times			n = 10 (9.4%)
3 times			n = 3 (2.8%)
4 + times			n = 17 (16.0%)
How many times have you lost a place to live?			
0 times	1.84	1.760	n = 39 (36.8%)
1 time			n = 17 (16.0%)
2 times			n = 7 (6.6%)
3 times			n = 7 (6.6%)
4 + times			n = 35 (33.0%)
How many times have you been treated rudely in a public place?			
0 times	1.17	1.570	n = 59 (55.7%)
1 time			n = 14 (13.2%)
2 times			n = 8 (7.5%)
3 times			n = 6 (5.7%)
4 + times			n = 19 (17.9%)
How many times have you been asked to leave a business or restaurant?			
0 times	0.27	0.927	n = 94 (88.7%)
1 time			n = 3 (2.8%)
2 times			n = 1 (0.9%)
3 times			n = 1 (0.9%)
4 + times			n = 5 (4.7%)
Table 4-8 Continued.			
How many times have you lost a friend because of your registration status?			
0 times	1.35	1.670	n = 56 (52.8%)
1 time			n = 9 (8.5%)
2 times			n = 11 (10.4%)
3 times			n = 5 (4.7%)
4 + times			n = 24 (22.6%)
How many times have you been harassed in person?			
0 times	1.23	1.571	n = 57 (53.8%)
1 time			n = 11 (10.4%)
2 times			n = 11 (10.4%)
3 times			n = 9 (8.5%)
4 + times			n = 18 (17.0%)

Table 4-6. Continued

Questions	Mean	St. Deviation	Frequency
How many times have you been assaulted or attacked?			
0 times	0.37	1.012	n = 90 (84.9%)
1 time			n = 3 (2.8%)
2 times			n = 5 (4.7%)
3 times			n = 3 (2.8%)
4 + times			n = 5 (4.7%)
How many times have you received harassing / threatening telephone calls?			
0 times	0.83	1.497	n = 74 (69.8%)
1 time			n = 11 (10.4%)
2 times			n = 1 (0.9%)
3 times			n = 3 (2.8%)
4 + times			n = 17 (16.0%)
How many times have you received harassing / threatening mail / fliers / notes?			
0 times	0.96	1.593	n = 71 (67.0%)
1 time			n = 9 (8.5%)
Table 4-8 Continued.			
2 times			n = 4 (3.7%)
3 times			n = 3 (2.8%)
4 + times			n = 19 (17.9%)

Table 4-7 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the Societal Ramifications that serve as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of ten items asking participants how many times the following behaviors occurred in their lives - including job loss, being forced to leave a public place, harassment in person and harassment through phone calls, mail and fliers. All ten questions were measured using a 0 - 4+ Likert scale (0 times, 1 time, 2 times, 3 times, 4+ times). The answer choices were then scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the ten questions and then dividing them by 10. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to analyze the results based on the original Likert scale values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable

the measures used were in evaluating the construct of Societal Ramifications. The Cronbach's alpha found was 0.883 - which means that the measures are reliable in measuring the Societal Ramifications. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in Table 4-7, using the time requirement ratio to predict the Societal Ramifications results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship, however it must be noted that the model does not bare statistical significance. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 1.178 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.141. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining the Societal Ramifications. Unfortunately, for the entire model only 3.6% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square.

Table 4-7. Model 1: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Societal Ramifications

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	1.178	0.852	0.141
Participant Race	-0.282	0.411	-0.069
Participant Age	-0.103	0.101	-0.104
Offender Status	-0.035	0.481	-0.007
Constant	1.475	0.673	
F Statistic	0.898		
R Square	0.036		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

Associated with quantitative model, a qualitative model has been developed to further elaborate the dependent variable of each model. For Model 1, the dependent variable is experiencing adversity and harassing behaviors while on the registry - something that I call Societal Ramifications. As stated before, questions were asked about how many times a certain behavior was experienced since first being required to register. Table 4-10 shows the qualitative results found within the letters, notes and phone calls that the participants voluntarily provided me during the period of data collection. The questions were developed based on the previously developed survey to see if the participant provided qualitative data matched the quantitative survey data.

As seen in the Table 4-8, of the 38 qualitative responses received, the majority of women did not report experience harassing behaviors (n = 29, 76.3%) and did not report having to move repeatedly (n = 35, 92.1%).

Table 4-8. Model 1: Qualitative Data Analysis for Societal Ramifications

Research Question	Mean (N=38)	St. Deviation	Frequency (No)	Frequency Percent (Yes)
Is there mention of harassing behaviors? 0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.24	0.431	n = 29 (76.3%)	n = 9 (23.7%)
Does the participant mention having to move repeatedly? 0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.8	0.273	n = 35 (92.1%)	n = 3 (7.9%)

From the passages, some quotations were pulled to elaborate the sentiments that were provided in the participants' answers. For the first qualitative question, did the participant mention any harassing behaviors, participants reported that they had "Not yet" lost a place to live (C110) and had "Been refused jobs" (A4). In regards to rude treatment in a public place one participant reported "Once by a church!" (B66). The

second question addressed having to repeatedly move residences. Regarding this issue, one participant stated that she did not have to move, “Only because we were here before the school was built, could not move here now” (B66).

Model 2: Reintegrative Shaming Theory

Hypothesis: Shame associated with mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the time ratio increases.

Table 4-9. Descriptive Statistics for Model 2 Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency
I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.			
1 = Disagree Completely		n = 7	(6.6%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided		n = 11	(10.4%)
3 = Agree Completely		n = 88	(83.0%)
I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense.			
1 = Disagree Completely		n = 13	(12.3%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided		n = 7	(6.6%)
3 = Agree Completely		n = 86	(81.1%)
I am less likely to leave the house because I am afraid that someone might recognize me as a sex offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely		n = 67	(63.2%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided		n = 16	(15.1%)
3 = Agree Completely		n = 23	(21.7%)
I avoid certain public places because I am afraid of being recognized as a sex offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely		n = 50	(47.2%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided		n = 14	(13.2%)
3 = Agree Completely		n = 42	(39.6%)

Table 4-10 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the shame participants feel that serve as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of four items asking participants about the shame felt for being on the registry, for having committed a sexual offense, their likelihood of being recognized as a sex offender and whether or not they avoid public places for fear of being recognized as a sex offender. All four questions were measured using a 1-10 Likert scale (1: Disagree Completely, 2, 3, 4, 5: Unsure/Undecided, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10: Agree Completely). The answer choices were then

scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the four questions and then dividing them by 4. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to analyze the results based on the original Likert scale values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable the measures used were in evaluating the construct of shame. The Cronbach's alpha found was 0.667 - which means that the measures are reliable in measuring shame. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in Table 4-10, using the time requirement ratio to predict the shame results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship, however it must be noted that the model does not bare statistical significance. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1,

Table 4-10. Model 2: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Shame

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	1.596	1.845	0.086
Participant Race	0.634	0.858	0.074
Participant Age	-0.079	0.206	-0.038
Offender Status	1.081	1.062	0.101
Constant	4.929	1.427	
F Statistic	0.504		
R Square	0.020		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 1.596 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.086. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining shame. For the entire model only

2.0% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square.

As seen in the Table 4-11, of the 38 qualitative responses received, the majority of women did not report feeling ashamed of being on the registry (n = 36, 94.7%) and did not mention that she has tried to hide her sex offender status (n = 35, 92.1%). These two results do not show that some participants' responses generate support for the proposed hypotheses. However, the quantitative entries were analyzed to see if the women are speaking of shame. So while they may actually feel shame for being on the registry, they are just not voicing that feeling. Therefore, these two results must not override the quantitative results.

Table 4-11. Model 2: Qualitative Data Analysis for Shame

Research Question	Mean (N=38)	St. Deviation	Frequency (No)	Frequency Percent (Yes)
Does the participant mention feeling ashamed of being on the registry? 0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.08	0.273	n = 36 (94.7%)	n = 3 (5.3%)
Does the participant mention that she tries to hide her sex offender status from people? 0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.08	0.273	n = 35 (92.1%)	n = 3 (7.9%)

Several quotations were examined from the qualitative passages and comments written on the surveys to provide support for the quantitative data. The first theme that was developed was the idea that participants are ashamed of being on the registry. Participants were reluctant to accept the shame that is associated with the registry saying that they are "ANGRY, not ashamed" (B37), "Not ashamed just mad! (C82) and "Because I was and am not guilty at all" (A6). The second theme addressed whether or not participants would try to hide their status from community members. Again, the participants were reluctant to accept the shame that accompanies their statuses as sex offenders. Participants stated that they would not disclose their sex offender status

“Because I am not guilty” (A6) and that publicly identifying herself as a sex offender “Certainly does not benefit me” (B66) and that they are afraid to identify themselves as a sex offender because “You do not know how people will react. They could come to shoot me!” (B66).

These quotations and the qualitative datum presented show that even though shame is not being acknowledged by the participants, strain certainly is. The anger element that is included in their words show that the registry is creating stress in their lives. Participant B66 who stated that she was afraid of being shot is a perfect of example of strain being present in someone’s life – not too many things are as stressful as fear of being shot. These qualitative passages are highly indicative of strain being present in the participants’ lives. This strain will be addressed in the third model, which is the next model that will be explained.

Model 3: General Strain Theory

Hypothesis: Stress and strain associated with mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry will increase as the time ratio increases. Table 4-12 shows the descriptive statistics for the model. Table 4-13 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the strain participants feel that serve as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of six items asking participants if being registered has caused any unnecessary stress in their lives, if they act out in unhealthy ways, if they consume more alcohol then they did in the past, if they use illegal substances more than they did in the past, if they have ever tried to hurt themselves or if they if they ever tried to hurt someone else. All six questions were measured using a Yes/No dichotomous answer choice (0 = no and 1 = yes).

Table 4-12. Descriptive Statistics for Model 3 Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency	
Do you feel that being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has caused unnecessary stress in your life?				
0 = No	0.87	0.340	n = 14	(13.2%)
1 = Yes			n = 92	(86.8%)
Because of this stress, do you feel that you act out in an unhealthy way?				
0 = No	0.32	0.469	n = 72	(67.9%)
1 = Yes			n = 34	(32.1%)
Because of this stress, do you consume alcohol more than you did in the past?				
0 = No	0.25	0.432	n = 80	(75.5%)
1 = Yes			n = 26	(24.5%)
Because of this stress, do you use illegal substances more than you did in the past?				
0 = No	0.12	0.330	n = 93	(87.7%)
1 = Yes			n = 13	(12.3%)
Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt yourself?				
0 = No	0.28	0.453	n = 76	(71.7%)
1 = Yes			n = 30	(28.3%)
Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt someone else?				
0 = No	0.06	0.232	n = 100	(94.3%)
1 = Yes			n = 6	(5.7%)

The answer choices were then indexed in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the six questions and then dividing them by 6. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to analyze the results based on the original dichotomous values. A Cronbach's alpha was not found for this model because the questions were indexed rather than scaled. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in the Table 4-13, using the time requirement ratio to predict the strain results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the

time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.254 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.135.

Table 4-13. Model 3: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Strain

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	0.254	0.184	0.135
Participant Race	-0.008	0.086	-0.010
Participant Age	-0.043*	0.021	-0.205
Offender Status	0.000	0.106	0.000
Constant	0.406	0.142	
F Statistic	1.492		
R Square	0.056		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining strain. However, age of the offender is a statistically significant variable, at a .05 alpha level. It must be noted that age is not significant in the desired direction in this instance; age plays a role in a negative relationship with strain. The unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as -0.043 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as -0.205. For the entire model only 5.6% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square.

As seen in the Table 4-14, of the 38 qualitative responses received, the majority of women did not mention that she was engaging in illegal drug use (n = 33, 86.8%) or that she was trying to hurt herself (n = 36, 94.7%). The results of the two qualitative questions do not show that participants are generating responses that are supportive of the proposed hypothesis. However, the quantitative entries were analyzed to see if the women are speaking of strains that were present in their lives. So while they may actually feel a certain level of stress that is associated with being on the registry, they

are just not voicing that feeling. Therefore, these two results must not override the quantitative results.

Table 4-14. Model 3: Qualitative Data Analysis for Strain

Research Question	Mean (N=38)	St. Deviation	Frequency (No)	Frequency Percent (Yes)
Does the participant mention engaging in illegal drug use?	0.13	0.343	n = 33 (86.8%)	0 = No, 1 = Yes n = 5 (13.2%)
Does the participant mention trying to hurt herself?	0.05	0.226	n = 36 (94.7%)	0 = No, 1 = Yes n = 2 (5.3%)

In the surveys and through the qualitative entries, the participants talked about drug and alcohol use as well as the possibility that the stress may lead them to hurt themselves. The participants stated that in the past they had used alcohol but “I stopped drinking all together” (C32) and that “I have been sober since the date of my arrest” (C110). As for the possibility of letting the stress build to the point when a participant might consider hurting herself as an option, one participant stated that she had not yet hurt herself, “But considered it” (E82).

Model 4: Defiance Theory

Hypothesis: Defiant attitudes will increase as the time ratio associated with mandatory registration on the Florida Sex Offender Registry also increases. The model four hypothesis covers defiant attitudes in general, however, the model will be broken up into four sub-models that each analyze the components of defiance theory: unfair sanctions, poor bonds and alienation, stigmatization of the offender not the offense, and refusal to acknowledge shame. Theoretically it makes more sense to break the theory up into four models than to run everything together. The theory states that all four elements must be in place in order for defiant behaviors to be manifest – therefore, the models should be run separately in order to ensure that the four elements are present.

Table 4-15 shows the descriptive statistics provided for the questions making up the first of the four defiance theory elements, unfair sanctions.

Table 4-15. Descriptive Statistics for Model 4A Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency
I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.66	0.631	n = 9 (8.5%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 18 (17.0%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 79 (74.5%)
I believe that having my picture on the Florida Sex Offender Registry is going too far.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.54	0.706	n = 11 (10.3%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 26 (24.5%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 69 (65.1%)
I feel that the Florida Sex Offender Registry has unfairly characterized me as a sex offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.74	0.557	n = 6 (5.7%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 16 (15.1%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 84 (79.2%)

Table 4-16 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the unfair sanctioning element of the defiant behavior that that serves as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of three items asking participants if they feel they are being unfairly punished by being on the registry, if having their picture on the registry is going too far, and if the registry has unfairly characterized them as a sex offender. All three questions were measured using a 1-10 Likert scale (1 = Disagree Completely, 2, 3, 4, 5 = Unsure/Undecided, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 = Agree Completely). The answer choices were then scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the three questions and then dividing them by 3. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to analyze the results based on the original Likert scale values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable the measures used were in evaluating the element of unfair sanctioning within the defiant behaviors construct. The Cronbach's alpha found was 0.762 - which means that the measures are reliable in measuring the level of unfair sanctioning. The race, age

and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in the Table 4-16, using the time requirement ratio to predict the unfair sanctions results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship. For this model, two variables were significant – the time ratio and the offender status. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 3.843 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.209. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change.

Table 4-16. Model 4A: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Unfair Sanctions

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	3.843*	1.788	0.209
Participant Race	1.207	0.827	0.141
Participant Age	0.026	0.198	0.013
Offender Status	1.976***	1.023	0.186
Constant	4.758	1.375	
F Statistic	2.322***		
R Square	0.084		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

The time ratio variable was a significant predictor in explaining the unfair sanctions, at a .05 alpha value. The offender status is also statistically significant but at a .10 alpha level. The unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 1.976 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.186. Unfortunately, for the entire model only 8.4% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement

ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square, but the overall model was statistically significant at the .10 level. Table 4-17 shows the descriptive statistics for the poor bonds portion of defiance theory. Just like in the other tables, the questions and coding schemes are described.

Table 4-17. Descriptive Statistics for Model 4B Dependent Variable

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency
People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.			
1 = Disagree Completely	1.88	0.813	n = 42 (39.6%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 35 (33.0%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 29 (27.4%)
I feel that since I have registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I have been ostracized from my community.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.12	0.813	n = 29 (27.4%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 35 (33.0%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 42 (39.6%)
I no longer feel a part of my community because I am required to register as a sexual offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.27	0.868	n = 29 (27.4%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 19 (17.9%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 58 (54.7%)

Table 4-18 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the poor bonds and alienation element of the defiant behavior that that serves as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of three items asking participants if people avoid being around them if they know about the participant's sex offender status, if they feel ostracized from their community since having to register and if they no longer feel a part of their community because of their registration requirement. All three questions were measured using a 1-10 Likert scale (1 = Disagree Completely, 2, 3, 4, 5 = Unsure/Undecided, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 = Agree Completely). The answer choices were then scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the three questions and then dividing them by 3. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to analyze the results based on the

original Likert scale values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable the measures used were in evaluating the element of poor bonds and alienation within the defiant behaviors construct. The Cronbach's alpha found was 0.783 - which means that the measures are reliable in measuring the level of poor bonds and alienation experienced. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in the Table 4-18, using the time requirement ratio to predict the poor bonds results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship, however it must be noted that the model does not bare statistical significance. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable.

Table 4-18. Model 4B: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Poor Bonds

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	2.970	2.256	0.130
Participant Race	0.675	1.049	0.064
Participant Age	0.173	0.251	0.068
Offender Status	1.738	1.298	0.132
Constant	2.733	1.745	
F Statistic	1.060		
R Square	0.040		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 2.970 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.130. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining the poor bonds. For the entire

model only 4.0% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square.

Table 4-19 shows the descriptive statistics for the stigmatization of the offender portion of defiance theory.

Table 4-19. Descriptive Statistics for Model 4C Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency
Because I am registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I will never be seen as anything other than a sexual offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.41	0.766	n = 18 (17.0%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 27 (25.5%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 61 (57.5%)
People do not treat me with respect once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.14	0.856	n = 32 (30.2%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 27 (25.5%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 47 (44.3%)
I feel that community members do not treat me fairly once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.33	0.801	n = 22 (20.8%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 27 (25.5%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 57 (53.8%)

Table 4-20 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the stigmatization of the offender element of the defiant behavior that that serves as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of three items asking participants if they feel that they will never be viewed as anything other than a sex offender because of the registration, if people treat them with respect once they find out that they are a registered sex offender, and if they feel that community members do not treat them fairly once they find out about their registered status. All three questions were measured using a 1-10 Likert scale (1 = Disagree Completely, 2, 3, 4, 5 = Unsure/Undecided, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 = Agree Completely). The answer choices were then scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the three questions and then dividing them by 3. The scale was divided in order to return to the original

value format in order to analyze the results based on the original Likert values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable the measures used were in evaluating the element of stigmatization of the offender within the defiant behaviors construct. The Cronbach's alpha found was 0.850 - which means that the measures are reliable in measuring the level of stigmatization of the offender experienced. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model. As shown in the Table 4-20, using the time requirement ratio to predict the stigmatization of the offender results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship.

Table 4-20. Model 4C: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Stigmatization of the Offender

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	2.714	2.304	0.115
Participant Race	0.846	1.071	0.077
Participant Age	0.228	0.257	0.087
Offender Status	2.770*	1.326	0.203
Constant	2.331	1.781	
F Statistic	1.724		
R Square	0.064		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

The Stigmatization of the Offender element of the Defiant Behaviors Variable is scaled from three items measured on a 1-10 Likert scale. The items were added and then divided to return the answers to fit within their originally measured scale.

Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 2.714 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.115. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are

only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining the stigmatization of the offender. Offender status is a statistically significant variable in predicting stigmatization of the offender. The unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 2.770 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.203 and the variable is significant at a .05 alpha level. For the entire model only 6.4% of the model variance was explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square. The Table 4-21 shows the descriptive statistics for the refusal to acknowledge shame element of defiance theory.

Table 4-21. Descriptive Statistics for Model 4D Dependent Variable Questions

Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequency
I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.76	0.561	n = 7 (6.6%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 11 (10.4%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 88 (83.0%)
I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense.			
1 = Disagree Completely	2.69	0.681	n = 13 (12.3%)
2 = Unsure / Undecided			n = 7 (6.6%)
3 = Agree Completely			n = 86 (81.1%)

Table 4-22 shows an OLS Regression that was completed using the time requirement ratio as the independent variable to predict the participants' refusal to acknowledge shame element of the defiant behavior that that serves as the dependent variable. The dependent variable consisted of two items asking participants if they feel ashamed to be on the registry and if they are ashamed to have committed a sexual offense Both questions were measured using a 1-10 Likert scale (1 = Disagree Completely, 2, 3, 4, 5 = Unsure/Undecided, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 = Agree Completely). The answer choices were then scaled in order to run the regression. Scaling these answer choices involved adding the answers across the two questions and then dividing them by 2. The scale was divided in order to return to the original value format in order to

analyze the results based on the original Likert Scale values. A reliability coefficient was run to determine how reliable the measures used were in evaluating the element of refusal to acknowledge shame within the defiant behaviors construct. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.494. Unlike the other models, the reliability coefficient is not very strong and does not do an adequate job of measuring the refusal to acknowledge shame element of the construct. However, one final reliability coefficient was run for the entire model examining the total construct of defiant behaviors. The coefficient found was 0.869 which shows that the entire construct was measured correctly and that the low coefficient associated with the refusal to acknowledge shame element does not drag down the entire model. The race, age and offender status of the participant (offender v. predator) were used as controls in the model.

As shown in the Table 4-22, using the time requirement ratio to predict the refusal to acknowledge shame results in a positive relationship between the two variables. This supports the predicted hypothesis in terms of direction of the relationship, however it must be noted that the model does not bare statistical significance. Once again, the independent variable used is the time ratio, which was computed using time spent on the registry divided by the total number of years spent on the registry. This time ratio only ranges from 0 to 1, meaning that there will never be a value larger than one associated with the time variable. Therefore, the unstandardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.214 and the standardized regression coefficient is reported as 0.012. Due to the fact that the variable is a ratio, the units of increase are only small units of change. The time ratio variable was not a significant predictor in explaining the refusal to acknowledge shame. For the entire model only .9% of the model variance was

explained by the time requirement ratio and the controls, as shown by the model's R square.

Table 4-22. Model 4D: Registration Time Requirement Ratio Predicting Defiant Behaviors - Refusal to Acknowledge Shame

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Beta
Time Requirement Ratio	0.214	1.772	0.012
Participant Race	0.359	0.824	0.044
Participant Age	0.121	0.197	0.062
Offender Status	0.555	1.020	0.054
Constant	7.487	1.370	
F Statistic	0.239		
R Square	0.009		

***p < .10, ** p < .01, * p < .05

As seen in Table 4-23, of the 38 qualitative responses received, the majority of women did not mention that they were alienated from family members (n = 31, 81.6%) or that she was ashamed to be on the registry (n = 36, 94.7%). However, the results were a little more divided for whether or not the registration requirements are too severe. Twenty-four women (63.2%) felt that the requirements were not too severe despite their own experiences on the registry compared to the fourteen women (36.8%) who thought the requirements were too severe.

Table 4-23. Model 4: Qualitative Data Analysis for Defiant Behaviors

Research Question	Mean (N=38)	St. Deviation	Frequency (No)	Frequency Percent (Yes)
Does the participant mention any alienation from family members or friends?	0.18	0.393	n = 31 (81.6%)	0 = No, 1 = Yes n = 7 (18.4%)
Does the participant feel the registration requirement is too severe?	0.37	0.489	n = 24 (63.2%)	0 = No, 1 = Yes n = 14 (36.8%)
Does the participant feel ashamed of being on the registry?	0.08	0.273	n = 36 (94.7%)	0 = No, 1 = Yes n = 2 (5.3%)

The results of the qualitative questions do not show that participants are generating responses that are supportive of the proposed hypothesis, however it does not mean that the participants are not experiencing these items – just that they aren't vocalizing them. So, the questions are asking if there is presence of shame within the

voluntary passages. This means that while they may actually feel a certain level of shameless that is associated with being on the registry, they are just not voicing that feeling. Therefore, these two results must not override the quantitative results.

The final model used qualitative data to further support the issues discussed within the quantitative survey results. One of the themes developed within Defiance Theory discuss alienation and poor bonds that result, in this case from the sex offender status that is applied to an individual post conviction. Participants discussed these feelings of alienation saying, “I have two little girls; my crime was in 1987 when I was 23 – very young and easily influenced. Now I can’t attend events at my daughter’s school due to 1 day almost a quarter of a century ago” (A4). As for feeling that the registry requirements are too severe, participants state that they completely agree and that “I did my time for that stupid shit” (C30) and “In my case, yes” (C52). There was also a large amount of agreement that they are being unfairly punished in response to their convictions. Participants were reluctant to accept the shame that is associated with the registry saying that they are “ANGRY, not ashamed” (B37), “Not ashamed just mad!” (C82) and “Because I was and am not guilty at all” (A6). The refusal to acknowledge shame was also established in Model 2, which elaborated on the shame felt as a result of the sex offender status.

Other Qualitative Data

The final qualitative data that were examined concludes on the opinions of the participants. In Table 4-24, the results are mixed in terms of how the participants felt about the registry itself. While most registrants did not agree that the registry’s current state is agreeable (n = 28, 73.7%), they also predominately did not adamantly oppose the registry altogether (n = 36, 94.7%). This last finding is important since this opinion is

coming from those who are actually on the registry. Despite the inconveniences that the registry may pose to their own lives, they are still in favor of its existence for various reasons.

Table 4-24. Qualitative Data for Registry Views

Does the participant agree with the registry?				0 = No, 1 = Yes
0.26	0.446	n = 28	(73.7%)	n = 10 (26.3%)
Does the participant adamantly oppose with the registry?				0 = No, 1 = Yes
0.05	226	n = 36	(94.7%)	n = 2 (5.3%)
Does the participant offer suggestions for modifying the registry?				0 = No, 1 = Yes
0.470	0.506	n = 20	(52.6%)	n = 18 (47.4%)

Participants also addressed whether or not they felt the registry was a good thing, stating “Needs to classify sex offenders according to age of victim” (B27) and “Disagree Completely. Because people get hysterical” (B66). The final question talks about modifications to the registry for which one participant stated that the registration requirements are not necessarily fair for the crimes committed. She states, “I do not feel it is fair that depending on what county you are in you may have a much lighter sentence. The sentence should fit the crime. I feel my sentence was very fair for what I did” (B96).

Criminal Histories

The final data analysis conducted displays the distribution of offenses recorded on both the participant and non-participant criminal histories. The two takes display twelve groups of offense ranging from sexual offenses to traffic offenses. Originally there were plans to look at each individual offense to see the distribution within the groups of offenses. However, the offenses were deemed too sporadic to list individually - hence the need for the groupings. For example, 99 individual offenses were coded within the sex offense category alone. In total, there were 257 individually coded

offenses. As previously stated, the grouped offenses are listed in the Table 4-25 and the complete list of coded offenses is listed in the appendix.

