Summer 1987

Patterns of Stranger and Serial Rape Offending: Factors Distinguishing Apprehended and at Large Offenders

James L. LeBeau

PATTERNS OF STRANGER AND SERIAL RAPE OFFENDING: FACTORS DISTINGUISHING APPREHENDED AND AT LARGE OFFENDERS*

James L. LeBeau**

I. INTRODUCTION

Using information gathered from police investigators' reports, this Article identifies some of the salient patterns and characteristics that differentiate forms of stranger rape, distinguish stranger from nonstranger rape, and distinguish serial from nonserial rape. The patterns and characteristics discussed reflect the situational nature of the offense, which is how the offender commits the offense, rather than descriptions of personal characteristics. These distinguishing patterns and characteristics also suggest why some stranger rapists are apprehended while others remain at large. The major framework utilized in distinguishing rape in this study is not solely based on victim-offender relationship. Rather the joint consideration of victim-offender relationship and the number of reported rapes committed by the same person before apprehension is suggested to better reflect the complex interplay between offender, victim, and situational characteristics and how they relate to the apprehension of the rape offender.

II. STRANGERS AND SERIAL OFFENDERS

A. STRANGERS

The relationship between the victim and offender is very important.[1] It is alleged that assaults by strangers allow the victims to see

---

[1] See, e.g., M. AMIR, PATTERNS IN FORCIBLE RAPE (1971); S. BROWNMILLER, AGAINST OUR WILL: MEN, WOMEN, AND RAPE (1975); A. MEDEA & K. THOMPSON, AGAINST RAPE (1974); Weis & Borges, Victimology and Rape: The Case of The Legitimate Victim, 8 ISSUES IN

themselves as legitimate victims and that other parties, such as the police, will hold similar perceptions as well.[2] Assaults by strangers thus allow the victims to identify themselves as classic victims conforming to the popular conceptions of the crime.[3] Moreover, a study by the Vera Institute of felony arrests in New York City found that stranger rape cases, as compared to nonstranger rape cases, were more likely to involve a contested trial and that there was a greater probability that the defendant would receive a conviction and imprisonment.[4]

Finally, rapes by strangers are more likely to be reported to the police than are rapes by nonstrangers.[5] The significance of the stranger rape to the police, however, is that more resources must be utilized and expended in order to apprehend the offender. This condition is particularly true when the stranger rapist appears to have committed two or more incidents or a series of rapes.

B. SERIAL OFFENDERS

The notion of serial offending—a situation in which an individual commits two or more crimes before his apprehension— is not new, but the amount of research on this issue is rather meager.[6] Two works that have addressed the issue of serial offending and rape have shown that failing to control statistically for the presence of the serial offenders produces exaggerated, distorted, and short lived generalizations about the racial, numerical, geographical, and ecological patterns of rape.[7] Using the same data set employed in the present study, the author mapped the locations of the crime scenes of rapes committed by apprehended serial offenders, apprehended one-incident offenders, and at large offenders in San Diego,

---

CRIMINOLOGY, 71-115 (Fall 1973); Williams, *The Classic Rape: When Do Victims Report?*, 31 SOC. PROBS. 459-67 (1984).

2 Williams, *supra* note 1, at 461.

3 Weis & Borges, *supra* note 1; Williams, *supra* note 1, at 460.

4 Vera Institute, FELONY ARRESTS 42-43 (rev. ed. 1981).

5 *See* McDERMOTT, RAPE VICTIMS IN 26 AMERICAN CITIES 1979 L. Enforcement Assistance Admin. Newsl. at 51; Williams, *supra* note 1, at 464.

