University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2015

Another collateral consequence? : examining homeless shelters policies on sex offenders across four states.

Shawn M. Rolfe
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd

Part of the Sociology Commons

ANOTHER COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCE? EXAMINING HOMELESS

SHELTERS POLICIES ON SEX OFFENDERS ACROSS FOUR STATES

By

Shawn M. Rolfe
B.A., Wright State University, 2013

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2015

ANOTHER COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCE? EXAMINING HOMELESS

SHELTERS' POLICIES ON SEX OFFENDERS ACROSS FOUR STATES

By

Shawn M. Rolfe

B.A., Wright State University, 2013

A Thesis Approved on

April 17, 2015

by the following Thesis Committee:

_____
Ryan Schroeder, Thesis Chair

_____
Dave Roelfs, Committee Member

_____
Richard Tewksbury, Committee Member

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my partner, daughter, and parents

Mrs. Sheila Rolfe, Kayla Rolfe,

Mr. and Mrs. Robert and Joyce Rolfe,

and

Mr. and Mrs. Halliard and Beverly Brown

without their constant support none of this would have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

ANOTHER COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCE? EXAMINING HOMELESS

SHELTERS' POLICIES ON SEX OFFENDERS ACROSS FOUR STATES

Shawn M. Rolfe

April 17, 2015

The primary focus throughout the literature regarding sex offenders has been on the
efficacy and collateral damage of sex offender laws such as Sex Offender Registration
and Notification (SORN) and residency restrictions. However, there is a lack in
scholarship regarding transient sex offenders. The current research examines homeless
shelter's policies on permitting sex offenders to use their services in Michigan, Ohio,
Kentucky and Tennessee. Previous research has found that sex offenders face reoccurring
obstacles throughout the reintegration process, which has affected their ability to find
suitable housing, employment and social support. The author explored homeless shelters'
policies and whether or not homeless shelters are furthering collateral damage for sex
offenders. The findings suggest that homeless shelters sex offender policies do create
another collateral consequence for them. Therefore, sex offenders being denied shelter
not only keeps them onto the streets, but also creates a public safety issue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent news reports have drawn attention to the issues of housing problems for registered

sex offenders (RSOs), including homelessness. Over the past 15 years, residency

restriction laws (i.e. 500 to 2,500 feet from where children congregate) have been

creating barriers as to where RSOs may or may not live within their communities across

the United States. For example, New York has severely limited access to homeless

shelters for sex offenders, which is the last protection against vagrancy in a contemporary

society. According to an article published in the *New York Times,* only 14 out of 270

shelters in NYC are available to house registered sex offenders. Due to the limited

number of shelters that fall within the residency restriction laws and permit sex offenders,

most sex offenders compete for the same resources, which consequently has left many of

them to become transient (New York Times, 2014). In another example of sex offender

housing issues, a small rural church situated in Clanton, Alabama with a population

density of approximately 60 people per square mile was forced to shutdown their

operation of housing registered sex offenders. The location of the church was not in

violation of the state's residency restriction laws for RSOs; rather, housing sex offenders

violated a newly instituted law prohibiting sex offenders from living within 300 feet of

each other on the same property (U.S. News and World Report, 2014). Similarly, a

church in Richmond, Virginia closed their homeless shelter because they could no longer afford the insurance premiums due to housing sex offenders.

Across the board, there are intended and unintended collateral consequences being caused by residency restriction, and Sex Offender Registration and Notification (SORN) laws. These laws have made it difficult for sex offenders to obtain and maintain housing and/or employment (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Levenson, 2008; Levenson & Cotter 2005a, 2005b; Tewksbury, 2005). The collateral consequences of the current sex offender laws have involuntary made many sex offenders transient or homeless. If society continues on its path of excluding sex offenders from the last line of homelessness defense, the homeless shelter, then vagrancy becomes a significant issue for sex offenders and society. For example, Florida banned all sex offenders from homeless and hurricane shelters (Levenson & D'Amora, 2007). These additional laws consequently have pushed homeless sex offenders to live in locations that do not violate residency restriction laws, including a wooded area (*USA Today*, 2014) on private property unbeknownst to the owner, and under bridges (see Julia Tuttle Causeway, CNN, 2007; Zandbergen & Hart, 2006).

It is no secret that sex offenders are regarded as one of the most heinous and despised types of offender in our society due to the nature of their crime. Due to this widely held sentiment across the country, the focus has been to protect our children at all costs from those who have sexually offended. Because of this consensus view, it has made sex offenders one of the most targeted and controlled offenders to date. Some of the most notable methods developed over the past 20 years to regulate sex offenders have been through SORN laws, as well as residency restriction laws. A wide and growing

body of literature has questioned the efficacy of these laws and highlighted the collateral consequences it causes to society, the sex offender, and their families (Jennings, Zgoba & Tewksbury, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a, 2005b; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Mercado, Alverez & Levenson, 2008; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006). Creating instability for family members of RSOs could potentially displace RSOs and not allow the support they need to transition back into society (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009).

There are nearly 820,000 individuals listed on publicly accessible sex offender registries in the United States and this list is expanding everyday (National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, 2014). Further, the laws and regulations are also evolving at a rapid pace. The result of these laws and regulations has been, in part, the movement of RSOs into socially disorganized neighborhoods. Socially disorganized areas have historically lacked the necessary resources for reintegration due to the limitations on employment opportunities, transportation, therapy, and/or increasing the distance between the sex offender and their family members or from positive social support systems (Hipp, Turner & Jannetta, 2010; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a, 2005b; Mustaine, Tewksbury & Stengel, 2006a, 2006b; Socia & Stamatel, 2010; Tewksbury, 2005). In addition, RSOs who are unable to find or afford adequate housing due to residency restriction laws have been relegated into homelessness (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2011). Unfortunately, public services are very limited for the homeless population (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2015). In 1998, for example, Section 8 housing became banned for all registered sex offenders that are required to register for life (42 U.S.C. §13663).

Throughout the literature, public perceptions on homelessness in America are shown to vary based on how someone became homeless. The main two competing ideas have been whether or not it was self-inflicted (i.e. drugs or alcohol addictions, criminal history) or was it extreme circumstances outside of the individual's control (i.e. loss of employment, mental illness) that led them to be homeless (Lee, Lewis & Jones, 1992) For sex offenders, both are applicable. On the one hand, they committed a sexual offense, but this does not necessarily make them homeless, but rather SORN and residency restriction laws have reduced their options in obtaining and/or maintaining viable residential units. In some states, residency restriction laws also encompass where an RSO may work, which only further complicates their ability to provide housing for themselves and other basic needs. Not knowing the whereabouts of sex offenders should be cause for concern, especially for those who pose the greatest risk to potentially reoffend.

Although SORN and residency restriction laws are considered the two main causes for RSOs' housing obstacles, it should also be recognized that many sex offenders lack the necessary social support systems, which typically falls upon family members, to help with the reintegration process. A study by Tewksbury and Levenson (2009) found that family members of RSOs were not impervious to being stigmatized and labeled from their communities, and that many of them experienced similar harassment such as property damage, verbal taunting, and in extreme cases were physically assaulted. Furthermore, most social services such as an emergency homeless shelter are unlikely to provide assistance to RSOs because the shelter's location is either too close to where children congregate, and/or it is for the protection and safety of the shelter's employees, volunteers, and residents. An example of such policy is in Columbus, Ohio, where

publicly funded homeless shelters signed "good neighbor policies", which forbid homeless shelters from housing sex offenders (Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless, 2003).

Another challenge faced by sex offenders once they are released from prison and living among the general public is that they lack the necessary income and social capital to obtain housing, which has caused them to become transient or homeless (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008). Homelessness is a constant battle for sex offenders (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Levenson & D'Amora, 2007), not solely due to the laws, but the resources available to the homeless population are in short supply (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2014). Because homeless shelters are in short supply, shelters have to decide who is able to use their services. Nonetheless, the greater challenge for sex offenders is to find a homeless shelter that will accept them and their status without violating their SORN registration requirements and local and/or state residency restriction laws. As such, the question then remains, what factors structure the sex offender policies of homeless shelters?

The present study focuses on the sex offender policies of emergency homeless shelters (EHS) for men and family shelters that also permit single men to use their facilities across four states (Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee). Previous research has outlined the negative consequences of SORN and residency restriction laws on RSOs throughout the country, but no research currently exists on homeless shelter policies regarding the availability of emergency homeless shelters for sex offenders. The current research will identify homeless shelter policies across the four state region and whether or not the shelters make exceptions to these policies drawing on the neo-institutionalism

concept of loose coupling (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Weick, 1976). The theory suggests that organizations will institute policies that are ceremonial, but make it difficult to accomplish the organization's intended purpose. At times, an organization may make exceptions to their policies in order to complete the organization's goal. Homeless shelters are the last line of defense for the homeless within our society, and the policies of the shelters regarding sex offenders only further impede any opportunities for reintegration. This research ultimately aims to identify a new collateral consequence for RSOs not previously studied and discuss how existing policies may have deleterious consequences for sex offenders and their communities. Previous studies have not addressed homeless shelter policies as a collateral consequence of RSO status, and the present study adds to our understanding of how sex offenders may be further sanctioned, managed, stigmatized, and ostracized from society.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Over the past two decades, our society has sought to punish those who commit sexual

offenses and keep our children and the public safe from sexual offenders through Sex

Offender Registration and Notification (SORN) and residency restriction laws. SORN

laws places these types of offenders on a national public registry that is universally

available to everyone via the Internet. Residency restriction laws vary widely from one

jurisdiction to the next. Depending on the jurisdiction, the sex offender could be

prohibited from residential units within 500 to 2,500 feet from schools, preschools,

daycares, playgrounds, parks, and/or any other community structures where children

congregate deemed necessary by policymakers within the state and/or local jurisdiction

(Neito & Jung, 2006). The consequences of these residency restriction laws have been

serious and long lasting for the registrants, as well as the communities in which they live

(Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Harris, Lobanov-Rostovsky & Levenson, 2010; Kernsmith,

Craun & Foster, 2009; Levenson, 2008; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a, 2005b; Levenson &

Hern, 2007; Mustaine, 2014; Mustaine, Tewksbury & Stengel, 2006b; Ragusa-Saleno &

Zgoba, 2012; Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009; Tewksbury, 2005; Willis & Grace, 2009).

Moreover, SORN has made the reintegration process for sex offenders extremely

difficult, because it limits their options in housing, employment, social support, and

education (Barnes, Dukes, Tewksbury & De Troye, 2009; Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Duwe, Donnay & Tewksbury, 2008; Dyck & Hagley, 2012; Farkas & Miller, 2007; Huebner, Kras, Rydberg, Bynum, Grommon & Pleggenkuhle, 2014; Levenson, 2008; Levenson, D'Amora & Hern, 2007; Logan, 2009; Mercado, Alvarez & Levenson, 2008; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2011; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009; Zandbergen & Hart, 2006).

Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws

The first federal law passed to regulate sex offenders was the Jacob Wetterling Act (1994), which established the sex offender registry and address verification system for law enforcement agencies. In 1996, the rape and murder of Megan Kanka by a convicted sex offender who resided on her street prompted the development of Megan's Law. This law authorized the expansion of the sex offender registry to include community notification, which is disseminated through the Internet, mailers, media outlets, and/or fliers. Every state has an Internet website dedicated to SORN (as does the federal government), but it is also not uncommon for states to use multiple methods to notify the public. Megan's Law has been adopted in all 50 states in one form or another, meaning that states have established their own structures and processes of SORN. Primarily, this law expanded access to the sex offender registry to the public. It also established the length of time a registrant must register, as well as assigning a degree of threat level the registrant posed. The latest law passed pertaining to SORN was the 2006 Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act (AWA). This law was passed, in part because it is believed that Megan's Law presented too many loopholes for sex offenders

to take advantage of from one state to the next in the classification and notification schemes. To eliminate these issues, a universal three-tiered system of identification was devised with specific guidelines for each one. Previously, tier-level designation was determined by assessing the registered sex offender's potential to reoffend. Under AWA, tier-level designation is solely determined by the nature of the sexual offense conviction. However, AWA has been met with resistance from the majority of states due to its efficacy when compared to Megan's Law and the costs associated with implementing it (Justice Policy, 2008). To date, only 17 states, 69 tribes and three territories have substantially implemented the Adam Walsh Act (Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking, 2015).

Previous research has found SORN to be a detriment to sex offenders because it has caused RSOs to lose employment, positive living conditions, and social support systems (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Huebner et al., 2014; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Mustaine, 2014; Tewksbury, 2005). All of these factors are necessary to the successful reintegration processes, but more importantly, to reduce the RSOs' potential to recidivate (Jennings, Zgoba & Tewksbury, 2012). Despite popular belief that SORN laws and practices are in place to protect the public and reduce recidivism, previous research has consistently shown that SORN policies have little to no effect on sexual recidivism (Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012; Tewksbury & Jennings, 2010; Tewksbury, Jennings & Zgoba, 2012; Socia, 2014).