Table 4-25 shows that of returned survey participant criminal histories, there were a total of 873 offense listed for the group of 98 participants, giving each participant an average of 8.91 crimes per person. This means that of the 106 returned surveys, eight criminal histories were unavailable during the period of criminal history research. The main offenses committed were sexual offenses (n = 594, 68.04%) and “Other” Offenses (n = 145, 16.61%). Within the other category, offenses such as public intoxication, resisting arrest, giving false information to the police and fleeing from a law enforcement official are included. Of all the remaining categories of offenses, drug crimes rank third in frequency (n = 38, 4.35%).

Table 4-25 also shows that for 68 non-participants, 796 crimes were committed. Even though there were less criminal histories found for the non-participants than for the participants, the average number of crimes per person was 11.71. This average was higher than the 8.91 average found for the participants. Using the averages as an estimate, if 98 non-participant criminal histories would have been found then the estimated total of offenses would have been 1,148. For the histories that were found, sexual offenses still occurred at the highest rate, making up 61.68% of the total number of offenses (n = 491). Again, the category of “other” crimes ranked second making up 16.58% of the total number of offenses (n = 132). The non-participants differed from the participants in the category of drugs and in fraud. For participants, drug crimes ranked third and fraud ranked fifth in frequency. The non-participants engaged in more fraud crimes - ranking third, (n = 29, 3.52%) - and in fewer drug crimes than the participants -

ranking fifth, (n = 20, 2.51%). Overall the criminal histories are not too different in terms of the distribution in criminal behavior, however it is important to note that on average non-participants are engaging in more crimes than participants.

Table 4-25. Returned Survey Participant vs. Non-Participant Criminal Histories

Offense Groups and Coding	Frequency (Participants)		Frequency (Non-Participants)	
1 = Sexual Offenses	n = 594	(68.04%)	n = 491	(61.68%)
2 = Battery / Assault	n = 6	(0.69%)	n = 16	(2.01%)
3 = Fraud	n = 19	(2.18%)	n = 28	(3.52%)
4 = Driving / Traffic Issues	n = 35	(4.01%)	n = 22	(2.76%)
5 = Prostitution	n = 17	(1.95%)	n = 20	(2.51%)
6 = Drugs	n = 38	(4.35%)	n = 18	(2.26%)
7 = Theft	n = 9	(1.03%)	n = 8	(1.01%)
8 = Burglary / Robbery	n = 2	(0.23%)	n = 17	(2.14%)
9 = Kidnapping	n = 1	(0.11%)	n = 24	(3.02%)
10 = Larceny	n = 3	(0.34%)	n = 4	(0.50%)
11 = Child Neglect	n = 4	(0.46%)	n = 16	(2.01%)
12 = Other	n = 145	(16.61%)	n = 132	(16.58%)
Total Number of Offenses:	n = 873		n = 796	

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

This research project started out hypothesizing that most behaviors and feelings related to the sex offender registry as measured by a ratio of time served over time sentenced on the sex offender registry. Instead, overall there has been a lack of support for these hypotheses. Although the direction of the relationship has remained consistent with the hypotheses – positive relationships between the time ratio and the Societal Ramifications, shame, strain and defiant behaviors – only one of the models (Model 4A) showed a statistically significant relationship. Using participant race, age and offender status (offender vs. predator) the time ratio was only able to explain a small amount of variance, despite the fact that most scales had acceptable reliability coefficients. This means that the models measured the constructs of the Societal Ramifications and the three theories correctly but that there was no association found between these constructs and the time element used as the independent variable.

In the Model 1 (Table 4-7), only 3.6% of the variance could be explained for the prediction of the Societal Ramifications. Model 2 (Table 4-10) was able to explain only 2.0% of the variance for the prediction of participant shame levels. Model 3 (Table 4-13) was able to explain 5.6% of the variance in the prediction of participant reported strain levels. Model 4A (Table 4-16) only explained 8.4% of the variance in the prediction of the unfair sanctioning element of defiance theory. Models 4B (Table 4-18), 4C (Table 4-20) and 4D (Table 4-22) were only able to explain 4.0%, 6.4% and 0.9% of the variance in predicting the poor bonding, stigmatization of the offender and refusal to acknowledge shame elements of defiance theory respectively.

The frequencies and the descriptive statistics show that there is evidence that the participants are experiencing the hypothesized behaviors. Although this section of the paper is not meant to exhaustively recap the results presented earlier, there are a few items that can be highlighted. For the Societal Ramifications, 64 participants (62%) reported that they lost a job at least one or more times. Sixty-Six (63%) participants reported that they lost a place to live at least one time or more. For the shaming models, 88 (83%) participants agree that they are ashamed of being on the registry and 86 (82.1%) participants agree that they are ashamed of committing a sexual offense. The strain and defiance theory findings are similar in nature to the Societal Ramifications and shame findings. Ninety-two (86.8%) participants identified that there has been unnecessary stress in their lives as a result of their registration status. For the final model predicting defiance theory, the four elements were examined separately. For the element of unfair punishment, 79 participants (74.5%) identified that they felt they were being unfairly punished. For poor bonds, 58 (54.7%) participants felt that they were no longer a part of their communities because of their status. The third element, stigmatization of the offender, 61 (57.5%) participants felt that they will not ever be seen as anything other than a sex offender. The fourth element, refusal to acknowledge shame was not as widely supported as 88 participants (83%) stated that they were experiencing shame as a result of their sex offender status. This brief review of the frequency results does show that participants are answering in the direction of the hypothesized relationships, however the fault in the relationship may lay with the independent variable of the time ratio. The time element used was based on the project conducted in the Tewksbury study conducted in 2004 that used a similar independent

variable. That study used only time spent on the registry, but this study developed that variable further into the time ratio (time served divided by the time sentenced). Since the current study shows that the models are reliably constructed then it is logical to suggest that there is no support for the Tewksbury recommended independent variable⁷. This is something can be developed in future research and in future data analysis.

Future research may benefit from using the scaled Societal Ramifications as the independent variable instead of the time requirement. The Societal Ramifications are the ten items asking about the number of times that the participant lost a job, was denied a promotion at work, lost a place to live, experienced rude treatment in public, were asked to leave a business or restaurant, lost a friend because of the registration status, were harassed in person, received threatening or harassing phone calls and received harassing or threatening mail, flyers or notes. Using a scale across participant responses as the independent variable would be able to show how much of the shame, strain and defiance theory behaviors are a result of the sex offender status. In other words, does experiencing the ten behaviors tested in this study then in turn effect shame, strain and defiance levels among participants? The Societal Ramifications are a direct result of the known offender status. So, in relation to the theories, how does experiencing these behaviors affect the levels of shame, strain and defiance experienced? As shown in the previous results sections, there is enough variation among the answers given for the ten items to use the Societal Ramifications as an

⁷ After the initial regression models were run, I reverted back to the original Tewksbury time variable (time on the registry) and re-ran the regression models. No significance was found with this time variable either.

independent variable. The lack of variation in the time ratio variable was one of the biggest criticisms that were established after the results were analyzed. By using the Societal Ramifications as the independent variable, that variation is present and allows for better prediction.

Other research may include more in-depth, structured interviews with the participants. The qualitative data was unexpected and not collected in a consistent manner. However, there was still a good amount of information provided by the participants. In the future, in-depth interviews with the 106 participants from this project could explain some of the responses that were provided within the quantitative survey instrument. Although the survey provided good information, by allowing the female registrants to speak about their experiences would tell a lot more about the effects of the registry rather than choosing a dichotomous answer choice. The qualitative data that was collected generated some support for the models but did not conclusively support or contradict the hypotheses proposed. Since there were no structured questions, the women were varied in the information that they supplied. This means that for some of the themes, even though they were not discussing certain items it does not mean that those items are not present in their lives – they just simply aren't being vocalized. Asking structured questions in the interviews about the theoretical models proposed in the quantitative instrument would help to back up the information gathered from the survey.

More research should be conducted looking specifically at the General Strain Theory results. The anger element of strain theory (anger results from the behavior and then participants find coping mechanisms to deal with that anger) is something that

could be further developed to see how anger is associated with being required to register. Are the participants angry because of their registration status and then manifesting that anger through drug use, alcohol use or other harmful behaviors? The physical actions that the participants are engaging in can be used as measure of the emotions that they are experiencing because of the registry status. The anger issue is something that could also be incorporated into the male and female registrant sample. Males and females often internalize anger and other emotions differently from one another, so their reactions may provide two distinct sets of results.

Since the project focused only on female registrants (the main focus of the Tewksbury study), future research could include adding male registrants to the sample. Often times there are gender differences among male and female registrants in terms of what they are experiencing once they are required to register. These experiences, and their reactions to the experiences, could tell us more about the registry in general and more about individuals are experiencing in regards to their known sex offender status specifically. Females comprise only a small portion of the total population of registered sex offenders, so this research is imperative to learning more about their experiences while being registered. However, now that some of the information is available in regards to female registrants, having a male registrant comparison group would add greatly to the literature. In addition to the gender differences, there may be a great amount of information to be gathered comparing those who are currently on the registry to those who have timed out. Examining the experiences of those who are not longer required to register would provide great insight into the prisonization effect that was proposed in this study. Because most of the participants are lifetime registrants, they

will never experience the reintegration elements that Clemmer proposed in his theory. However, for those who are no longer required to register, they may have indeed experienced the behaviors that Clemmer proposes. This other comparison group would also add a great deal to the literature surround the registry.

In addition further data analyses may benefit from the revised time ratio equation that was briefly explained earlier in the paper. The equation that was used created a skewed distribution because of the large amount of individuals that are required to register for life. As a reminder the equation used was as follows:

$$\text{Time Requirement Ratio} = \frac{\text{Amount of time spent on the registry as of 2010}}{\text{Time required to register on the FSOR}}$$

This equation produces a time ratio for all individuals who returned a survey. However, there is no variation in produced ratio, which does not do an adequate job that is necessary for the independent variable. Therefore, an alternative equation must be developed which takes into account the life expectancy of the individuals on the registry. In the first equation, 99 years was used as the numerical equivalent to lifetime registry requirement. However, the use of the 99-year marker further skews the data because it makes all of the ratios smaller and adds to the lack of variability in the variable. At the time, the 99-year marker was used with the justification that no one will outlive the sentence. In retrospect, this was not an adequate reason for using the number. Working to correct this problem, future data analysis could put the following equation to use to see if it can correct the skewness issue found in the time ratio variable.

$$\text{Time Requirement Ratio} = \frac{\text{Amount of time spent on the registry as of 2010}}{\text{Average life expectancy} - \text{Age at the time of registration}}$$

Participants provided qualitative information unexpectedly. This information was not foreseen when the project was being developed. Based on the positive response of the participants, there may be some value in conducting the in-depth interviews with the participants. Prior research explains some reasons for why female sexual offenders are convicted of sexual offenses, but there may be other reasons for their convictions. This is not to suggest that all female sexual offenders have been falsely convicted but there could be underlying reasons for why these women were convicted. The qualitative information showed that most of the females included in this study have been married or are currently married. The accusations of the sexual offense could have come at the time of the divorce. Or if there was a custody battle over the couple's children, then the accusations could have taken place in order for the father to obtain full custody of the children. While there are some of the participants who fully admit to the offenses, others are not so quick to admit to their responsibility. Perhaps there was a history of sexual abuse against the participant or perhaps the participant was addicted to illegal substances or had alcoholic tendencies. These problems could be contributing factors as to why the females committed the sexual offenses they were convicted for.

Policy Implications

Based on the prior research conducted on sex offender registration, it has been shown that the offenders can experience registration negatively. The registry creates a second sentence for those registered – the first being the court imposed sentence and the second being the stigma and hardships associated with being a registered sex offender. The prior literature on female sex offenders is sparse. However, this study adds to the literature by showing the effects that the registration causes for these women. From the data collected (both qualitative and quantitative) it seems that women

are not committing the heinous crimes that the media associates with sexual offenders. The female sex offenders in this study tend to be in custody battles, with a sex offense allegation resulting from the fight. There may also be a secondary player involved in the commission of the sexual offense or the women were engaged in a sexual relationship with a minor (mostly students). These women, for the most part do not seem to be engaging in violent sexual crimes, however law enforcement and the present rules of the registry treat them as though they have committed violent sexual offenses.

The law enacted, in its basic form, requires that sex offenders to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registration List. This law makes it mandatory for states to publish the information collected about sex offenders, however the societal reaction to the registration law is different from what the law originally intended. The societal reaction views these women only as sex offenders – never to be trusted – and people that must be exiled from the community. The amount of shame that follows this reaction makes it very difficult for sex offenders to reintegrate back into society, making reoffending more likely according to Reintegrative Shaming Theory. The registration laws may seem to be the correct solution to many, but the way the law is constructed may make it harder for sex offenders to have a life once they live return to the community. The societal reaction to sex offenders is the reason why more research must be conducted on the side-effects of the registration laws. If it can be determined that the sex offender registrations laws are doing more harm than good, then perhaps a new alternative can be produced to make the reintegration of female sex offenders more possible.

Another side effect of the registry and of the sex offender status shows up in terms of employment. Most of these women are not able to find employment because of their sex offender status. If they were simply convicted of a felony, they may have had a better chance of finding employment. However, because they were convicted of a felony sexual offense, the odds of these women finding employment are drastically reduced.

The laws for the registry, in the current state provides safety and security to the general public – letting families know that their children will be protected because the sex offenders are known and can be identified. However, because they can be identified, these offenders encounter hardships and harassing behaviors that were not intended to take place by law.

While it would be difficult to argue that the sex offender registry should be abolished from public policy, perhaps it would be feasible to argue that some adjustments need to be made. Most women on the registry agree that it is in place for a reason and needs to be upheld, however modifications must be made if those on the registry are supposed to be able to live independently post-conviction. In this instance, it is a clear differentiation between the law's intent and the social reality that takes place. Because of this distinction, more research must be conducted to see whether the current system of registration is not being as effective as it could be.

APPENDIX A
INSTRUMENT

For each question, please answer based on your personal experience, or how you feel about the issue. Your participation is completely voluntary. Please do NOT put your name anywhere on the survey; all responses are completely confidential.

Thank you for your participation!

Please provide only one answer for each of the following questions unless instructed otherwise. The personal questions asked below are not enough to identify you over any other participant in this study. However, please remember to answer only according to the provided answers. Please do not provide any additional information.

1. When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?
_____ Month _____ Year

2. How long are you required to register: **(Please check only one answer)**
_____ 15 years _____ 25 years _____ Lifetime

3. For the sexual offenses that you have been convicted of, is/are the victim(s): **(please check all that apply)**

_____ Female _____ Multiple victims _____ Male _____ A relative
_____ Children/Minors

4. For the sexual offenses that you have been convicted of, did you commit the offense alone?

_____ Yes _____ No

a. If you answered No, what was the gender of the person you committed the offense with?

_____ Male _____ Female

b. Did you have a previous relationship with the person you committed the offense with?

_____ Yes _____ No

c. Who was the person you committed the offense with?

_____ Spouse/Partner _____ Relative _____ Friend
_____ Other

5. Approximately what portion of your family, friends, co-workers, and other people you consider a part of your life know about your sexual offense conviction(s)?

_____ Everyone _____ Almost Everyone (90% or more)
_____ Most people (60%-90%) _____ A lot of people (40%-60%)
_____ Some people (10% - 40%) _____ Only a few people (less than 10%)
_____ No one knows

6. Based on your listing on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, how often are you recognized in public as a convicted sex offender?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Daily | <input type="checkbox"/> A couple of times a week |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About once a week | <input type="checkbox"/> A couple of times a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About once a month | <input type="checkbox"/> A few times a year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year | <input type="checkbox"/> Never |

7. How often do you have law enforcement officers (police) or other government workers contact you, as a result of your placement on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Daily | <input type="checkbox"/> A couple of times a week |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About once a week | <input type="checkbox"/> A couple of times a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About once a month | <input type="checkbox"/> A few times a year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year | <input type="checkbox"/> Never |

8. Have you ever looked at your listing on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|

For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement.

9. "I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry"

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Disagree Completely | | | | | Unsure Undecided | | | | | Agree Completely |

10. "I understand why people want there to be a Florida Sex Offender Registry"

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Disagree Completely | | | | | Unsure Undecided | | | | | Agree Completely |

11. "I think that the Florida Sex Offender Registry is a good thing"

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Disagree Completely | | | | | Unsure Undecided | | | | | Agree Completely |

12. "People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry"

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Disagree Completely | | | | | Unsure Undecided | | | | | Agree Completely |

13. "I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry"

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Disagree | | | | | Unsure | | | | | Agree |

21. "I feel that being required to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has limited my efforts to reenter back into my community"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

22. "Because I am registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I will never be seen as anything other than a sexual offender"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

23. "I feel that the Florida Sexual Offender Registry should not be made available to the public because it makes life difficult for the people who are registered"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

24. "I feel that the Florida Sexual Offender Registry should not be made available to the public because it harms everyone registered and prevents me and other from turning our lives around"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

25. "I feel that since I have registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I have been ostracized from my community."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

26. "I feel that my relationships with other have suffered because I am required to register as a sexual offender."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

27. "I no longer feel apart of my community because I am required to register as a sexual offender."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Disagree Unsure Agree
Completely Undecided Completely

28. "People do not treat me with respect once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

36. During your trial or time spent in court, do you feel that the court officials treated you fairly?

_____ Yes _____ No

37. During your trial or time spent in court, do you feel that the court officials treated you with respect?

_____ Yes _____ No

38. While you were incarcerated, did the correctional staff treat you fairly?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

39. While you were incarcerated, did the correctional staff treat you with respect?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

40. While you were incarcerated, did you feel that the correctional staff was judgmental of your offense?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

41. While on probation, did you feel that that your probation office treated you fairly?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

42. While on probation, did you feel that your probation officer treated you with respect?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

43. While on probation, did you feel that your probation officer was judgmental of your offense?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

44. While on probation, did your probation officer give you advanced warning before making a home visit?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

45. While on probation, did your probation officer ever come by unannounced for a home visit?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

46. While on probation, did your probation officer visit you at home on a regular basis?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply

47. Do you feel that your probation officer visited you more often because you were convicted of a sexual offense?

_____ Yes _____ No

48. Do you feel that your probation officer would not have visited you as often if you had been convicted of a non-sexual offense?

_____ Yes _____ No

77. Do you feel that your current neighborhood is a last resort area for you (meaning that you only live there because the law has limited your other opportunities of residence)?

Yes No Not sure

78. How safe do you feel in your neighborhood?

1 **2** **3** **4** **5**
Very Unsafe **Somewhat Safe** **Very Safe**

The following questions address activities that you may participate in within your community. Please answer one answer per question.

79. Do you attend a religious service of any kind on a regular basis?

Yes No

80. Do you participate in religious activities within the church you belong to (anything that is not included in regular service)?

Yes No

81. Do you seek out the support of a religious leader on a regular basis (rabbi, priest, chaplain, pastor, etc...)?

Yes No

82. Do you take part in a support group within the community?

Yes No

82a. If you answered Yes, is the support group designed specifically for sexual offenders?

Yes No

83. Do you belong to any hobby groups or clubs?

Yes No

84. Are you involved in any intramural sports organizations?

Yes No

85. Do you feel like the activities in which you are involved help make you feel a sense of belonging to your community?

Yes No

86. Are you in contact with any other registered sex offenders in your community?

Yes No

The following questions ask about your identification as a sexual offender. Please answer the question based on how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

87. "If the situation requires it, I am comfortable with identifying myself as a sexual offender."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

88. "If my neighbors make contact with me, I am comfortable with identifying myself as a sexual offender."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

89. "If I were to change residences, I would be likely to introduce myself to my new neighbors and disclose my status as a sexual offender."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

90. "If I had my way, I would never disclose my status as a sex offender."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

91. "I feel that publically identifying myself as a sexual offender does not benefit anyone."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

92. "I do not like to identify myself as a sexual offender because people treat me differently once they know my status."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

93. "I do not like to identify myself as a sexual offender because I feel people are afraid of me once they find out."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Disagree					Unsure				Agree
Completely					Undecided				Completely

94. "I am not afraid to identify myself as a sexual offender."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Disagree Unsure Agree
 Completely Undecided Completely

95. "I feel that people are more receptive to me once I tell them about my status as a sex offender."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Disagree Unsure Agree
 Completely Undecided Completely

96. "If I had my way, I would remove myself from the sex offender registry and never identify myself as a sexual offender again."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Disagree Unsure Agree
 Completely Undecided Completely

97. "I would feel more comfortable identifying myself as a sexual offender if only select information was provided to the public."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Disagree Unsure Agree
 Completely Undecided Completely

The final questions are about you personally. Remember, all of your answers are anonymous and confidential. These items are simply to allow a better understanding of who among Florida's registered sex offenders has what experiences.

98. Your age: _____ years

99. What is your relationship status?

_____ Married _____ Single _____ Unmarried but living with a partner
 _____ Dating _____ Divorced _____ Widow

100. Do you have children? _____ Yes _____ No

100a. If you answered Yes, are your children still minors?

_____ Yes _____ No

100b. If you answered Yes, do you have custody of your children?

_____ Yes _____ No

100c. If you answered No, who has custody/guardianship of your children?

_____ Father _____ Grandparent _____ Aunt
 _____ Uncle _____ Older Sibling _____ Other Relative
 _____ Other

Thank you for your assistance! Please return your completed survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer L. Klein, Department Sociology, Criminology and Law, University of Florida. Jennifer L. Klein can also be reached via email at: jklein87@ufl.edu.

APPENDIX B
CODING MANUAL

Florida Counties

County	Code	County	Code
Alachua	1	Lee	35
Baker	2	Leon	36
Bay	3	Levy	37
Bradford	4	Liberty	38
Brevard	5	Madison	39
Broward	6	Manatee	40
Calhoun	7	Marion	41
Charlotte	8	Martin	42
Citrus	9	Miami-Dade	43
Clay	10	Monroe	44
Collier	11	Nassau	45
Columbia	12	Okaloosa	46
DeSoto	13	Okeechobee	47
Dixie	14	Orange	48
Duval	15	Osceola	49
Escambia	16	Palm Beach	50
Flagler	17	Pasco	51
Franklin	18	Pinellas	52
Gadsden	19	Polk	53
Gilchrist	20	Putnam	54
Glades	21	Saint Johns	55
Gulf	22	Saint Lucie	56
Hamilton	23	Santa Rosa	57
Hardee	24	Sarasota	58
Henry	25	Seminole	59
Hernando	26	Sumter	60
Highlands	27	Suwannee	61
Hillsborough	28	Taylor	62
Holmes	29	Union	63
Indian River	30	Volusia	64
Jackson	31	Wakulla	65
Jefferson	32	Walton	66

Lafayette	33	Washington	67
Lake	34		

Eligible Offenses – Offenses taken from the FDLE Sex Offender Registry

Offense Title (will be listed in SPSS as the following:)	Offense Committed	Coding Number
Sex Offense Against a Child	Sex Offense Against a Child	1
Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	2
Abuse of a child, sexual performance	Abuse of a child and engaging in sexual performances	3
Conspiracy, abuse of a child, sexual performance	Conspiracy to attempt the abuse of a child, engaging in sexual performances	4
Sexual Battery, minor under 16	Commits acts defined as sexual battery to a minor under 16 OR Sexual Assault against a child less than 16 years old	5
Sexual Battery 12 or older, no harm	Sexual Battery of a victim 12 years or older, no serious harm committed Or Sexual Battery to a victim 12 years or older, not likely to commit serious injury	6
Sexual Battery 12 or older, physically helpless victim	Sexual battery to a victim 12 years or older and the victim is physically helpless	7
Sexual Battery 12 or older , mental defects	Committed sexual battery to a victim 12 years or older with mental defects	8
Sexual Battery 12 or under	Sexual Battery of a victim under 12	9
Sexual Battery 12 or under with harm	Sexual Battery and/or injury of victim 12 years old or younger OR Sexual battery with a victim 12 years or older while threatening to use harmful force	10
Sexual Battery, injury to sexual organs, 12 or younger	Commits sexual battery and/or injures the sexual organs of a victim less than 12 years of age	11
Sexual Battery, no harm	Commits sexual battery and uses force not likely to cause harm	12
Sexual Battery, coercion authority	Sexual Battery by coercion of authority	13

Sexual Battery, coercion adult	Sexual Battery with the coercion of the child by an adult	14
Sexual Battery	Sexual Battery in the 1 st degree OR Sexual Battery in the 2 nd degree OR Sexual Battery in the 3 rd degree OR Sexual Battery in the 4 th degree	15
Conspiracy, sexual battery, coercion child	Conspiracy to commit sexual battery and coerce a child	16
Crimes Against Nature	Crimes Against Nature	17
Endangering welfare, child	Endangering the welfare of a child OR Endangering the welfare of children OR Endangering the welfare of a child/children in the 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd or 4 th degree	18
Kidnapping, minor	Kidnapping a minor against their will	19
Kidnapping	Kidnapping	20
False imprisonment	False imprisonment or confinement	21
Failure to Register	Failure to comply with section requirements to report to Law Enforcement OR Failure to register with local Law Enforcement OR Failure to register in allotted time OR Failed to notify sheriff of relocation to another jurisdiction OR Sex offender registration violation	22
Commit a felony with a child under 16	Commit or Facilitate the commission of a felony with a child under 16	23
Sexual Assault, overcoming	Sexual assault and overcoming one's will	24
Sexual Assault, minor	Sexual assault against a minor	25

Sexual Assault, child	Sexual assault against a child OR Sexual Assault against a child , 1 st degree OR Sexual Assault against a child , 2 nd degree OR Sexual Assault against a child , 3 rd degree OR Sexual Assault against a child , 4 th degree	26
Sexual Assault	Sexual Assault OR Sexual Assault, 1 st degree OR Sexual Assault, 2 nd degree OR Sexual Assault 3 rd degree OR Sexual Assault, 4 th degree	27
Deviate Sexual Assault	Deviate Sexual Assault	28
Felonious Sexual Assault, age difference of 3 years	Felonious sexual assault with a victim 13 or older and under 16, with an age difference of 3 years between the victim and the perpetrator	29
Employee Sex, juvenile	Employee Sex with a juvenile offender	30
Indecent Liberties, child	Indecent liberties with a child OR Indecent liberties with a child by custodian, abuse of child	31
Indecent assault and battery, victim over 14	Indecent assault and battery on a person over 14 years of age	32
Lewd and Lascivious, minor less than 16	Committing a lewd act upon a minor less than 16 years of age OR Lewd and lascivious conduct with a victim under the age of 16	33
Lewd and Lascivious, minor less than 16 and offender less than 18	Lewd and lascivious conduct with a victim under the age of 16 and an offender under the age of 18	34
Lewd and Lascivious battery, victim 12-15	Lewd and lascivious battery against a victim 12-15 years old	35