6 A few studies have alluded to the notion of serial offending: M. WOLFGANG, R. FIGLIO, & T. SELLIN, DELINQUENCY IN A BIRTH COHORT (1972); J. PETERSILIA, P. GREEN-WOOD, & M. LAVIN, CRIMINAL CAREERS OF HABITUAL FELONS (1977); Chaiken & Chaiken, *Offender Types and Public Policy*, 30 CRIME & DELINQ. 195-226 (1984). Two works have directly addressed the issue rape and serial offending: LeBeau, *Some Problems With Measuring and Describing Rape Presented By The Serial Offender*, 2 JUSTICE Q. 385-98 (1985) [hereinafter LeBeau, *Measuring and Describing Rape*]; LeBeau, *Rape and Racial Patterns*, 9 J. OFFENDER COUNSELING, SERVICES & REHAB. 123-48 (1984) [hereinafter LeBeau, *Rape and Racial Patterns*].

7 *See* LeBeau, *Measuring and Describing Rape supra* note 6; LeBeau, *Rape and Racial Patterns*, *supra* note 6.

California. From this cartographic analysis, the most important finding was "the proclivity of chronic serial offenders to use repeatedly the same geographic and ecological space."[8] In other words, these offenders, unlike others, patterned themselves geographically. Hence, LeBeau proposed that it was these obvious patterns that aided in the apprehension of the serial offenders.[9]

III. INFORMATION AND CRIMINAL APPREHENSION

Skogan and Antunes have asserted that "the availability and reliability of information about incidents and offenders plays a key role in determining the ability of the police to solve crimes and apprehend offenders."[10] An assault within a more intimate relationship will likely produce the tangible information that expedites and eases the investigation and apprehension process.[11] However, when interpersonal distance between the participants is maximized, as in situations of stranger rapes, the task becomes one of isolating the sources of the tangible information about the offender that lead to his apprehension. For example, aforementioned geographical and ecological patterning of the serial offenders is the plausible source of tangible information. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that there are very general behaviors that distinguish between apprehended and at large stranger rapists.

Given a situation of complete anonymity between the victim and the offender, the sources of tangible information about the latter emanate from descriptions of how the offender commits the rape. Interaction between the victim, the offender, and witnesses before the assault enhance the probability that a positive identification of an offender can be made.[12] Moreover, previous research on eyewitness recall indicates that one of the factors leading to a more accurate description of an offender is the length of time that an eyewitness has to observe a person or an object to be identified.[13] This result implies that the maximization of time between the participants has the effect of providing the victim and any witnesses with more details or information about the offender. Furthermore, the

---

[8] LeBeau, *Measuring and Describing Rape, supra* note 6, at 397. "Chronic serial offenders" refers to those offenders who commit five or more rapes before apprehension.

[9] *Id.*

[10] Skogan & Antunes, *Information, Apprehension, and Deterrence: Exploring the Limits of Police Productivity,* 7 J. CRIM. JUST. 217, 219 (1979).

[11] *See* M. AMIR, *supra* note 1, at 285.

[12] *Id.*

[13] Laughrey, Alexander & Lane, *Recognition of Human Faces: Effects of Target Exposure Time, Target Position, Pose Position, and Type of Photograph,* 55 J. APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY 477-83 (1971).

maximization of time between the participants may have the effect of minimizing interpersonal distance, allowing a stranger to reveal more information about himself and become a casual acquaintance to his victim.

A. NOMINATED SOURCE OF INFORMATION: METHOD OF APPROACH

An important characteristic of the offender's behavior is the manner by which he gains access to the victim or, more simply, his method of approach.[14] Rapists employ three general varieties of methods for approaching their victims. The first method is basically contingent upon the participants having an existent intimate relationship. During this type of rape, the assailant simply uses the relationship as the basis for gaining access to the victim and "deceives the person by not honoring the bounds of that relationship."[15] The second method of approach is "capturing the victim."[16] "In this style, there is an effort to strike up conversation with the victim and to use verbal means to capture her rather than physical force."[17] The assault is, therefore, preceded by a range of interaction between the participants. Distinct examples of capturing the victim include incidences where the participants meet at a party or bar or where the victim is hitchhiking and accepts a ride from the offender.[18] The third set of approaches have received the succinct designation of "blitz rapes."[19] The essence of the blitz approach is that the "rape occurs out of the blue and without prior interaction between the assailant and victim."[20] The offender immediately applies threat and force to subdue his victim.[21] Examples of blitz approaches are those where the offender breaks into the residence of the victim, as in a burglary rape, or the victim is attacked while walking outdoors.

