Collateral Consequences of Sex Offender Registration

The Commission’s focus on best practices in sex offender risk level assessment is grounded in the belief that accurate and current risk assessments are essential to both public safety and a constitutionally sound process. Reliable classifications are especially critical given the negative consequences that can flow from the registration and notification process. This report is based on national research findings, testimony presented to the Commission and Massachusetts case law. Research in this regard specific to Massachusetts has not yet been conducted. The Commission recommends that such research be pursued.

Many individuals who are publicly identified as sex offenders have difficulty securing employment and housing, and find that their social, emotional and physical well-being is compromised. The impact of these laws on youth can be especially severe. Because of their developing brains and susceptibility to outside pressures, the humiliation of being labeled as a sex offender can be alienating and destabilizing, undermining rather than supporting rehabilitation efforts.[[1]](#endnote-1) Other effects of registration, classification and notification on youth may include:

* Stunted development of healthy social relationships and the alienation of youth by peers and family;
* Creation of overwhelming barriers to educational and employment opportunities;
* Exacerbation of psychological difficulties;
* Physical harm as a result of suicide attempts and violence at the hands of vigilantes and harassment.[[2]](#endnote-2)

Registration may also have the unintended consequence of increasing “the likelihood of future criminal behavior” by “restrict[ing] adolescents from the prosocial activities and developmentally appropriate affiliations that are necessary for normal, successful transitions from adolescence into adulthood.”[[3]](#endnote-3) Children are further impacted when their families experience increased fiscal strain, difficulty finding and maintaining stable housing and stressed or severed relationships as a result of registration and notification laws.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Current national research similarly recognizes the negative impact of registration and notification on adult sex offenders.[[5]](#endnote-5) In addition to the debilitating social and emotional effects suffered from the stigma of the sex offender label, many offenders find it difficult to maintain lifestyle stability, an important factor in reducing recidivism.[[6]](#endnote-6) Adults are known to experience:

* difficulty acquiring and sustaining stable housing resulting in frequent moves, inability to reside with supportive family, and homelessness[[7]](#endnote-7)
* difficulty obtaining and sustaining stable employment[[8]](#endnote-8)
* destabilizing psychosocial stressors including[[9]](#endnote-9):
  + Financial hardship;
  + Emotional distress including shame, alienation, isolation, and lack of social supports;
  + Living farther away from employment opportunities, treatment and support services, family and friends[[10]](#endnote-10);
  + Exacerbation of mental health symptoms such as depression, anxiety and substance abuse
  + Physical harm including violence at the hands of vigilantes and suicide[[11]](#endnote-11)

Ironically, studies show that “publicly revealing the identity and criminal history of a released offender seems to increase the likelihood of his returning to crime.”[[12]](#endnote-12) To protect public safety and enhance offender stability, the Commission recommends the creation of best practices strategies and options in housing, treatment, employment and other support services for sex offenders and their families. [[13]](#endnote-13) It is further recommended that Massachusetts adopt a research-based, best practice levelling paradigm that will lead to the fewest possible erroneous leveling decisions and limit the subsequent collateral consequences to registrants and to the public to the greatest extent possible.
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