Lewd and Lascivious battery, victim under 16	Lewd and Lascivious battery causing the person under 16 to engage in a sexual act OR Lewd and Lascivious battery causing a sexual act with a victim under 16	36
Lewd molestation, elderly or disabled	Lewdly molesting an elderly or disabled person	37
Lewd molestation	Lewd molestation	38
Lewd and Lascivious molestation, victim 12-15	Lewd and Lascivious molestation of a victim between 12-15 years old	39
Lewdly fondle, under 16	Lewdly fondle or assault on or in the presence of a child under 16	40
Lewd and Lascivious exhibition, under 16	Lewd and lascivious exhibition of a victim under 16 years of age	41
Molestation, under 12	Molestation to a victim under the age of 12	42
Aggravated child molestation	Aggravated child molestation	43
Aggravated sexual assault, child	Aggravated sexual assault on a child	44
Aggravated criminal sexual abuse, victim 13-16	Aggravated criminal sexual abuse with a victim 13-16 years of age with bodily harm committed	45
Aggravated criminal sexual abuse	Aggravated criminal sexual abuse	46
Sexual Abuse	Sexual Abuse in the 1 st degree OR Sexual Abuse in the 2 nd degree OR Sexual Abuse in the 3 rd degree OR Sexual Abuse in the 4 th degree	47
Sexual Abuse, minor	Sexual Abuse of a minor	48
Statutory Rape	Statutory Rape	49
Sodomy	Sodomy	50
Sodomy in the 3 rd degree, actor over 21, victim under 17	Sodomy in the 3 rd degree with the actor over 21 years of age and the victim under 17 years of age	51
Statutory Sodomy	Statutory sodomy in the 1 st degree OR Statutory sodomy in the 2 nd degree OR Statutory sodomy in the 3 rd degree OR Statutory sodomy in the 4 th degree	52

Criminal sexual conduct	Criminal sexual conduct in the 1 st degree OR Criminal sexual conduct in the 2 nd degree OR Criminal sexual conduct in the 3 rd degree OR Criminal sexual conduct in the 4 th degree	53
Criminal sexual conduct, victim 13-16	Criminal sexual conduct in the 4 th degree, victim between 13-16 years of age	54
Intentionally touching, lewd and lascivious, 12-15	Intentionally touching in a lewd and lascivious manner the breasts, genitals, genital area, or buttocks, or the clothing touching them, of a person 12-15, or forcing or enticing a person 12 to 15 to so touch the perpetrator	55
Intentionally touching, lewd and lascivious, person under 16	Intentionally touching a person under 16 years of age in a lewd and lascivious manner or soliciting a person under 16 to commit a lewd and lascivious act	56
Intentionally Masturbating, lewd and lascivious, person under 16	Intentionally masturbating, exposing genitals in a lewd or lascivious manner, or committing any other sexual act with no physical or sexual contact in the presence of a person under 16 years of age	57
Attempted sexual conduct, minor	Attempted sexual conduct with a minor	58
Carnal Knowledge	Carnal Knowledge of a juvenile	59
Incest	Incest in the 1 st degree OR Incest in the 2 nd degree OR Incest in the 3 rd degree OR Incest in the 4 th degree	60

Rape	Rape in the 1 st degree OR Rape in the 2 nd degree OR Rape in the 3 rd degree OR Rape in the 4 th degree	61
Rape, 3 rd degree, victim under 17 and the perpetrator over 21	Rape in the 3 rd degree with a victim less than 17 years old and the perpetrator 21 years or older	62
Rape of a Child	Rape of a child in the 1 st degree OR Rape of a child in the 2 nd degree OR Rape of a child in the 3 rd degree OR Rape of a child in the 4 th degree	63
Rape and abuse, child	Rape and abuse of a child	64
Rape and abuse, child under 16	Rape and abuse of a child, under 16 years old	65
Solicitation of a minor	Solicitation of a minor OR Solicitation of a child	66
Procuring for prostitution, 16 or under	Procuring any person under the age of 16 for prostitution	67
Procuring for prostitution, 18 or under	Procuring any person under the age of 18 for prostitution	68
Prostitution, other offenses, minor	Prostitution and related offenses with a minor	69
Prostitution/Pandering	Prostitution/Pandering	70
Knowingly Sexual Activity, minor	Knowingly engaging in and attempting to engage in a sexual act with a minor	71
Sexual Activity with a minor	Engages in sexual activity with a minor	72
Sexual Activity, minor 12-15	Sex with a victim 12-15 years of age	73
Sexual Activity, minor older than 15	Engages in sexual activity with a minor older than 15 years old	74
Sexual Activity, 16-17	Engages in sexual activity with a person who is 16-17 years old	75
Enticing a child	Enticing a child for indecent purposes OR Enticing a child to enter for immoral purposes	76
Corruption of a minor	Corruption of a minor	77

Unlawful sexual acts, minors	Unlawful sexual acts with certain minors	78
Obscene materials, minor	Provided obscene materials to a minor	79
Conspiracy, child pornography	Conspiracy to produce child pornography	80
Possession child pornography	Possession of child pornography	81
Sexual Exploitation, child pornography	Sexual exploitation of children and activity related to child pornography	82
Induces child to sexually perform	Induces, employs or authorizes child to engage in sexual performances	83
Possession of representation of sexual conduct, child	Possession of photograph, film or other representation that knowingly includes sexual conduct by a child	84
Transmitting information, known minor	Transmitting an image, information or data that is harmful to minors to an individual known to be a minor in this state	85
Use of the internet for sex, child	Use of the internet to solicit or attempt to solicit a child for sex or lewdness	86
Communicating with a minor	Communicating with a minor for immoral purposes	87

Criminal History Offenses - Coding and Eligible Offenses

1 = Sexual Offenses
- SEX BAT BY ADULT/VCTM UNDER 12 (ATTEMPTED)
- ADULT ENGAGING IN SEX WITH A MINOR OVER AGE 15 (X1) FELONY SECOND DEGREE 0794.05.1
- CARNAL INTERCOURSE WITH CHASTE PERSON UNDER 18 (X1) 0794.05.1 FELONY SECOND DEGREE
- ADLT SEX W/16-17 YR OLD F.S.794.05(1)
- UNLAWFUL SEX W/ MINOR (X3) CRIMINAL FELONY
- UNLAWFUL SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH CERTAIN MINORS 16/17 YR OLD; F.S.794.05(1)
- FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH SEX OFFENDER (X1) S9430435(4)
- LEWDLY FONDLE OR ASSAULT, COMMIT OR SIMULATE SEXUAL ACTS ON OR IN PRESENCE OF A CHILD UNDER 16 IN LEWD, LASCIVIOUS OR INDECENT MANNER (X1) 0800.04 FELONY SECOND DEGREE

1 = Sexual Offenses
- L/L BATTERY V 12-15 YO 800.04(4)
- TX SEXUAL ASSAULT CHILD 22.011(A)(2)
- L/L CONDUCT V<16 OFF 18+
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS EXHIBITION VICTIM UNDER 16 YOA OFFENDER 18
- LEWD, LASCIVIOUS CHILD U/16 (F.S.800.04)
- FL. SX OFFNDR FAIL COMPLY PSIA
- SEX OFFENSE, OTHER STATE (SEXUAL ASSAULT)
- SEXUAL ACTIVITY (FAMILIAL/CUSTO) S794041(2)(B) (X2)
- SEXUAL BATTERY: DEF +18 VICT S794011(2)-1
- L/L MOLEST V<12 OFF 18+
- SEX BAT/COERCE CHILD BY ADULT 794.011(2)(B)
- GA SEXUAL BATTERY WPN OR FORCE
- PERSON 18 OR OLDER COMMITS SEXUAL BATTERY AND/OR INJURES SEXUAL ORGANS OF A VCTM LESS THAN 12 0794.011.2 (X1)
- COMMITS SEXUAL BATTERY; VICTIM 12 OR OLDER; OFFENDER COERCES VICTIME BY THREAT OF FORCE OR VIOLENCE (X1) 0794.011.4B FELONY LIFE
- SEX BAT/WPN. OR FORCE 794.011(3)
- SEX BAT/THREAT W/ DEADLY WPN. 794.011(1)
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS BATTERY ON CHILD AGED 12 TO 15 (X1) F.S.800.04(4)
- LEWD ASLT/SEX BAT VCTM
- SEX BAT BY JUV/VCTM UNDER 12; F.S.794.011(2)
- SEXUAL BATTERY (FAMILIAL OR CU) (X2) S794011(8)(B)
- SEX OFFENDER FAIL TO NOT. SHERIFF; F.S.943.0435(7)
- EMPLOYEE SEX W/DJJ OFNDR; F.S.985.404591)(A)(X3)

1 = Sexual Offenses
- LEWDLY FONDLE OR ASSAULT, COMMIT OR SIMULATE SEXUAL ACTS ON OR IN PRESENCE OF A CHILD UNDER 16 IN A LEWD, LASCIVIOUS OR INDECENT MANNER (X1) 0800.04
- COMMITS SEXUAL BATTERY; COERCES BY AUTHORITY (ENGAGES IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A CHILD) (X1) F.S.0794041.2B FELONY FIRST DEGREE
- L/L MOLEST V12-15 OFF 18+
- L/L INDEC.ASLT CHILD U/16
- SEX OFFENSE, OTHER STATE (X3 SEXUAL ABUSE 1ST DEGREE
- SEX BAT/WEAP/SER INJ
- SEX BAT THREAT W/ DEADLY WPN. 794.011(3)
- SEX OFND/VIOL REGIST FELONY
- SEX BAT/WPN. OR FORCE; F.S.794.011(3)
- SEXUAL OFFENDER FAIL REGISTER AS A SEXUAL OFFENDER 943.0435(9)
- SEX BAT/PHYS RESIST;F.S.794.011(4)(A)
- L/L INDEC.ASLT.CHILD U/16
- ABUSE OF CHILD, ENG SEX PERFM. 827.071(2)
- SEX OFFENSE-AGAINST CHILD FONDLING MOLEST VIC LESS THAN 12YOA OFF 800.04 5B
- OBSCENE MATERIAL-DISTRIB TO MINOR 847.0133
- CRUELTY TOWARD CHILD USE OR ALLOW CHILD TO ENGAGE IN SEX 827.071. 2
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS EXHIBITION, VICTIM UNDER 16, OFFENDER UNDER 18; F.S.800.04(7)C
- SEX.OFNDR. NOT NOTIF.SHERIFF 943.0435(7)
- ABUSE OF CHILD, ENG SEX PERFM. 827.071(2)

1 = Sexual Offenses
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS/ SENT 96.45 MONTHS DOC (X1) CRIMINAL FELONY
- SEX BAT/INJURY NOT LIKELY
- SEX BAT/PHYSICAL FORCE 794.011(5)
- ATTEMPTED SEXUAL BATTERY 794.011 1F THIRD DEGREE
- SEX PERF/CHILD/POSN
- POSS OF PHOTOS/PICTURES SHOWING SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY A CHILD; F.S.827.071(5)
- ABUSE OF CHILD, ENG SEX PERF;F.S.827.071(2)
- SEX OFFENSE, OTHER STATE (SODOMY, 3RD DEGREE: ACTOR OVER 21, VICTIM UNDER 17 YEARS OF AGE)
- OK. LEWD MOLESTATION
- ATTEMPTED SEXUAL BATTERY 794.011 1F THIRD DEGREE
- LEWD/LASC EXHIBIT BY PERSON 18 YOA, VICT 16 YOA (800.04-7C-1)
- PROVIDE OBSCENE MATERIAL TO A F.S. 847.0133.1
- FALSE IMPRISONMENT OF A CHILD UNDER 13 WHILE COMMITTING AGGRAVATED CHILD ABUSE, SEXUAL BATTERY, INDECENT ASSAULT, PROSTITUTION, OR EXPLOITATION X1 F.S.0787.02.3A
- PERSON 18 OR OLDER COMMITS SEXUAL BATTERY AND OR INJURES SEXUAL ORGANS OF A VICTIM LESS THAN 12 X1 F.S.0794.011.2 FELONY SECOND DEGREE
- COMMITS SEXUAL BATTERY; VICTIM 12 OR OLDER PHYSICALLY HELPLESS F.S. 0794.011.4A X1 FELONY SECOND DEGREE
- SEX ASSLT-SOL SEX BATT ACT BY CUSTODIAN VICTM UNDER 18 YOA (STATUTE: 794.011(8A))
- AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL SEXUAL ABUSE/VICTIM 13-16
- POSSESS PHOTOGRAPH, FILM OR OTHER REPRESENTATION THAT KNOWINGLY INCLUDES SEXUAL CONDUCT BY CHILD (OFFENSE CODE: 0827.071.5) FELONG THIRD DEGREE

1 = Sexual Offenses
- ABUSE OF CHILD, PHOTO SEX CONDT (OFFENSE CODE: 827.071(5))
- POSS OF PHOTO/PICTURE SHOWING SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY A CHILD; F.S. 827.071(5)
- SEX ASSLT-SOL SEX BATT ACT BY CUSTODIAN VICTM UNDER 18 YOA (STATUTE: 794.011(8A))
- SEXUAL OFFENDER REGISTRATION (NOT AN ARREST)/CONVICTED FELON REGISTRATION OFFENSE CODE: 775.13
- ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A PERSON 12 TO 1 OR ENCOURGING, FORCING, OR ENTICING A PERSON UNDER 16 TO ENGAGE IN SADOMASOCHISTIC ABUSE, SEXUAL BESTIALITY, PROSTITUTION, OR ANY OTHER ACT INVOLVIN (OFFENSE CODE: 0800.04.4)
- PROMOTES SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY A CHILD WHICH INCLUDES SEXUAL CONDUCT OFFENSE CODE: 0827.071.3
- CARNAL INTERCOURSE WITH CHASTE PERSON UNDER 18 0794.05.1
- VA. STATUTORY RAPE (OFFENSE CODE: 18.2-63) FELONY
- DIRECT PROMOTE SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY CHILD 827071 3 SECOND DEGREE
- CRUELTY TOWARD CHILD-DIRECT PROMOTE SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY CHILD (827.071(9))
- OBSCENE MATERIAL POSSESS-POSS PHOTOGRAPH OF SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY CHILD (827.071(5))
- ABUSE OF CHILD, ENG SEX PERFM.
- FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH SEX OFFENDER REPORTING REQ (X1)
- SEX BAT/MENTALLY DEFECTIVE
- INDUCES, EMPLOYS OR AUTHORIZES CHILD TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL PERFORMANCE, FELONY SECOND DEGREE F.S.0827.071.2 (X1)
- LEWDLY FONDLE OR ASSAULT, COMMIT OR SIMULATE SEXUAL ACTS ON OR IN PRESENCE OF A CHILD UNDER 16 IN LEWD,LASCIVIOUS OR INDECENT MANNER (X1) 0800.04 FELONY SECOND DEGREE
- F/VOP F/T REG SEX OFFENDER (PIP 94806) FELONY THIRD DEGREE

1 = Sexual Offenses
- SEX BATT/SOLICITATION OF CHILD
- SEX BAT BY ADULT/VCTM UNDER 12; F.S. 794.011(2)
- CRUELTY TOWARD CHILD-DIRECT PROMOTE SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY CHILD (827.071(9))
- ABUSE OF CHILD, PHOTO SEX CONDT (OFFENSE CODE: 827.071(5) COURT/TRAFFIC)
- OBSCENE MATERIAL POSSESS-POSS PHOTOGRAPH OF SEXUAL PERFORMANCE BY CHILD (827.071(5))
- SOLICIT SEX-MISD. (OFFENSE CODE: 796.07(2)(F))
- SEX OFFENSE, OTHER STATE (CHILD PORNOGRAPHY-FEDERAL OFFENSE)
- LEWDLY FONDLE OR ASSAULT, COMMIT OR SIMULATE SEXUAL ACTS ON OR IN PRESENCE OF A CHILD UNDER 16 IN LEWD, LASCIVIOUS OR INDECENT MANNER OFFENSE CODE: 0800.04
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS BATTERY (X1) F.S.800.04(4)
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS EXHIBITION VICTIM UNDER 16 YOA OFFENDER 18 OR OLDER; F.S.800.04(6)(B)
- SEX BAT/COERCE CHILD BY ADULT 794.011(2)(B)
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS BATTERY ON CHILD AGED 12 TO 15 (X1) F.S.800.04(4) ABUSE CHILD
- L/L INDEC.ASLT.CHILD U/16
- LEWDLY FONDLE OR ASSAULT, COMMIT OR SIMULATE SEXUAL ACTS ON OR IN PRESENCE OF A CHILD UNDER 16 IN LEWD,LASCIVIOUS OR INDECENT MANNER (X1) 0800.04 FELONY SECOND DEGREE
- LEWD OR LASCIVIOUS VICTIM UNDER 16 YEARS OLD BY OFFENDER 18 YEARS OR OLDER; F.S.800.04(6)(B)

2 = Battery / Aggravated Assault
- MISDEMEANOR-BATTERY (X1) 0784.03 MISDEMEANOR FIRST DEGREE

2 = Battery / Aggravated Assault
- BATTERY/AGGRAVATED, FELONY
- BATTERY LAW ENFORCEMENT 240.381(2)
- BATTERY/AGG/BOD HARM
- BATTERY ON PERSON 65 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER 78408 THIRD DEGREE
- AGGRAVATED BATTERY; VICTIM PREGNANT (X1) F.S.0784.045.1B
- BATTERY (DOMESTIC) (X2) F.S.S78403-1
- AGGRAVATED ASSUALT; ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON WITHOUT INTENT TO KILL (X1) 0784.021.1A
- AGG ASSLT-W/WPN NO INTENT TO K 784.021(1)(A)
- AGG BATTERY INTENDED HARM 784.045(1)(A)1
- BATTERY LAW ENFORCEMENT 784.07(2)(B)
- BATTERY ON OFFICER 784.07 2B

3 = Fraud
- WILLYFULLY AND WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION FRAUDULENTLY USES, OR POSSES WITH INTENT TO FRAUDULENTLY USE, PERSONAL ID INFO CONCERNING AN INDIVIDUAL (FRAUDULENT USE OF PERSONAL ID) (X1) 0817.568.2
- COUNTERFEITING A PAYMENT INSTRUMENT WITH INTENT TO DEFRAUD OR POSSESSING ANY COUNTERFEIT PAYMENT INSTRUMENT (X1) 0831.28.2A
- FRAUD USE OF PERSONAL ID 817.568(2)
- COUNTERFEIT PAYMENT INSTR. 831.28(2)(A)
- FRAUD-CREDIT CARD
- FAM.SERV.FRAUD.\$200 OR MORE 414.39(2)
- FRAUD-OTHER

3 = Fraud
- SELL GOODS WITH FAKE OR COUNTERFEIT LABEL (X1) 0831.05.1A
- RACKETEERING VIOLATION 89502
- OBTAINING PROPERTY IN RETURN FOR W/L CHECK (X1) MISDEMEANOR
- WORTHLESS CHECK OBTAINING PR S83205(4)(A)-2
- PASSING WORTHLESS BANK CHECK F.S.832.05 2B
- WORTHLESS CHECKS
- UTTERING FORGERY
- UTTERING A FORGED INSTRUMENT FORG2000

4 = Driving / Traffic Issues
- DRIVING WHILE LICENSE SUSPENDED (X1) S32234(1)
- DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE (X4) S316193(1)
- NO VALID DRIVER'S LICENSE (X1) F.S.S32203
- DRIVING WITH LICENSE SUSPENDED, REVOKED, CANCELED, OR DISQUALIFIED (X1) 0322.34
- FL. DUI-UNDER INFLUENCE OF ALCHO OFFENSE CODE: S316193(1)
- DRIVER'S LICENSE EXPIRED FOR M (X1) S32203(4)
- SPEEDING 85/70 STATUTE:012
- SPEEDING 316.189(1)-2
- EXPIRED REGIS 6 MONTHS OR LESS
- ACCIDENT FAIL TO SUBMIT PROOF OF INSURANCE
- DRIVING VEHICLE IN UNSAFE CONDITION
- FAILED/OBEY TRAFF. CONTROL DEV

4 = Driving / Traffic Issues
- CARELESS DRIVING
- DRIVING WHILE LICENSE SUSPENDED (X1) F.S.S32234
- EXPIRED TAG MORE THAN 4 MONTHSF.S.320.07 3B
- STREET VIOLATION
- FAIL TO DISPLAY REGISTRATION; POSSESSION REQUIRED F.S.320.0605
- UNLAWFUL USE OF A TEMPORARY TAG F.S.320.131(3)
- RAN STOP SIGN
- UNLAWFUL SPEED
- NO OR IMPROPER LAMPS BICYCLE
- 88/70 SPEED STATE ROAD OR INT
- NO HEADLIGHTS
- C/0371ATS 4 NO MTR.VEH.REGIST. 32002 MISDEMEANOR SECOND DEGREE
- I/0372ATS 5 NO PROOF/INSURANCE 316646
- DRIVE WHILE LICENSE SUSPENDED OR REVOKED 322.34(2A)
- OPEN STORAGE OF PROHIBITED VEHICLE
- FAILED TO STOP AT INOPERATIVE TRAFFIC LIGHT 316.1235
- IMPROPER TAG; F.S.S320261 (X1)
- PERMIT UNAUTHORIZED PERSON TO DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLE F.S.322.36

5 = Prostitution
- PROSTITUTION LEWDNESS OR ASSIG (OFFENSE CODE: 796.07.2E)
- SOLICIT SEX-MISD. (OFFENSE CODE: 796.07(2)(F))

5 = Prostitution
- DERIVING SUPPORT FROM PROSTITUTION (OFFENSE CODE: 79605) THIRD DEGREE
- PROSTITUTION LIVE OFF EARNINGS OF (OFFENSE CODE: 79605) THIRD DEGREE
- SOLICITATION OF PROSTITUTION 79607 SECOND DEGREE
- PROSTITUTION 79607
- PROSTITUTION PIMPING LEWD INCECENT ACT
- LOITERING FOR PROSTITUTION (X1)
- LOITERING OR PROWLING (X1) F.S.S856021
- PROCURING FEMALE UNDER 16 (X2) F.S.S79603
- PROCURING A PERSON UNDER AGE OF 18 FOR PROSTITUTION F.S.796.03
- SOLICITING FOR PROSTITUTION, MISDEMEANOR SECOND DEGREE 0796.07.2F (X1)

6 = Drugs
- DANGEROUS DRUGS
- DELIVER TO MINOR OR HIRE AS AGENT IN SALE OR DELIVERY- MARIJUANA LSD, SYNTHETIC NARCOTIC, ETC. F.S.0893.13.4B X1
- POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED SUBST (X1) F.S.S893147(1)
- SALE OF MARIJUANA CRIMINAL FELONY
- SALE OF CLONAZEPAM CRIMINAL FELONY
- SALE OF OXYCODONE CRIMINAL FELONY
- POSS OXYCODONE CRIMINAL FELONY
- MARIJUANA POSSESS-NOT MORE THAN 20 GRAMS F.S.893.13(6B)
- REMANDED FOR POSSESSION OF COCAINE

6 = Drugs
- MARIJUANA-SALE/MANUF/DEL
- OTH.DRUG-SALE/MANUF/DELIV
- INT POSS CONTR SUBST BY PER NOT REG
- CONSPIRE MANUF/DEL/POSS/W INT MANUF OR
- NARCOTIC EQUIP POSS OR USE 893.147.1
- POSSESSION OF CRACK COCAINE (X2) FELONY THIRD DEGREE
- POSSESSION OF DRUG PARAPHERNALIA (X2) MISDEMEANOR FIRST DEGREE
- COCAINE POSSESSION 893.13(6)(A)
- POSSESSION (X1) FELONY THIRD DEGREE
- SALE OR DELIVERY OF CANNIBIS T F.S. 893.13.4B
- SYN.NARC-SALE/DELIV. MINOR
- FS/PROHIBITED HARVEST MISDEMEANOR SECOND DEGREE

7 = Theft
- GRAND THEFT \$5K L/\$10 K 812.014(2)(C1)
- PETIT THEFT-MISDEMEANOR SECOND DEGREE (X1) 0812.014.3A
- CRIMINAL MISCHIEF OVER \$200 BUT L/T 1,000 F.S.806.13.1B2
- GRAND THEFT \$300 LESS \$20,000
- CREDIT CARD THEFT OFFENSE CODE: 18.2-192 FELONY
- RETAIL THEFT, SECOND DEGREE (STATUTE: 812014)
- GRAND THEFT 812.014 2D
- GRAND THEFT, \$100 BUT LESS THAN \$300 FROM DWELLING 0812.014.2D (X1)
- PETIT THEFT; PROPERTY NOT SPECIFIED IN F.S. 812.014 (3RD SUBSEQUENT OFFENSE) 0812.014.2D (X1)

7 = Theft

- | |
|--|
| - PETIT THEFT/3RD CONVICTION 812.014(2)(D) |
| - RETAIL THEFT/SHOPLIFTING 812.015(2) |

8 = Burglary / Robbery

- | |
|--|
| - BURG/UNNOC.STRUCT/CONVEY 810.02(4)(A) |
| - BURGLARY/ASSLT/ARMED |
| - BURGLARY ASSAULT ANY PERSON |
| - BURGLARY OF A STRUCTURE (X1) FELONY THIRD DEGREE |
| - ROBBERY/ARMED/WEAPON |
| - ROBBERY WITH OTHER WEAPON 812.1392)(B) |
| - ROBB.WPN-NOT DEADLY |
| - ROBBERY N/FIREARM OR D/WEAPON 812.13(2)C |

9 = Kidnapping

- | |
|--|
| - KIDNAPPING/WEAPON |
| - KIDNAP;COMM.OR.FAC.FELONY |
| - KIDNAP; HOLD RANSOM OR HOST. |
| - KIDNAP; COMM.TO.FAC.FELONY 787.01(1)(A)2 |
| - KIDNAP MINOR FOR RANSOM;F.S.787.01(1)(A)1 |
| - KIDNAP MINOR AGAINST WILL;F.S.787.01(1)(B) |

10 = Larceny

- | |
|---------------------------|
| - PETIT LARCENY (X1) 5513 |
|---------------------------|

- LARC-OVER 300 DOLLARS UNDER 20000 F.S.812.014(2C)
- 812.014(2C1) LARC-THEFT IS 300 OR MORE BUT LESS THAN 5000 DOLS
- 817.60(2) LARC-LOST OR DELIVERED BY MISTAKE CREDIT CARD

11 = Child Neglect
- INTERFERES WITH CUSTODY/CHILD UNDER 17 F.S.0787.03.1
- ENDANGER WELFARE CHILD-DUTY
- CHILD ABUSE/NO HARM
- CHILD ABUSE-INJ/NEGLECT
- CHILD ABUSE-NEGLECT F.S.82703(3)(B)
- NEGLECT CHILD