Collateral Consequences

Based on the literature, the reintegration process is more challenging for sex offenders than non-sex offenders. SORN and residency restriction laws have created collateral consequences for sex offenders ranging from obtaining and/or securing reliable housing, employment, and strains on family support systems. Finding residential units have been one of the greatest challenges faced by RSOs because of the restrictive ordinances at the state and/or local level that range from 500 to 2,500 feet from schools, childcare facilities, playgrounds, and parks (Barnes et al., 2009; Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Levenson & Cotter 2005b; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Nieto & Jung, 2006; Tewksbury, 2005). Residency restriction laws have consequently relegated sex offenders to socially disorganized neighborhoods and/or homelessness, which further limited their access to basic services and needs (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Hipp et al., 2010; Levenson, 2008; Mustaine, 2014; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2011). Ordinances that establish buffer zones, whether it is from local and/or state governments, only impedes an RSO's ability to secure available and reliable housing (Barnes et al., 2009; Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a, 2005b; Levenson et al., 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012; Tewksbury, 2005; Zgoba, Levenson & McKee, 2009). Due to the restrictive nature of these laws, sex offenders may violate registration requirements (Levenson, Letourneau, Armstrong & Zgoba, 2010). When applicable, sex offenders may become dependent on government assistance programs or even family members (Duwe et al., 2008; Rolfe, 2013; Willis & Grace, 2009).

Previous literature has stated that regardless of the buffer zone created by various government agencies to protect children and the public, residency restriction laws are a significant detriment to RSOs' successful reintegration because it severely limits where they can live and work (Barnes, et al., 2009; Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Huebner et al., 2014; Levenson, 2008; Mercado, et al., 2008; Mustaine, 2014; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2011; Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Jennings, 2010; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009; Zandbergen, Levenson & Hart, 2010). Although residency restriction laws create the most difficulties for sex offenders to reintegrate, the false sense of security that it provides to the public may be the most dangerous consequence of them all (Mercado, et al., 2008; Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012). The premise of sex offender laws have been based on "stranger danger", but it has been found that being sexually assaulted will most likely come from a family member or an acquaintance (Greenfeld, 1997).

Residency restrictions laws remain popular among the public and lawmakers as necessary tools to protect children from sex offenders, despite empirical research suggesting that residency restriction laws create a false sense of security (Dyck & Hagley, 2012; Kernsmith et al., 2009, Levenson, Brannon, Fortney & Baker, 2007). Despite great support for sex offender laws from lawmakers and the public, the fact remains that these laws have lead to direct hardships for registrants, their families, and positive support systems (Farkas & Miller, 2007; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). The consequences of SORN and residency restrictions are most acute for many RSOs in acquiring housing, thus leaving them to become dependent on family members, but family members are not impervious to the effects of

these laws that subject them to emotional, social, and financial hardships (Farkas &

Miller, 2007; Jennings, Zgoba & Tewksbury, 2012; Levenson & Tewksbury, 2009;

Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009). And when everything else fails for the RSO, they are left

with living on the streets in hopes of not violating sex offender and/or homeless laws.

Homelessness

In the United States, nearly 600,000 or more people experiencing homelessness

on any given night (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2014). Nearly one-third of

the homeless are families, but the majority are single individuals. Of this population, an

alarming 18% are considered chronically homeless, which is anyone that has been

homeless for a year or longer or had four episodes of homelessness over the last three

years (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2014; US Department of Housing and

Urban Development, 2014). Homelessness, by definition, is anyone that does not have a

stable residence where they can sleep and receive mail (Robertson, Ropers & Boyer,

1984).

The debate over what causes homelessness and where to put them has been

thoroughly researched since the 1980s. Past research has found that society's policies and

the restructuring of urban areas to be the greatest contributing factors to homelessness.

For example, gentrification, urban renewal, reduction in assisted units, exclusionary

zones, and community opposition have pushed the homeless population into other parts

of the city (Wolch, Dear & Akita, 1988). In order to assist in the removal of the homeless

from highly desirable areas, many cities enacted various anti-homeless ordinances such

as laws against panhandling, eating/sleeping in parks, loitering, and vagrancy

12

(DeVerteuil, 2006). Most of these ordinances have not only added to the proclivity of marginalizing the homeless population, but are also punitive, which according to Neil Smith (1996) is the definition of a revanchist city. A revanchist city is a city that uses gentrification, privatization, and deregulation as means for the powerful to take their revenge, meaning that the powerful will use any means necessary to take back their city (Smith, 1996). These various methods used by our cities leave the homeless population with few to no options.

Another popular policy that has been instilled in many cities as a proliferation of anti-homeless is the "quality of life/livability" laws. These policies vary from city to city, but it is suggested that the homeless population should be of good hygiene and that living on the street is not a good quality of life/livable environment for the homeless. More importantly, in the eyes of the city, this policy/ordinance works by controlling and even criminalizing homelessness, and to demoralize this population from their activities and to hopefully control the mobility of the homeless (DeVerteuil, 2006; Mitchell, 1997). Cities have gone so far as to use their jails as a means to remove the homeless from the streets whether or not they have committed a significant crime (Fitzpatrick & Myrstol, 2011). Homeless shelter use and reincarceration following prison release appears to go hand-in-hand. Metraux and Culhane (2004) found that more than 10% of offenders used a homeless shelter within the first two years of being released. Of those, more than 30% were reincarcerated. They attest that time span from last prison release and history of residential instability increase the risks of reincarceration, but more importantly, homelessness increases the risk of incarceration and incarceration increases the risk of

homelessness, which creates a revolving door between the two (Metraux & Culhane, 2004).

The dangers of living on the street have become more intensified due to gentrification, exclusionary zones, and reduction in assisted and/or affordable housing because the homeless are more confined into certain areas. Due to them being marginalized (i.e. outsiders), the homeless face a constant battle of being criminally victimized day or night compared to the "domiciled" population (Lee & Schreck, 2005). In addition, the homeless population also suffers from a lack of social concern in providing enough homeless shelters and adequate medical care (Lee & Schreck, 2005). The homeless population, without question, is plagued with issues of drug/alcohol abuse, mental illness, and/or criminal history (Lee & Schreck, 2005). But the structures within our society have made them a marginalized population. The homeless population is marginalized because of the various policies that cities have put in place to exclude them from living in various areas of the city and/or lack of shelters to affordable residential units. As such, the "not in my backyard" mentality is not just for the homeless population, but also sex offenders (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008). Society has enacted laws that have marginalized both and further created more obstacles that impede their opportunities for reintegration. The combination of homelessness and RSO status is particularly problematic.

Theoretical Framework

The current study investigates homeless shelters' policies on sex offenders from an organizational framework. Formal organizations within our society have taken on very

complex structures and procedures as a way to establish legitimacy for their existence.

According to neo-institutionalism, organizations' policies are tightly coupled with

stakeholders, funders, different levels of government (i.e. local, state, and federal), and

professional associations (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott

1995). Organizations with a similar mission have mirrored one another in various ways

regarding formal structures and rules in order to establish and maintain legitimacy. For

example, many institutions have enacted many of the same common practices through a

hierarchy, such as a board of directors and standard procedures (i.e. bureaucracy) to help

facilitate a balance that not only fosters legitimacy from within, but more importantly,

legitimacy from stakeholders and their community (Abzug & Galaskiewicz, 2001; Sosin,

2012). The survival of an organization is not solely hinged on the organization's

economic success, but also the organization's ability to obtain and maintain this

legitimacy.

Organizations develop and implement formal structures and policies that are

ceremonial in order to appease those from within the organization as well as those outside

of the organization (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). However, at times these formal structures

and policies may cause an imbalance between the formal structures and the overall

mission or activities of the organization, thus leading an organization to create buffers

between formal structures/policies and the organization's actual work activities. Loose

coupling refers to the bridge between the two that helps the organization to achieve its

intended purpose while maintaining their legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Although

Meyer and Rowan (1977) established loose coupling within neo-institutional theory,

Maguire (2002) asserts that loose coupling is not bound or limited by any specific

theoretical arena. Meaning that loose coupling is used in varies ways across all organizations.

Sosin (2012) argued that legitimacy is established from both the higher and lower levels of society. But it is the higher society (i.e. those who hold positions of power) that prevails in establishing legitimacy. Therefore, in order for not-for-profit organizations to carry out their mission, they must adhere to the demands and constraints placed on them by their local, state, and federal government. As such, organizations emphasize their dedication to a particular type of clientele or socially valued service and place prominent people on their board of directors in order to increase the organization's reputation in the eyes of various government agencies. This helps maintain and increase funding for the organization and support from their community (Sosin, 2012). Therefore loose coupling has been used throughout various agencies such as academia, the criminal justice system, for-profit, and not-for-profit organizations in order to find a balance between the stated goal of an organization and its policies set forth from within and outside agencies.

Loose coupling has been used within the criminal justice system in various ways. For example, during the 1970's there was an increase in sexual harassment lawsuits that forced companies to institute a grievance procedure along with sexual harassment training. The goal of these policies was to minimize this particular type of lawsuit. Dobbin and Kelly (2007) found that the judges and executives did not care if these new policies were effective or reduced sexual harassment. Rather, these newly instituted policies were more ceremonial in value (i.e. loose coupling).

Policing procedures also vary by the organizations' size and region as to how prominent and often loose coupling is used. More importantly, the policies of the agency

become more or less loosely coupled based on the relationship that the police organization has with the public (Maguire & Katz, 2002). Eitle (2005) asserts that police policies are loosely coupled to the daily demands of the officers and that variation in policies does not produce significant consequences for the police in carrying out their jobs. Throughout the criminal justice system, it is apparent that loose coupling is a formative way to accomplish the organization's goals without completely violating policies and is a means to maintain and increase their legitimacy within the organization and with the community they serve.

Abzug and Galaskiewicz (2001) emphasize that not-for-profit organizations are the most susceptible to loose coupling, as directors must constantly change the organizations' policies and formal structures in order to keep up with the ever-evolving demand of their communities and environments. There is blind-faith from the community as to how not-for-profit organizations are managed to how fiscally responsible they are. Therefore, the composition of a not-for-profit organization's board is critical for its survival. This also has a domino effect on other organizations within the same field. For example, homeless shelters provide an important service to their community, but in order for them to be successful, they must constantly evolve to keep up their reputation and funding. Homeless shelters are in short supply compared to the homeless population; therefore, these organizations become more homogeneous because of the outside influences that claim a stake in the organization's policies and missions (Sosin, 2012).

SORN and residency restriction laws are policies that were put into place to satisfy society's fears of victimization or re-victimization from sex offenders, especially for our children. Despite popular belief among the public, scholarship has shown that

these policies have not fulfilled the intended goals, which are to reduce sexual offenses and recidivism (Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012; Tewksbury & Jennings, 2010; Tewksbury, Jennings & Zgoba, 2012; Socia, 2014). If anything, these laws were enacted for similar reasons as the sexual harassment grievance procedures of the 1970s. However, these laws have unfortunately created collateral consequences for the sex offenders and their communities. The collateral consequences for the sex offender range from lack of available housing units, loss of family members and friends, employment opportunities, positive social supports (Burchfield & Mingus; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a, 2005b; Tewksbury & Levenson, 2009; Tewksbury, 2005), and even homelessness. The collateral consequences for communities are the consistent embellishment of "stranger danger" and the false sense of security these laws promote (Mercado et al., 2008; Ragusa-Salerno & Zgoba, 2012).

Current Study

The primary focus throughout the literature regarding sex offenders has been on the efficacy and collateral consequences of sex offender laws such as SORN and residency restrictions. However, there is a lack in scholarship regarding transient and homeless sex offenders. The current research will examine homeless shelters' policies on permitting sex offenders to use their services in Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee. Previous research has found that sex offenders face recurring obstacles throughout the reintegration process, which has affected their ability to find suitable housing, employment and social support. The current study will explore the basis of homeless shelter policies regarding sex offenders, possibly highlighting another collateral

18

consequences for sex offenders. Being denied lodging at a homeless shelter could possibly force RSOs onto the streets, which could potentially lead them to violate SORN and residency restriction laws and/or vagrancy laws. Sex offenders becoming transient or homeless consequently will create a public safety issue. Based on the literature and theory reviewed above, the researcher expects that homeless shelters will have written or unwritten policies prohibiting sex offenders, but that those rules will occasionally be over-looked to help reach organization goals which is to help their homeless population. In order to better understand what may factor into the homeless shelters' RSO policies, the researcher will analyze whether or not this policy is influenced by the homeless shelter's structural, procedural, geographical location, housing, population, and/or the presence of children near the shelter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

This research was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Louisville. The research focused on emergency homeless shelters across four states (Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, & Tennessee) that cater to single homeless men. Specifically, it concentrated on single homeless men shelters and family homeless shelters that also permit single men. These states were chosen because all four are located within the U.S. 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, their variances in population, number of urban environments, difference in urban and rural environments, variations in seasonal weather, geographical location (Midwest and Mid-southern), similarities in SORN and residency restriction laws with the commonality that each state uses a 1000' residency restriction for sex offenders. For example, all four states impose it for schools (kindergarten – 12th grade). Ohio also incorporates it for preschools and daycare facilities. Kentucky has the same parameters as Michigan and Ohio, but also includes parks and public playgrounds. And Tennessee residency restrictions are the same as Kentucky's, but also include recreation centers. Due to the limited number of homeless shelters within each state, every emergency homeless shelter that fit the criteria of housing single homeless men was included for participation within this study, regardless of whether it was situated in an urban or rural environment. The population for this study

was obtained (October, 2014) through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) website. HUD (2014) provides a homeless shelter directory for each state; however, it is possible that not all homeless shelters are listed with HUD, as this directory is constantly being updated. The shelters listed on the HUD website may also be shelters that receive various forms of funding from HUD. In order to verify as to whether or not the shelter served single men, the researcher examined each shelter's mission as to whom the shelter served through either the shelter's website and/or Facebook page. If neither a website nor a Facebook page were available, the researcher called the shelter anonymously to ask pertinent questions as to whom the shelter served specifically. There were a total of 113 shelters that met the qualification for this study across all four states. The specific number of shelters per state is as follows: Michigan (43), Ohio (35), Kentucky (18), and Tennessee (17). Due to the population being small, there was no need to sample it.