Although some approaches are unique to specific types of victim-offender relationships, it is very evident that rape is the outcome of a variety of different initial encounters between the participants.

---

[14] *See* LeBeau, *The Journey to Rape: Geographic Distance and The Rapist's Method of Approaching The Victim,* 15 J. POLICE SCI. & ADMIN. 129-136 (1987).

[15] A. Burgess & L. Holmstrom, RAPE: VICTIMS OF CRISIS 8 (1974). The authors have labeled this form of rape as confidence rape knowing the victim.

[16] *Id.* at 6.

[17] *Id.*

[18] LeBeau, *supra* note 14.

[19] *See* BURGESS & HOLMSTROM, *supra* note 15; J. SCHWENDINGER & H. SCHWENDINGER, RAPE AND INEQUALITY (1983); Hazelwood, *The Behavior Oriented Interview of Rape Victims: The Key to Profiling,* 52 FBI L. ENFORCEMENT BULL. 8 (1983).

[20] A. BURGESS & L. HOLMSTROM, *supra* note 15, at 4.

[21] J. SCHWENDINGER & H. SCHWENDINGER, *supra* note 19.

Moreover, the variety of approaches imply different intensities of interaction and thus, theoretically provide varying quantities of information about the offender.

B.   NOMINATED SOURCE OF INFORMATION: SCENES IN THE CRIME

Related to the method of approach is the number of scenes in the incident. Amir, during his benchmark study of rape in Philadelphia, conceptualized that a rape incident was composed of scenes and that a rape could be composed of one, two, or three scenes or sites: 1) the initial meeting place; 2) the crime scene; and 3) the after scene.[22] The initial meeting place is the location where the victim meets the offender. The crime scene is the location where the actual rape takes place. The after scene is the location where the offender leaves the victim. Amir suggests that often a rapist will meet or identify his victim at a particular site and then assess whether he needs to move the victim to a location more conducive to the commission of the crime.[23] The concept of scenes is a surrogate measure of the geographic movement during an offense. A rape is very mobile if the initial meeting place, crime scene, and after scene are all separate and distinct locations. The victim of such a rape had to travel with the offender to two of the three scenes. In contrast, it is possible for a rape to be very immobile if the initial meeting place is the crime and after scenes as well. While Amir developed this elaborate typology, he did not measure the geographic distances between and among the scenes. However, as an information source, the implications are very clear: the joint movement of the victim and offender from different scenes requires time. Therefore, it can be assumed that this travel time allows the victim to acquire or recall additional details about the incident and her assailant.

In summary, the potential sources of tangible information that lead to an apprehension when the victim and offender are strangers is dependent either upon how the offender approaches his victim or upon the number of separate and distinct locations or scenes in the incident, or both.

IV.   PROCEDURES

A.   DATA SOURCE

The data for this study was collected from the rape investiga-

---

[22] M. AMIR, *supra* note 1, at 137.
[23] *Id.* at 38.

tors' files of the San Diego, California Police Department. The data set consists of all the lone assailant or one offender rapes reported between 1971 and 1975 (612 incidents). The investigator files contain all the specific documentation pertaining to each rape as well as a summary of all the pertinent facts related to the incident.

B.   MAJOR CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: OFFENDER STATUS

A very common and appropriate framework for analyzing rape is to classify the incidents according to the relationship between the participants and to compare this classification scheme with schemes based on other demographic or situational variables. This approach has numerous merits, as it allows one to ascertain the characteristics that distinguish stranger from non stranger rapes as well as incidents with apprehended suspects from incidents in which the suspects remain at large. A serious drawback with this framework, however, is that it does not provide any sense of the extent of any offender's assaultive activity. In other words, even with a sample of apprehended offenders it is not possible to differentiate between offenders who commit only one reported offense and those who commit a series of reported rapes.