12 = Other
- PRESIST OR OBSTRUCT OFFICER WITHOUT VIOLENCE 843.02
- RESISTING OFFICER WITHOUT VIOLENCE (X1) 0843.02 MISDEMEANOR FIRST DEGREE
- COUNTY VIOLATION (X1)
- FL. FELON/FAILED TO CHANGE ADDRESS ON ID W/I 48 HR
- FL. FUGITIVE-WANTED OTHER JURISD OFFENSE CODE: S941
- MISDEMEANOR-PUBLIC INTOXICATION (X1) 0856.011 MISDEMEANOR SECOND DEGREE
- VICTIME BY THREAT OF FORCE OR VIOLENCE (X1) 0794.011.4B FELONY LIFE
- INJ/LILL PD/FD/SAR ANIMAL 843.19
- NC REGISTERED AS A RESULT OF OUT-OF-STATE CONVICTION (LIFETIME)14-208.6.4.B.2
- RESIST OFF W/O VIOL MISDEMEANOR

12 = Other
- FALSE REPORT/CRIME MISDEMEANOR
- BREACH OF PEACE OR DISORDERLY CONDUCT 877.03
- RESIST RETAIL MERCHANT OFFICER FARMER 812.015 6
- FAILURE TO APPEAR FOR MISDEMEANOR (843.15(1B))
- RESIST OFFICER-OBSTRUCT WHO VIOLENCE (843.02)
- FLEEING OR ELUDING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER 316.1935(2)
- BAIL SECURED BOND-FAILURE TO APPEAR FOR FELONY OFFENSE 843.15(1A)
- FALSE IMPRISONMENT
- CONTRI DELINQ MINOR , MISDEMEANOR
- PUBLIC DRUNK
- SALE OF CIGARETTES WRAPPERS F.S.859.06
- GIVING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TO M F.S. 562.11.A-B
- GOV. WARRANT/AUTH.ARREST
- OUT OF COUNTY WARRANT; HOLD FOR SANTA ROSA CITY
- ZONING VIOLATION
- FELON/FAILED TO CHANGE ADDRESS ON ID W/I 48 HR
- HARBORING FUGITIVE
- ACESSORRY AFTER FACT
- F/U-SENT (FSP) OFFENSE CODE: 91905 FELONY
- FUGITIVE-WANTED OTHER JURISD OFFENSE CODE: S941
- BAIL SECURED BOND-FAILURE TO APPEAR FOR FELONY OFFENSE (843.15(1A))
- VIOLATION OF 2500 FT ORDINANCE
- FUGITIVE WARRANT

12 = Other
- DUMPING OR LITERING 403413 4
- TAMPERING WITH PHYSICAL EVIDENCE
- FALSE REPORT LAW/OFF
- ACCESSORY AFTER FACT
- REMANDED FOR TAMPERING WITH PHYSICAL EVIDENCE
- GIVE FALSE INFO TO POLICE F.S.316067
- TRESPASS-PROP OTHER THAN STR(X1) F.S.S81009
- BOOKED PER ADM ORDER 2.068; MUST 1ST APPEAR
- WRIT HABEUS CORPUS AD TESTIFICANDUM (X1)
- VIOLATION OF INJUNCTION FOR PR (X1) F.S.S784047

APPENDIX C
REFERENCE TABLES

Florida Sex Offender Registry Definitions: Sexual Predator vs. Sexual Offender (FDLE Sex Offender Registry, 2010b).	
Sexual Predator	<p>Any person who is convicted for a qualifying and Capital, Life, or First degree felony sex offense committed on or after 10/1/1993</p> <p>OR</p> <p>is convicted for any felony or attempt thereof for a qualifying offense committed after 10/1/1993 in addition to a prior conviction for any felony violation or attempt thereof for a qualifying offense</p> <p>OR</p> <p>A written court finding designating the individual a sexual predator.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Regardless of whether an individual meets or does not meet the criteria listed above, anyone civilly committed under the Florida Jimmy Ryce Sexually Violent Predator Act must register as a sexual predator.</p>

Sexual Offender	<p>There are several ways for a person to be classified as a sexual offender. They are:</p> <p>1) Be convicted of committing, or attempting, soliciting, or conspiring to commit, any of the crimes specified in Chart 1* below, or of similar offenses in another jurisdiction (or any similar offense committed in this state which has been redesignated from a former statute number to the one specified)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>a. Be in the custody or control of, or under the supervision of, the Florida Department of Corrections, or be in the custody of a private correctional facility, on or after October 1, 1997, as a result of the above conviction(s)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>b. On or after October 1, 1997, be released or have been released from the sanction(s) imposed for the above conviction(s). (<i>"Sanction" is defined below.</i>)</p> <p>2) Establish or maintain a residence in this state and have <u>not</u> been designated as a sexual predator by a court of this state but <u>have</u> been designated as a sexual predator, as a sexually violent predator, or by another sexual offender designation in another state or jurisdiction and as a result of such designation, are subjected to registration or community or public notification, or both, or would be if a resident of that state or jurisdiction;</p> <p>3) Establish or maintain a residence in this state and be in the custody or control of, or under the supervision of, any other state or jurisdiction as a result of a conviction for committing, or attempting, soliciting, or conspiring to commit, any of the specified criminal offenses listed below (or any similar offense committed in this state which has been re-designated from a former statute number to the one specified).</p> <p>4) Be adjudicated delinquent for committing, or attempting, soliciting, or conspiring to commit on or after July 1, 2007, any of the crimes specified in Chart 2** below when the juvenile was 14 years of age or older at the time of the offense.</p>
-----------------	---

*Chart 1 can be found in the Appendix, Table X.

**Chart 2 can be found in the Appendix, Table X.

FDLE Chart 1, Qualifying Adult Convictions. (FDLE, 2010b).

<p>Commission of OR Attempt, Solicit, or Conspire to Commit</p>	<p>s. 787.01* Kidnapping <i>Where the victim is a minor and the defendant is not the victim's parent or guardian</i></p> <p>s. 787.02* False imprisonment <i>Where the victim is a minor and the defendant is not the victim's parent or guardian</i></p> <p>s. 787.025(2)(c) Luring or enticing a child <i>Where the victim is a minor and the defendant is not the victim's parent or guardian</i></p> <p>s. 794.011** Sexual Battery; <i>**excluding subsection (10)</i></p> <p>s. 794.05 Unlawful sexual activity with certain minors</p> <p>s. 796.03 Procuring a person under the age of 18 for prostitution</p> <p>s.796.035 Selling or buying of minors into sex trafficking or prostitution</p> <p>s. 800.04 Lewd/lascivious offenses committed upon or in the presence of persons less than 16 years of age</p> <p>s. 825.1025 Lewd/lascivious offenses committed upon or in the presence of an elderly person or disabled adult</p> <p>s. 827.071 Sexual performance by a child</p> <p>s. 847.0133 Protection of minors; prohibition of certain acts in connection with obscenity</p> <p>s. 847.0135 Computer pornography, excluding subsection 847.0135(4)</p> <p>s. 847.0137 Transmission of child pornography by electronic device/equipment</p> <p>s. 847.0138 Transmission of material harmful to minors to a minor by electronic device/equipment</p> <p>s. 847.0145 Selling or buying of minors (for portrayal in a visual depiction engaging in sexually explicit conduct)</p> <p>s. 985.701(1) Sexual misconduct prohibited</p>
	<p>Or A violation of a similar law of another jurisdiction</p>

FDLE Chart 2, Qualifying Adjudication of Delinquency Offenses (FDLE, 2010b).

<p>Commission of OR Attempt, Solicit, or Conspire to Commit</p>	<p>s.794.011* Sexual Battery; <i>*excluding subsection (10)</i></p> <p>s. 800.04(4)(b) Lewd/lascivious battery where the victim is under 12 or the court finds sexual activity by the use of force or coercion</p> <p>s. 800.04(5)(c)1 Lewd/lascivious molestation, victim under 12, where the court finds molestation involving unclothed genitals</p> <p>s. 800.04(5)(d) Lewd/lascivious molestation, victim under 16 but more than 12, where the court finds the use of force or coercion and unclothed genitals</p>
	<p>Or A violation of a similar law of another jurisdiction</p>

APPENDIX D QUALITATIVE DATA

Participant A21

In the returned survey, Participant A21 sent me a letter titled, “My Sex Offender Story, State of Florida vs. [Name Removed], Case # [Case Removed]. The following is the letter that was sent, typed verbatim.

“I am seeking a full pardon under the Florida executive clemency process in order to be relieved of the requirements imposed by F.S.943.0435 for registered sex offenders. These requirements place an unnecessary burden on me, my wife of 33 years, my grown children, my grandchildren, my neighbors and the [County Removed] Sheriff’s Department as well as impending volunteer work that I do in advocacy and education on behalf of persons living with HIV and different sexual orientations or gender identity. The following paragraphs tell my side of the story of my arrest, the consequences for my life and provide a solid base for clemency.”

“On March 24, 1999 I was arrested for ‘possession of child pornography.’ My ‘crime’ was in not knowing how to purge an unmarked email attachment sent to me by an unknown Internet predator, which I naively downloaded onto the hard-drive of my personal computer at home before realizing that it contained at least one image of probably child pornography. At the time, late in 1998 and early 1999, I was role playing (profiling) as a 14 year old girl in an adult Internet chat room. I am now a fully transitioned post-operative male-to-female transsexual woman and at the time was seeking ‘safe’ ways to explore the depth of my gender dysphoria. I later took the computer into a local repair shop after the power supply failed. The technician discovered the existence of the electronic image(s) and reported the discovery to the

local police. I had forgotten that the image was on the computer, but remembered it when the police confronted me. I naively assumed that we would work together to find the perpetrator. Apparently there was a second image associated with the download file, which was a collage of six images of what appeared to be a teenage girl engaged in sexual acts with an adult male. The police pushed this at me during the interview but I had not been previously aware of its existence. The [name removed] City Police were not interested in my story or in pursuing the real culprit. They assumed that I was part of a larger child pornography ring. I was taken to the [name removed] County jail and was subsequently released on a \$7500 bail bond.”

“A thorough search at my home (to which I had agreed) and office revealed no other illegal material whatsoever. Even after finding absolutely no evidence of any involvement in child porn other than this since incident, the prosecuting attorney, [Name removed], refused to meet with me and chose instead to prosecute me to the fullest extent of the law in order to further his ambition to become a county judge. He was building his career based upon ‘child advocacy.’ He subsequently lost his bid for election as [name removed] County Judge and became a defense attorney. He was later found guilty on several counts of conspiracy and fraud by the United States District Court in [city removed] and served hard time in a Federal prison.”

“The original charges brought by [name removed] under case number [case number removed] were one count possession of child pornography and six counts of promoting sexual performance by a child. I subsequently lost my job [job removed], my ministry (as an ordained deacon in the Roman Catholic Diocese [Diocese removed])

and the respect of many in the community due to the notoriety caused by the publication of these charges in our local newspaper.”

“I was advised by my attorney, [name removed] to enter a plea of ‘nolo contendere’ to ‘one count possession of child pornography’ in order to avoid a very stressful trial and the possibility of a long prison term (I was transgender and living with AIDS). I later learned that [name removed] encouraged all of his clients to agree to plea bargains rather than argue their cases before a jury. [Name removed] never informed me that I would be designated a sex offender and subjected to applicable legislatively mandated restrictions. He also told me that my record would be wiped clean upon completion of my sentence and that I would be free to travel anywhere I needed or desired during my period of probation. Even so, my intuition and desire was to declare myself innocent of any real crime and to argue my case in court. The judge [name removed] threatened me with at least five years in state prison if I did not agree to this plea bargain and was subsequently found guilty by a jury. According to my defense attorney, the state would only have to show that I knew that an image of child porn existed on my computer hard-drive to gain a guilty verdict (a fact that I had already freely admitted). Judge [Name removed] recently committed suicide. In my opinion, there was a strong hint of collusion between the prosecuting attorney, my defense attorney and the presiding judge at the time of my hearing. I also feel that these individuals were biased against me because of my being transgender and living with AIDS.”

“On December 2, 1999 Judge [name removed] ordered that I be placed under supervised probation for five years without adjudication of guilt. He did not declare me

to be a 'sex offender' from the bench. Prior to the hearing I had submitted letters from my wife, mental health professionals, family members and community leaders attesting that I am neither a pedophile nor a danger to anyone...that, in fact, **I was not a true sex offender and never have been.** To my surprise and horror, when I reported to my probation officer I learned that the governing statutes relating to any violation of F.S.827.071 mandated my ***lifetime designation as a 'sex offender'*** and placed me under a host of mandated restrictions per F.S.847.0145, which apply equally ***without regard to the severity or circumstances of the alleged 'crime.'*** For example my probation officer informed me that I was not allowed to travel outside of [name removed] County without explicit written permission, I was placed under a strict curfew, I could not live in my house (since it was within 1,000 feet of a home with children), I could not embrace or be alone with my grandchildren, etc. This 'crime' also resulted in a lifetime designation as a 'sex offender' displayed on the FDLE website, which is accessibly by anyone through the Internet.”

“While I was under supervised probation, I successfully passed a series of polygraph examinations mandated by F.S.847.0145, Para(b)1 and was released from the sex offender treatment program required by Para.3 of that same statute. Judge [name removed] did ultimately grant me some relief via court ordered modifications especially related to living in my home and the ability to travel for necessary purposes including medical care. None of this, however, was able to affect the way that the Florida Department of Corrections treated me. Our lives were shattered, our health jeopardized and the financial drain continues to be severe. I was pushed close to the edge of suicide on a number of occasions.”

“I was finally released from supervised probation 22 months early effective March 17, 2003. Relief of sex offender registration restrictions can only be pursued by being granted a full pardon through the executive clemency process. Under current rules I cannot apply for executive clemency for over three more years without first requesting a waiver of these rules, which I am doing with this submission. In the meantime I face continuous harassment by the local sheriff’s office as well as potential violence from local vigilantes. New restrictions have been placed on me by the recent passage of the ‘Jessica Lunsford Act’ that requires me to register with the local sheriff’s office as a ‘sex offender’ once every six months rather than simply whenever I move. [Name removed] County deputies come to my home at least once every month to ensure that I am physically present at my address of record (we have lived in the same house for 30 years and do not intend to move or to be driven out!). My sex offender designation, photograph and address and other personal information are easily available via the Internet with no clarification concerning the severity of my so called ‘crime.’ Much of the local populace has no clue as to the differences between a ‘sex offender’ and a ‘sexual predator’! Many assume that I have actually molested a child (while in truth I was the victim of a sexual predator who apparently was ‘grooming me’ thinking that I was a 14 year old child!)”

“I currently remain unemployable and cannot volunteer with many state agencies or other service organizations that have contractual relationships with state agencies. For example, I am not allowed to volunteer as an HIV/AIDS test counselor or to teach HIV/AIDS survival skills to others diagnosed with this still potentially fatal disease. I am still heavily involved in GLBT education and advocacy, HIV/AIDS spirituality, and HIV

patient care planning at the local, regional and state levels. I am also heavily involved in fighting for civil liberties for all citizens.” “Respectfully submitted, Participant A21.”

The letter that was sent back to me from Participant A21 was a copy of the clemency submission that was used in A21’s application. At the end of the letter, A21 wrote that “My case was never reviewed by the clemency board.”

Participant A45

Participant A45 called me to ask a few questions about the survey that I sent to her. She could not speak too much in terms of sexual offenses since she was in the car with her two children. A45 was convicted in Michigan slightly before her 18th birthday, however she was arrested and charged when she was 16. She felt that she was “set up” and if someone were to read her case file, they would not believe what it was that she was convicted of. Unfortunately, she never outright said what she was convicted of, but the registry lists her as committing “criminal sexual conduct in the 3rd degree.”

Michigan law lists “criminal sexual conduct in the 3rd degree” as the following:

“A person is guilty of criminal sexual conduct in the third degree if the person engages in sexual penetration with another person and if any of the following circumstances exist:”

**Section 750.520d Criminal sexual conduct in the third degree; felony.
Michigan Legislature (2010).**

a) That other person is at least 13 years of age and under 16 years of age.
b) Force or coercion is used to accomplish the sexual penetration.
c) The actor knows or has reason to know that the victim is mentally incapable, mentally incapacitated, or physically helpless
d) That other person is related to the actor by blood or affinity to the third degree and the sexual penetration occurs under circumstances not otherwise prohibited by this chapter.

<p>e) That other person is at least 16 years of age but less than 18 years of age and a student at a public school or nonpublic school and either of the following applies:</p> <p>(i) The actor is a teacher, substitute teacher, or administrator of that public school, nonpublic school, school district, or intermediate school district. This subparagraph does not apply if the other person is emancipated or if both persons are lawfully married to each other at the time of the alleged violation.</p> <p>(ii) The actor is an employee or a contractual service provider of the public school, nonpublic school, school district, or intermediate school district in which that other person is enrolled, or is a volunteer who is not a student in any public school or nonpublic school, or is an employee of this state or of a local unit of government of this state or of the United States assigned to provide any service to that public school, nonpublic school, school district, or intermediate school district, and the actor uses his or her employee, contractual, or volunteer status to gain access to, or to establish a relationship with, that other person.</p>
<p>f) That other person is at least 16 years old but less than 26 years of age and is receiving special education services, and either of the following applies:</p> <p>(i) The actor is a teacher, substitute teacher, administrator, employee, or contractual service provider of the public school, nonpublic school, school district, or intermediate school district from which that other person receives the special education services. This subparagraph does not apply if both persons are lawfully married to each other at the time of the alleged violation.</p> <p>(ii) The actor is a volunteer who is not a student in any public school or nonpublic school, or is an employee of this state or of a local unit of government of this state or of the United States assigned to provide any service to that public school, nonpublic school, school district, or intermediate school district, and the actor uses his or her employee, contractual, or volunteer status to gain access to, or to establish a relationship with, that other person.</p>
<p>(2) Criminal sexual conduct in the third degree is a felony punishable by imprisonment for not more than 15 years.</p>

Despite her conviction and her own status on the registry, A45 felt as though the registry is something that should be in place to keep track of sexual offenders. She feels as though 90% of sex offenders should be on the registry. Not those who are extremely low risk, but those who are molesting and who are raping. She feels as though the registry serves as a sort of “double jeopardy” for those who are low risk offenders. They have served their sentence but now they are serving a second one by

being on the registry. A45 chose to accept a plea bargain which resulted in her status as a sexual offender. Her husband begged her not to take the plea deal since she did not commit the offense, but she took it anyway because she could not afford to go to trial.

She feels as though her case file is full of contradictions and that there were “dirty cops” working her case. She stated that she was required to submit DNA samples, but that they went missing before the case was brought to court. After spending 60 days in jail (she was denied bond), she finally got to see the judge. Her case made statewide news in Michigan, which included her past sexual experiences and the time she spent growing up in foster care. A45 said that she was removed from her biological parents care because her father was a habitual sexual offender and she was included in his victims. At the time of her father’s arrest, A45 said that he was charged with over 200 sexual offenses. So because of the abuse and her mother’s failure to report her husband’s actions, A45 was sent into foster care.

While in foster care, she was roomed with another girl who came from an abusive house hold. A45 and her roommate did not get along well at all, leading A45 to spend as much time as she could away from her roommate. Supposedly, A45’s sexual offense took place while she was still in residence at the foster home. Her roommate found out about the sexual offense from reading A45’s journal. She reported what she knew to local law enforcement and later provided testimony to the prosecutor. The roommate testified on the promise that the prosecutor would be able to make sure she could go home to her family, which is exactly what happened. However, as time went on A45’s roommate proved to not be a very reliable witness and her testimony did not

make much sense. Apparently even the judge was confused by her testimony. Nevertheless, A45 was convicted of the sexual offense but she was still a minor at the time of the conviction.

In Michigan, she was not required to register as a sexual offender because she was a minor when she was convicted. She moved to Florida 10 years after her conviction and was pulled over in a routine traffic stop. Her license was run through the system but her status as a sexual offender did not show up. Later on, A45 had a dispute with her neighbor and as a result, the neighbor called DCF (Department of Child and Family Services) on A45. DCF came to the home and did not find anything unusual in the home but through conversation with the DCF agent, her sexual offending status was revealed. The DCF agent told her to call up the sheriff's office to see if she was required to register. She did call the sheriff's office, who could not find her in the system. They instead found her in the archives. They then pulled her case and reopened it, making her active within the system again. So, she was originally closed and did not have to register but because of her phone call to the sheriff's office, she is not listed as an active case and is required to register as a sex offender.

Participant A55

Participant A55 included a letter in her returned survey envelope. Her letter writes the following:

“I apologize for the informal format but I thought a few words to you could benefit the both of us.”

“I was decided ‘guilty’ before I even went to court. The media made one simple act into breaking news and then blew it out of proportion. That’s where my fun started!

Now, add in my abusive husband, that fed lies into the mind of the young man's father. Out of jealousy of a friendship. On the other side an alcoholic mother and father on the young man's side who didn't even show up for an injunction they set on me, then showed up drunk and testified for the restitution. Oh! I would like to add it was a voting year and my judge was up for the next seat or that they were in such a rush to send me away that they added my score sheet up to points that put me over!"

"I believe that God has brought me to this place in my life for many reasons. I cannot accept how unjust our court systems are and the 'deals' that go on between the attorney's when a person's life is at hand."

"I've lost full rights to a proven white supremacist, abuse man."

"I've lost a \$45,000 a year job."

"I've lost cars, a house, material items and am currently in debt."

"I am restricted on where I can live, work and take my kids."

"I can no longer participate in my children's school activities, which I was known by school and teachers and welcomed."

"I cannot spend time with my nieces and nephews, or meet new family members!"

"I can go on and on. Florida has not helped to rehabilitate me, but constantly found new ways to keep me in their 'system.' Thank you for your time! God be with you and your study." Sincerely, A55.

Participant A62

Participant A62 called me and left a message. She then sent me an email in regards to the survey since she did not get me on the phone. Her email reads:

“Hey, just posted your survey and I wanted to touch base I am probably one of the few offenders that will send the survey back and fill it out. Honestly, the entire court system from start until today has actually been very good to me. Most of the corrections people I have had contact with over the last 18 years have all stated that I should have never been listed. The circumstances were let’s say unusual at best. My biggest problem with the registry from an offender’s perspective is that most are hiding in their homes because of it and that unfortunately gives them plenty of time to figure out how to reoffend and not get caught. Basically it makes them worse and more dangerous to the community. While society thinks it’s some kind of failsafe they are sadly mistaken. It keeps them from reentering at any level that may be close to normal.”

“I spent 2 years in mandatory therapy and volunteered for 2 more after that. I had daughters and I wanted to learn. It would make you physically ill if you could sit in on some of the group sessions I did. I was one of the last offenders that was "Graduated" from my program. The biggest losers in all of this were my children, 3 of which were not even born at the time of my crime. The crime occurred in 1989. I was sentence in 1993 (I bought out) it cost me ten grand but I didn't do a day. So as far as the legal system goes it was a joke. I had a gag order due to being the first woman in the county ever arrested for L&L behavior. I was on the front page of the local paper, 48 hours was coming to sit on my front lawn and Montel Williams was calling me. I sent my oldest daughter to live with her father in another state. She was in school at the time and I wanted to save her the embarrassment. My 2nd daughter was not school age so I kept her with me. I was in a bad marriage and choose to hang with the teenagers in the neighborhood to make myself feel important and needed. Yes there

was drugs and alcohol involved, there always is. The young man actually went on to rob a bank and murder the teller. Very sad. He is doing life in prison. We still write each other on occasion... from time to time there have been instances that embarrassed my children - flyers being distributed by a woman at my son's bus stop. Flyers posted on the local nail salons wall where my daughter went and they published the school paper 2 years ago at my son's high school with my picture (along with others) because we lived within a 1 mile radius. I have had a bus stop in my front yard for all that time. I have had the county change more than one bus stop so that it was closer to my house because my child was the only child at the bus stop. LOL go figure that one out."

"As far as the offender site the only people that really visit it are people that are paranoid or have nothing else to do. I think most of the population forgets that misdemeanor offenders are not on the site. Flashers, stalkers and most offenders get their charges reduced so just because you can see that your neighborhood doesn't have a "Registered offender" doesn't mean anything. I understand the Justice system has to make it look like they are doing something but personally it's just a waste of time and money wasted on a few people that had a chance to grandstand their plight. Please don't misunderstand I think child molesters should be put away and when their sentence is up, "Jimmy Ryce" them all. However the system first needs to learn how their minds really work and who is really a danger to society." [A62 refers to Jimmy Ryce, a 10 year old boy who was abducted in 1995 from a bus stop in Florida. He was sodomized by Juan Carlos Chavez. Jimmy tried to escape Chavez but he shot the young boy in the back and later dismembered the body. (Jimmy Ryce Center, 2010)]

“I personally had my father arrested for fondling my daughter - he died in prison. He was sick and incurable. He did not deserve therapy, it would have changed nothing. So in my opinion unless the system takes the time to evaluate offenders and categorize them properly us and our children will never be truly safe. It may appear that they are but then that is the fantasy the justice system has created. At this stage my kids don't care and it never bothered me. All along when I meet someone new if they have children or their children play with mine, I have disclosed my offense. Sometimes we see them again sometimes we don't. That is their choice, not mine. It has never stopped me and I have never been embarrassed. I walk the park near my residence that is clearly posted 'No Sex Offenders Allowed.' Never been stopped or anything. I have lived at the same address since 1997. Do you think the city knows or cares? It's just another thing to create a false sense of security. NONE of my friends are afraid to have me around their children with or without them. This is just the highlights..... Please feel free to contact me with any more questions you may have. I have been interviewed on television and have no problem telling you how I feel and what transpired. I think your questionnaire is a little too sterile and really doesn't get to the real questions. Perhaps they aren't interested in the real mind of an offender or can't find one to be honest. Hope this helps. Participant A62.”

Participant B1

Participant B1 called me to talk about her status as a sexual offender on the registry. She was willing to share her court paperwork and she also offered me the opportunity to speak to her attorney if I so desired. I declined that offer but I did agree to listen to her story. She stated that she is writing a book about her circumstances, but

due to privacy rights she changed some of the names within the story. She currently works as a paralegal but is enrolled in college to complete her bachelor's degree. She asked that her college remain confidential so that she could complete her studies in peace. I gladly assured her that it would.

In 1993, her husband accused her of sexual offenses against her three children during a custody battle while they were in the process of divorcing. At the time she did not have the money to hire an attorney but was convicted of the sexual offense with the registration requirement being "Lewdly fondle or assault, on or in presence of a child under 16." She has not seen or talked to her children since her conviction but she is in the current process of appealing the conviction based on court errors and errors on the part of the district attorney.

Participant B1 spoke of a group that she is involved with where she works with other sexual offenders who feel they were wrongfully convicted of their crimes. She said that the group is similar to the Innocence Project but specifically is aimed towards sexual offenders. She also shared with me the names of others who were convicted under circumstances similar to her own. Along with those names, she also guided me towards some court cases that were similar to her own case as well as some custody cases that resulted in accusations of sexual offending. She stated that when people are accused of sexual offenses, they try to become experts on the areas of law that are relevant to their case. B1 was very respectful towards my survey and my research endeavors and I was happy to listen to her story and her knowledge on the subject.