Procedure

Homeless shelters were contacted via e-mail requesting them to participate through a web survey. Web surveys have been known to produce low response rates due to the threat of computer viruses, scams, and identity theft to name a few (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009), but conducting the research electronically allowed the respondents to contact the researcher with any questions regarding the research. This method also permitted the researcher to efficiently and effectively send multiple requests to the population asking for their participation in the research. When using the Internet, anonymity is usually questioned, therefore creating legitimacy and trust is paramount in

order to produce a high response rate. To overcome some of these prospective problems, there are several processes that were used to increase the overall response rate (Dillman et al., 2009).

To establish legitimacy and trust, the researcher constructed the initial e-mail within the parameters of a professional business style letter, and used the University of Louisville's logo in the upper right hand corner of the e-mail page. To further instill credibility and trust, the researcher's university email was used to e-mail each homeless shelter director or supervisor directly. Dillman et al., (2009) highly recommends that directing the e-mail to the said individual, along with e-mailing them directly instead of a mass e-mail, creates and promotes trust, thus making the respondent feel obliged to participate in the research because the respondent feels personally sought out.

According to Dillman et. al., (2009) the most successful way to administer a web survey is through a delivery sequence. The researcher used the following sequence. First, on January 19, 2015, an invitation letter was sent that specifically outlined who the researcher was, what the research was about, any potential risks or benefits for participation, and provided the link to the survey. Dillman (2009) attests that the best time to send out the initial invitation is during the early hours prior to the start of the workweek (i.e. between 5-7 am on Mondays). Second, a follow-up letter with the survey link was e-mailed again five to seven days after the initial invitation. Third, a final reminder letter was e-mailed with the survey link seven to ten days after the follow-up letter. By now there were 45 responses to the survey with one respondent opting out of the research and five respondent e-mails being invalid. It should be also noted that the researcher was not able to obtain an e-mail address for every homeless shelter; therefore,

as a contingency plan to reach the entire population, the last sequence used was mailing a paper copy of the invitation letter with the survey for them to fill out and send back in the prepaid postage envelope provided for them.

The survey was mailed out on February 18, 2015, with a deadline of March 1, 2015 for the survey to be returned. In all, there were 68 surveys mailed to potential respondents. There were 20 surveys returned with 14 completed and six as non-deliverable. The last survey that was accepted into the analysis for this research was March 10, 2015. There were no other outlets of follow-ups used, whether it was via e-mail or mail, after the 68 hard copy surveys were mailed. Using this other format to obtain more responses may have been vitally useful because computers at various homeless shelters may not be capable or permit (spam filter) them to fill out a web survey. In doing so, it helped to produce an overall higher response rate. Due to six surveys being returned as undeliverable and one respondent opting out, there are now 106 homeless shelters across four states Michigan (38), Ohio (34), Kentucky (18), and Tennessee (16) used for this research. Of the 106 potential respondents, 45 responded via the e-mail survey, and 14 responded by mail, thus the total number of responses was 59, which yielded an overall response rate of 55.66%. However, 3 of the online survey respondents were found to be incomplete, thus not permitting them to be used throughout the full analysis. The final subset of the population was 56 homeless shelters.

The web survey was constructed in Survey Monkey. In order to better understand how loose coupling is used among homeless shelters and particularly the shelter's policies for registered sex offenders, various questions were devised to address this process. The survey has general questions such as how long they have been in service,

what state the homeless shelter is located in, how many full-time, part-time paid

employees, and number of volunteers. In examining whether or not an organization uses

loose coupling to achieve the homeless shelter's mission despite the homeless shelter's

policies, various direct and follow-up questions were used (see attached Appendix B).

The questions within this survey consisted mostly of nominal choice (yes/no),

some categorical questions, and a few short answers. To promote focus from the

respondent, each question had its own web page except those that needed to be grouped.

For example, asking the homeless shelter director if they have a maximum length of stay

policy is a precursor for a follow-up question. The follow-up question asked was whether

or not there is an exception to the maximum length of stay policy. By asking if there is an

exception to the policy will indicate if loose coupling is taking place. Only these

particular types of questions were presented on the same page. This was done in order to

help facilitate the best answer for each question without having the respondent trying to

recall what they answered to a previous question. Putting the rest of the questions on its

own separate page also helps reduce errors from the respondent, as well as prevent

questions being accidentally skipped. It also gave the researcher control over the

branching process to further protect against respondent error (Dillman et al., 2009).

Variables

The dependent variable used in this analysis was whether or not the homeless

shelter permitted registered sex offenders to use their facility, measured nominally as a

"yes =1" or "no = 0" question. It should be noted that there were five maybes (exception

to their RSO policy), but due to the significantly small number of responses to this

question, they were recoded into the yes/no variable based on the explanation of their exception to their policy. An example of what would be coded as a "yes" was homeless shelters that permitted women and disabled sex offenders. An example of what would be coded as a "no" was homeless shelters that accepted only those that were convicted of statutory rape.

Independent Variables

There were a total of 31 independent variables used to conduct the analysis. However, the number of key independent variables was categorized to fit within each model because regressions require no less than ten cases per variable. Again, the population of this study is 56. There were six models used in order to understand homeless shelters and its surrounding area: structural characteristics, procedural characteristics, geographical location characteristics, housing characteristics, population characteristics, and the presence of children nearby. Below, the independent variables are described in groups that will be used in the analyses.

<u>*Structural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters*</u>

Years Open. Years open was measured as a continuous variable, but due to a nonlinear association with the dependent variable it was recoded into three dummy variables based on the scatterplot distribution (0-17 = 0; 18-74 = 1; 75-122 = 2).

Number of Beds Per Staff. This variable was created through the use of several variables. Staff members were assigned a value based on their contribution to the organization (Full-time = 1; Part-time = .5; Volunteer = .25). Three staff member

variables were combined into a new variable, *Overall Staff.* In order to obtain the *Number of Beds Per Staff* variable, the *Maximum Occupancy* (number of beds per shelter) was divided by the *Overall Staff* variable. Due to the *Number of Beds Per Staff* having a nonlinear association with the dependent variable, it was recoded into a dummy variable based on the scatterplot distribution (0 - 3 = 0; 3.01 - Highest = 1).

Maximum Occupancy. Maximum occupancy was measured as a continuous variable based on the reported maximum number of beds.

Men's Only Homeless Shelter. Not every shelter within this research was a men's only shelter, therefore finding the percent of beds designated for men across all homeless shelters within this study was determined by dividing the *Number of Beds for Men* by *Maximum Occupancy.* However, there was a nonlinear association with the dependent variable, which required the variable being recoded into a dummy variable based on the scatterplot distribution (Else = 0; 100.00 = 1).

Dollars Per Bed. Several variables were used to determine the dollars per bed. First, the annual budget was a categorical variable using 150,000 increments (i.e. 0 - 150,000) up to 1.15 million dollars. Annual budget was recoded into a 7-point ordinal variable using the mean of each categorical range. After annual budget was recoded, it was then divided by the Maximum Occupancy variable, in order to reflect the dollars spent per bed by each shelter. However, there was a nonlinear association with the dependent variable, which required the variable to be recoded into a dichotomous variable by using the mean as the cut point (Lowest thru $8,750 = 0; $8,750.01 thru Highest = 1).

Procedural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

    Religious Affiliation. Religious Affiliation was measured as a "yes = 1" and "no = 0" variable.

    Required Valid Identification. Whether or not a homeless shelter required valid identification from their clientele in order to access services was measured using a five-point Likert scale (never = 0; rarely = 1; sometimes = 2; usually = 3; always = 4). Required valid identification was recoded into a dummy variable with (never/rarely = 0; sometime/usually/always = 1).

    Criminal Background Check. A five-point Likert scale (never = 0; rarely = 1; sometimes = 2; usually = 3; always = 4) was used to measure as to whether or not homeless shelters ran a background check on their clientele prior to allowing them access to the shelter. Running a criminal background check was recoded into a dummy variable (never/rarely = 0; sometime/usually/always = 1).

    Sex Offender Registry Check. A five-point Likert scale (never = 0; rarely = 1; sometimes = 2; usually = 3; always = 4) was used to measure as to whether or not homeless shelters checked the public sex offender registry on their clientele prior to allowing them access to the shelter. Checking the public sex offender registry was recoded into a dummy variable (never/rarely = 0; sometime/usually/always = 1).

    Written or Unwritten Sex Offender Policy. Homeless shelters were asked (yes = 1; no = 0) as to whether or not they had a written or unwritten sex offender policy.

Geographical Location Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

Homeless Shelter State. Homeless Shelter State was measured as a categorical variable (Michigan = 0; Ohio = 1; Kentucky = 2; Tennessee = 3). Each state was recoded into a dummy variable (Michigan = 1; Else = 0) (Ohio = 1; Else = 0) (Kentucky = 1; Else = 0) (Tennessee = 1; Else = 0).

Homeless Shelter Urban or Rural. Homeless shelters were measured as either urban or rural based on self-report (urban = 0; rural = 1) variable.

Percent of White Population. The White population (in percent) in close proximity to the homeless shelter was provided by the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau at the block group level, and was measured as a continuous variable.[1]

Percent of Population Foreign Born. The percent of the population that were foreign born in the immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.[2]

Housing Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

Percent of Owner Occupied Housing Units. Dividing the number of owner occupied housing units by the total number of housing units and multiplying by 100 calculated the percent of owner occupied housing units in close proximity to the homeless shelter. The number of owner occupied housing units and total number of housing units was obtained from the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau at the block group level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

---

[1] U.S. Census Bureau states that a census block is less than 250 housing units.

[2] U.S. Census Bureau states that a block group is between 250 and 550 housing units.

Percent of Vacant Housing Units. . Dividing the number of vacant housing units by the total number of housing units and multiplying by 100 calculated the percent of vacant housing units in close proximity to the homeless shelter. The number of vacant housing units and total number of housing units was obtained from the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau at the block group level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Percent of Residence that Lived in the Same Place 5+ Years. The percent of the population that lived in the same place for five or more years in the immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was determined by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Median Home Value. The median home value in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was determined by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.[2] In order to make this variable easier to interpret, the median home value was recoded into (median home value recoded) variable by dividing the median home value by 10,000.

Population Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

Percent of Unemployment. The percent of unemployment in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Percent of the Population in Poverty. The percent of the population in poverty in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Percent of High School Graduate or Higher. The percent of the population that had a high school diploma (or equivalent) and higher in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Percent of College Graduate or Higher. The percent of the population that had a four year college degree and higher in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable.

Median Household Income. The median household income of the population in the near immediate surrounding area of the homeless shelter was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau through the 2013 American Community Survey at the census block level, and was measured as a continuous variable. In order to make this variable easier to interpret, the median household income was recoded into (median household income recoded) variable by dividing the median household income by 1,000.

Presence of Children Near Homeless Shelters

The 1000' residency restriction law of where sex offenders may live is used in all four states within this study. In order for the researcher to know whether or not homeless

shelters were within the 1000' residency restriction from where children congregate,

Google Maps was used to measure in a straight line the distance from the homeless

shelter to preschools, daycare facilities, schools, public parks, and public playgrounds.

Preschool within a 1,000' of the Homeless Shelter. Having a preschool within a

1,000' (residency restriction law) of the homeless shelter was measured as a dichotomous

variable (yes = 1; no = 0).

Daycare Facility within a 1,000' of the Homeless Shelter. Having a daycare

facility within a 1,000' (residency restriction law) of the homeless shelter was measured

as a dichotomous variable (yes = 1; no = 0).

School within a 1,000' of the Homeless Shelter. Having a school within a 1,000'

(residency restriction law) of the homeless shelter was measured as a dichotomous

variable (yes = 1; no = 0).

Park within a 1,000' of the Homeless Shelter. Having a park within a 1,000'

(residency restriction law) of the homeless shelter was measured as a dichotomous

variable (yes = 1; no = 0).

Public Playground within a 1,000' of the Homeless Shelter. Having a public

playground within a 1,000' (residency restriction law) of the homeless shelter was

measured as a dichotomous variable (yes = 1; no = 0).

Percentage of Households with Children. Dividing the number of households

with children by the number of occupied housing units and multiplying by 100 calculated

the percent of households with children in close proximity to the homeless shelter. The

number of households with children and the number of occupied housing units was

obtained through the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau at the block group level, and was

measured as a continuous variable.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

The variables were analyzed using binary logistic regression. Collinearity was examined

using variance inflation factors (VIFs).[3] Cook's distance statistic (Cook's D) was used to

identify outliers and influential cases, with cases where Cook's D was less than $4/(n - k -$

$1)$ being considered for removal from the analysis.[4] Studentized residuals were used as a

secondary method for identifying outliers, with cases where the absolute value of the

studentized residual was greater than 2.58 (i.e., 3 standard errors away from the mean)

being considered for removal form the analysis. Linearity of association between the

dependent variable and the ordinal and interval/ratio predictors was examined using

scatterplots of the studentized residuals versus each ordinal/interval/ratio predictor.

Descriptives and Bivariate Results

Descriptive statistics are reported in **Tables 1 - 3** and differences between shelters

that did or did not allow RSOs was analyzed using chi-squared (dichotomous

independent variables) or independent *t*-tests (continuous independent variables). There

were 56 shelters analyzed in three separate models: Homeless Shelters Characteristics,

Homeless Shelters Geographical Characteristics, and the Presence of Children near

---

[3] Collinearity diagnostics were assessed and shown not to be problematic.

[4] Where *n* refers to the number of cases and *k* refers to the number of independent variables used.