The offender status scheme, derived by LeBeau, classifies incidents according to the number of reported rapes committed by the same person before apprehension. Thus, three categories emerge:

1) *Open Unknown*—the number of rapes committed by the same person is unknown because a specific suspect has not been identified and/or apprehended; thus, the case remains open;
2) *Single*—an offender commits one reported rape and is apprehended by the police;
3) *Series*—an offender commits two or more reported rapes before he is apprehended by the police.[24]

Using this scheme in concert with another scheme which differentiates the victim-offender relationship provides both an indication of the types of relationships that comprise a group and a clearer sense of the extent of an individual's offending activity. The data set used in this study consist of 271 Open Unknown cases, 240 Single cases, and 171 Series rapes committed by 39 serial offenders. Moreover, eleven of the serial offenders are chronic, since they are responsible for five or more offenses during a year.

C.   SECONDARY FRAMEWORK: VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP

Table 1 is a list of the victim-offender relationship categories that

---

[24] LeBeau, *Rape and Racial Patterns*, *supra* note 6, at 133.

are employed in this study. Basically, the classifications are a modification of those employed by Amir in his Philadelphia study.[25]

TABLE 1
VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP CATEGORIES

STRANGER	- No previous contact and acquaintanceship established before the offense.
CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE	- Offender becomes known to victim just before the offense
ACQUAINTANCE	- Victim has some prior knowledge about her offender's residence, place of work, or nickname, but no specific relationship exists.
FAMILY FRIEND	- Offender is the friend of one of the victim's family members, often at her home and trusted (includes mother's boyfriend).
CLOSE OR BOY FRIEND	- Offender often in victim's home or dated with her, or having close, direct, or frequent relationship (includes ex-boyfriend).
FAMILY - RELATIVE	- Includes father, step-father, brother, step-brother, cousin, and uncle.

Source: Amir, 1971, p. 233.

D.   THE METHODS OF APPROACH

Ten methods of approaching the victim are operationalized for this article (Table 2). Illegal Entry of residence and Kidnap-Attack are the blitz rapes or methods. Accept Ride, Meet Outdoors, Public Building, Party/Bar, and Third Person constitute the capturing the victim methods. The remaining categories are self-explanatory.

---

[25] M. AMIR, *supra* note 1, at 233.

TABLE 2
METHODS OF APPROACHING THE VICTIM

ILLEGAL ENTRY	-	Offender breaks into the residence of the victim.
KIDNAP-ATTACK	-	In an outdoor setting, offender immediately applies force to neutralize the victim.
ACCEPT RIDE	-	Offender offers victim in transit a ride or offender looks for hitchhiking victims.
MEET OUTDOORS	-	Offender encounters the victim in an outdoor setting.
PUBLIC BUILDING	-	Offender meets his victim in a public or semi-public building.
PARTY/BAR	-	The offender meets the victim at a party or in a bar.
THIRD PERSON	-	The offender meets the victim through a third person.
KNOWN	-	The offender knows the victim. Social interaction between the two is not uncommon.
UNKNOWN	-	The offender's method of approaching the victim is unknown.
OTHER	-	Catch-all category to include the low frequency methods not appropriate for any of the nine previous categories.

E. NUMBER OF SCENES

Amir's original scene typology has been recast for this study. The initial meeting place, crime scene, and after scene are still the core of the typology, but the residences of the offender and the victim are each considered a separate scene. The reason for this is to acquire a surrogate measure of geographic movement. From this new typology, a rape incident can have from one to five separate scenes. The definitions for the scene typology are displayed in Table 3. A one scene rape, in which all action occurs in one place, implies a more intimate relationship between the offender and the victim. However, rapes involving scenes two through five may involve the entire range of offender status and victim-offender relationship classifications.