Participant B4

Participant B4 included a letter, written to me, in her returned survey packet. Her letter was somewhat incoherent and did not make much sense overall. However, she did write about her concerns and feelings regarding the registry. Her letter reads:

“What is interesting is that other people who live with you, may be the ones that actually goes to jail for people that know a sex offender lives in the house but doesn’t know who that sex offender is because of the verbal attacks – I will not give specific info.”

“I would like to talk to you about getting the law changed for the first time offenders. Registration for 5-10 years should be plenty enough to know if they are going to reoffend, if they do make it longer naturally.”

“First time offenders have a nasty label they have been labeled.”

“P.S. Interesting for some one that didn’t commit a crime. Thanks.”

Participant B22

Participant B22 returned her survey and added a note to the bottom of the final page. Her note reads the following:

“I feel since I have served the probation – why can’t they take me off the sex offender [registry] – Is there any way I can get a pardon, this way? Thank you.”

Participant B27

Participant B27 emailed me in regards to the probation status requirement of the survey. She was eager to share her story and her experiences with registration. She states that she must re-register twice a year in January and July and it is a frustrating process for her because she feels that the law enforcement officials only repeat the same questions every session and she always gives the same answers. She stated

that she was a school teacher who made a very poor decision in life but she is an educated woman who knows that what she did was a mistake. She is registered for “Engaging in sex with minor over 15.” She indicated that offenders like her deserved a second chance in life and that for what she was convicted of, she will pay for it for the rest of her life.

I send participant B27 a follow up email to invite her to share her story and to participate in the survey. Participant B27’s follow-up email reads the following:

“I am so sorry. I totally forgot about doing the survey. I just finished it & will be mailing it tomorrow. I hope it's not too late. I've been super busy with work, & my sister came to visit me a few weeks ago which totally threw off my schedule.”

“I know the survey said not to provide additional information on the answers, but some of them REQUIRED (in my opinion & from what I've been through) additional information. I hope I didn't eliminate my answers due to this.”

“Once again, I apologize about the delay. If you need any more information, feel free to contact me. I do not have to be anonymous either. After dealing with this for over 10 yrs. now, I feel somewhat comfortable discussing my situation, especially if I can help others in my same situation. I feel very strongly in the state of FL going to some sort of classifying system with the registry, as New Jersey already has, & Iowa is in the process. I think it is extremely unfair that I am grouped (my victim was 4 mos. from being 18 yrs. old) with people that harmed infants, babies, toddlers, etc.”

Participant B37

On her returned survey, Participant B37 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “Most people don’t care that I am a sex offender once I

explain what happened. I was in a bar and met someone. Dated her for 5 months and then found out she was 16.”

Participant B58

On her returned survey, Participant B58 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “I am innocent of the charges. At this time I am trying to clear my name. My sons accused me but they were forced to, so if you can help me please contact me at [phone number removed]. Thanks Participant B58.

Participant B66

On her returned survey, Participant B66 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “Your survey is geared towards those who are guilty of the accusations they were charged with. I was falsely accused – and am NOT GUILTY. I accepted a plea bargain of probation only (attorney’s advice in lieu of court). During probation a new law came into affect requiring me to register on the sex offender list. I was required by law to comply or to be incarcerated.”

Participant B74

On her returned survey, Participant B74 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “It’s hard to get your rights returned after the waiting period. I have been trying now for 2 years. I also have been arrest free since 1999.”

Participant B76

On her returned survey, Participant B76 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “For those of us who mind our own business we should be left alone. The media should know the difference between the offender and predator and get it straight. They cause most of the problems.”

Participant B89

Participant B89 called me to speak about what I will use her information for in my Master's Thesis. I explained to her briefly what the project was examining and how I would compare her information against other surveys that were returned by other sex offenders. B89 asked me if I knew any people in Gainesville who could help her with her charges and if I could explain to her why no one told her that she would be classified as a sexual offender because of her conviction. I advised B89 that I was not a lawyer and I could not give her legal advice, but I encouraged her to find a lawyer to explain her situation to her. I asked B89 what she was charged with and she stated that she used to run an "escort service" with her father. Her father was adamant about being able to help the girls who turned to prostitution to help with their drug problems. Her father would take the girls in off of the streets and help them clean up. B89 claimed that her father would never check ID's to see how old the girls were and that age was just another statistic to him. If the girls needed help, then he would help them get clean and sober. Most of the girls that B89's father took in were addicted to crack cocaine. However, B89 said that her father did not discourage the girls from prostituting themselves. B89 said that prostitution brings in good money and the work is not difficult to do. Instead, if the girls were still interested in working, B89 and her father would help them find Johns and teach them how to work the men soliciting the girls. B89 stated that her father, even though he would help the girls get sober, loved prostitutes and was a frequent customer of the girls that he helped out. Her father was a married man and his wife knew of his love for prostitutes. He loved them so much that B89 said "my daddy died with a hooker in his arms."

Even though she worked in the sex industry, working as a madam or as a pimp, depending on who she was talking to, B89 did not feel what she was convicted of was a sex crime. For her, sex was viewed differently in her home. Her father was molested by his father when he was a small child. B89 was molested by her own father as a young girl. She has memories of running down the street crying out for help because her father raped her nightly. However, her father did not think that was a bad thing and over time she stated that she also did not think that was a bad thing. The two carried on an incestuous relationship for a while and her father even brought his daughter clients. B89 stated that she began her own career as a prostitute at age 14. She remembers her father bringing her to parking lots where the two would meet up with a John. She would ask her father what to do if the John wanted to have sex with her. Her father would reply, "you figure it out." Because of these experiences, B89 knew how to use sex as a means of support and as a way to get by. She did not know the rules that went along with sex, including what was and was not against the law. The first time that B89 was arrested for prostitution, she was 17 years old. She was arrested in a hotel along with her John, who was a police officer arrested for soliciting a prostitute. However, the police officer claimed that B89 forced him into physical contact with her and that she forced his hand down her shirt. In the court room the presiding judge asked B89 how she forced the John's hand down her shirt. The jury laughed when the question was asked in court. She told the judge that she could grab the officer's hand, but he was considerably stronger than a 17 year old girl, so if he wanted to remove his hand he had the capabilities to do so. B89 did not tell me if she was convicted of the prostitution charge.

About 10 years before her sex offense conviction, B89 stated that she began to run her escort service. She would run the service through a local newspaper, using a business permit that she obtained for \$50 in Jacksonville. The ads would cost \$5 per day and she would charge that \$5 to the girl that corresponded to the advertisement. The ads would have information about the girls, but would never mention names. They would not outright advertise for sex but would include things like "BJ's and Kitties Available." The John would then contact Participant B89 and she would set up the appointment for the John with a specific girl. B89 would not meet with a John in person, but rather did all the scheduling over the phone. The girls were not permitted to meet their John in a hotel room either. All of the business would be done either at the John's house or wherever the girl would be staying. B89 stated that she had contacts with the police department, as well as customers, who would provide her information as to when raids would be occurring, when undercover operations would be happening and when set-ups would be taking place. Until she got the all clear from her police contact, she would keep her girls out of sight, would not post ads in the newspaper and would not allow the girls to work. Because of this contact, B89 stated that she had a very low arrest rate for all of the girls under her employ.

At the time of her arrest, B89 was called out to the house of one of her Johns. One of the girls under her employ called her up and asked her to come out to the house of the John. The police were waiting for her and arrested her for "procuring any person under the age of 16 for prostitution." At the same time, her father was arrested for the same charge. B89 told the police that the entire business was run through her and her father had nothing at all to do with it. Since the business license was in B89's name

and other documents were found in B89's name, the police dropped the charges against her father. After she was arrested, the girls working for her and her father turned on B89. They started to claim that she forced them into prostitution and got them all addicted to crack cocaine. The prosecutor got statements against B89 from almost all of the girls in B89's employ. The girls spoke about how "inhumane" B89 and her father were to them and how much they suffered because they did not want to work as prostitutes.

Participant B89 also spoke to the deal that the prosecutor offered her. The prosecutor agreed to drop some of the charges, in exchange for B89 to give up some of the names of her Johns. B89 told me the names of those men she turned into the prosecuting attorney. However, in the interest of confidentiality, I will not be revealing those names. She also told me the professions of the Johns. I am not able to share the professions of some of the men since the case was high profile. However, she did tell me that she had multiple college professors, multiple judges, a public defender, several police officers and one man who owns several well known businesses. She was able to prove that some of these men were clients because they chose to pay her by personal check.

B89 knew the routine of one John so well, that she was able to take law enforcement to his home. She pointed out that he liked to drink a certain type of alcohol every night with dinner and other routine activities that he did nightly. She even had files on that particular man that helped her case against the Johns. She did not state if there were any legal ramifications for the Johns once she turned her information over the prosecutor, but she did state at the time of her arrest, the Johns present were fined

\$200. Part of her plea bargain stated that she would be sentenced post-incarceration to regular probation. She did not receive notice that she would be characterized as a sex offender until she was almost out of prison. She stated that if she knew that the conviction would result in her current sex offender status, then she never would have taken all of the blame for the escort service. She stated that as a result of her high profile case, a city ordinance was established in the city where she was convicted, banning the use of newspapers to advertise for escorts. I cannot state what the ordinance is called because it contains her last name.

When she talked about how the registry has affected her life, she spoke of how people are not educated enough about the differences in sex offenders. The Florida Registry delineates between sexual offender and sexual predator. The differences between sexual offender and sexual predator can be found in the Appendix, Table X. She stated that education on the subject would help sex offenders out in terms of employment, housing and other areas of life. While she was incarcerated, B89 completed her GED and also completed a Bachelor's Degree in Medical Assistance. She cannot use her degree because hospitals and doctor's offices do not allow sex offenders to be employed there because of the children that are present. Some of the other areas of her life that have been affected include housing. She was evicted from her apartment and now lives with her mother in a city other than the one she was convicted in. She has children and has experienced hardship concerning them. Her son was raped by a boyfriend of hers once and when B89 took him to the hospital, she was not permitted to be in attendance when the ER staff performed a rape kit because of her sex offender status. The same thing occurred when her daughter was molested

by the man who fathered B89's son. She was not permitted to be in attendance when the ER staff examined her daughter.

B89 stated that she is very open with her status as a sexual offender. She tells people about her case and since it was so high profile, she feels as though there is nothing left for her to hide. She even spoke to me on the phone when her youngest son was in the room. I could hear him speak to B89 and she would respond to him while I was still on the phone. Since her charge was a prostitution related charge, she was allowed to maintain custody of her children. She wished me luck on the project and asked again that if I knew anyone who could help her out with her case, to please let her know. I reiterated that I was not an attorney and did not know any, but I wished her luck in finding someone to help her out.

Participant B94

Participant B94 called me with a few concerns about the survey that I sent her in the mail. She stated that all of my questions were very general and did not touch on the individual differences among sex offenders. There are different types of offenders on the registry and she is not someone who is "out stalking children." She is classified as low risk and has no intention of ever recidivating. Therefore, she wanted to speak to me to understand what kind of person that I was and how I was using the data that she would provide in taking the survey. B94 stated that she was an alcoholic most of her life due to a diagnosis of bi-polar disease. Instead of taking the prescribed medication that was given to her, she self-medicated with alcohol. The problem with the self-medication is that she eventually became prone to blackouts. During one blackout, she was told that she had sex with a 16 year old boy who was at the time a friend of her son's. She

does not remember anything that she was accused of. The prosecutor told B94 that the boy was let into the house by B94. She told me that was entirely possible as she would frequently let her son's friends in the house to wait for her sons when they were not home. However, on this instance she was told that she had sex with the boy when no one else was home. The boy was seen by neighbors leaving her house late at night when no one else was around.

The prosecutor offered B94 a plea bargain and she accepted, receiving no jail time but instead received 10 year of probation and the required registration time. She said if she had known what she was signing herself up for (being on the registry), then she would have gone to trial and not taken the plea bargain. However, since she did not know what had happened with the 16 year old boy, she felt that she had to be a responsible adult and accept the charges that were against her. She said that the prosecutor had no concrete proof that anything had occurred beyond the testimony of the 16 year old. She did admit that when she woke up from the blackout that she did not have any clothes on the lower half of her body. But there wasn't anything that she could do to prove that nothing had happened. She is listed on the registry for "sexual activity with 16/17 year old."

B94 stated that she is very confused about everything that took place and the blackouts left her very much in the dark. She has since stopped drinking and has been sober for 8 years. She works as a sponsor for other women who are alcoholics and she presses upon them how they are responsible for things that happen to them while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. The main thing that B94 was upset about was that the courts convicted her on a crime where there was no intent present. She used the

example of killing someone while in an automobile in an accident compared to shooting someone with a gun because you wanted to see them dead. Because there was no intent on her part to commit the crime, she feels as though she should not have been “treated the same as child molesters and rapists.”

Even though the registry has made her life harder than she ever thought possible, she feels that the registry should exist. It is a way to keep track of those offenders who commit violent sexual crimes. But it is not meant for those offenders who are very low risk and not in danger of recidivating. The registry has affected every aspect of her life she said, but fortunately the people in her neighborhood know that she is not someone to be afraid of. They are aware that she had problems with alcohol and that she would never intentionally hurt anyone; especially since she herself was abused when she was 5 years old. She said after experiencing that kind of abuse, she would never lay a violent hand on anyone. B94 has also experienced bulimia throughout her teenage years as well as her adulthood. The bulimia has gotten bad since she was placed on the registry and she has lost a considerable amount of weight.

She asked me if I knew anyone who had ever gotten their record expunged from a sexual offense. I responded that I did not know of anyone, but that isn't to say that someone out there has not gotten their record expunged. B94 also asked me if I could help her with that process. I told her that I am not an attorney and I cannot help her with anything legally. I encouraged her to find an attorney if that is what she would like to pursue. She said that she wished she would have known what was involved with a plea deal compared to a full trial, but before this she was never in trouble with the law. Her main concern now is the life she has ahead of her. Her three sons are at an age where

grandchildren will be coming soon. So, she wonders how her grandchildren will react when they find out about her registration status. She stated that she is still undecided if she will turn in the survey but she was appreciative of the time I spent talking with her. She felt that no one has ever talked to her about her status or allowed her to speak her mind about things related to the registry. She also asked if other women were getting in touch with me to share their stories. She hopes that there will be some sort of reform to the registry one day, but until then she said she is just going through life trying to keep her status to herself.

Participant B96

Participant B96 emailed me about the project with concerns about how to answer specific questions regarding the survey. She stated that she would like to tell me her story and the circumstances surrounding her conviction, but only if she would remain anonymous and her place of employment remains confidential. I assured her of both aspects and she was willing to share her story. She emailed me back and gave me the following information concerning her offense and the circumstances surrounding it. Aside from changing a few details to keep things confidential, I have kept her words as they were sent to me. She states:

“I was 26 at the time of my offense. My victim was 14. I was friends with his mom. We taught together for years. It was a friendship based on alcohol and drug use. She would have her son around with us while we were drinking and smoking he became a peer. He did not attend the school I taught at. I was engaged to be married. I was in a very mentally abusive relationship. My victim's mom and my fiancée became very close and ended up "hooking up" kissing, etc a few times. I would hang out with my victim

while this happened. It was not a secret. It wasn't okay or discussed though. Bottom line, my victim and I had consensual vaginal sex two times and oral sex once. I was also arrested for sending him 15 pornographic pictures off the internet (not pictures of me).”

“My victim at 14 had already got his middle school girlfriend pregnant. His mother helped pay for her abortion. He was also our marijuana supplier. Since his mom couldn't ask for it. She'd have me get it from him.”

“It all came to an end [the sexual relationship] after my fiancée and I were married in June of 2003. My victim continued to make contact through phone calls and emails. Eventually his father figured it out by having their computer looked at by detectives. The night before I was arrested, my victims' parents called me and asked me to babysit his [the victim] younger sister who was 12 at the time. They needed her out of the house so the police could talk to my victim. I did not know this of course. I also did not babysit the sister that night, I went out.”

“The next day my victim called me on the phone and asked who I told about us having sex. When I said no one...they had me. I was arrested walking home from class. I had already quit teaching and was going to college again to get my degree in business.”

“Of course I was scared to death. The detectives were all polite, as well as the police officers. The media was the worst! I stopped reading the articles and watching the news when I bonded out. That is one area that is terrible. The way the media distorts and twists the story. At one point it was being reported that I was 30 and he was 12. In reality I was 26 he was 14. I was charged with having sex with him 18 times. It

dropped down to 3 and then they charged me for the 15 pictures separately as distribution of harmful materials to a minor. Geraldo Rivera contacted my lawyer for an interview and Oprah had my mug shot on her sex offenders show.”

“I was sentenced to 364 days in the county jail and 7 years of Sex Offender probation. I had to pay for my victim’s private schooling down in Jamaica for 1 year where he went for drug rehab. He was treated for several drugs all of which I was accused of introducing to his life. I have never done/seen any drug besides marijuana. I also paid the family \$30,000.00 to cover their family counseling. My husband left me immediately. Never to see him again.

“I survived my 10 months in jail (I was released early for good behavior). Now I am in my 5th year of the probation with 2 years to go. In other counties you can apply for early termination halfway through but not in my county [St. John’s County]. The judge has never let anyone off Sex Offender probation early.”

“Life today is great for the most part. I have learned to deal and live with my situation. My new husband, who I met just before going to jail, and his family are amazing. 100% supportive. My immediate family is also wonderful. I have not told most of my aunts and uncles or cousins what happened. Most people I think know. Same with old friends from High School and College. They know. Some have reached out and we are still friends. No one has ever said to me that they are not friends with me because of my offense.

“I have a fabulous job. A very understanding and accommodating boss. I am so lucky compared to other registered sex offenders. When I walked out of jail I had a condo to live in, a wonderful boyfriend(now my husband), a car, a job(not the one I have

now, but my boss had held my job), and 2 supportive parents and brother. On my survey I said I lost 2 jobs because of my offense. 1 was my teaching license- no big deal since I hated it and had quit before I was even arrested. The other was my job at Cracker Barrel which I held before going to jail. I found out about a month before jail that they were going to let me go once I was sentenced and I would not be hired back. I found another job for the month before jail and they saved me a position. I worked there for a year after jail until I was hired at my current job.”

“Sex offender probation is hard. It is not hard not re-offending. My one victim was my only victim, and I will not have anymore. The hard part is having a 10pm curfew, avoiding all contact with anyone under 18 - even my relatives. Also, keeping a detailed driving log, taking polygraphs 4 times a year, having probation come by the house 2 times a month, having probation and the city police search your house a couple times a year, not going to any place where children might gather, having to go to court to get permission to travel for work or to visit my family in CT and paying for it every time I need to go to court to ask for permission for something.”

“My biggest pet peeve is to attend the sex offender therapy class. In my county [St. John’s County] men and woman are together. In my county whether you urinated outside or raped a 3 year old, you are in the same class and category. I ended up being the only woman in my class at one point. I was harassed by another member of the group. He cornered me outside of group one day and would show up at my work. He was a 55 year old man that had raped several 14-17 year old girls. I reported it to probation. They moved me to another class out of town (all female class). I couldn't get a restraining order against the guy because I needed to have the dates and times of at

least 5 incidences that he harassed me. My new class was better, but it was an hour drive each way and was in another county. I was given the longest sentence of all the woman. The grandmother that sexually molested her 5 and 7 year old grandchildren was given 30 days in jail and 2 years probation. The 50 year old woman that continued seeing her 16 year old victim after she did 6 months in jail was punished by wearing an ankle monitor. I do not feel it is fair that depending on what county you are in you may have a much lighter sentence. The sentence should fit the crime. I feel my sentence was very fair for what I did.”

“Another issue I have is that the rules are continuously changing. I understand that new rules need to be put in place all the time. But those who have been sentenced should be grandfathered in under the old laws... unless they have re-offended. There are some rules that I am grandfathered under, others have been added. One rule that REALLY bothers me is having to tape a fluorescent sign to your door on Halloween night that reads- “No Candy Here!” Prior to this rule I was required to have my door locked, no Halloween decorations outside and all lights off. That was fine. No one came to my door. Now kids see this sign and think it's a joke! They want to knock and see if there really isn't any candy here. The police also come by 3 times during the night on Halloween to check our house inside and outside. Last year I was married on Halloween. Of course my husband and I were in the house by 10pm curfew, lights out. The police had to come by and do their checks. The last one at 12:45am. Most kids are done trick or treating by 8pm...I felt this was harassment.”

“There are so many issues and things I have learned to deal with and adjust to. There are still so many things to discuss – such as society's thinking that it is alright to

joke about older females with young boys. You see it on TV. There was a Clearasil commercial with a mom getting all turned on by her son's friend who washed his face with Clearasil. It's constantly the theme in many movies and TV shows, it's always no big deal. The victim is never portrayed as a victim. Even people in my life who know my story joke about it in front of me, then realize I am there and living it and it is NOT OK and it is NOT funny.”

“I won't ever know if my victim was permanently scarred from our “relationship”. According to my group therapy he is most likely a dysfunctional adult that will never succeed due to our relationship. I do believe I affected him terribly, but ruined his life forever, I don't think so.”

“I am 3 ½ months pregnant now. Maybe once I have my own child I will see things in a whole different light. Right now I am just focusing on my next court date. I have to pay a lot of money to have the state of FL allow me to be around my own child when he or she is born in January. I will be off probation in 2 years before my child attends school, but I worry about that day all the time. I will not be able to volunteer in my child's class, go on field trips, etc. When my kid has a birthday party who knows if any parents will let their children attend. I can live with my punishment. I am harder on myself everyday about what happened than any court could be. It's the punishment that my family has to go through daily is what kills me.”

Participant B106

Participant B106 called me with concerns since she is currently on probation and did not know if she should participate or not. I told her that if she was uncomfortable

answering the questions about probation she could leave those blank, but I would not know if she is currently on probation since the questions are worded in the past tense.

For her convicted offense, B106 felt like she was “railroaded” into taking the plea deal. She said that she was forced into the plea by her co-defendant. His father was a criminal defense attorney who had a reputation in the town she lived in. She believes he had a hand in forcing her to take the plea as well. He was an individual who frequently had sex with teenagers and when he and B106 started dating, she was not aware of his sexual preferences. He did however ask her to participate and she admits that she knew about what he was involved in, but says that she never took part in the activity. She eventually left her co-defendant and before this conviction was never in trouble with the law. She feels that from day one, she was treated badly by law enforcement and by correctional staff. The intake officers at the jail were rude, belittled her and treated her in a forceful manner. She is not currently living in the town where she was arrested and convicted.

At the time of the arrest, there were three charges against B106 and her co-defendant for having sexual relationships with minors. The three girls that were involved all told different stories about what had happened. B106 intended to go to trial, but on the advice of her defense attorney took the plea bargain since it looked like her co-defendant was going to “flip on her”, meaning he was going to reverse his story and claim that she was more involved than was previously thought.

B106 is currently on probation serving a 5 year supervision sentence, with all 5 years being on electronic monitoring. She has currently served 3 years of that sentence. During this time she has appealed to the court to receive visitation privileges

to see her boyfriend's grandchildren. In order to receive these privileges, she was required to take multiple polygraph tests and take a risk assessment. She did both items – all of her polygraphs showed “denial” results (meaning that she is telling the truth in that she did not commit the offense) and her risk assessment showed that she was not a danger for recidivating. The risk assessment cost her \$1200. In addition she received letters of recommendation from a psychiatrist she had been voluntarily seeing for two years which stated that she had not emotional disturbances and was not a danger to anyone. Her probation officer sent the judge a letter stating that B106 was a “model probationer.” She filed a motion and sent the documentation to the court and the judge denied her a hearing. Upon receiving the denial, B106 wrote to the judge explaining further and he simply sent back a final notice of denial. B106's attorney told her that she has never had a motion receive a denial of a hearing in her legal career. She has not tried to file anymore motions due to a lack of money to keep her attorney.

B106 mentioned that she is going to try to file with the Florida Clemency Board to see if she can get her record expunged. She also has thought about working her way up the appeals courts but again due to a lack of money, that will be difficult. Her final option she said is to just wait out the last 2 years of her probation sentence and move on with her life.

Participant C19

Participant C19 contacted me to talk about various aspects of the survey that I did not include in my instrument. She was not aware of every angle that I wanted to cover in my research, but she recommended that I look into the impact a sexual offense conviction had upon the children of the convicted sexual offender. Upon a conviction,

depending on the offense committed, children of the offender are often taken away from the offender. Custody is given to a spouse, the other parent or relatives. For those who get to maintain custody of their children, there are aspects of life that are forever changed. Participant C19 is not permitted to go to any of her daughter's school functions, field trips, birthday parties or any other activity where minors under 18 may be present. She says that it is not a hardship for her to not interact with individuals under the age of 18, but it is a hardship on her daughter since she is missing out on activities as a mother. C19 also questioned if I was interested in the hardships presented to other parents, spouses and partners of the convicted offender. Since the convicted parent is not able to be present for certain aspects of the child's life, the other parent must pick up the slack left behind. While it may not be a hardship for the other parent to partake in these activities, it is a lot to ask for the non-convicted parent to do the work of two parents.

Participant C19 also spoke about the difficulties that are involved in finding employment. She has had jobs where other employees found out about her sex offender status. She states that those employees made copies of her registry information and posted it throughout the factory. It made her time there very uncomfortable and she experienced heckling, harassment and other behaviors. Due to the harassment, she was forced to quit that job and has been unemployed for roughly 15 years. She has had the odd job every now and then but overall, C19 has not been able to maintain employment. She states that she is now legally blind and because of this she will have an even harder time finding employment. She has tried to find work in the food service industry, but people bring their children to restaurants. She cannot be

a teacher, she cannot work at a hotel, she cannot work in an amusement park and she cannot work in retail because these are all areas in which children and teenagers may be present.

In order to solve the problem of employment, she is currently enrolled in college to complete her Bachelor's Degree. I agreed to keep the name of her university and the programs that she is enrolled in confidential so things are not made harder for her. That was not an issue at all for me to comply with since C19 was very open and willing to help out in this project. She questioned whether or not I had considered the issue of sex offenders returning to school, since they must report their presence to the university, the college and the program that they are enrolled in. For her, the university issue was not too much of an issue since she takes most of her classes online. Because of the blindness, she is able to take her tests at a disability center. Therefore, she does not have much contact with anyone on campus very often. However, she stated that there may be a large contingent of sexual offenders who are in the same position as C19 – trying to obtain a college degree to help press past the unavailability of employment for convicted sexual offenders.

Participant C19 has not had an easy time post-conviction beyond the employment issues she has faced. She spoke of turning to drugs at one point to cope with the stress and the harassment that she experienced. But after the first time trying drugs (she would not tell me which drug she chose to use) she realized that if she continued to use drugs, then there is the increased possibility that she could be arrested for possession of the drug she was using.