Homeless Shelters. Of those 56 shelters, 40 shelters stated that registered sex offenders were not permitted on the premises, and the other 16 shelters indicated that RSOs were allowed to use their facility.

Structural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

In Table 1, the descriptive and bivariate statistical results are reported for the structural characteristics of homeless shelters.

Overall, 25.4 percent of the shelters were open less than 17 years, 57.6 percent of the shelters were open 18 to 74 years, and 17.0 percent have been open 75 to 122 years. The data also provide some indication that the newer homeless shelters are more likely than the older shelters to allow registered sex offenders. For instance, among shelters that allow registered sex offenders, 37.5 percent have been open less than 17 years, but among the shelters that do not allow registered sex offenders, only 20 percent have been open less than 17 years ($\chi^2 = 1.867$, $p = .172$), although the chi-squared statistic indicates this difference in proportions is not statistically significant. Moreover, the proportion of shelters that allow registered sex offenders open between 18 and 74 years (37.5%) is significantly lower than the proportion of shelters that do not allow registered sex offenders open between 18 and 74 years (65%) ($\chi^2 = 3.529$, $p = .060$). This suggests that the shelters that allow sex offenders are more likely to be newer. The proportion of the shelters that allow registered sex offenders open 75 to 122 years (25%), however, is not statistically different from the proportion of shelters (15%) that do not allow registered sex offenders ($\chi^2 = .779$, $p = .377$). Taken together, the bivariate data

provide some limited evidence that those homeless shelters that are more accommodating to RSOs tend to be newer than the organizations that do not allow RSOs.

Of the homeless shelters that were analyzed, 32.1 percent had a high number of staff to bed (3 or more to 1 bed) ratio. The proportion of shelters that allow RSOs with high staff to bed ratio (31.3%), and the proportion of shelters that do not allow RSOs with high staff to bed ratio (32.5%) is not statistically different, which indicates that having a high number of staff per bed has no significance on RSOs' accessibility to shelters ($\chi^2 =$ .008, p = .928). Furthermore, homeless shelters that allow registered sex offenders have an average of 106.69 beds (maximum occupancy) compared with an average of 51.38 beds (maximum occupancy) in shelters that do not allow registered sex offenders. The data therefore shows that shelters that allow registered sex offenders tend to be larger, having more beds for single men (t = -2.054, p = .054). The data further indicates that being a men's only shelter slightly increases RSOs' opportunities for shelter. Overall, 61 percent of the shelters in this study are men's only shelters. Among the shelters that allow RSOs, 75% are men's only shelters, compared with 60% of shelters that do not allow RSOs serving men only (χ^2 = 1.120, p = .290). The cost per bed annually for homeless shelters varies, but 48.2 percent of the shelters spend $8,750.01 or more per bed annually. Although the chi-squared statistic indicates the difference in proportions is not statistically significant, the proportion of shelters that allow RSOs spending $8,750.01 or more per bed annually (37.5%) is moderately lower than the proportion of shelters that do not allow RSOs (52.5%) (χ^2 = 1.030, p = .310).

Procedural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

In Table 1, the descriptive and bivariate results are reported for the procedural characteristics of homeless shelters.

Over half (62.1%) of the shelters identified as being associated with a religious organization. The data indicates that shelters with a religious affiliation were no more likely to allow or not allow RSOs. The proportion of shelters that allow RSOs that have a religious affiliation (68.6%) is relatively similar to the proportion of shelters that do not allow RSOs being religiously affiliated (62.5%) (χ^2 = .194, *p* = .659). The majority (78.6%) of shelters, however, did require a valid form of identifications (ID) from their potential clientele. The data suggest that shelters' requiring a valid form of ID is significant as to whether or not RSOs are allowed to use their shelter. The proportion of shelters that allow RSOs requiring an ID (62.5%) is significantly lower than shelters that do not allow RSOs requiring an ID (85%) (χ^2 = 3.436, *p* = .064).

Despite the majority of shelters requiring a valid form of ID (78.6%), less than half (40%) run a criminal background check on their potential clientele. However, the proportion of shelters that allow RSOs that checked criminal backgrounds (31.3%) is not significantly lower than the proportion of shelters that do not allow RSOs that checked criminal backgrounds (40%) (χ^2 = .373, *p* = .541). But more than half (64.3%) of the shelters did check the state and/or national sex offender registry websites on their potential clientele. The data indicates that the proportion of shelters that allow RSOs checked the sex offender registry (37.5%) is significantly lower than the proportion of shelter that do not allow RSOs that checked the sex offender registry (75%) (χ^2 = 7.000, *p*

$= .008$). This suggests that shelters that check the state and/or national sex offender registry are very unlikely to be accommodating to RSOs.

Regardless of shelters requiring a valid ID, running a criminal background check, and/or checking the sex offender registry on potential clientele, the data indicates that shelters that have an unwritten sex offender policy affects whether or not RSOs can use the shelter, and was found to be statistically significant. The proportion of shelters that allow RSOs that have an unwritten sex offender policy (25%) is significantly lower than shelters that do not allow RSOs that have an unwritten sex offender policy (82.5%) ($\chi^2 = 16.856$, $p = .000$). Taken together, the bivariate data highly suggests that shelters that have an unwritten sex offender policy are less accommodating to sex offenders.

Table 1: Descriptives and Bivariate Results on Emergency Homeless Shelters that Cater to Single Men

Variables	Allow RSOs (N = 16)		Do Not Allow RSOs (N = 40)		χ^2/T-Score	Overall		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Range
Structural Characteristics								
Open 17 years or less	0.375		0.200		1.867	0.254		0 - 1
Open 18 to 74 years[1]	0.375		0.650		3.529 +	0.576		0 - 1
Open 75to 122 years	0.250		0.150		0.779	0.170		0 - 1
Number of Beds Per Staff (High)	0.313		0.325		0.008	0.321		0 - 1
Maximum Occupancy	106.688	101.902	51.375	55.118	-2.054 +	67.179	74.980	4 - 365
Men's Only Homeless Shelter	0.750		0.600		1.120	0.610		0 - 1
Dollars Per Bed (High)	0.375		0.525		1.030	0.482		0 - 1
Procedural Characteristics								
Religious Affiliation[2]	0.688		0.625		0.194	0.621		0 - 1
Required Valid ID	0.625		0.850		3.436 +	0.786		0 - 1
Criminal Background Check	0.313		0.400		0.373	0.375		0 - 1
Sex Offender Registry Check	0.375		0.750		7.000 **	0.643		0 - 1
Written RSO Policy[3]	0.250		0.825		16.856 ***	0.661		0 - 1

[1] Reference Group

[2] No religious affiliation is the reference group

[3] Unwritten RSO policy is the reference group

Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

N = 56

38

Geographical Location of Homeless Shelters

In Table 2, the descriptive and bivariate statistical results are reported on the geographical location of homeless shelters.

Four states were used for this study based on their similarities in geographical location and sex offender residency restriction laws (i.e. 1,000' restriction from places where children congregate). Overall, 25.4 percent of the shelters were located in Michigan, 39.9 percent of the shelters were located in Ohio, 25.4 percent of the shelters were located in Kentucky, and 10.2 percent of the shelters were in Tennessee. The data also provide some indication that Michigan homeless shelters are more likely than shelters in Ohio, Kentucky, or Tennessee to allow registered sex offenders. Among shelters that allow registered sex offenders, 50 percent are in Michigan, but among the shelters that do not allow registered sex offenders, only 12.5 percent are in Michigan (χ^2 = 9.015, p = .003), and the chi-squared statistic indicates this difference in proportions is statistically significant. Moreover, the proportion of shelters in Ohio that allow registered sex offenders (37.5%) is not much different from the proportion of shelters in Ohio that do not allow registered sex offenders (40%) (χ^2 = .030, p = .863). The proportion of shelters that allow registered sex offenders in Kentucky (12.5%) is somewhat lower than the proportion of shelters in Kentucky that do not allow registered sex offenders (32.5%) (χ^2 = 2.331, p = .127). Lastly, the proportion of shelters that allow RSOs in Tennessee (0%) is lower than the proportion of shelters in Tennessee that do not allow RSOs (15%) (χ^2 = 2.688, p = .101). Taken together, the bivariate data provides some limited evidence that those homeless shelters that are more accommodating to RSOs tend to be in Michigan more so than any other state.

The data also show that only 23.7 percent of homeless shelters were located in rural areas throughout all four states. Although not found to be significant, the proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs in rural areas (12.5%) is lower than shelters that do not allow RSOs in rural areas (30%) ($\chi^2 = 1.867$, $p = .172$).

Furthermore, the average percent of the White population near homeless shelters was 64.73 percent. The data also shows that shelters that allow registered sex offenders tend to have a smaller percentage of a White population in close proximity to the shelter. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow registered sex offenders have an average White population of 59.62 percent near shelters, whereas shelters that do not allow registered sex offenders have an average White population of 67.05 percent ($t = .982$, $p = .334$).

Additionally, the average percent of foreign-born population in close proximity to homeless shelters was 3.53 percent. This indicates that the average percent of foreign-born population near homeless shelters is very low. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs have an average percent of foreign-born population of 4.14 percent near shelters, whereas shelters that do not allow RSOs have an average percent of foreign-born population of 3.30 percent ($t = -.751$, $p = .458$).

Housing Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

In Table 2, the descriptive and bivariate statistical results are reported on the housing characteristics near homeless shelters.

The data also shows that the average percent of owner occupied housing units (35.3%) has no significant barring on homeless shelters allowing RSOs. The proportion

of homeless shelters that allow RSOs have an average of 29.3 percent of the housing

units being owner occupied, and is statistically insignificant when compared to shelters

that do not allow RSOs with an average of 36.6 percent of housing units being owner

occupied (t = 1.002, p = .326). Moreover, the average percent of vacant housing units

near homeless shelters that allow RSOs was 14.8%, and appears to have no relationship

in allowing sex offenders. In fact, the proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs

have on average 16.52 percent of vacant housing units near the shelters, which is

relatively similar to shelters that do not allow RSOs average of vacant housing units near

the shelters (14.1%) (t = -.791, p = .438). Even the average (77.3%) of housing units

lived in five years or more by the same resident did not affect homeless shelters

accommodating RSOs. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs have an

average of 74.1 percent of the housing units lived in five or more years by the same

resident near the shelters, and is very similar to the homeless shelters that do not allow

RSOs average of housing units lived in five or more years by the same resident near the

shelters (77.1%) (t = .741, p = .467). Of all the measures used for housing units

surrounding homeless shelters that allow RSOs, the data indicates that the median home

value is the best predictor as to whether or not homeless shelters permit RSOs. The

overall average median home value was $98,280. The homeless shelters that permit

RSOs have an average median home value of $117,030 for homes in close proximity to

the shelters. This is higher than the median home value of $88,990 in the immediate

vicinity of homeless shelters that do not permit RSOs (t = -1.577, p = .131).

Population Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

In Table 2, the descriptive and bivariate results are reported on the population characteristics near homeless shelters.

The average percent of unemployment near homeless shelters was 17.4 percent. The data shows that the average percent of unemployment near homeless shelters that allow RSOs (17.1%), and the average percent of unemployment near homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs (17.5%), is not statistically different, which indicates that having a higher percentage of unemployment has no influence on RSOs' accessibility to shelters ($t = .159$, $p = .875$). The average percent of poverty near homeless shelters was 37.6 percent. The data shows that the average percent of poverty near homeless shelters that allow RSOs (39.2%), and the average percent of poverty near homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs (37.5%), is not statistically different, which indicates that having a higher percentage of poverty has no association with RSOs' accessibility to shelters ($t = -.354$, $p = .726$). Moreover, 79.5% of the population near homeless shelters has a high school degree or higher. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs have, on average, 78.4 percent of the population being a high school graduate or higher near the shelters, which is nearly identical to the proportion of homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs that show an average of the population being high school graduates or higher near shelters (79.9%) ($t = .616$, $p = .508$). Although not statistically significant, the average percent of college graduates or higher near homeless shelters does somewhat determine the accessibility of shelters to RSOs. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs have an average of 22.3% of the population with a college degree or higher near the shelters, and is somewhat higher than the shelters that do not allow RSOs average

population with a college degree or higher near the shelters (15.32%) (t = -1.544, p =

.139). Overall, the average median household income was $25,519.58. The data shows

that although not statistically significant, the average median household income

($28,992.13) near homeless shelters that allows RSOs is higher than the average median

household income ($25,519.58) near shelters that do not allow RSOs (t = -.691, p =

.498).