Even though C19 has spoken about how difficult it has been for her post-conviction, she also voiced her opinion about the need for the registry in the first place. She agreed that the registry should exist, but she also stated that some changes need to be made. One idea that she voiced was the necessity of individualizing the registry and basing the requirements on a case by case basis. The current rules for registration are a blanket cover for all convicted sex offenders, but it has no leeway for those who were not convicted of high risk crimes. Participant C19's registry page states that she "lewdly fondled or assaulted, on or in presence of a child under 16." C19 did not elaborate during our phone conversation the exact circumstances surrounding her offense; however she did state that she was considered very low risk. In her home state of Wisconsin, law enforcement officials were amazed at how low risk of an offender she was, yet she was still required to register in a similar manner to someone who was very high risk.

C19 said that in Wisconsin, the registry is broken up into risk levels ranging from low to high risk offenders. Florida does not break registration down into risk levels – the only distinction that is made is between predator and offender. A sexual predator is defined as "a person who has been convicted of, or plead guilty to, committing a sexually oriented offense(s) and who is *likely to commit additional sexually oriented offense(s)*" (Holmes and Holmes, 2009: 4). In contrast there are two types of sexual offenders. A habitual sex offender is defined as someone who "is determined by the sentencing court to have previously convicted of or plead guilty to *one or more* sexually oriented offenses." Finally, a sexually oriented offender is "a person who has been convicted of, or plead guilty to, committing a sexually oriented offense" (Holmes and

Holmes, 2009: 4). So therefore, a predator is someone who is likely to commit another sexual offense in the future, but an offender is someone who has been convicted of one or more sexual offenses, but is not deemed a treat for future offending. Since Florida only makes a distinction between predator and offender, Participant C19 makes an argument for Florida to adapt a registry similar to the one found in Wisconsin.

C19 believes that there is no way for the registry to disappear completely, but she does think that the modifications she suggested could make things better for those who are currently on the registry. One suggestion that C19 made concerning the risk levels would be to screen convicted sexual offenders with personality profiling. C19 stated that she voluntarily went through the process and the expert she met with deemed her extremely low risk and very unlikely to recidivate with another sexual offense. However, the expert is unwilling to make that testimony in a court of law since there is always a chance for any convicted sexual offender to recidivate. Court ordered sex offender therapy is also a recommendation of Participant C19. I asked if she was court ordered to participate in therapy and she answered that she was indeed court ordered. Through this research I have seen that most sexual offenders seem to be court ordered to therapy sessions. But what Participant C19 recommends is that there be therapy ordered to everyone and the therapy sessions be both individualized (one offender and one therapist) as well as in groups. The group sessions would be with other offenders who are all on the same risk level.

Participant C19 was very gracious in answering my questions and was very willing to help out in this study. She is currently trying to save money to work on an appeal to her case, but she was quoted a \$15,000 starting fee for the process. Since

she offended in Wisconsin and now lives in Florida, she would need to retain a lawyer in both states which adds to that \$15,000 starting fee. However, C19 would like to attempt to appeal her case and possibly get her name removed from the registry altogether.

Participant C32

Participant C32 was the second participant to contact me in response to my survey. She also wanted reassurance as to why I was collecting data on female sexual offenders. She asked me specific questions about how she should answer the survey since she did not have a direct victim in her case of sexual offending. Over 20 years ago, participant C32 was convicted of prostitution in Louisiana, where prostitution is considered a sexual offense, worthy of registration.

At present, participant C32 had been convicted of not registering again with the state of Florida. She is currently registered and is trying to appeal her conviction. She did not state on what grounds she was trying to appeal her conviction but was very happy to tell me her story. She agreed that there was a need for the registry, but not for an individual such as herself because she was only engaging in prostitution. The conversation was short but she restated that she would be sending the survey back into me soon.

Participant C48

Included in her returned survey, participant C48 included a letter informing me of her situation. The letter reads as follows:

“I have just completed the sex offender survey that you mailed me. You may hear this a lot but I am innocent of the charges. I have documents supporting this from trial testimony, to two sex offender evaluations, to the denial polygraph and the risk

assessment that lists me as “no risk.” The judge even terminated my 5 years of s/o probation (sex offender) when I had only completed less than 9 months of this probation.”

“I would like to find someone who would help me overturn my conviction but I only work one day a week and have no money to pay anyone to help me.”

“Would you know of any law professor who would like to go over all my paperwork with their students and see how or if this can be overturned? I would be willing to meet with them to discuss this with their class if need be.”

“I appreciate any help that you can help me with. Thank you. Sincerely,
Participant C48.”

Participant C52

On her returned survey, Participant C52 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “There should be levels to base things on some people should have to register, but not identified to the world on the internet, especially when it’s a misdemeanor. Felons, yes especially child molesters, I simply got railroaded by the small town of [name removed] county.”

Participant C60

On her returned survey, Participant C60 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “After thought – There are many different classifications of a sexual offender. With consent, without consent, minor [victim], etc... Unfortunately the system groups everyone into the same classification.”

Participant C80

Participant C80 was very eager to speak to me and tell me about the circumstances surrounding her conviction. In 1980, she was involved in a custody battle in Tennessee with her current ex-husband. She stated that she and her ex-husband were both accused by an outside party of child molestation against her three children who were 4,5, and 9 at the time . She is categorized in the registry for the offense of "Sex Offense, Other". She stated that her ex-husband plead out for a sex offense that was not worth of registration but she fought the charges. C80 was issued a public defended and stated that she believes she was convicted because she could not afford an attorney on her own. She spent 10 years in federal prison and after that served her probation sentence but did not say how long she was supervised for.

She said that she has not spoken to or seen her children since the conviction. Participant C80 became quite emotional when talking about her children and the registration requirements that she must follow. Currently she is required to report twice a month at an office in northern Florida. When she reports, she states that she cries in the parking lot before entering and cries through the whole meeting with the law enforcement official that she meets with.

Participant C80 is looking for a pro-bono attorney who would be willing to take her case and work on her appeal. She does not have money for the appeal but hopes for a change one day since she believes that she was falsely convicted. She understands the need for a sex offender registry but also believes that it needs to be enforced on a case by case basis. She stated that her status as a sex offender has ruined her life and has forced her to relocate several times. She has experienced several attacks on her own person and on her personal property. Her current fiancée has also experienced

attacks by neighbors because he is engaged to a registered sex offender. C80 stated that she was thankful that I am completing this research and sent me a follow up email thanking me a second time and also apologized for being emotional over the phone.

Participant C84

Participant C84 emailed me to let me know that she would not be participating in my survey. However, she did write about the circumstances surrounding her offense and some of her positions concerning the registry as well. C84 is listed on the registry for "lewdly fondle or assault, on or in presence of a child under 16". Her email states the following:

"I received your packet and read through it and have decided not to return it. I wanted to send you this email to explain why. I understand the importance of your Thesis as I, too, have my Master's."

"First, I cannot tell you how flawed I feel the Florida Judicial System is, especially when it comes to the "Sexual Offender" program. Every person has their own set of circumstances and every person should be "judged" according to those circumstances. But that is not how things work. Every person that is labeled a "Sexual Offender" is lumped into one category and that's it."

"Just to explain my individual circumstances, for instance, would tell you a lot. Ten years ago, I was married to a man who was abusing me when I met a family on a vacation who happened to live in Florida, but several hours away. We became good friends (or so I thought). I spent many weekends with this family, getting away from my husband, who knew what he was doing. I thought they were my safe haven. My husband had not touched me intimately in 2 years and I was completely depressed and

very lonely. This family had a 17 year old son who the mother kept pushing us together - having me bring him to baseball practice or pick him up, giving me money to take him to the movies, or out to eat - I could go on and on. After a while, we got very close and he paid so much attention to me (something I hadn't had in quite a while). One thing led to another and what happened was completely consensual. I fully understand that he was not of legal age and that I do take responsibility for. I know what I did was wrong. I tried to explain to the mom before anything happened, that maybe it wasn't such a good idea for her son & I to spend so much time alone and she only encouraged it more.”

“After, I told her what had happened and she turned into someone I never knew ever existed. She wanted money! My, now ex-husband was pretty wealthy and apparently she thought she could get some of that. Little did she know, he couldn't care less what happened to me and basically told me I was on my own. So, yes, I plead guilty, because I was. But the mother never allowed the son to testify (her right because he was a minor), so the judge never heard his side of things.”

“I never served any time in jail but my original sentence was 2 years of house arrest and 10 years probation. After doing some research, I learned that my sentence was more harsh than someone who was charged with attempted murder. Is this right? I say no. Are murders' or attempted murders' pictures on the internet on a special public site? I was released from house arrest after 10 months and released from probation at least 5 years ago.”

“Do I feel that the officers or probation officials treated me fairly or with respect? Most of the time yes. Just by looking at me (4ft 11in - 103lbs) people usually know that

I'm not some "career criminal". Also, the probation officers that I had, once they got to know me, were very fair with me. They did show up to the house unannounced a couple times, but it was not a problem. I knew they were just doing their job."

"I will say that I definitely am extremely ashamed that my picture is out there and how I am labeled. I am also ashamed of what I did and am extremely remorseful. But I am not a threat to society. This is something that will NEVER again happen with me. Since then, I have met the most wonderful man, who I have been together with since just after this happened, and we have been married for the past 7 years. I have a wonderful daughter who is 23 and going to college full time and working full time and I have been employed by the same company for the past 4 years. Only once during my current employment did someone go to my employer to notify him that they "knew who I was because they saw my picture". My employer told her "She is one of my best employees and she is not going anywhere. If you are not comfortable with that, then I suggest you find somewhere else to take care of your needs." We have lived in the same house/neighborhood for the past 8 years and ALL of my neighbors know about me and despite that, they all love and respect me. We all get together for street picnics and everyone is very caring and concerned."

"So, you see, I am the lucky one. I live my life just like anyone else and usually don't think about my past unless I receive something in the mail from someone who is asking questions for their Master's Thesis :) Yes, I would give ANYTHING to be off of that list, but really, it doesn't affect me to the point where I'd hire an attorney to see what my options are. Maybe there aren't any, maybe there are. Someday, I will do my research and find out. But until then, I am one very happy woman who knows that if I

didn't go through what I did, I would have never met the man of my dreams and would never have had the most wonderful life that I have now. Just thought I would share this with you and this is why everyone's individual circumstances should be looked at.”

Participant C88

Participant C88 called me with concerns that I would be sharing her survey with her probation officer. In fact, she even stated that she had called her probation officer and asked for advice. Her probation officer told C88 to call me and ask some questions about what I was trying to find with my survey. C88 is the mother of two daughters and stated that her ex-husband set her up with law enforcement, getting her in trouble as a form of punishment. She did not state why he felt the need to punish her, but she did say he used law enforcement as an alternative to beating her so he would not get in trouble with law enforcement himself. C88 is listed on the registry for the offense “lewdly fondle or assault, on or in presence of a child under 16.” She stated that she is a one time offender and would not even be a one time offender if not for her ex-husband setting her up. She did not state whether the child in question was one of her own children, but since she still has custody of her daughters, I would guess that the offense was not against one of her own.

Participant C88 was sentenced to ten years probation (post-incarceration) and for the entirety of that sentence; she must be on electronic monitoring. She has currently been on electronic monitoring for five years and states that it is an incredible nuisance. She must report everywhere that she is going to her probation officer and she must remain at home if she does not report that she is leaving. C88 lives with her children at her parents' home, which is 1,001 feet away from an elementary school.

Despite the close proximity, she is allowed to live in the home since it is one foot beyond the 1,000 boundary rule of closeness to a school. However, she is not allowed to enter that zone or her electronic monitor will go off. One problem with her monitor beyond the inconvenience of it all is that she cannot take her children to the park or to any school functions. She cannot even take her children to their father's home since he lives within the 1,000 foot radius of a school zone. One of her parents must shuttle them over to their father's house. The only place that her sentencing judge approves for her to go with her children is SeaWorld – they have been there 7 times in the month of July. Before her conviction, C88 worked as a paralegal, but she says one of her probation conditions is that she is not allowed to be employed. So she has been unemployed for roughly five years according to her probation terms. C88 also stated that she is currently on medications for mental illness. She never had any problems before her conviction, but the stress of everything has caused her to have mental issues.

I asked participant C88 about her perceptions of the registry and I was surprised by her answer. She said that even though the registry has caused her problems in her personal life and has limited her involvement with her own children, she appreciates the security that the registry provides her. After asking her to elaborate, she stated that if a child goes missing, the first group that law enforcement investigates is the convicted sex offenders. Due to her electronic monitoring and the fact that they know her address, she can be ruled out of the investigation. If the child went missing at 10pm and her monitor states that she was in her home at 10pm, where she is supposed to be, then she is not a suspect in that case. In other words, the registry “keeps her out of trouble”

with law enforcement. Participant C88 agreed to talk to me further if there were any other questions that I had and stated that she would return the survey very quickly. She said that as the conversation went on, she felt more at ease with my project and that was why she offered to supply more information.

Participant D41

Participant D41 emailed me after receiving the survey packet in the mail. She states that she has never encountered any harassing behaviors or problems because of her registration status but she has heard stories about other sex offenders. The following stories were told to participant D41 from other convicted sex offenders that are members of a sex offender therapy group with participant D41. In Citrus County, Florida there was a sign posted that featured all of the pictures of the area's sex offenders. This sign was a setback to the area's sex offenders and made them angry with the community. In Marion County, Florida, a developmentally challenged man committed suicide in 2009 over a sign that was posted in his neighborhood, which showed his sex offender status. Participant D41 told me about a rumor that she had heard concerning a double murder in the state of Maine where the killer knew of the victims' sex offender statuses. She was not completely positive on how true that was, but I researched the story and found that the double murder did indeed happen. One of the two men killed was required to register after being convicted of having sex with his 16 year old girlfriend when he was 19 years old himself. The other sexual offender was 57 years old at the time of the shooting and was registered for indecent assault and battery on a child and rape of a child. The shooter then killed himself later on the day of the two murders (Ellement & Smalley, 2006).

Participant D41 also told me about incidents that happened in the county where she was convicted (Citrus County). One such incident included a bar owner who would post pictures of registered sex offenders in his bar. This bar owner was known to be a friend of Mark Lunsford, who is known for being the father of Jessica Lunsford. Jessica was abducted from her home in Homosassa, Florida in February 2005 by John Couey. Couey, a previously convicted sexual offender, lived nearby the young girl and upon abducting her; he raped and murdered Jessica, who was nine years old at the time. The case was well documented and followed very steadily by the media in Florida and in other states. Because of Mark Lunsford's efforts, the Jessica Lunsford Act was passed in 2006 which calls for heavier supervision of sexual offenders and includes mandatory electronic monitoring for some offenders (Jessica Lunsford Foundation, 2010).

Participant D41 also told me about a local Halloween tradition that takes place in the county she was convicted in (Citrus County). Every Halloween a local General Dollar Store posts a sign that shows the community all of the sex offenders that reside in the area. D41 stated that one Halloween she took her teenage son to the store where he saw the signs and shouted, "There's my Mom!" Also in Citrus County, Participant D41 noticed in one Mobil gas station that someone is publishing a book made up of listings from the sex offender registry. The gas station owner and employees are a part of selling the book and allowing it to be sold in the store to customers. D41 expressed her anger over people making money off the registry and that her information was included in the book, despite it being public information. As an end to her email D41 agreed to alert her fellow sexual offenders that my survey may be

in route to them. She stated that she would encourage these women to participate in my study since all the information I can gather will be beneficial to my thesis. D41 stated that she appreciates what this project is attempting to discover since it is this type of information that will be useful in attempts to change legislation. Individualized registration is necessary in the future, but she understands that there is a need to keep the registry to protect citizens from the severe sex offenders that are present in the community.

D41 states that the registry cannot be a one size fits all solution to a very diverse problem. Each case is different and an overarching registry is not the best fix for the sex offender problem. In D41's case, she was convicted after engaging in a sexual relationship with a student of hers when she was a high school teacher. She is listed on the registry for committing "lewd and lascivious battery with a victim 12-15 years of age." She acknowledges that she should not have engaged in the relationship and through sex offender group therapy she understands why she did not stop the relationship. However, even though she realizes that she committed a crime and has paid for that crime, she feels as though she is being punished a second time because she is being equated to some very destructive and very violent sex offenders. She does not believe that she is sex offender in the same way that some other sex offenders are viewed. D41 believes that there needs to be a "leveling system" so the community can determine which sex offenders are high and low risk offenders. She also believes that there are currently more low risk offenders on the registry than high risk offenders. Also, the high risk offenders are not being caught because they are family members that are going undetected from law enforcement.

Participant D53

On her returned survey, Participant D53 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: "I am very open about my charge. Please contact me if ever needed. I would love to read your Master's Thesis."

Participant D63

Participant D63 called me in order to get a better feel for who I was as a person and why I was conducting this type of research. She stated that she is very active in the sex offender community and would not participate if she felt as though I was not sincere in my intentions. I explained to her my reasons and she felt as though those reasons were falling in line with her personal goals for sex offender research. Being active in the sex offender community, she said that she is very aware of all the legislation being passed in regards to sex offenders and is up to date on the academic research that is being conducted. She stated her disgust over the recent Supreme Court decision in regards to civil commitments for sexual offenders. By simply civilly committing them, the courts and the practitioners are not making any effort to get into the minds of sex offenders.

Participant D63 also told me about her offense. She is listed on the registry for "lewdly fondle or assault, on or in presence of a child under 16." She stated that her ex-husband is to blame for her sex offender status, but she did not state if he was a co-defendant in her case. Since her conviction, she has twice tried to reinstate her civil liberties but has failed to do so. She has attended sex offender psychotherapy sessions where she has been deemed to be an extremely low risk offender. However low risk she may be, she has still encountered harassment and hardships. Her ex-husband's

current wife printed out her FDLE flyer and distributed it throughout the city. After confronting his wife, a joint restraining order was issued against D63 and her ex-husband's current wife. She has also been forced to move multiple times due to her status. She did lose multiple jobs and now works at an entry level with low pay. She states that her employer does not know about her status and she is not volunteering that information either.

She feels that there is a lack of education among the general public in regards to sex offenders. The Adam Walsh Act for example is nothing more than a "witch-hunt" in her opinion, is a waste of government money and provides no resolution for what it is trying to accomplish. She asked at what point is it alright for the public to go on a witch-hunt for sexual offenders? She also gave me the names of organizations that are trying to provide education to the general public about the differences in sex offenders. One group is called SOSEN (Sex Offender Solutions and Education Network) and it works out of Ohio. Every year they host a conference for convicted sexual offenders who believe they were falsely convicted to meet and get resources to help their cases. A second group is just starting with a similar goal in mind, but is exclusively for female sex offenders. This group is WAR (Women Against the Registry).

At the end of our phone call, D63 was still unsure if she would be participating in my survey. She told me that she would email me no matter how she decided. She recently sent me an email to confirm that she would be participating. Her email states:

"After careful consideration I have decided to complete your survey. I will be sending it back to you Monday. Please keep me informed at the results. From time to time I will be forwarding you information that may be helpful and interesting. As-a-

matter fact I will send you the contact information of the researchers that spoke at the 2010 Conference in Washington, DC.”

Participant D73

On her returned survey, Participant D73 wrote a short note at the bottom of the final page. Her note reads: “I believe that people like me that done only one victim and haven’t reoffended shouldn’t be on the site unless I reoffend. I know why I did what I did and it won’t happen again. I had 5 years of intense sex offender therapy.”

Participant D98

I received a phone call from participant D98 and she indicated that she did not appreciate that I sent her the survey. She did not indicate that she was upset that I was asking about her sexual offense, but rather that I had designed the survey towards a state sex offender and that she was a federal sex offender. The registry lists her as “Knowingly engaging in and attempting to engage in a sexual act with a minor.” She stated that her offense was different from all other sex offenders because she was the victim rather than the offender but since she was the adult in the situation she was charged for the crime. She did not elaborate as to what occurred that made her the victim within the situation.

Participant D106

Participant D106 was the first to contact me in response to the survey. This was one day after I had sent out the surveys. At first, D106 was slightly reluctant to speak to me as she believed that I was a law enforcement official, even though she was the one who made the phone call. After I assured her that I was not involved with law enforcement, she began to ask me questions about my legal background and requested

that I look into her case to see if I could help her. After I told her that I also was not a lawyer, D106 began to tell me her story.

She was convicted of sexual activity with a 16-17 year old according to the FDLE website. In her own words, D106 explained that she was arrested along with her ex-husband (current husband at the time of the arrest) on suspicion of child molestation against her own children. She has 2 children who were both under the age of 10 at the time of the arrest. Participant D106 was offered a plea bargain and was convicted as a sexual offender, after pleading down from the molestation charge to "lewd or lascivious exhibition victim under 16 years old." She stated that the husband was granted custody of their two children and she has not seen them since.

D106 is trying to appeal her conviction, but at present time does not have the funds to hire an attorney. However, even though D106 was told that I am not an attorney, I think she got confused and believed that I was. I received a phone call from the current husband of D106 asking me for help with the appeal. I again told him that I am not an attorney but he was adamant about telling me the story that the participant told me herself. The conversation with D106's husband was long and he also seemed adamant that I could help the couple with their case. Throughout the entire conversation I reiterated that I am not a licensed attorney and I could not take their case. I did however advise them to find a pro-bono attorney who may be willing to take their case.

D106's husband told me that he believes that his wife received a bad plea deal from the prosecuting attorney. He also stated that he has firsthand knowledge that this particular prosecutor has a political agenda against sex offenders and those who are

involved in gun crimes. He repeatedly asked me if it was legal for a prosecutor to go after sex offenses more harshly than other offenders. I advised him to ask his attorney that question.

The husband relayed the circumstances surrounding the cases and their experiences post-conviction. At the time of the offense, D106 was engaged in sexual intercourse with her boyfriend (her husband and she were separated) when her son walked into the room and saw the two having sex. The son was young (7 years old) and told his father and his father's girlfriend what he saw at his mother's house. His father's girlfriend then reported the sexual activity to law enforcement but told law enforcement that D106 was intentionally disrobing in front of her son and was making sexually suggestive remarks to him.

After the initial arrest of D106, she spend 3 months in jail because there was no one with enough money to get her released on bond – her current husband included. D106's current husband was unclear about the marital relationships that were present at the time of the offense, but he did state that he was not the boyfriend that D106 was having sex with when her son walked in. The 3 months that D106 spent in jail was the only time she spent incarcerated. However, she was sentenced to 4 years probation supervision with all of that time also to be spent on electronic monitoring. D106's husband voiced his frustration over the fact that she must be on electronic monitoring for the entirety of her probation sentence. He also voiced frustration over the fact that he cannot live in the same house as his wife since he has a young daughter. He said that D106 at many points has been depressed and suicidal over her conviction. She has been to therapists and counselors many times and has been clinically diagnosed as

schizophrenic. D106's husband told me that he would call back in a few days to see what I can do in contacting a lawyer for him and his wife. Before the conversation ended, I reiterated that I am not a lawyer and it is not my responsibility to find him one. I do not think that her husband completely understand of what I was telling him, but if he calls me back then I will again tell him what I have told him previously.

Participant E12

Participant E12 emailed me in response to the survey that I mailed to her. She was adamant about her name and location remaining confidential because city she resides is small and a big vacation spot. Therefore, she cannot afford to have any problems arise as a result of her name being made public. In the response email, I ensured E12 that her identity and her place of employment would remain confidential. She is on the registry for "engaging in sexual activity with a minor." I have removed information from the email that could identify Participant E12. The email that she sent to me reads:

"I received your survey and I will be sending it to you in a few days. I am glad that someone is actually taking notice of the idea of the Registry itself. Please understand, I do not want my name mentioned but I have several things I would love to share with you as a female who was thrown into this whole fiasco without knowing what it actually entailed. Also, I am not sure, but I don't think that there are too many women in the registry and I might be able to give you a different perspective for your thesis. I have had all kinds of problems and prejudice associated with this and I feel like "we" have been grouped together as a label and placed at the bottom of the horrible people list. Even below those who have killed others or broken into homes and beaten people

within an inch of their life do not have to answer to the world the way our label does. I do not feel it is fair to group us as such. During the civil rights era, they used to say that some were placed at the back of the bus. Well, I tell my husband all the time, that I do not feel "we" have been placed at the back of the bus, I feel we have been hog-tied and are being dragged behind it."

"I guess you can tell that I am very passionate about the extreme stigma given to our label as a whole and I would love to speak to you about it if that is something you would be interested in... Again, I respectfully ask that you do not share my name or where I work with anyone because I cannot handle any more problems associated with this in my life... Thank you for your understanding and I look forward to hearing from you."

In the response email, I invited her to share as much as she wanted to about her experiences, her offense and other items that she may want to make known. She wrote a second email to me and promises to write a third. In the second email, she relates that there is so much that she wants to say about her offense. The email states:

"I would like to mention that the survey is very comprehensive however, it assumes that you are guilty. Some of the questions say "did you commit this crime..." There are many people on the registry that are there because they felt they had no other option except to either plead "no lo" or guilty because many, many, many years ago lawyers advised their clients to do this because the system was going through a phase where they would always side with the "kid/victim" regardless of truth just to make a point. There was no registry back then or the ridiculous hoop jumping we are made to do today. Those clients, back then, had nothing to lose except a possible small

jail term which was a whole lot better than risking a massive jail term and losing your own kids. People made decisions on what was the lesser of the two evils even if they did not, in reality, deserve either. Today, a lawyer would not give that kind of advice to a client. I am sure that many of those "older" offenders would fight for the truth rather than compromise for what they believed to be the best route if they had known what they would have to go through in the future just to get through the day with this scarlet "A" on our chests."

"The survey, in essence, portrays the same kind of prejudice that we are exposed to on a daily basis. It assumes, and therefore, directly or indirectly accuses and formulates a predicted outcome, that of...if you are on the registry you are automatically guilty. End of discussion."

"I am sure that there is nothing that you could have done differently on the survey because if you asked the question... are you guilty...I believe that many people probably would say "no" whether it be true or not. And, even if you are not guilty, no one ever really believes you. So what is the point, the truth is actually irrelevant. I guess the bottom line is that it just "assumed" with no room for error or interpretation."

"I also just want to mention that things that I have been told are written about me on the registry are so far off I can't even imagine where they came from. I refuse to look at it because I guarantee you that after I throw up, cry, rant and rave I will be depressed for quite awhile. I can't do that to myself anymore so I ignore it and just plod on. I try to keep that "out of sight, out of mind" attitude. It is what gets me through the day until something happens and I get blind-sided again. We do what we need to do to survive."

“I didn't mean to ramble on, but I do have many thoughts and feelings and, until you, no one has ever cared. Thank you for being there, even if it is for a school thing and probably mandatory, I still thank you.”

As previously stated, Participant E12 promised to write a third email, specifically detailing everything she has to say. However, I responded to her second email explaining some of the issues she brought up concerning my survey and why I wrote things the way that I did. My email to her stated:

“I would like to respond to some of the items you brought up in this email however. As far as the survey goes, I understand that there are a lot of people on the registry who were falsely accused, who took the plea deal as "the lesser of two evils" or because their lawyers advised them to do so. In my research and the research of my colleagues, we see this trend not only with those on the registry, but with those convicted of murder, burglary or basically any other type of crime. In fact, there are so many of these convictions taking place that people have dedicated themselves to reversing this trend and to help those who were falsely convicted.”

There is a group in New York called the Innocence Project who works to help out those who were convicted of murder. They have exonerated close to 300 individuals from death row because there is DNA evidence somewhere that can clear them of their convictions. Some of their work is incredible! They reopen cases that have been ignored for years and they find some sort of DNA evidence that exonerates them for their crimes. So not make any less of the registry convictions, but people are arrested and convicted of other crimes that they have not committed.”

“As for why I wrote the survey the way I did, I sent the survey to those who were convicted. So even though the circumstances may have forced them into their plea through the reasons you spoke of before, there was still a conviction. Therefore, according to previous research, you ask the questions to people phrased in that way. I personally am not making any judgments of anyone because I wrote the questions that way. I had to write them that way because of how previous research requires it to be. Plus as you stated, if I wrote the questions asking people are you guilty, then I probably would have gotten a lot more responses stating No, even if they were guilty. So again, I did not mean any offense by the wording and I know that everyone is not guilty, despite the conviction. However, since the conviction exists, I have to write the survey questions as such.”

“Also, I wanted to let you know that you are partially right about this study being mandatory. Part of the requirement for me to achieve my Master's Degree it to write and conduct research for a Master's Thesis. However, there is a lot of academic freedom in choosing what you would like to study. So for my thesis, I chose the topic of sex offenders and the registry. I created the survey with help of my supervising professor. So I just wanted to let you know that this topic of study was not mandatory for me, it was my chosen route of study.”

“I hope that lets you know a little bit more about me and why I chose to study the registry and those on it. And also why I chose to write the survey the way I did. I appreciate that you brought those issues up though. I don't want anyone to think that I just assume that everyone on the registry is guilty. If you have anything else like that

discuss with me, I would love to hear your concerns. Thank you again for bringing them up!"

Her response to my email states the following:

"I did not mean to make you feel like I was second guessing you. I have just been on the defensive for so long, that the wall automatically goes up. I truly apologize if I gave you the wrong impression. I actually feel that you are not the type of person who is accusatory or judgmental because you wouldn't have chosen this topic if you were. I believe it was an excellent survey and as I mentioned very comprehensive. Your questions were well thought out and touched on things that even I had not considered or realized could happen to others in my situation because I had not experienced them."

"I also realize that others and different crimes are in the same boat. I never meant to make any less of their circumstances, but I can only speak of mine and since (thank God) I have never been accused of anything else, I cannot and should not speak as if I know."

"I will be in touch, and again, I hope you are not angry with me. I am not the type of person who goes around nit-picking on things people say or semantics. I am really a very easy going person and tend to avoid confrontation of any kind to the point where my shrink says I need to "grow a pair!"

Participant E14

Participant E14 contacted me with questions about the survey. She stated that she wanted to learn a bit more before she completed the survey. I thought she would have concerns about what I was going to do with her information, but she was just

confused about how to answer the questions considering that she had not committed a crime against another person.

E14 stated that she received an email from a boyfriend when she was 20 years old which contained a picture of his erect penis. Her boyfriend was an adult, but she did not say how old he was. In the email, her boyfriend was trying to convince E14 to have sex with him and send the picture of his erect penis as a way to show her “what she was missing.” E14 was a virgin at the time the email was sent. She did not say how the email was received by law enforcement but she did say that the prosecutor told her that if her boyfriend’s penis had been flaccid, then there would be no reason to charge her with anything. She did not say whether or not her boyfriend was charged with a sexual offense. E14 is listed on the registry for “being in possession of child pornography.” E14 did not have the money to hire an attorney, so she accepted a plea deal for the 2 years probation, but says that her status as a sexual offender was not revealed to her during the plea bargain.

Participant E14 was sentenced to 2 years of probation and is required to register on the sex offender registry. However, E14 was not aware of how long she was required to register for. She asked me how she would find out that information. I told her that upon her conviction, most likely at the sentencing phase, she would have been told that she was required to register for a certain amount of years. She did know that she is required to report every June and December to the Sheriff’s Office in South Florida. The first time she reported to the sheriff, the officer that she saw asked her why she was there. The officer said it was a waste of his/her time as well as E14’s time. However, she still reports even though it is a “waste of time” for the officer.

Before her conviction, E14 was in the fire academy to become a Fire One firefighter. She was also training to get her EMT license. Through a friend who was also in the academy with her, E14 met the boyfriend who sent the email to her. E14 would help babysit her friend's two children. There was one incidence where the friend's son caught his mother and her boyfriend having sex. The child was terrified and ran into a closet to hide. E14 found the child in the closet after hearing the door slam and coaxed the child out, telling him that his mother was alright and that her boyfriend was not hurting her, they were just wrestling. Even though the child was young enough to believe E14, she feels that the mother did more damage to her son than E14 did with the email. After her conviction, E14 was forbidden to see her friend's children. Not because it was court ordered, but because her friend did not want a sex offender in the presence of her children. Participant E14 was also not allowed to remain in the fire academy and was not allowed to finish her EMT training. She had currently been unemployed since 2008.

Since her conviction came before the changes in the sex offender registry laws, E14 was grandfathered into her neighborhood, even though it may breach the boundaries of proximity to schools, bus-stops and daycares. She has two children of her own now that were fathered by her current boyfriend. He lives seven houses down from her home, but she is not allowed to be at his house past 10 o'clock at night and she is not allowed to loiter there unnecessarily. She said that if it were not for her two children and for her boyfriend, she would have "put a bullet in her head years ago." Being on the registry has not been easy for her and now that her children are approaching school age, she is afraid that she will not be able to attend their school

functions or attend birthday parties the way other mothers can. She has not yet told her children about her sex offender status. Because of how low risk her offense makes her, she does not understand why she is “being treated like another John Couey” (Couey was the murderer of Jessica Lunsford). E14 states that the registry needs to set up a tier system like the one present in Colorado. She says that works out better because more emphasis is given to the high risk offenders and those who are low risk like herself are not in the spotlight as much. Participant E14 was very generous with her explanations and stated the need for this information to be made public. Not every offender of the registry is a high risk offender and through projects like this one, E14 feels that the truth will come out and hopefully changes can be made to the registry.

Participant E19

Participant E19 returned her survey and added a note to the bottom of the final page. Her note reads the following:

“Trying to overturn this record. Can you help me? I will be contacting you really soon or you can contact me at [phone number removed].”

Participant E56

Participant E56’s boyfriend called me in place of E56 herself. Her boyfriend stated that he was calling because E56 violated her probation, was violated and is currently in jail for the violation. Her boyfriend stated that E56 does not have a job but she was trying to gain employment through her uncle.

Her boyfriend stated that E56 was associating with a group of illegal aliens, however she is not an illegal herself. When the group of illegals were found and were charged for their illegal entry, they set up E56 by claiming that she was sleeping with a

teenage boy. She is listed on the registry for “lewd or lascivious molestation victim 12-15 years old.” E56 subsequently was arrested and she accepted a plea deal because she did not have the money for her bond. However, her boyfriend claims that she did not know what she was agreeing to at the time. I don’t know if she pled for a probation sentence only or if she was incarcerated as well. However, she is currently on probation and is on electronic monitoring as part of her sentence. Since she is unemployed, she does not have money for an attorney at this time. Her boyfriend mistakenly thought that I am an attorney. I told him that I could not help him on her case and that I am not an attorney. However, I did recommend for him to do an internet search of attorneys who are doing pro-bono work in his area and possibly might be willing to take her case.

Participant E82

In participant E82’s returned survey, a letter was included in the packet. From the letter it seems that E82 is back in custody, so the letter was written by the participant’s mother. It reads:

“I am [name removed, participant E82’s] mother, my name is [name removed]. I saw the survey you sent to her and I am returning it because she will not. I would like to talk to you and get your prospective/advice on her case. I would like to know if there is anything that can be done to get her out of this mess.”

“My husband filed a complaint against the attorney that we hired but that was to no avail. This attorney told her to just say yes to whatever the judge said. Also, on her plea day the attorney had told her that she did not need to be there but he did not show up for court either.”

“If you don’t mind, please call me at [number removed]. Again, I appreciate anything you can recommend. Sincerely, [name removed].

Participant E94

Included in her returned survey packet, Participant E94 included several documents concerning her case. She included documentation proving her certification as a paralegal, the test scores surrounding her paralegal training, a letter from a correctional staff psychologist clearing E94 of any mental illness, an inmate informational detail sheet from the Florida Department of Corrections showing the details of a white male who was involved E94’s convicted offense, a Florida Department of Law Enforcement Investigation Report for her convicted offense, a complete psychological history of E94, and a letter written by E94 herself explaining the circumstances surrounding her conviction.

The letter she wrote states the following:

“I received your inquiry about sex offenders, etc... I am one of the ones that was placed on the list because a person who I had befriended and invited into my home. He had just gotten out of prison on probation from his 5th term in state prison.”

“I am a widow lady on my husband’s Social Security, so I only have a limited income. Now, he was in [city name removed] staying with his friend, when Hurricane Opal hit our beaches. I called him to help me and my lady I worked for so he could clean up all the debris, etc...”

“He came to my home and was welcomed and stayed for some time and he did clean up the mess that Opal made. My large storage shed was damaged and had to be

hauled off. He worked really well and he was a big help to me and the lady I worked for also.”

“However, what I did not know was that he did NOT have the permission from his probation officer to come to [county name removed] County!! When the officer put the pressure on him and was about to violate him and he would have had to serve his 20 year term from prison. He knew all the tricks of the trade so he went through my private bedroom and STOLE 3 or 4 pictures of my granddaughter. She was nude and he called two FDLE officers and told them lies.”

“I am enclosing a copy of the documents I got after I got of prison! I NEVER thought anyone could be put in prison for what was done to me by a person who had been in prison five different times. He painted me as a sexual person who would harm children. When I went to court the judge gave my 97 months in a federal prison. I was 66 years old and NEVER been in any trouble with the law.”

“I had to serve every day of my sentence because I was listed as a sex offender. I also lost my homestead and my check from Social Security. I really do need someone to help me get off the computer because I AM NOT A SEX OFFENDER!!! Since you mailed me this literature it may help me to get to the right person to get help. I am sure there are many more on the list that are innocent also. I hope you can let know if you can help me or not.”

“While I was in prison I took a paralegal course and I also studied constitutional law with a person that knew the law of the constitution. She was in my cube and she taught constitutional law on Saturdays. I had 60 hours of that and I had 4 or 5 courses

in Battered Woman's Studies. I also took a course in Business Education and learned to type."

"I took a plea because I did not want my family to be embarrassed if I went to court. Had I known then what I know now, I would have taken my chances with the courts."

"I am also sending you a copy of my Bi-Polar-Manic-Depression that I was suffering at that time. In my transcript the judge asked my attorney 'How can we take her plea if she is contesting the homestead?' However, they did take it!!! They also told me if I did not take a plea I would get 20 years if I went to court!!!"

"With the document you will notice that the FDLE Officers and the U.S. Postal Service made a deal to take my homestead and sell it and split the money between them. I did not know what was happening to me!!!"

"On January 11, 1999 I was awakened by the Holy Spirit at 2:30 a.m. and God assured me that he that he was healing me of my depression and I could see it leaving me at that time and I went to the Doctors and told them I wanted to stop taking the 20mg of Prozac that I was on. They told me if I was alright in 3 months they would take me off the meds. I have NEVER HAD another attack with it since."

"Please call me or write me if you can help me in any way!! The judicial system is NOT at all it is supposed to be. After I got in prison I know of several others that were not guilty of what they were charged with either. I have notarized statements of my good character in our community however the U.S. Attorney told the judge that I was a threat to my community and NOT to grant me bail so I was denied bail even though I

had property in Florida and should have been granted release on my own because of my property.”

“I am returning your document and I do hope you know someone who can help me get off that computer. I will be leaving on Saturday to stay with my elder son in Georgia for two weeks so if you write, give me time to answer. I am listing my home and cell phone numbers.”

“Sincerely Yours, Participant E94.”

Participant E110

Participant E110 returned the survey that I sent to her and included a letter addressed to me as well as a copy of the court paper work which states that her driver’s license was revoked, due to “failure to pay financial obligations for any criminal offense as required by the county court.” The letter she sent to me is incoherent and written in a somewhat rambling manner. Nonetheless, it reads as follows:

“I promise you I am not what I have got accused of.”

“I am not a sex offender. I never was. My step brother [name removed] and his wife [name removed] accused me of being a sex offender. I am not a sex offender. I never was. I was supposed to go to trial and take a polygraph test. The polygraph test is \$250.00. I don’t have the money for that. [Name removed], [name removed] and [name removed] did not want me to go on trial because they did not want Judge [name removed] or Tallahassee to know about the moonshine. My step sister died from the moonshine. My step sister and I was drunk and we past out. I have been accused of that and now this. My step sister [name removed] did this to me. I have never been to

Orange County, I don't know where Orange County is. 1998 my granddaughter was born. 2004 I was locked up. I promise you I am not a sex offender, never was."

"I promise you my step sister [name removed] did this. My friend [name removed] he told me that [name removed] was there in Orlando. He told me that he don't want he don't have anything to do with her. Please don't put my friend in this. My family had's a lot of trouble. I am on parole for 8 years March 12th, 2011. I don't want to be on parole anymore. I want my freedom back. [Name removed] she said that I can live anywhere I want to. I don't want to be anywhere around my family. I want my own place. My step sister, my family had's hurt me too much. Now this is what makes me upset. [name removed], my step sister she smokes crack and she had's sex with a lot of men, gives a lot of BJ's. My son, my daughter, my aunts and uncles along with myself we are very upset. I am writing to Channel 12 but I don't want my family to know about this. [name removed] she's in the wrong for hurting me the way she did and [name removed] and [name removed] for accusing me of being a sex offender.

Mrs. Jennifer can you help me with my own place, a job, money, a pickup truck? I want my drivers license back. Mrs. Jennifer I have cookware, clothes that I need to sell so that I can take [the polygraph test] to prove that I am not a sex offender. I want my freedom back, my family gave [name removed] my step sister money for crack over my freedom. This is not right. Her name, [name removed], is 45 years old, 5'3". She is very ugly. [name removed] does not like my friend. He's black. I try my best to keep [name removed] and [name removed] away from each other."

"I need my own place. I need money. I need a job. I need my driver's license back. I have a 1983 Toyota Crestia. The car don't run. I need to sell it do I can have

the money for the polygraph test to prove that I am not a sex offender. I promise I am not for the Grace of God on Jesus Cross. I am asking for help. Thank you, [name removed]. Why can't I have my divorce? Have my name back. I wood like to have my name be [name removed].”

“[name removed] trys her best to get my friend [name removed] in trouble with my family. Damn she's all ready had's me in trouble with [county name removed] County for sleeping with a lot of men, smoking crack. My friend that that he don't want [name removed] around him and [name removed] tells my family she can't stand him. Well she need to stay away from him and stop calling him. I have cookware, a care and clothes for sell so I can live wherever I want to, I can have my freedom back. \$250.00.”

“Thank you, [name removed]. I need my driver's license to say [name removed]. Have my divorce, my new name back.”

As I stated before, the letter is very incoherent and written in a rambling manner. On the copy of her driver's license revocation, she wrote the following words:

“I promise you I am not a sex offender, I never was and my stepsister [name removed] did this. I get food stamps. I need a cell phone.”

APPENDIX E
SURVEY COMMENTS

Question 1: “When were you placed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”

Participant A4: “After 9 ½ years in prison.”

Question 2: “How long are you required to register?”

Participant A4: “I can apply to be removed.”

Participant B66: “Unknown – have never been told. May be able to file for clemency in 25 years but no guarantee.”

Participant B87: “Don’t know.”

Participant C15: “Unknown. Did not say.”

Participant C22: “Don’t know.”

Participant C30: “7 years. But the law changed and didn’t look over my case.”

Participant D41: “Not sure I assume life but not sure”

Participant E19: “Don’t know.”

Participant E82: “Unknown.”

Question 3: “For the sexual offenses that you have been convicted of, is/are the victim(s)?”

Question 4: “For the sexual offense that you have been convicted of, did you commit the offense alone?”

Participant A6: “Not at all.”

Participant A21: “N/A, Not convicted.”

Participant A104: “Not exactly. I didn’t do it. I was framed.”

Participant A107: “No. Victim.”

Participant B66: “Not guilty. I did not commit the offense.”

Participant C93: "That's what they say but I didn't do it."

Participant D76: "I was charged but didn't do the crime."

Participant E110: "My husband raped me and my sister."

Question 4a: "If you answered No, what was the gender of the person you committed the offense with?"

Participant A6: "My husband did."

Question 4b: "Did you have a previous relationship with the person you committed the offense with?"

Question 4c: "Who was the person you committed the offense with?"

Participant A107: "Victim."

Participant B76: "Abusive."

Participant D38: "Ex-husband. Cousin."

Question 5: "Approximately what portion of your family, friends, co-workers, and other people you consider a part of your life know about your sexual offense conviction(s)?"

Question 6: "Based on your listing on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, how often are you recognized in public as a convicted sex offender?"

Participant A4: "I don't know."

Participant A104: "I don't know."

Participant B27: "I don't know."

Participant C8: "Maybe once every few years."

Participant D41: "Never. At least nobody has said anything to me."

Question 7: “How often do you have law enforcement officers (police) or other government workers contact you, as a result of your placement on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”

Participant D41: “They are required to come every 3 months.”

Participant D53: “A couple times a month. But I am still on probation.”

Question 8: “Have you ever looked at your listing on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?”

Participant E45: “I cannot go online for 5 years.”

Question 9: “I feel ashamed that I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry”

Participant A6: “Because I was and am not guilty at all.”

Participant B37: “ANGRY, not ashamed.”

Participant C82: “Not ashamed just mad!”

Participant D38: “Yes.”

Question 10: “I understand why people want there to be a Florida Sex Offender Registry”

Participant B66: “Why not a registry for murders, drug dealers, etc...”

Question 11: “I think that the Florida Sex Offender Registry is a good thing”

Participant B27: “Needs to classify sex offenders according to age of victim.”

Participant B34: “If you did it. I didn’t rape no one he was 17 ½.”

Participant B66: “Disagree Completely. Because people get hysterical.”

Question 12: “People avoid being around or talking with me if they know I am on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.”

Participant E110: “My family and friends know that I did not rape my sister.”

Question 13: “I feel I am being unfairly punished by being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry.”

Participant A97: “Only because I’m the victim. I was raped.”

Participant B66: “Agree Completely. Times 1000.”

Participant E110: “I am not a sex offender, never was.”

Question 14: “I believe that having my picture on the Florida Sex Offender Registry is going too far”

Participant B66: “Agree Completely. Times 1000.”

Participant C30: “Agree Completely. Cause I did my time for that stupid shit.”

Participant C52: “In my case, ‘yes.’”

Question 15: “If I found out that the address listed for me on the Florida Sex Offender Registry was not correct, I would contact someone to have it corrected”

Participant A4: “Wrong info may cause me to get a felony charge.”

Participant B66: “Agree Completely. Required by law.”

Participant D41: “Only if they would charge me with something would I tell them.”

Question 16: “If I found out that the picture on my the Florida Sex Offender Registry page was of someone else, I would contact someone to have it corrected”

Participant B66: “Agree Completely. Required by law.”

Participant D41: “Only if they would charge me with something would I tell them.”

Question 17: “If I found out that the offenses for which I was convicted were incorrect (listed as more or less serious) on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I would contact someone to have it corrected”

Participant A6: "I wish I could prove that I'm innocent."

Participant B66: "Agree Completely. To be honest."

Question 18: "If I move or change addresses I would contact someone to update my information on the Florida Sex Offender Registry"

Participant A4: "Mandatory Registration."

Participant A31: "Required by law within 48 hours."

Participant B66: "Agree Completely. Required by law."

Participant B87: "I have to by law. If not I'll be violated."

Participant D41: "It's the law."

Question 19: "Because my name and personal information is listed on the Florida Sex Offender Registry I am less likely to commit another sexual offense in the future."

Participant A4: "Or any other crime."

Participant B27: "I will not commit the same crime, but it has nothing to do with the registry."

Participant B66: "Never committed original offense accused of."

Participant C32: "No that is not why. I have learned from my mistakes in the past and I would not want to repeat that kind of thing ever again and I will not ever again with me being sober now."

Participant C82: "Nothing to do with it."

Participant C110: "I will not commit another offense because I am not the same woman anymore; I have undergone a physic change thanks to AA and the grace of God."

Participant D41: "Regardless, I wouldn't commit this offense again."

Participant E 35: "I wouldn't because I have learned from my choices. It was something I did not something I am."

Question 20: "I feel that the Florida Sex Offender Registry has unfairly characterized me as a sex offender."

Participant B66: "Agree Completely. Times 1000."

Participant B87: "As a predator."

Question 21: "I feel that being required to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has limited my efforts to reenter back into my community."

Participant A4: "I cannot get a job in the mainstream."

Question 22: "Because I am registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I will never be seen as anything other than a sexual offender."

Participant A4: "Job applicant wise, I concur. On a personal level, I don't."

Participant C32: "That is the people of the world, but not with God because God forgives."

Participant E110: "My family and friends know that I am not a sex offender. That is really sick."

Question 23: "I feel that the Florida Sexual Offender Registry should not be made available to the public because it makes life difficult for the people who are registered."

Participant A4: "Depends on the circumstances of the crime and if [the person is] a repeat offender."

Participant A21: "List only predators."

Participant B109: “Depending on the number that follows the person.”

Participant C32: “It’s according to what the situation was about.”

Question 24: “I feel that the Florida Sexual Offender Registry should not be made available to the public because it harms everyone registered and prevents me and others from turning our lives around”

Participant C8: “It depends on individual situations and crimes.”

Participant C32: “It’s according to what the situation was.”

Participant E110: “For what my husband did to me and my sister was wrong.”

Question 25: “I feel that since I have registered on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, I have been ostracized from my community.”

Participant A4: “I have two little girls; my crime was in 1987 when I was 23 – very young and easily influenced. Now I can’t attend events at my daughter’s school due to 1 day almost a quarter of a century ago.”

Participant C32: “In certain places.”

Participant C110: “I have not experienced any.”

Question 26: “I feel that my relationships with other have suffered because I am required to register as a sexual offender.”

Participant A6: “If you know me you know it’s not true.”

Participant B86: “Agree Completely. With my husband.”

Question 27: “I no longer feel apart of my community because I am required to register as a sexual offender.”

Question 28: “People do not treat me with respect once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender.”

Participant E110: "I have a hard time trying to get a job."

Question 29: *"I feel that community members do not treat me fairly once they find out that I am required to register as a sexual offender."*

Question 30: *"I am ashamed that I have committed a sexual offense."*

Participant A97: "I didn't, again I was raped."

Participant A 104: "Because the kids said that I showed them the pictures when I didn't. They stole my phone."

Participant B37: "ANGRY I was lied to."

Participant B66: "Never committed original offense accused of."

Participant C8: "All individuals are classified the same and it shouldn't be that way. Cases are all different."

Participant C30: "Strongly Agree."

Participant C80: "I didn't rape, molest or sexually abuse a child."

Participant C52: "I didn't."

Participant C93: "Didn't do it but am ashamed that they say I did."

Participant C110: "My shame has been removed by God."

Participant D76: "By being accused of this crime and no way to prove my innocence. No one would listen."

Participant E82: "I read an email."

Question 31: *"I am less likely to leave the house because I am afraid that someone might recognize me as a sex offender."*

Participant E35: "Early on yes, but not now."

Question 32: *“I avoid certain public places because I am afraid of being recognized as a sex offender.”*

Question 33: *“I feel that the Florida Sex Offender Registry helps protect people from serious offenders.”*

Participant A4: “As a mother of 2 young daughters I check my neighborhood.”

Participant B87: “From predators.”

Participant E35: “Too many non-dangerous offenders to know the difference.”

Question 34: *“At the time of your arrest, do you feel that law enforcement officials treated you fairly?”*

Participant E42: “Did not take place in Florida.”

Question 35: *“At the time of your arrest, did you feel that law enforcement officials treated you with respect?”*

Question 36: *“During your trial or time spent in court, do you feel that the court officials treated you fairly?”*

Participant E110: “I never did go to trial because [name removed] and [name removed] did not want the Judge in Tallahassee to know about the moonshine.

Question 37: *“During your trial or time spent in court, do you feel that the court officials treated you with respect?”*

Question 38: *While you were incarcerated, did the correctional staff treat you fairly?*

Participant A4: “Some did and some did not.”

Participant B27: “Yes, in county jail. No, in prison.”

Participant B66: “Only in jail 3 days until bonded out.”

Participant E45: "Only because I was former law enforcement!"

Question 39: While you were incarcerated, did the correctional staff treat you with respect?

Participant B27: "Yes, in county jail. No, in prison."

Participant B66: "Only in jail 3 days until bonded out."

Question 40: While you were incarcerated, did you feel that the correctional staff was judgmental of your offense?

Participant B27: "Yes, in prison. No, in county jail."

Participant B66: "Only in jail 3 days until bonded out."

Question 41: While on probation, did you feel that that your probation office treated you fairly?

Participant A4: "My 1st PO in Gainesville I felt treated me unfairly. My Tampa officer treated me fairly."

Question 42: While on probation, did you feel that your probation officer treated you with respect?

Participant A77: "Had more than 1 out of 3. I was totally disrespected and they did everything to try and violate me."

Question 43: While on probation, did you feel that your probation officer was judgmental of your offense?

Question 44: While on probation, did your probation officer give you advanced warning before making a home visit?

Participant B66: "No. Never by appointment."

Question 45: While on probation, did your probation officer ever come by unannounced for a home visit?

Participant B66: "Yes. Always."

Question 46: While on probation, did your probation officer visit you at home on a regular basis?

Question 47: Do you feel that your probation officer visited you more often because you were convicted of a sexual offense?

Participant B66: "No. Law required monthly visits so that is what they did."

Participant B109: "Does not apply."

Participant E19: "Does not apply."

Question 48: Do you feel that your probation officer would not have visited you as often if you had been convicted of a non-sexual offense?

Participant B109: "Does not apply."

Participant E19: "Does not apply."

Question 49: Do you feel that you have been treated differently by law enforcement, corrections official or court officials based on your status as a sexual offender?

Participant B66: "Local law enforcement comes by now monthly (not probation). They have come in the middle of the night for no reason. If they miss us on other attempts, they do not even have the courtesy to call and ask 'when will you be home'."