Table 2: Descriptives and Bivariate Results on Emergency Homeless Shelters that Cater to Single Men (Continued)

Variables	Allow RSOs (N = 16)		Do Not Allow RSOs (N = 40)		χ^2/T-Score	Overall		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Range
Location Characteristics								
Michigan	0.500		0.125		9.016 **	0.254		0 - 1
Ohio	0.375		0.400		0.030	0.399		0 - 1
Kentucky[1]	0.125		0.325		2.331	0.254		0 - 1
Tennessee[1]	0.000		0.150		2.688	0.102		0 - 1
Rural[2]	0.125		0.300		1.867	0.237		0 - 1
% of White Population	59.619	24.766	67.045	27.431	0.982	64.373	26.796	13.10 - 97.70
% of Foreign Born	4.138	3.379	3.330	4.215	-0.751	3.527	3.883	.00 - 22.60
Housing Characteristics								
% of Owner Occupied Housing Units	29.265	25.888	36.622	21.927	1.002	35.337	23.920	.42 - 93.83
% of Vacant Housing Units	16.542	11.292	14.118	7.559	-0.791	14.836	8.835	4.03 - 53.41
% of Residents Same House 5+ years	74.529	12.775	77.138	9.371	0.741	77.245	10.817	51.59 - 98.95
Median Home Value[3]	11.703	6.656	8.899	3.825	-1.577	9.828	4.893	2.84 - 23.89
Population Characteristics								
% of Unemployment	17.088	8.642	17.498	8.982	0.159	17.354	8.611	3.90 - 40.30
% of Population in Poverty	39.206	16.891	37.488	15.170	-0.354	37.559	16.201	5.80 - 85.20
% of HS Graduate and Higher	78.419	10.315	79.880	8.041	0.508	79.448	8.752	63.80 - 95.70
% of 4yr Degree and Higher	22.250	16.915	15.320	9.539	-1.544	17.719	12.769	.30 - 58.90
Median Household Income[4]	28.992	19.079	25.519	10.007	-0.691	27.453	14.729	87.77 – 79.64

[1] Reference Group

[2] Urban is the reference group

[3] Measured in 10,000

[4] Measured in 1,000

Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

N = 56

44

Presence of Children Near Homeless Shelters

In Table 3, the descriptive and bivariate statistical results are reported on the presence of children near homeless shelters.

This model focuses on whether or not the close proximity of children influence homeless shelters in accommodating registered sex offenders in their neighborhood. The data shows that 23.7% of the homeless shelters were within a 1000' (all four states have a 1000' residency restriction law) of a preschool. The proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs in close proximity to preschools (18.8%) is marginally less than the proportion of homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs in close proximity to preschools (25%) ($\chi^2 = .250$, $p = .617$). Over half (54.2%) of the homeless shelters were within 1000' of daycare facilities. The data indicated that homeless shelters that allow RSOs within 1000' of daycare facilities (25%) is lower than homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs within 1000' of daycare facilities (62.5%) ($\chi^2 = .260$, $p = .610$). However, homeless shelters that were in close proximity to schools are important to whether the shelters allow RSOs. Nearly half (44.1%) of the homeless shelters were within a 1000' of schools. The data shows that the proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs within 1000' of schools (50%) is statistically higher than the proportion of homeless shelters that do not allow RSOs within 1000' of schools (42.5%) ($\chi^2 = 6.437$, $p = .011$). Furthermore, 44.1% of the homeless shelters are within 1000' of a park. Although not statistically significant, the proportion of homeless shelters that allow RSOs that are within a 1000' of a park (56.3%) is slightly greater than shelters that do not allow RSOs that are within a 1000' of a park (40%) ($\chi^2 = 1.221$, $p = .269$). Nearly half (44.1%) of the homeless shelters were within a 1000' of a public playground. The proportion of homeless shelters

that allow RSOs within a 1000' of a public playground (50%) is somewhat greater than the proportion of shelters that do not allow RSOs that are within a 1000' of a public playground (35%) (χ^2 = 1.078, p = .299). Besides schools, the other significant predictor as to the proximity of children near shelters is the average of households with children under the age of 18 years old (25.5%). The data indicates that homeless shelters were less likely to allow RSOs when the percent of households with children is greater. Homeless shelters that permit RSOs show an average of 18.9 percent of households with children near the shelters, which is statistically lower than the average percent of households with children near shelters that do not permit RSOs (28%) (t = 2.162, p = .041).

Table 3: Descriptives and Bivariate Results on Emergency Homeless Shelters that Cater to Single Men (Continued)

Variables	Allow RSOs (N = 16) Mean	S.D.	Do Not Allow RSOs (N = 40) Mean	S.D.	χ^2/T-Score	Overall Mean	S.D.	Range
Presence of Children Nearby								
Preschool w/in 1000' of Shelter[1]	0.188		0.250		0.250	0.237		0 - 1
Daycare facility w/in 1000' of Shelter[1]	0.250		0.625		0.260	0.542		0 - 1
School w/in 1000' of Shelter[1]	0.500		0.425		6.437 *	0.441		0 - 1
Park w/in 1000' of Shelter[1]	0.563		0.400		1.221	0.441		0 - 1
Public Playground w/in 1000' of Shelter[1]	0.500		0.350		1.078	0.390		0 - 1
% of Households with Children	18.873	14.872	28.016	12.736	2.162 *	25.475	13.572	0 - 56.58

[1] Not within a 1000' is the reference group

Note: +p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

N = 56

47

Binary Logistic Regression Models

Two binary logistic regressions were used to examine homeless shelters' characteristics. The reason for the two models was 1) due to the population size of this study and the number of variables that can be used in a regression and 2) the other was to pair variables that were similar and compatible with one another.

Structural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

The first regression reported for this model is in **Table 4a**. The significant predictors of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders included whether or not shelters have been open 17 years or less and the maximum occupancy of the shelters. The non-significant predictors were shelters that were open 75 to 122 years ($p = .349$), number of beds per staff ($p = .954$), men's only shelters ($p = .254$), and dollars spent per bed annually ($p = .904$). The model fits the data reasonably, with a Cox & Snell $R^2 = .179$ and a NagelKerke $R^2 = .257$.

The odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders are influenced by two variables measured in this model. First, there is a 317.2% increase in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders if they have been open 17 years or less (B = 1.428; *exp(B)* = 4.172) compared to shelters open 18 – 74 years. Second, the odds for homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders increased by 1.2% for every 1 bed increase in shelters' maximum occupancy (B = .012; *exp(B)* = 1.012).

There was no significant difference in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offender open 75 to 122 years when compared to shelters open 18 to 74 years ($p = .349$). The number of beds per staff did not predict the odds of

homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders ($p = .667$). When comparing

men's only homeless shelters to family shelters that also accept men, there was no

significant influence on the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex

offenders ($p = .254$). Lastly, the dollars spent per bed annually did not increase the odds

of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders ($p = 904$).

Table 4a: Structural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters Predicting the Availability to RSOs [1]

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio	
Constant	-3.000	1.066	0.050	
Open 17 years or less	1.428	0.839	4.172	+
Open 75 - 122 years	0.861	0.919	2.366	
Number of Beds Per Staff	-0.042	0.728	0.959	
Maximum Occupancy	0.012	0.006	1.012	*
Men's Only Homeless Shelter	0.890	0.780	2.435	
Dollars Per Bed	0.094	0.782	1.099	
Chi-squared	11.073 +			
Cox & Snell R^2	0.179			
Nagelkerke R^2	0.257			

[1] Logistic Regression

Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

N = 56

Procedural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

The second regression reported for this model is in **Table 4b**. The significant

predictors of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders included whether

or not shelters have a written sex offender policy. The non-significant predictors were

shelters' religious affiliation ($p = .953$), requiring a valid identification ($p = .129$),

running criminal background checks on potential clients ($p = .224$), checking the state

and/or national sex offender registry (p = .124). The model fits the data well, with a Cox & Snell R^2 = .333 and a NagelKerke R^2 = .477.

The odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders are influenced by one variable measured in this model. There is a 91.4% decrease in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders if they have a written sex offender policy (B = -2.450; *exp(B)* = .086).

There was no significant difference in the odds of homeless shelters that have and do not have a religious affiliation accommodating registered sex offender (p = .953). Homeless shelters that required potential clients to have a valid form of identification did not predict the odds of shelters accommodating RSOs (p = .129). The homeless shelters that ran criminal background checks on their potential clientele did not predict the odds of shelters accommodating RSOs (p = .224). Lastly, the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs were also not influenced by checking the state and/or national sex offender registry (p = .124).

Table 4b: Procedural Characteristics of Homeless Shelters Predicting the Availability to RSOs

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio	
Constant	2.071	1.126	7.935	
Religious Affiliation	0.052	0.869	1.053	
Required Valid ID	-1.566	1.030	0.209	
Criminal Background Check	1.565	1.286	4.784	
Sex Offender Registry Check	-1.884	1.224	0.152	
Written RSO Policy[2]	-2.450	0.795	0.086	**
Chi-squared	22.692	***		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.333			
Nagelkerke R^2	0.477			

[1] Logistic Regression
[2] Unwritten RSO policy is the reference group
Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$
N = 56

Geographical Location Characteristics of Homeless Shelters

The first regression reported in this model is in **Table 5a**. The significant predictors of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders included whether or not shelters were located in the state of Michigan and Ohio. The non-significant predictors were shelters located in rural areas ($p = .467$), the average percent of foreign born in close proximity to homeless shelters ($p = .745$), the average percent of the white population in close proximity to homeless shelters ($p = .377$). The model fits the data reasonably, with a Cox & Snell $R^2 = .218$ and a NagelKerke $R^2 = .312$.

The odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders are influenced by two variables measured in this model. First, there is a 1,864.1% increase in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders if they are located in Michigan when compared to shelters located in Kentucky and Tennessee (B = 2.978;

exp(B) = 19.641). Secondly, the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs

increased by 406.1% if the shelters are located in Ohio when compared to Kentucky and

Tennessee (B = 1.622; *exp(B)* = 5.061).

There was no significant difference in the odds of homeless shelters

accommodating registered sex offender that are located in rural areas (p = .467). The

average percent of foreign born near shelters did not predict the odds of homeless shelters

accommodating RSOs (p = .467). Lastly, the average percent of the White population

near homeless shelters also did not predict the odds shelters accommodating RSOs (p =

.377).

Table 5a: Geographical Characteristics of Homeless Shelters Predicting the Availability to RSOs[1]

Variables	*Coefficient*	*Standard Error*	*Odds Ratio*	
Constant	-1.586	1.240	0.205	
Michigan	2.978	0.963	19.641	**
Ohio	1.622	0.963	5.061	+
Rural[2]	-0.734	1.009	0.480	
% of White Population	-0.013	0.015	0.987	
% of Foreign Born	0.031	0.094	1.031	
Chi-squared	13.757	*		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.218			
Nagelkerke R^2	0.312			

[1] Logistic Regression

[2] Urban is the reference group

Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

N = 56

Housing Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

The second regression reported in this model is in **Table 5b**. The significant predictor of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders is the median home value in close proximity of homeless shelters. As the median home value in the surrounding area of homeless shelters increases by one unit ($10,000), there is a 13.1% increase in the odds of shelters accommodating registered sex offenders (B = .123; *exp(B)* = 1.131). The non-significant predictors were the average percent of owner occupied housing units near shelters (p = .529), the average percent of vacant housing units in the immediate surrounding area of homeless shelters (p = .451), the average percent of residents living in the same place for five years or more (p = .329). The model fits the data reasonably, with a Cox & Snell R^2 = .117 and a NagelKerke R^2 = .166.

There was no significant difference in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offender based on the average percent of owner occupied housing units near shelters (p = .529). The average percent of vacant housing units near shelters did not predict the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs (p = .451). Lastly, the average percent of residents living in the same place five years or more near homeless shelters also did not predict the odds shelters accommodating RSOs (p = .329).

Table 5b: Housing Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters Predicting the Availability to RSOs[1]

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio	
Constant	0.388	2.647	1.474	
% of Owner Occupied Housing Units	-0.010	0.017	0.990	
% of Vacant Housing Units	0.028	0.038	1.029	
% Lived in Same Place 5+ years	-0.033	0.034	0.967	
Median Home Value	0.123	0.071	1.131	+
Chi-square	6.619			
Cox & Snell R^2	0.117			
Nagelkerke R^2	0.166			

[1] Logistic Regression

Note: +*p* < .10, **p* < .05, *** p* < .01, **** p* < .001

N = 53

Population Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters

The last regression reported in this model is in **Table 5c**. In the last regression reported for this model, there was no significant predictors found in predicting the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders. The non-significant predictors were the average percent of unemployment near shelters (p = .977), the average percent of poverty in the immediate surrounding area of homeless shelters (p = .139), the average percent of high school graduates or more near shelters (p = .242), the average percent of four-year college degree or more near shelters (p = .133), and lastly, the median household income near shelters (p = .137). The model fits the data reasonably, with a Cox & Snell R^2 = .128 and a NagelKerke R^2 = .183.

Table 5c: Population Characteristics Near Homeless Shelters Predicting the Availability to RSOs[1]

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
Constant	-1.670	3.691	0.188
% of Unemployment	-0.002	0.062	0.998
% of Population in Poverty	0.058	0.039	1.059
% of HS Graduate and Higher	-0.05	0.043	0.951
% of 4yr Degree and Higher	0.048	0.032	1.05
Median Household Income	0.062	0.042	1.064
Chi-squared	7.661		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.128		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.183		

[1] Logistic Regression

Note: $+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $** p < .01$, $*** p < .001$

N = 56

Presence of Children Near Homeless Shelters

The regression reported in this model is in **Table 6**. The significant predictors of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders included whether or not shelters were located within the 1000' residency restriction of a school, and the average percent of households with children under 18 years old. The non-significant predictors were shelters located within the 1000' residency restriction of preschools ($p = .361$), shelters located within the 1000' residency restriction of daycare facilities ($p = .224$), shelters located within the 1000' residency restriction of parks ($p = .702$), shelters located within the 1000' residency restriction of public playgrounds ($p = .879$). The model fits the data reasonably, with a Cox & Snell $R^2 = .278$ and a NagelKerke $R^2 = .398$.

The odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders are influenced by two variables measured in this model. The odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders decreased by 86.7% if the shelters are located within the 1000' residency restriction from schools (B = -2.015; *exp(B)* = .133). The odds

of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offenders also decreased by 1.7% for every one unit increase in the average percent of households with children under 18 years old in close proximity shelters (B = -.017; *exp(B)* = .983).

There was no significant difference in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating registered sex offender than shelters that did not accommodate registered sex offenders located within the 1000' residency restriction of preschools (*p* = .361). The 1000' residency restriction of daycare facilities near shelters did not predict the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs (*p* = .224). The odds were also not predicted for homeless shelters accommodating RSOs that are within a 1000' residency restriction of public parks (*p* = .702). Lastly, the odds were also not predicted for homeless shelters accommodating RSOs that are within a 1000' residency restriction of public playgrounds (*p* = .879).

Table 6: Predicting the Availability of Homeless Shelters for RSOs with Children Nearby[1]

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio	
Constant	1.238	0.978	3.450	
Preschool w/in 1000' of Shelter	-1.016	1.113	0.362	
Daycare facility w/in 1000' of Shelter	-2.607	0.875	0.074	
School w/in 1000' of Shelter	1.11	0.913	3.035	**
Park w/in 1000' of Shelter	0.547	1.43	1.727	
Public Playground w/in 1000' of Shelter	0.217	1.423	1.242	
% of Households with Children	-0.017	0.007	0.983	*
Chi-squared	18.212 **			
Cox & Snell R^2	0.278			
Nagelkerke R^2	0.398			

[1] Logistic Regression

Note: +$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

N = 53

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Homeless shelters are considered to be the last line of defense for members of our society against homelessness. Therefore, the current research aimed to identify whether or not emergency men's homeless shelters and family shelters (i.e. check in that evening and leave the following morning with no guarantee of a bed the next day) that cater to single men accepted registered sex offenders. Possible factors examined were the homeless shelters' structural (i.e. number of beds, employees), procedural, geographical location, surrounding housing and population characteristics, and the presence of children near the shelters. Furthermore, loose coupling was also examined to determine if shelters used it in order to accomplish their intended goal, which is to help the homeless population, especially registered sex offenders. Ultimately, the study aimed to highlight another possible collateral consequence for RSOs. The present study found three main conclusions as to whether or not emergency homeless shelters that cater to single men permitted sex offenders, associated with loose coupling, the presence of children near the shelters, and community social disorganization.

First, shelters' policies were assessed through the neo-institutionalism lens of loose coupling. According to Meyer and Rowan (1977), formal organizations use complex structures and procedures to establish legitimacy. Therefore, organizations' formal policies are tightly coupled to their stakeholders, government agencies, funders,

and communities they serve in order to maintain legitimacy (Abzug & Galaskiewics, 2001; Sosin, 2012). But these policies are often ceremonial, and at times cause problems for the organization to fulfill its intended mission. In order to overcome formal policies, organizations will create bridges (loosely couple) between their intended mission and the ceremonial policies (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1995). This is important because organizations that are tightly coupled to their policies will not be resilient in accomplishing their intended mission, which makes them very susceptible to collapsing. Therefore, the use of loosely coupling creates the opportunity for organizations to be flexible, so that if something breaks the organization will not collapse (Weick, 1976).

Based on the theory outlined above, emergency homeless shelters were asked whether or not they permitted sex offenders to use their shelter, and if not, were there exceptions to their policy. The findings did not support the loose coupling theory when examining shelters' sex offender policies. In fact, the findings indicated that 71.4% of the shelters do not allow sex offenders to use their facility with no exceptions. A possible explanation as to why homeless shelters have such a policy is that sex offender laws are in place to prevent sex offenders from reoffending. These laws are based on lawmakers' and the public's perception of sex offenders' potential to reoffend (Kernsmith et al., 2009; Levenson et al., 2007; Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009). Lawmakers are held accountable as to which policies are implemented in order to protect their constituents from sex offenders (Sample & Kadleck, 2008). Therefore, homeless shelters may also feel obligated to enact sex offender policies that reflect not only their local and/or state governments, but also the communities they serve. This is not surprising because Sosin (2012) argued that both the higher and lower levels of society determine not-for-profit

organizations' legitimacy. But it is the higher levels of society that will determine the demands and constraints to be placed on homeless shelters through their local, state, and federal governments. Therefore, it is likely that shelters facilitate policies that reflect their local SORN and residency restriction laws, as well as also trying to keep their neighbors safe from sex offenders. An example of this took place in Columbus, Ohio, where homeless shelters signed a "good neighbor" policy that prohibited the shelters from accommodating sex offenders (Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless, 2003).

Although the majority of shelters in this study did not make exceptions (loose coupling) to their sex offender policies, shelters did use loose coupling with three other policies not related to RSOs. The focus of the current study was sex offender policies of homeless shelters, but the data collected also included questions about other policies and whether there were exceptions to those policies. First, 53.9% of the shelters have a maximum length of stay policy. Of those shelters, 50% indicated that they did make exceptions to this policy. Some of the most common exceptions given were: 1) on the wait list for a more permanent housing solution, 2) need a couple more weeks to save up for deposit on housing, 3) on the list and waiting for their rehabilitation and/or transitional housing position, and 4) and extreme weather conditions. Second, shelters were asked if they accepted clients under the influence of drugs and alcohol. The majority (82.1%) of shelters indicated that they did not accept clients under the influence of drugs and alcohol. However, slightly over half (53.6%) of the shelters have exceptions to their drug and alcohol policy and the most common exceptions given were: 1) clients could stay as long as they were non-combative, 2) clients agreed to receive treatment from a nearby facility, and 3) extreme weather condition. Lastly, shelters were asked if

they allow individuals with a criminal background. All but one shelter indicated that they did allow criminals. However, when asked if the shelter had an exception to their criminal background policy, 46.4% indicated that the only exception was to not allow those convicted of a sexual offense. Most shelters stated that sex offenders were not permitted because of children on the premises or due to a playground, school or park being nearby. This is not surprising because residency restriction laws restrict RSOs from residing in close proximity to where children congregate (Neito & Jung, 2006). The results clearly indicated that shelters do not use loose coupling to allow sex offenders. The majority of shelters did not allow sex offenders at all, and the five shelters that made exceptions to the policies only allowed a small subset of the uncommon and least serious sex offenders (i.e. women, and statutory rape offender). Overall, the first conclusion is that homeless shelters are willing to violate other policies to achieve organizational goals, but the RSO policies are strictly enforced. This is further evidenced by the 91.4% decrease in the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs if the shelter has a written sex offender policy, suggesting that formal policies are a significant factor in restricting access to homeless shelters for RSOs.

Other formal procedures were found to be interesting and approached statistical significance and included: 1) valid form of identification, and 2) state and/or national sex offender registry check. The majority (78.6%) of shelters required a valid form of identification, which means that RSOs would not be able to hide their identity from shelters, especially those that check the state/national sex offender registry or run a criminal background check. More than half (68.3%) of the shelters checked the state

and/or national sex offender registry, but of the 40 shelters that do not permit RSOs, only 75% checked the sex offender registry.

The second main conclusion is that the presence of children near homeless shelters is influential as to whether or not shelters allowed sex offenders to use their facility. Previous research shows that registered sex offenders do have difficulties in finding and establishing housing due to the sex offender registration and notification, as well as the residency restriction laws (Huebner et al., 2014; Levenson & Cotter, 2005a; Levenson, D'Amora & Hern, 2007; Mustaine, 2014; Tewksbury, 2005). This study found that nearly half (44.1%) of the homeless shelters were within 1000' of a school, therefore making them off limits to sex offenders because it would violate the residency restriction laws of each state in this study. This finding is supported by previous research that has shown that one of the greatest challenges for sex offenders is trying to find housing that does not violate their local and/or state residency restriction laws, which generally prohibit them from residing within 500 to 2,500 feet from where children congregate (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Mustaine, 2014; Neito & Jung, 2006). Sex offender laws have been put in place to protect children, so it was not surprising to find that there was a 1.7% decrease in the odds of shelters accommodating RSOs for every one unit increase in the percent of households with children near the shelters. Therefore, one of the collateral consequences of SORN and residency restriction laws is that it causes some sex offenders to become transient and/or homeless (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Levenson, 2008; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2011; Tewksbury, 2005). The presence of children near homeless shelters appears to be an additional hurdle for sex offenders in finding shelters, however temporary, thus

highlighting an additional collateral consequence of SORN and residency restriction laws.

Although the presence of children near shelters was found to be a significant determinant on whether shelters allowed sex offenders. It was interesting to find that homeless shelters that have been open less than 17 years were more accommodating to RSOs. This could be due to not being with a national organization and/or not being tightly coupled with their local and state governments. Another significant determinant of shelters allowing sex offenders was the number of beds the shelter had on average. Shelters with an average of 106 beds or more were more likely to accommodate RSOs. Shelters having a larger number of beds may permit sex offenders to be more anonymous.

The geographical location characteristics of homeless shelters showed a distinct divide between the Midwestern and Southern states in shelters accommodating RSOs. All things equal, Michigan and Ohio were both found to be more accommodating to RSOs than Kentucky and Tennessee. Speculatively, Michigan and Ohio shelters are more likely to accommodate sex offenders because they have fewer residency restrictions as to where sex offenders are permitted to live, than Kentucky and Tennessee. Residency restriction laws in Kentucky and Tennessee not only include preschools, daycare facilities, and schools, but other places such as parks and public playgrounds. Besides homeless shelters, these off limit areas also create less residential housing units for sex offenders. As previously stated and supported by these findings, SORN and residency restriction laws have contributed to some sex offenders becoming homeless and/or relegated to socially disorganized neighborhoods (Burchfield & Mingus, 2008; Mustaine &

Tewksbury, 2011; Zgoba et al., 2009). The findings from this study further support previous research on the collateral consequences from residency restriction laws.

The final main conclusion was to determine whether or not socially disorganized areas factored into shelters accommodating RSOs. Mustaine et al. (2006a) found that sex offenders are often relegated to socially disorganized neighborhoods, and that the resources for sex offenders in these types of neighborhoods are less supportive of their needs (i.e. housing, employment, treatment, and social support systems). Several housing and population characteristics surrounding the shelters were examined in the current study. First, the median home value predicted allowing sex offenders in homeless shelters. However, homeless shelters that allow RSOs tend to be in communities with higher home values, which is inconsistent with the notion that more disorganized communities will be more likely to allow sex offenders. There were no other variables in the current study that supported socially disorganized neighborhoods and shelters accommodating RSOs. Additionally, there were a few other measures that approached statistical significance that also are inconsistent with the disorganization perspective and therefore are worth mentioning. First, there is a 5% increase in the odds of homeless shelter accommodating RSOs for every one unit increase in the population near homeless shelters with a four-year degree or higher ($p = .133$). Second, the odds of homeless shelters accommodating RSOs increase by 6.4% for every one unit ($1,000) increase in median household income ($p = .137$). But the variable that demonstrated the strongest correlation to socially disorganized neighborhoods was poverty in the direction predicted by social disorganization. Although not statistically significant, more impoverished communities tend to have homeless shelters that are more accommodating to RSOs. This

raises the possibility that the more socially disorganized the neighborhood is, the more

likely shelters are willing to accommodate registered sex offenders.

Limitations

Despite these results, this study is not without limitations. First, the shelters that

responded were a non-random subset of the population, which could cause the statistical

analysis to be misleading because the statistical tests used are designed for random

samples. However, the researcher is confident that the findings were not biased due to the

overall response rate of 55.7% across all four states. To further explain, Ohio had a

67.6% response rate, which should produce estimates that are highly accurate for the

population of Ohio's homeless shelters, where 37.5% of the shelters stated that they do

accommodate sex offenders. Michigan had a 39.5% response rate, with 50% of the

shelters indicating that they do accommodate sex offenders. The low response rate for

Michigan may limit generalizability, but since Michigan is similar to Ohio (in terms of

demographics, population, residency restriction laws, and the percentage of shelters that

accommodate sex offenders), the researcher argues that Michigan's non-respondent

shelters will not bias the overall results in major ways. Of the four states in this study,

Kentucky had the highest response rate of 83.3%, which should produce estimates that

are highly accurate for the population of Kentucky's homeless shelters, where 12.5% of

the shelters stated that they do accommodate sex offenders. Tennessee had a 35.3%

response rate, with none of the shelters stating that they accommodate sex offenders. As

with the Ohio-Michigan comparison, Tennessee is similar to Kentucky (demographics,

population, residency restriction laws, and the percentage of shelters that accommodate

sex offenders). The researcher therefore also argues here that Tennessee's non-respondent shelters will not bias the overall results in major ways. To further strengthen the generalizability of these findings, 76.3% of the shelters that responded to this study are located in an urban environment, compared to the 72.4% of the non-respondent shelters being located in an urban environment as well. The results therefore are generalizable to Ohio and Kentucky, and likely to Michigan and Tennessee, but not beyond the states within this study.

A second limitation stems from the fact that the neighborhood variables were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau at two different levels: census block (less than 250 housing units), and block groups (250 to 550 housing units). The problem with obtaining the neighborhood variables at two different levels is that the levels of measurements are not the same across the board. However, these two levels of measurement were the smallest available from the U.S. Census Bureau that were closely related to the 1000' residency restriction radius surrounding the shelter. The census block was slightly just inside the 1000' residency restriction radius of the shelters, and the block group expanded just slightly outside of the 1000' residency restriction radius. The other limitation pertaining to the neighborhood level variables was that the placement of the shelter within the census block or block group could vary. At this point and time, however, the use of U.S. Census Bureau blocks and block groups was the most reflective way of obtaining the population demographics surrounding the shelters.

As a final limitation, the researcher was not able to include all the variables in a single model for analysis. This was due to the number of respondents being 56, and each variable requires ten cases per model. There are 31 variables in this study for only 56

cases, which would have produced a 1.8 case per variable ratio had all the variables been included in one single model. Therefore, the researcher ran 6 separate models. Each model was different from one another, and the distinctness of the variables only pertained to that specific model, which permitted them to be overlapped. Eight significant variables were found in this study, however it still did not permit a full parsimonious model to be analyzed. This is due to there being only 7 cases available per variable, which does not meet the required minimum of 10 cases per variable to run the statistically analysis effectively.