Question 50: Do you feel that being on the Florida Sex Offender Registry has caused unnecessary stress in your life?

Participant A113: "Not yet."

Question 51: *Because of this stress, do you feel that you act out in an unhealthy way?*

Participant A4: "I suppress and have fibromyalgia from doing so."

Participant A113: "N/A, Not yet."

Question 52: *Because of this stress, do you consume alcohol more than you did in the past?*

Participant A113: "Not yet."

Participant C32: "I had but I stopped drinking all together."

Participant C110: "None, I have been sober since the date of my arrest."

Question 53: *Because of this stress, do you use any illegal substances more than you did in the past?*

Participant A4: "I don't regularly drink or do drugs at all."

Question 54: *Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt yourself?*

Participant E82: "No, but considered it."

Question 55: *Because of this stress, have you ever tried to hurt someone else?*

Question 56: *Do you feel angry for having to register on the Florida Sex Offender Registry?*

Participant A97: "Yes and No. Only because I am innocent."

Participant B66: "Yes. Times 1000"

Participant C110: "Frustrated at times."

Question 57: *Since registering on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, has your relationship with your significant other ended?*

Participant A4: “My co-defendant was my ex-husband. I since remarried and he is aware of my status.”

Participant A107: “Victim.”

Participant B62: “Yes, but remarried.”

Participant D38: “But with someone else.”

Question 58: *Since registering on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, have any relationships with family members ended?*

Question 59: *Since registering on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, have you been physically abused by someone close to you?*

Participant A4: “My ex [husband] was abusive.”

Participant C32: “A few years back.”

Question 60: *Since registering on the Florida Sex Offender Registry, have you been emotionally or verbally abused by someone close to you?*

Participant A4: “My ex.”

Question 61: *Lost a job*

Participant B66: “However, we own our own business and have had potential customers tell us they will not deal with us because of the implications that come with being on the sex offender registry.”

Question 62: *Been denied a promotion at work*

Participant A4: “Been refused jobs.”

Question 63: *Lost (or denied) a place to live*

Participant C110: “Not yet.”

Question 64: *Been treated rudely in a public place*

Participant B66: "Once by a church!"

Question 65: *Been asked to leave a business or restaurant*

Question 66: *Lost a friend because of your registration status*

Question 67: *Been harassed, in person*

Participant A4: "In prison."

Question 68: *Been assaulted/attacked*

Participant A4: "In prison."

Question 69: *Received harassing/threatening telephone calls*

Question 70: *Received harassing/threatening mail/flyers/notes*

Participant A4: "I get letters from male inmates with violent crimes seeking a relationship. I don't respond."

Question 71: *Since being released, how many times have you had to change residences?*

Question 72: *Is your current residence more than 2,500 feet away from a school?*

Participant B66: "No. Only because we were here before the school was built, could not move here now."

Question 73: *Have you ever been forced to move because your residence was located in an "exclusionary zone"?*

Participant E110: "Everyone knows that I did not do it."

Question 74: *Were you ever informed that you could not live within a certain area close to a school, park or school bus stop?*

Question 75: *Have you found it difficult to find employment after your release?*

Participant B34: "I don't work. I get a check once a month."

Participant B66: “Fortunately, have not had to try.”

Participant C52: “Wasn’t incarcerated.”

Question 75a: *If you answered Yes, is this because your employer knew that you are a registered sex offender?*

Participant C5: “People don’t hire felons.”

Question 76: *Has your residence ever been attacked or violated?*

Question 76a: *If you answered Yes, how was it attacked or violated?*

Question 77: *Do you feel that your current neighborhood is a last resort area for you (meaning that you only live there because the law has limited your other opportunities of residence)?*

Participant B66: “No. Our city and county have implemented distance restrictions to schools, etc...”

Question 78: *How safe do you feel in your neighborhood?*

Participant A4: “Because of the letters I receive, I moved within 2 blocks of the police department for my daughter’s safety and for my peace of mind.”

Question 79: *Do you attend a religious service of any kind on a regular basis?*

Participant B66: “No. Observe Sabbath at home.”

Participant D22: “Not able to.”

Participant D33: “I did before this.”

Question 80: *Do you participate in religious activities within the church you belong to (anything that is not included in regular service)?*

Question 81: *Do you seek out the support of a religious leader on a regular basis (rabbi, priest, chaplain, pastor, etc...)?*

Question 82: Do you take part in a support group within the community?

Question 82a: “If you answered Yes, is the support group designed specifically for sexual offenders?”

Participant E110: “It don’t have nothing to do with me.”

Question 83: Do you belong to any hobby groups or clubs?

Question 84: Are you involved in any intramural sports organizations?

Question 85: Do you feel like the activities in which you are involved help make you feel a sense of belonging to your community?

Question 86: Are you in contact with any other registered sex offenders in your community?

Participant D38: “They moved.”

Participant E26: “Not sure.”

Question 87: “If the situation requires it, I am comfortable with identifying myself as a sexual offender.”

Participant C110: “Depends on situation.”

Question 88: “If my neighbors make contact with me, I am comfortable with identifying myself as a sexual offender.”

Participant B66: “Disagree Completely. But we do so they do not find out when local law enforcement sends out fliers or does annual publications in the newspaper.”

Question 89: “If I were to change residences, I would be likely to introduce myself to my new neighbors and disclose my status as a sexual offender.”

Question 90: “If I had my way, I would never disclose my status as a sex offender.”

Participant A6: "Because I am not guilty."

Question 91: *"I feel that publically identifying myself as a sexual offender does not benefit anyone."*

Participant B66: "It certainly does not benefit me."

Question 92: *"I do not like to identify myself as a sexual offender because people treat me differently once they know my status."*

Participant C110: "I identify myself on a need-to-know basis."

Question 93: *"I do not like to identify myself as a sexual offender because I feel people are afraid of me once they find out."*

Question 94: *"I am not afraid to identify myself as a sexual offender."*

Participant B66: "Disagree Completely. Because you do not know how people will react. They could come to shoot me!"

Question 95: *"I feel that people are more receptive to me once I tell them about my status as a sex offender."*

Question 96: *"If I had my way, I would remove myself from the sex offender registry and never identify myself as a sexual offender again."*

Participant A6: "If I could be cleared."

Question 97: *"I would feel more comfortable identifying myself as a sexual offender if only select information was provided to the public."*

Participant A62: "Disagree completely. I don't care."

Question 98: *Your age?*

Question 99: *What is your relationship status?*

Participant E26: "Victim is both kids' dad. Help me."

Question 100: Do you have children?

Participant A107: "Three step children."

Question 100a: If you answered Yes, are your children still minors?

Question 100b: If you answered Yes, do you have custody of your children?

Participant A107: "Yes, 60/40."

Question 100c: If you answered No, who has custody/guardianship of your children?

Participant A97: "She's on her own. She's 20 with 4 children."

Participant C46: "My children are all adults."

APPENDIX F
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

IRB Approval Letter



PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
352-392-0433 (Phone)
352-392-9234 (Fax)
irb2@ufl.edu

DATE: June 24, 2010

TO: Jennifer Klein
[Redacted]

FROM: Ira S. Fischler, PhD, Chair *ISF*
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02

SUBJECT: Approval of Protocol #2010-U-0520

TITLE: Sex Offender Registration - Experiences of Female Offenders in Florida

SPONSOR: None

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this protocol. Based on its review, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based on 45 CFR 46.117(c), An IRB may waive the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for some or all subjects if it finds either: (1) *That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research, and the subject's wishes will govern;* or (2) *That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.*

The IRB authorizes you to administer the informed consent process as specified in the protocol. If you wish to make any changes to this protocol, **including the need to increase the number of participants authorized**, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your protocol. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications that affect your participants.

This approval is valid through **June 24, 2011**. If you have not completed the study by this date, please telephone our office [Redacted] and we will discuss the renewal process with you. It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research protocol.

ISF:dl

IRB Approved Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT

Please do not respond if you are currently on probation.
Title: "Sex Offender Registration: Female Experiences in Florida"

Please read this informed consent carefully before agreeing to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study: The purpose is to examine the experiences of females who are required to register as a sex offender in the state of Florida.

What You will be Asked to do in the Research Study: If you decide to participate in this survey, you will be asked to answer questions about your experiences as a registered sex offender. Your responses will be kept confidential. The survey will include questions about negative experiences (job loss, residence loss, etc.) as well as your perception of registration requirements. There will also be questions about your residence, any harassing behaviors that you have experienced and the stress involved with registration. The researcher conducting this survey is not connected to any type of law enforcement. Your answers will not be shared with anyone working in law enforcement, corrections or the court. **PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY AND DO NOT SHARE THE SURVEY WITH ANYONE.** Please do not provide specific information about criminal activities, so that you cannot be identified or have your answers used in ways you do not like. The questions asking about personal information at the beginning of the survey are not specific enough to be able to identify you compared to any other participant. When you are done answering the survey, please return it to the researcher in the pre-paid envelope that is included in this packet. Your survey will be marked as returned once received and will be set aside for later scoring. This delay in scoring will also ensure that your responses will not be linked to you. The information you provide will be stored in a secure computer, identified by the number on the survey. The link between that number and your name or address will be destroyed immediately when the survey is returned so that no one can identify your answers. You will only be known as the identification number located at the top of your survey.

Time Required: It will take between 30 minutes and an hour to answer the questions, depending on your pace.

Confidentiality: All of your answers will be confidential. No one will be able to link your answers to you. You were assigned an identification number that is located at the top of your survey. This will be the only number that is used to identify you from this point forward. When you return the survey, your return envelope will be destroyed – therefore, there is no way in which you will be identified as a participant. Your answers will be coded with numbers and these numbers cannot be traced to you, once the return envelopes are destroyed. The results of the study will be present patterns of how everyone answered. It will not focus on any one person's answers.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw From the Study: There are no benefits or rewards for participating in the study. The risks are minimal, but you may find that you are uncomfortable answering some of the questions. There are some questions that address probation supervision. Please do not elaborate any answers. Your responses will not be shared with any law enforcement, correctional or court officials. You are free to talk about any issues that might be raised for you by the survey to any and all counseling services that are available to you. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and you can stop taking the survey at any time. No one will be upset or angry if you decide not to participate or if you stop participating at any time for any reason. Participating will not affect your legal status as a registered offender in any way.

Whom to Contact if you Have Questions About the Study: Jennifer Klein or Dr. Lonni Lanza-Kaduce, Department of Sociology, Criminology and Law, 3219 Turlington Hall, PO Box 117330, Gainesville, Florida 32611-7330; Telephone: [REDACTED]

Whom to Contact About Your Rights as a Research Participant in the Study: UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; Telephone: [REDACTED]

Agreement: By completing and turning in the survey you will consent to participate in this study. By returning the survey, the assumption will be made that you have read the informed consent and are fine with the researcher using your answers for academic purposes only. This informed consent description is yours to keep.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!!

Approved by
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02
Protocol # 2010-U-0520
For Use Through 06-24-2011

IRB Approved Initial Letter



College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law

3219 Turlington Hall
PO Box 117330
Gainesville, FL 32611-7330

[Redacted] Fax

Dear Ms. _____,

My name is Jennifer L. Klein and I am a Master's student in Criminology at the University of Florida. I am currently conducting research that will serve as my Master's Thesis. The purpose of my study is to examine your perceptions of the Florida Sex Offender Registry. I am asking you about your experiences associated with being on the registry. For example, have you lost a job since being required to register? Have you been forced to move because you are required to register?

At this time, I would like to extend an invitation for you to participate in my study.

You were chosen to participate based on your registration status with the state of Florida as a sexual offender. I obtained your mailing address from the website posed by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. Included in this packet are an informed consent, a pre-paid return envelope and the survey, which I am inviting you to answer.

I understand that the questions I am asking are sensitive in nature and therefore, please do not feel obligated to participate. If you choose to participate, please don't feel as though you must answer every question in the survey. I am looking for honest and reliable answers but at the same time, I do not wish to make you feel uncomfortable at all.

The number that is written on your survey serves as your identification code. Your survey will be marked as returned once received and will be set aside for later scoring. This delay in scoring will also ensure that your responses will not be linked to you. Within one week after you return the survey, I will destroy any identifying information and you will only be known by this number. By doing this, I can ensure that all of the information that you supply remains anonymous.

If you choose to participate in the survey, please return the survey in the addressed, pre-paid envelope that is included in this packet. Please return the survey as soon as you have completed it, at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your time and thoughtful responses. If you have questions about the survey or how your information will be used, please contact me. My contact information is listed below. Thank you again for your time.

Approved by
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02
Protocol # 2010-U-0520
For Use Through 06-24-2011

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Klein [Redacted]

The Foundation for The Gator Nation
An Equal Opportunity Institution

IRB Approved Follow-up Letter



College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law

3219 Turlington Hall
PO Box 117330
Gainesville, FL 32611-7330

[Redacted] Fax

Dear Ms. _____,

My name is Jennifer L. Klein and I am a Master's student at the University of Florida. I am in the Criminology program at UF and I am currently conducting research for my Master's Thesis.

About a week ago, you should have received a packet of information containing a survey and an informed consent sheet. This packet came from me and it will serve as the research for my Master's Thesis.

At the time of this mailing, I have not received a completed survey from you. I hope that you have had the opportunity to take a look at my initial letter to you, the survey and the informed consent. If you have not yet completed the survey, I would like to extend a second invitation for you to take part in this study. Your information would be very valuable to me and for my research.

If you did not receive a survey packet or have disregarded it in error and would still like to take the survey, please contact me and I will send another packet to your address. My contact information is at the bottom of the page.

Please remember that I will not share your answers with anyone besides a research assistant. Your answers will remain anonymous. I understand the sensitivity surrounding the information that I am asking for. Therefore, no one besides me will be aware of your identity. Although you are sending your response back to me with your return address on the envelope, I will destroy all identifying factors (within one week of your response) and will only refer to you by the participant code that was written on your survey. After I destroy your contact information, even I will not be able to connect you with your answers.

If you have already completed the survey and returned it, I would like to thank you for your participation and ask you to disregard this reminder. I appreciate you taking the time to read my letter and I thank you in advance if you choose to participate in my research.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Klein

[Redacted]

Approved by
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02
Protocol # 2010-U-0520
For Use Through 06-24-2011

The Foundation for The Gator Nation
An Equal Opportunity Institution

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adshead, G., Howett, M., & Mason, F. (1994). Woman who sexually abuse children. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 1*, 45–56.
- Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces, 64*(1), 151-167.
- Agnew, R. (2001a). *Juvenile Delinquency: Causes and Control*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Agnew, R. (2001b). Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*, 319-361.
- Agnew, R. (2006a). *Pressured Into Crime: An Overview of General Strain Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Agnew, R. (2006b). General strain theory: current status and directions for further research. pp. 101-123 in Francis T. Cullen, John Paul Wright and Kristie R. Blevins (eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory. Advances in Criminological Theory*. Vol. 15. New Brunswick, NJ.: Transaction.
- Akers, R. & Sellers, C. (2009). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation and application*. Fifth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, C. M. (1991). *Women and men who sexually abuse children: A comparative analysis*. Orwell: Safer Society.
- Anderson, E.A. (1976). The “chivalrous” treatment of the female offender in the arms of the criminal justice system: A review of the literature. *Social Problems, 23*(3), 350-357.
- Banning, A. (1989). Mother-son incest: Confronting a prejudice. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 13*, 563-570.
- Baron-Evans, A. & Noonan, S. (2006). The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 -- Part I. Retrieved: January 15, 2010, from http://www.fd.org/pdf_lib/AdamWalshMemoPt1.pdf
- Barnes, H.E. & Teeters, N.K. (1959). *New horizons in criminology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Beech, A.R., Parrett, N., Ward, T. & Fisher, D. (2009). Assessing female sexual offenders' motivations and cognitions: an exploratory study. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 5*(2/3), 201-216.
- Bernard, T.J. (1990). Angry aggression among the ‘truly disadvantaged.’ *Criminology, 28*, 73-96.

- Block, H.A. & Geis, G. (1962). *Man, crime and society*. New York: Random House.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brezina, T. (1996). Adapting to strain: An examination of delinquent coping responses. *Criminology*, 34, 39-60.
- Bunting, L. (2006). Females who sexually offend against children: Responses of the child protection and criminal justice systems. Executive summary. London: NSPCC.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004). Criminal Offender Statistics. Washington, DC: Retrieved August 9, 2010, [file://localhost/from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/crimoff.htm - sex](http://localhost/from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/crimoff.htm - sex)
- Calley, N.G. (2008). Juvenile sex offenders and sex offender legislation: Unintended consequences. *Federal Probation*, 72(3), 37-41.
- Cavan, R.S. (1962). *Criminology*. New York: Crowell.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House.
- Collwell, L.H., Miller, H.A., Miller, R.S & Lyons, Jr., P.M. (2006). U.S. police officers' knowledge regarding behaviors indicative of deception: Implications for eradicating erroneous beliefs through training. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 12(5), 489-503.
- Cornell Law School. (2010). Legal Information Institute – U.S. Code. Retrieved October 11, 2010, from <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>
- Cortoni, F., & Hanson, R. (2005). A review of recidivism rates of adult female sexual offenders. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Cullen F.T. & Wright, J.P. (1997). Liberating the anomie-strain paradigm: Implications from social-support theory. Pp. 187-206 in *The Future of Anomie Theory*, ed. Nikos Passas and Robert Agnew. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Department of Corrections Washington State. (2010). Civil Commitment of Sexual Predators. Retrieved August 27, 2010, from <http://www.doc.wa.gov/community/sexoffenders/civilcommitment.asp>
- Ellement, J.R. and Smalley, S. (2006). Sex crime disclosure questioned: Maine killings refuel debate over registries. Retrieved August 8, 2010, from http://www.boston.com/news/local/maine/articles/2006/04/18/sex_crime_disclosure_questioned/

- English, K., Pullen, S. & Jones, L. (1997). *Managing adult sex offenders in the community: A containment approach*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Faller, K. C. (1995). A clinical sample of women who have sexually abused children. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 4(3), 13–30.
- Fazel, S., Sjostedt, G., Grann, M. & Langstrom, N. (2010). Sexual offending in women and psychiatric disorder: A national case-control study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 161-167.
- Finkelhor, D., & Williams, L. (1988). Perpetrators. In D. Finkelhor, L. Williams & N. Burns (Eds.), *Nursery crimes: Sexual abuse in day care*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FLDE). (2010a). Complete list of female sexual offenders. Unpublished Listing. Retrieved March 22, 2010.
- Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FLDE). (2010b). Florida Sexual Predators and Offenders. Retrieved August 11, 2010, from <http://offender.fdle.state.fl.us/offender/homepage.do>
- Ford, H. (2006). *Women who sexually abuse children*. Chichester: Wiley
- Freeman, J., Liossis, P. and David, N. (2006). Deterrence, Defiance and Deviance: An Investigation Into a Group of Recidivist Drink Drivers' Self-Reported Offending Behaviours. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 39(1), 1-19.
- Fromuth, M.E., & Conn, V.E. (1997). Hidden perpetrators: Sexual molestation in a nonclinical sample of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 456-465.
- Gannon, T.A., Rose, M.R, Williams, S.E. (2009). Do female child molesters implicitly associate children and sex? A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 15(1), 55-61.
- Grayston, A. D., & De Luca, R. V. (1999). Female perpetrators of child sexual abuse: a review of the clinical and empirical literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4(1), 93–106.
- Gray, N. S., Brown, A. S., MacCulloch, M. J., Smith, J. & Snowden, R. J. (2005). An implicit test of the association between children and sex in pedophiles. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114, 304-308.
- Higgs, D. C., Canavan, M. M., & Meyer, W. J. (1992). Clinical notes, moving from defense to offense: the development of an adolescent female sex offender. *Journal of Sex Research*, 29(1), 131–139.

- Hislop, J. (2001). *Female sex offenders: What therapists, law enforcement and child protective services need to know*. Ravensdale: Issues.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Holmes, S.T. and Holmes, R.M. (2009). *Sex Crimes: Patterns and Behaviors*. SAGE Publications, Inc.: California.
- Homel, R.J. (1988). *Policing and punishing the drinking driver. A study of specific and general deterrence*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Jacob Wetterling Act. (1996). General Final Guidelines for the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act. Federal Registration 16-15110-02.
- Jessica Lunsford Foundation. (2010). Retrieved August 8, 2010, from <http://www.jmlfoundation.org/>
- Jimmy Ryce Center. (2010). Increase Public Awareness of Sexual Predators and Predatory Abductions. Retrieved August 23, 2010, from <http://www.jimmyryce.org/JimmysKidnapping.html>
- Johansson-Love, J., & Fremouw, W. (2006). A critique of female sexual perpetrator research. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 11*, 12-26.
- Johansson-Love, J., & Fremouw, W. (2009). Female sex offenders: A controlled comparison of offender and victim/crime characteristics. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 367-376.
- Johnson, T.S. (2010). Crossing the line: When pedagogical relationships go awry. *Teachers College Record, 112*(8), 2021-2066.
- Kaplan, M. S., & Green, A. (1995). Incarcerated female sexual offenders: a comparison of sexual histories with eleven female nonsexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse, 7*(4), 287–300.
- Kaufman, K.L., Wallace, A.M., Johnson, C.F., & Reeder, M.L. (1995). Comparing female and male perpetrators' modus operandi: Victims' reports of sexual abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 322-333.
- Kubik, E. K., Hecker, J. E., & Rightland, S. (2002). Adolescent females who have sexually offended: comparisons with delinquent adolescent female offenders and adolescent males who sexually offend. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 11*(3), 63–83.

- Kubrin, C.E., Stucky, T.D., & Krohn, M.D. (2009). *Researching theories of crime and deviance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, C. F., & Stanley, C. R. (2000). Women accused of sexual offenses. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18, 73–81.
- Lloyd, C. (1987). Working with the female offender: a case study. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 50(2), 44–46.
- Mihailides, S., Devilly, G. J. & Ward, T. (2004). Implicit cognitive distortions and sexual offending. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16, 333-350.
- Makkai, T. & Braithwaite, J. (1994). Reintegrative shaming and compliance with regulatory standards. *Criminology*, 32, 361-386.
- Mathews, R., Hunter, J. A., & Vuz, J. (1997). Juvenile female sexual offenders: clinical characteristics and treatment issues. *Sexual Abuse*, 9(3), 187–199.
- Mayer, A. (1992). *Women sexual offenders*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.
- Miccio-Fonseca, L. C. (2000). Adult and adolescent female sex offenders: experiences compared to other female and male sex offenders. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, 11(3), 75–88.
- Michigan State Legislature. (2010). 750.520d Criminal sexual conduct in the third degree; felony. Retrieved August 16, 2010, from [http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(wcegeym1zofxdpq2r5hpw1e0\)\)/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=mcl-750-520d](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(wcegeym1zofxdpq2r5hpw1e0))/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=mcl-750-520d)
- Michigan State Police. (2006). Sex offender registry: Summary of legislation. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from http://www.michigan.gov/documents/SOR_Legislation_Summary_122883_7.pdf
- Nathan, P., & Ward, T. (2002). Female sex offenders: Clinical and demographic features. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 8, 5–21.
- National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). (2008). Adam Walsh child protection and safety act of 2006. Retrieved January 15, 2010 from <http://www.ncsl.org/IssuesResearch/CivilandCriminalJustice/HR4472AdamWalshChildProtectionandSafetyAc/tabid/12699/Default.aspx>
- Nunes, K. L., Firestone, P. & Baldwin, M. W. (2007). Indirect assessment of cognitions of child sexual abusers with the Implicit Association Test. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 454-475.

- Olsen, G. (1999). *If Loving You Is Wrong*. St. Martin's Press: New York.
- Palermo, G.B. (2005). Prisonization and sexual offenders: A compounded problem. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 4(96), 611-613.
- Payne, B.K. & DeMichele, M. (2008). Warning: Sex offenders need to be supervised in the community. *Federal Probation*, 72(1), 37-42.
- Peluso, E. & Putnum, N. (1996) Case study: Sexual abuse of boys by females. *Journal of the American Academy of Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35(1), 51-54.
- Reckless, W.C. (1961). *The crime problem*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Rosencrans, B. (1997). *The Last Secret: Daughters Sexually Abused by Mothers*. Orwell, VT: Safe Society Press.
- Rudin, M.M., Zalewski, C., & Bodmer-Turner, J. (1995). Characteristics of child sexual abuse victims according to perpetrator gender. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19, 963-973.
- Saradjian, J. (1996). *Women who sexually abuse children: From research to clinical practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Sarrel, P., & Masters, W. (1982). Sexual molestation of men by women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 11, 117-131.
- Scott, C.L. and Gerbasi, J.B. (2003). Sex offender registration and community notification challenges: The Supreme Court continues its trend. *Journal of American Academic Psychiatry and Law*, 31, 494-501.
- Scheff, T. and Retzinger, S.M. (1991), *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Sherman, L.W. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473.
- Sherman, L.W. (2006). Defiance Theory. pp. 286-293 in Francis T. Cullen and Robert Agnew (3rd ed.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present (Essential Readings)*. California: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Simons, R.L., Chen, Y., Stewart, E.A., & Broidy, G.H. (2003). Incidents of discrimination and risk for delinquency: A longitudinal test of strain theory with an African American sample. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(4), 827-854.
- Solomon, J. C. (1992). Child sexual abuse by family members: A radical feminist perspective. *Sex Roles*, 27, 473-485.

- Syed, F., & Williams, S. (1996). Case studies of female sex offenders in the Correctional Service of Canada. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Szymkowiak, K. & Fraser, T. (2002). *Registered Sex Offenders in Hawaii*. Honolulu: Department of the Hawaii Attorney General.
- Tewksbury, R. (2004). Experiences and attitudes of registered female sex offenders. *Federal Probation*, 68(3), 30-33.
- Vandiver, D., & Kercher, G. (2004). Offender and victim characteristics of registered female sexual offenders in Texas: A proposed typology of female sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16, 121–137.
- Vick, J., McRoy, R., & Matthews, B. M. (2002). Young female sex offenders: assessment and treatment issues. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 11(2), 1–23.
- Wakefield, H., & Underwagner, R. (1991). Female child sexual abusers: a critical review of the literature. *The American Journal of Forensic Psychology*, 9(4), 43–69.
- Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 5, 491-507.
- Ward, T., & Keenan, T. (1999). Child molesters' implicit theories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 821-838.
- Wyatt-Nichols, H. & Franks, G. (2009). Ethics training in law enforcement agencies. *Public Integrity*, 12(1), 39-50.
- Zaitch, D. & Staring, R. (2007). Trends and policies on women trafficking in the Netherlands. *Crime and Justice International*, 23(101), 15-22.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jennifer L. Klein summa cum laude graduated from the University of Florida in 2009 with a Bachelor of the Arts in criminology and a minor in history. She graduated in May 2011 with a Master of Arts in criminology, law and society.