Policy Implications

Homeless shelters are beholden to their communities, local governments, funders, and sex offender laws when it comes to whether or not they accommodate sex offenders. Until now, there has been no known research on homeless shelters' registered sex offender policies. Based on this research, the policy implications are as followed.

The presence of children greatly influenced homeless shelters' sex offender policies. More importantly, the findings also supported previous research on the housing consequences of residency restriction laws (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Levenson & Cotter, 2005b; Mustaine, 2014; Socia, 2014). Moreover, the majority of single men's only shelters did not accommodate sex offenders, which should be of great concern for several reasons.

First, homeless shelters are the last line of defense against vagrancy and homelessness. But if homeless shelters are unwilling to grant access for RSOs, this becomes a safety concern for the public because law enforcement agencies or the public

will not know the whereabouts of sex offenders in their communities. In addition, sex offenders will be faced with not only trying to survive on the streets, which brings its own set of challenges such as not violating vagrancy laws, as well as SORN and residency restriction laws. Moreover, sex offenders that have shelters in their community that accept RSOs will be competing not only with other sex offenders, but also with the general homeless population for the same resources, which will most likely leave them in constant flux between being transient or homeless. Therefore, shelters should work with policymakers in allowing more shelters to accommodate RSOs instead of the ones that do not violate residency restriction laws. In doing so, it will help them hopefully as a starting point to reintegrate into society, but most importantly, permit law enforcement agencies and the communities to know their whereabouts.

Over the past 10 years or so, researchers have found that residency restrictions cause collateral consequences for RSOs rather than accomplishing their intended purposes (Barnes et al., 2009; Huebner et al., 2014; Levenson & Cotter 2005a, 2005b; Mustaine, 2014; Tewksbury, 2005). For example, in 2006, California passed Proposition 83 (Jessica's Law), which increased the previous residency restriction law from 1000' to 2000'. In a year and half, the law increased the number of paroled homeless sex offenders by 800% (California Sex Offender Management Board, 2008). Recently, the California State Supreme Court ruled Proposition 83 as unconstitutional because it was retroactive and only applied to sex offenders on parole (LA Times, 2015). It appears for now that residency restriction laws across the country will continue to ebb and flow, but a possible solution for homeless RSOs is to implement a policy that was just initiated by Michigan's State Supreme Court. The Michigan Supreme Court recently (January, 2015) ruled that

sex offenders may use emergency homeless shelters within 1000' from school property under two conditions: 1) they are to leave the next morning; 2) no expectation of securing a place for the next day (Prison Legal News, 2015). Like Michigan, other states should reconsider their definition of "reside" for sex offenders, especially for emergency homeless shelters that serve the homeless on a first come basis. Perhaps lawmakers should use the definition of "reside" as a place where anyone can have a stable place to sleep and receive mail (Robertson et al., 1984).

Conclusion

In the end, the majority of homeless shelters' sex offender policies within this study did not help reduce homeless sex offenders from living on the streets. In fact, it keeps them on the streets with no place to go. Therefore, when all other housing resources have failed or been exhausted, homeless shelters should then be made available to sex offenders regardless of residency restriction laws. Despite the researcher's effort to find other reasons such as structural, procedural, geographical location, and surrounding housing and population characteristics as to why shelters do not allow sex offenders, the main theme that kept reoccurring from this study was the written sex offender policy and the presence of children near the shelters. It is not fully known why shelters do not allow sex offenders, but it could be that they are perceived as a threat to the shelter's staff, clientele, and neighbors. However, the researcher questions the validity of this logic because shelters already deal with a volatile population that includes mental illnesses, drug and alcohol addictions, and other types of criminals. Despite the findings, future research should examine not only homeless shelters' policies regarding sex offenders in

68

other parts of the country, but to also dig deeper into how, why and the premise for shelters to have such a policy. Also, future research should examine where sex offenders go from here, what other what other programs are made available to them if not permitted access to the shelter(s) within their community.

One of the most intriguing findings within this study was that the majority (71.4%) of homeless shelters did not allow sex offenders, which potentially points to a new collateral consequence and adds to the growing body of literature in this area. There is no easy answer or quick fix to this epidemic of sex offender policies that track and restrict the access of where sex offenders are allowed to be. However, we should use common sense initiatives moving forward, rather than creating more laws that have more deleterious effects on sex offenders, as well as society. Perhaps the best way to address access to homeless shelters for sex offenders is through educating the public and shelters that not depriving them of this resource is beneficial to sex offenders and society. The current laws force sex offenders more underground, which goes against the intended purposes of these laws: to promote public safety by monitoring sex offenders.

REFERENCES

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006. (2006). Stat. H.R. 4472.

Abzug, R., & Galaskiewicz, J. (2001). Nonprofit boards: Crucibles of expertise or symbols of local identities? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30*(1), 51-73.

Barnes, J. C., Dukes, T., Tewksbury, R., & De Troye, T. M. (2009). Analyzing the impact of a statewide residence restriction law on South Carolina sex offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(1), 21-43.

Burchfield, K. B., & Mingus, W. (2008). Not in my neighborhood: Assessing registered sex offenders' experiences with local social capital and social control. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 35*(3), 356-374.

California Sex Offender Management Board. (2008). Homelessness among sex offenders in California: The numbers, the risks and the response. Retrieved on September 25, 2014 from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/parole/sex_offender_facts/docs_somb/housing_2008_rev.pdf

Chajewski, M., & Mercado, C. C. (2009). An evaluation of sex offender residency restriction functioning in town, county, and city-wide jurisdictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(1), 44-61.

CNN (2007). [Florida housing sex offenders under a bridge.] Retrieved on September 25th, 2014, from http://www.cnn.com/2007/LAW/04/05/bridge.sex.offenders/index.html

DeVerteuil, G. (2006). The local state and homeless shelters: Beyond revanchism? *Cities, 23*(2), 109-120.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method (3rd ed.).* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48,* 147-160.

Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. L. (2007). How to stop harassment: Professional construction of legal compliance in organizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 112*(4), 1203-1243.

Duwe, G., Donnay, W., & Tewksbury, R. (2008). Does residential proximity matter? A geographic analysis of sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 35*(4), 484-504.

Dyck, J. J., & Hagley, A. (2012). Political geography, direct democracy, and the reasoning voter: Spatial proximity, symbolic politics, and voting of California's proposition 83. *Politics & Policy, 40*(2), 195-220.

Eitle, D. (2005). The influence of mandatory arrest policies, police organizational characteristics, and situational variables on the probability of arrest in domestic violence cases. *Crime & Delinquency, 51*(4), 573-597.

Farkas, M. A., & Miller, G. (2007). Reentry and reintegration: Challenges faced by the families of convicted sex offenders. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 20*(2), 88-92.

Fitzpatrick, K. M., & Myrstol, B. (2011). The jailing of America's homeless: Evaluating the rabble management thesis. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(2), 271-297.

Greenfeld, L. A. (1997). *Sex offenses and offenders: An analysis of data on rape and sexual assault.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Harris, A. J., Lobanov-Rostovsky, C., & Levenson, J. S. (2010). Widening the Net: The effects of transitioning to the adam walsh act's federally mandated sex offender classification system. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 37*(5), 503-519.

Hipp, J. R., Turner, S., & Jannetta, J. (2010). Are sex offenders moving into social disorganization? Analyzing the residential mobility of california parolees. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 47*(4), 559-590.

Huebner B. M., Kras, K. R., Rydberg, J., Bynum, T. S., Grommon, E., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2014). The effect and implications of sex offender residence restrictions: Evidence from a two-state evaluation. *Criminology & Public Policy, 13*, 139-168.

Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act, Public Law 103-322 (1994).

Jennings, W. G., Zgoba, K. M., & Tewksbury, R. (2012). A comparative longitudinal analysis of recidivism trajectories and collateral consequences for sex and non-sex offenders released since the implementation of sex offender registration and community notification. *Journal of Crime & Justice, 35*(3), 356-364.

Justice Policy Institute. (2008). What will it cost states to comply with the sex offender registration and notification act? Retrieved on September 25, 2014, from http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/08-08_FAC_SORNACosts_JJ.pdf

Kernsmith, P. D., Craun, S. W., & Foster, J. (2009). Public attitudes toward sexual offenders and sex offender registration. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*, 290-301.

LA Times. (2015). [A welcome decision limiting residency rules of Jessica's Law.] Retrieved on March 15, 2015, from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/parole/sex_offender_facts/docs_somb/housing_2008_rev.pdf

Lee, B. A., Lewis, D. W., & Jones, S. H. (1992) Are the homeless to blame? A test of two theories. *The Sociological Quarterly, 33*(4), 535-552.

Lee, B. A., & Schreck, C. J. (2005). Danger on the streets: Marginality and victimization among homeless people. *American Behavioral Scientist, 48*(8), 1055-1081.

Levenson, J. S. (2008). Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies, 21*(2), 153-166.

Levenson, J. S., Brannon, Y. N., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perception about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policies, 7*(1), 137-161.

Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005a). The effect of Megan`s law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 49-66.

Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005b). The impact of sex offender residence restrictions: 1,000 feet from danger or one step from absurd? *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 49*(2), 168-178.

Levenson, J. S., D'Amora, D. A. (2007). Social policies designed to prevent sexual violence: The emperor's new clothes? *Criminal Justice Policy Review 18*(2), 168-199.

Levenson, J. S., D'Amora, D. A., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Megan's law and its impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25*(4), 587-602.

Levenson, J. S., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Sex offender residence restrictions: Unintended consequences and community reentry. *Justice Research & Policy, 9*(1), 59-73.

Levenson, J., Letourneau, E., Armstrong, K., & Zgoba, K. (2010). Failure to register as a sex offender: Is it associated with recidivism? *Jusice Quarterly, 27*(3), 305-331.

Levenson, J., & Tewksbury, R. (2009). Collateral damage: Family members of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(1), 54-68.

Logan, W. (2009). Knowledge as power: Criminal registration and community notification laws in America. Stanford, CA: Standford Law Books.

Maguire, E. R. (2002). *Organizational structure in large police agencies: Context, complexity, and control.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Maguire, E. R., & Katz, C. M. (2002). Community policing, loose coupling and sense making in American police agencies. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(3), 503-536.

Megan's Law, Public Law 104-45, *Stat 110* (1996).

Mercado, C. C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. (2008). The impact of specialized sex offender legislation on community reentry. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research & Treatment (Sage), 20*(2), 188-205.

Metraux, S., & Culhane, D. P. (2004). Homeless shelter use and reincarceration following prison release. *Criminology & Public Policy, 3*(2), 139-160.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Mitchell, D. (1997). The annihilation of space by law: The roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States. *Antipode 29*, 303-335.

Mustaine, E. E., (2014). Sex offender residency restrictions: Successful integration or exclusion? *Criminology & Public Policy, 13*, 169-177.

Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006a). Residential location and mobility of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(2), 177-192.

Mustaine, E. E., Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K. M. (2006b). Social disorganization and residential locations of registered sex offenders: Is this a collateral consequence? *Deviant Behavior, 27*(3), 329-350.

Mustaine, E., & Tewksbury, R. (2011). Residential relegation of registered sex offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*(1), 44-57.

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2014). [Snapshot of Homelessness.] Retrieved on September 25, 2014, from http://www.endhomelessness.org/pages/snapshot_of_homelessness

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. (2014). [Map of registered sex offenders in the United States and territories.] Retrieved on September 25, 2014, from http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/documents/Sex_Offenders_Map.pdf

Neito, M., & Jung, D. (2006). *The impact of residency restrictions on sex offenders and correctional management: A literature review*. Sacramento: California Research Bureau.

New York Times. (2014). [Housing restrictions keeps sex offenders in prison beyond release dates.] Retrieved on September 25, 2014, from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/22/nyregion/with-new-limits-on-where-they-can-go-sex-offenders-are-held-after-serving-sentences.html

Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless. (2003). Homeless shelters in Columbus, Ohio signing "good neighbor policy" to not permit sex offenders in homeless shelters. *The Grapevine, 60*.

Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking. (2012). [Spring 2012 Newsletter] Retrieved on July 18, 2014, from http://www.smart.gov/newsroom_jurisdictions_sorna.htm

Prison Legal News. (2015). [Michigan Law Allows Sex Offenders To Use Homeless Shelters Within 1000 Feet of School.] Retrieved on April 9, 2015, from https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2015/jan/12/michigan-law-allows-sex-offenders-use-emergency-shelters-within-1000-feet-school/

Ragusa-Salerno, L., & Zgoba, K. M. (2012). Taking stock of 20 years of sex offender laws and research: An examination of whether sex offender legislation has helped or hindered our efforts. *Journal of Crime & Justice, 35*(3), 335-355.

Robertson, M., Ropers, R., & Boyer, R. (1984). Emergency shelter for the homeless in Los Angeles County. UCLA Basic Shelter Research, Document #2, School of Public Health. Los Angles: University of California, Los Angeles.

Rolfe, S. M. (2013). Housing obstacles faced by sex offenders reentering society: Examination of megan's law and the adam walsh act in Ohio. Presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Dallas, TX.

Sample, L. L., & Kadleck, C. (2008). Sex offender laws: Legislators' accounts of the end for policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 19*(1), 40-62.

Schiavone, S. K., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). Public perception of sex offender policies and the impact on sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 53*, 679-695.

Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Socia, K. M., (2014). Residence restrictions are ineffective and inadequate: So now what? *Criminology & Public Policy, 13*, 179-188.

Socia, K. M., & Stamatel, J. P. (2010). Assumptions and evidence behind sex offender laws: Registration, community notification, and residence restrictions. *Sociology Compass, 4*(1), 1-20.

Sosin, M. R. (2012). Social expectations, constraints, and their effect on nonprofit strategies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41*(6), 1231-1250.

Tewksbury, R. (2005). Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 67-81.

Tewksbury, R., & Jennings, W. G. (2010). Assessing the impact of sex offender registration and community notification on sex-offending trajectories. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 37*(5), 570-582.

Tewksbury, R., Jennings, W. G., & Zgoba, K. M. (2012). A longitudinal examination of sex offender recidivism prior to and following the implementation of SORN. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*(3), 308-328.

Tewksbury, R., & Lees, M. (2006). Perception of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum, 26,* 344-399.

Tewksbury, R., & Levenson, J. (2009). Stress experiences of family members of registered sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 27*(4), 611-626.

USA Today. (2014). [Sex offenders say Lee County, Fla. Sheriffs department directed them to camp in the woods.] Retrieved on September 25, 2014 from http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/02/02/hidden-fla-camp-houses-sex-offenders/5165603/

U.S. News and World Report. (2014). [Alabama shuts down rural church's makeshift camp for convicted sex offenders.] Retrieved on September, 25, 2014 from http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2014/07/01/alabama-shuts-down-churchs-sex-offender-housing

Willis, G. M., & Grace, R. C. (2009). Assessment of community reintegration planning for sex offenders. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 36*(5), 494-512.

Wolch, J. R., Dear, M., & Akita, A. (1988). Explaining homelessness. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 54*(4), 443-453.

Zandbergen, P. A., & Hart, T. C. (2006). Reducing housing options for sex offenders: Investigating the impact of residency restriction laws using GIS. *Journal of Research and Policy, 8*(2), 1-24.

Zandbergen, P. A., Levenson, J. S., & Hart, T. C. (2010). Residential proximity to schools and daycares: An empirical analysis of sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 37*(5), 482-502.

Zgoba, K. M., Levenson, J., & McKee, T. (2009). Examining the impact of sex offender residence restrictions on housing availability. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(1), 91-110.

Weick, K. A. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-19.

APPENDIX A

HOMELESS SHELTERS' POLICIES QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge.

1. In what year was the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men established? _____

2. What state is the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men located in?
    _____ Michigan   _____ Ohio   _____ Kentucky   _____ Tennessee

3. Your emergency homeless shelter that serves men is located in:
    _____ Urban   _____ Rural   _____ Do Not Know

4. Does this emergency homeless shelter that serves single men have a religious affiliation? _____ Yes (Go to Question 5)   _____ No (Go to Question 6)

5. Which religious affiliation does this shelter identify with: (Check only one)

    _____ Baptist   _____ Presbyterian   _____ Catholic   _____ Muslim

    _____ Non-Denomination   _____ Other: (specify)_____

6. How many on-site paid employees are with the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men? Full-time _____   Part-time _____

7. In a given year, approximately how many unpaid volunteers work for the homeless shelter that serves single men? _____

8. Is your emergency homeless shelter that serves single men part of a "single point of entry" system? ____ Yes ____No ____ Do Not Know

9. What is the maximum occupancy for this emergency homeless shelter that serves men per night? _____

10. What is the maximum occupancy under extreme weather conditions for this emergency homeless shelter that serves single men? _____

11. How many beds do you generally have designated for each category?
    Single Men: _____ Single Women: _____ Families: _____

12. Does the homeless shelter that serves single men have a maximum length of stay policy? ____ Yes ____ No (Go to Question 13)
    a. If yes, what is the maximum length of stay (please specify in days, weeks, or months)? _____
    b. Are there exceptions to this maximum length of stay policy?
        ____ Yes ____ No (Go to Question 13)
    c. If yes, please briefly explain the most common exception?
        _____
        _____
    d. Who generally makes the determination as to the length of stay exception? (Check only one, please) ____ Director ____ Supervisor ___ Intake-Staff ___ Other (explain): _____

13. Does the federal government regulate this shelter's policies regarding who can stay at your facility? ____ Yes ____ No ____ Do Not Know

14. Does the state regulate this shelter's policies regarding who can stay at your facility? ____ Yes ____ No ____ Do Not Know

15. What is the current annual budget for this shelter? (Check only one, please)

_____ $0 - $149,999 _____ $150,000 - $299,999 _____ $300,000 - $449,999

___ $450,000 - $599,999 ___ $600,000 - $749,999 _____ $750,000 - $849,999

___ $850,000 - $999,999 ___ $1 million – $1.149 million ___ $1.150 million +

16. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men administer a drug/alcohol test? _____ Yes _____ No

17. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men permit individuals under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol to use the facility?

_____ Yes (Go to Question 18) _____ No

   a. Are there exceptions to this drug/alcohol policy?

   _____ Yes _____ No (Go to Question 18)

   b. If yes, please briefly explain the most common exception to the drug/alcohol policy? _____

   _____

   c. Who generally makes the determination of exceptions to the drug/alcohol policy? (Check only one, please) _____ Director _____ Supervisor

   ___ Intake-Staff ___ Other (explain): _____

18. How does the homeless population get referred to your shelter: (Check all that apply)

___ Police ___ Fire Department ___ Hospitals ___ Social Services

___ Coalition of the Homeless ___ Agency Outreach Workers

___ Other (explain): _____

19. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men permit individuals with criminal backgrounds to stay in the shelter?

_____ Yes (Go to Question 20) _____ No

79

a. Are there exceptions to this criminal background policy?

_____ Yes _____ No (Go to Question 20)

b. If yes, please briefly explain the most common exception to the criminal background policy?

_____

_____

_____

c. Who generally makes the determination as to the criminal background policy? (Check only one, please) _____ Director _____ Supervisor _____ Intake-Staff

_____ Other (explain):

_____

20. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men require a valid form of identification from the individual seeking shelter?

___ Always ___ Usually ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ Never

21. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men run a criminal background check on individuals before permitting them access to stay onsite?

___ Always ___ Usually ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ Never

22. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men run a sex offender registry check on individuals before permitting them access to stay onsite?

___ Always ___ Usually ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ Never

23. Does the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men permit registered sex offenders to stay at the homeless shelter?

_____ Yes (Go to Question 26) _____ No (Go to Question 24)

24. What are the reason(s) as to why the organization ***does not*** allow registered sex offenders to use their facilities? (Check all that apply)

___ Close proximity to a school   ___ Close proximity to a day-care-center

___ Close proximity to a playground   ___ Close proximity to a public park

___ Community pressure   ___ Political pressure

___ Issues with fundraising   ___ State law prohibits sex offenders from using homeless shelters

___ Previous experience with a registered sex offender using your shelter   ___ Based on previous experience of another homeless shelter

___ Perceived as a threat to your staff   ___ Perceived as a threat to other clients

___ There already are nearby shelter that caters to homeless sex offenders   ___ Children on premises

___ Legal liability   ___ Other (explain): _____

25. Are there exceptions to this sex offender policy?

____ Yes ____ No (Go to Question 26)

    a. If yes, please briefly explain the most common exception to the sex offender policy? _____

    _____

    b. Who generally makes the determination of exceptions to the sex offender policy? (Check only one, please) ____ Director ____ Supervisor

    ___ Intake-Staff ___ Other (explain): _____

26. Is there any specific registered sex offender tier level that is not permitted to stay at the shelter? (Check all that apply)

___ Tier I ___ Tier II ___ Tier III ___ Tier IV ___ Do not know

27. Is the policy on registered sex offenders a written or unwritten rule within the emergency homeless shelter that serves single men? ____ Written ____ Unwritten

28. Please feel free to use the space provided below to add any factual statements that would be beneficial to this research regarding homeless shelter policies that was not addressed in this survey. (If more space is needed, feel free to write on the back of this sheet paper)

Note: Again, thank you for your willingness to participate. Please make sure that you filled out and signed the consent form that is attached to this survey (which will be separated from the survey prior to being included in the data). For your convenience, we have included a prepaid postage envelope with our address for you to return the survey and consent form. Please send back to us by: March 1st, 2015

CURRICULUM VITA

Shawn M. Rolfe

University of Louisville
103 Lutz Hall, Rm 113
Louisville, KY 40292
502-852-8044 (office)
937-751-4318 (cell)
shawn.rolfe@louisville.edu

Education

2013 – present   **M.A. in Sociology (Expected, Spring 2015)**
University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky
Cumulative GPA: 3.95
Thesis: Another Collateral Consequence? Examining Homeless
Shelters'

Policies on Sex Offenders Across Four States.
Committee: Dr. Ryan Schroeder, Ph.D. (Chair)
         Dr. David Roelfs, Ph.D. (Member)
         Dr. Richard Tewksbury, Ph.D. (Member)

2013   **B.A. in Sociology**
Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio
Honor Student within the University and Sociology Department
Cumulative GPA: 3.86
Minor: Crime and Justice Studies

Scholarship

Past Research   **Departmental Honors Thesis**
"Sex Offenders and the Obstacles They Face Reentering Society"
Committee: Dr. Karen Lahm, Ph.D. (Chair)
         Dr. Michael Norris, Ph.D. (Member)
         Dr. Jim Adamitis, Ph.D. (Member)

Manuscripts Under Review

Rolfe, Shawn M., and Richard Tewksbury, and Karen F. Lahm. Housing Obstacles Faced
by Sex Offenders Reentering Society: Examination of Megan's Law and the
Adam Walsh Act in Ohio.

Rolfe, Shawn M., and Richard Tewksbury. Assessing the Collateral Consequences of
SORN and Residency Restriction Laws on Employment for RSOs.

Manuscripts in Progress

Rolfe, Shawn M. Another Collateral Consequence? Examining Homeless Shelters'
Policies on
Sex Offenders Across Four States.

Rolfe, Shawn M. Sex Offenders: Does Tier Designation Make a Difference Pertaining to
Housing Availability?

Rolfe, Shawn M. Sex Offenders and the Obstacles They Face Reentering Society.

Rolfe, Shawn M. Megan's Law versus the Adam Walsh Act: How Does it Effect Sex
Offenders Ability to Obtain Employment.

Papers Presented at Professional Conferences

Rolfe, Shawn M. and Richard Tewksbury. Assessing the Collateral Consequences of
SORN and Residency Restriction Laws on Employment for RSOs. Presented at
the 2014 *American Society of Criminology* conference, San Francisco, CA.

Rolfe, Shawn M. Another Collateral Consequence? Examining Homeless Shelters'
Policies on Sex Offenders Across Four States. Presented at the 2014 *Southern
Criminal Justice Association* conference, Clearwater Beach, FL.

Rolfe, Shawn M. Sex Offenders: Does Tier Designation Make a Difference Pertaining to
Housing Availability? Presented at the 2013 *American Society of Criminology*
conference, Atlanta, GA.

Rolfe, Shawn M. Sex Offenders and the Obstacles They Face Reentering Society.
Presented at the 2013 *Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences* conference, Dallas,
TX.

Funding

2015   National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program (Unfunded)

2014   University of Louisville Graduate Student Council Travel Grant: $350.00

2014   University of Louisville Graduate Student Council Research Grant: $300.00 (Awarded)

2014   National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program (Unfunded)

2013   Wright State University Sociology Travel Grant: $750.00 (Awarded)

2012   Wright State University Sociology Research Grant: $200.00 (Awarded)

2012   Wright State University Undergraduate Research Grant: $4,500.00 (Unfunded)

2012   Wright State University Undergraduate Honors Grant: $400.00 (Awarded)

Teaching Experiences

Fall 2013 - present   Introduction to Sociology, University of Louisville

Spring 2013   Guest Lecture for graduate course ABS 7600: Sex Offenders and the Laws

    Topic Covered: Laws within the U.S. and Ohio. How do these laws affect sex offenders housing ability within Ohio? Wright State University

Spring 2012   Guest Lecture for SOC 200: Introduction to Sociology
Topics Covered: Deviance, Labeling Theory, Shaming, Social Bond and Anomie – Strain Theory. Wright State University

Academic Employment

2013 – present   Graduate Teaching Assistant
Department of Sociology
University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

2012 – 2013   Work-study: Department of Sociology
Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio

2011 – 2012   Work-study: Veterans Counseling Center
Veterans Administration, Dayton, Ohio

Service

2014 - present   Sociology Graduate Student Association, University of Louisville, Treasurer

2014 - present   Graduate Student Council, University of Louisville, Department Representative

2013 - present   Sociology Graduate Student Association, University of Louisville, Member

Academic Honors & Awards

2014   Graduate Teaching Academy, University of Louisville

2013   Wright State University, Sociology Department "Most Outstanding Senior"

2013   Wright State University Honors "Departmental Honors"

2012   Phi Kappa Phi Honors Society (Member)

2012   Alpha Kappa Delta Sociology Honor Society (Lifetime Member)

2012   Alpha Phi Sigma Criminal Justice Honor Society (Lifetime Member)

2011   Golden Key International Honour Society (Lifetime Member)

Organizational Memberships

2014 – present   Southern Criminal Justice Association

2012 – present   American Sociological Association

2012 – present   American Society of Criminology

2012 – present   Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
2010 – present   American Veterans

2009 – present   Disabled American Veterans

2009 – present   American Legion

2000 – present   Veterans of Foreign Wars

1995 – 1999   Active duty – U.S. Marine Corps (Honorable Discharge)