TABLE 3
NUMBER OF RAPE SCENES AND DEFINITIONS

NUMBER OF SCENES	DEFINITIONS
One	Victim Residence, offender residence, initial meeting place, crime scene, and after scene—all in the same location.
Two	Victim and offender residences separate but the rest of the scenes take place in one of the residences.
Three	Victim and offender residences separate but a third assumes the role of meeting place and/or crime scene and after scene.
Four	Victim and offender residences separate but a third location is the initial meeting place and a fourth is the crime scene. The after scene can be any one of the previous locations.
Five	All scenes have separate locations.

The number of scenes involved in a rape reflects the geographic movement involved in the rape, but it does not measure the quantity of such movement or the distance traveled jointly by the victim and the offender. Calculating these measures involves the following process. First, the approximate street block addresses of the scenes are located on a map. Second, each location plotted is assigned a unique X,Y Cartesian coordinate. Third,using these coordinates, the distances between the scenes are calculated using the Pythagorean Theorem.;[26] Fourth, the distances between the scenes which involved the joint movement of the victim and offender are sorted out for analysis.

F.   TECHNIQUES

The statistical techniques utilized in this study are standards for social research. The use of classification and other nominally scaled variables dictate the use of the chi square statistic. The optimal technique for this type of research would be a log linear model; however, the number of cases in the data set suggest that this model may not be too beneficial.[27] Single factor analysis of variance is employed in this study in order to determine if the distances traveled jointly by the victim and offender are constant across different offender status categories.[28]

---

[26] For a discussion of the different methods for calculating distances using the Pythagorean theorem, see J. LOWE & S. MORYADAS, THE GEOGRAPHY OF MOVEMENT 13-24 (1975).

[27] *See* D. KNOKE & P. BURKE, LOG LINEAR MODELS (1980).

[28] For an informed discussion of this technique, see J. NETER & W. WASSERMAN, APPLIED LINEAR STATISTICAL MODELS: REGRESSION, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS 419-57 (1974).

V. RESULTS

A.   OFFENDER STATUS AND VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP

The distribution of the victim-offender relationship across the three offender status groups is displayed in Table 4. As might be

TABLE 4
VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP AND OFFENDER STATUS

VOR	OFFENDER STATUS			ROW TOTAL
	OPEN*	SINGLE	SERIAL	
Stranger	190	80	151	421
	45.1	19.0	35.9	69.2%
	96.4	33.3	88.3	
Casual Acquain.	7	61	7	75
	9.3	86.3	9.3	12.3%
	3.6	25.4	4.1	
Acquain.	0	43	10	53
	.0	81.1	18.9	8.7%
	.0	17.9	5.8	
Family Friend	0	20	1	21
	.0	95.2	4.8	3.5%
	.0	8.3	.6	
Close Friend	0	23	2	25
	.0	92.0	8.0	4.1%
	.0	9.6	1.2	
Family Relative	0	13	0	13
	.0	100.0	.0	2.1%
	.0	5.4	.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	197 32.4%	240 39.5%	171 28.1%	608 100.0%

Chi-square = 248.22; d.f. = 10; p < .000

Note: # = % of Row Total
        # = % of Column Total
   * Four cases of unknown relationships are not in the Open column.

expected the open offenders are overwhelmingly strangers to their victims, hence the open offenders tend to maximize interpersonal distance. The serial offenders tend to maximize interpersonal distance as well. But the major difference between the open and serial groups is that the latter consists of apprehended offenders. Given this situation, a major disimilarity between the groups is the fact that the series group contains many of the nonstranger relationships. While all the serial offenders preyed upon strangers, some, possibly, shortened their criminal career by assaulting nonstrangers. The sin-

gle group contains all victim-offender relationships, and strangers comprise one-third of this group. Hence a partial explanation for why the single group consists of apprehended offenders is that two-thirds of the rapists assaulted nonstrangers.

B.   RELATIONSHIPS, METHODS OF APPROACH, AND OFFENDER STATUS

1.   *The Open Offenders*

The proclivity of the open offender to maximize interpersonal distance with his victim is reinforced by the methods of approach used by this group. Over 75% of the open rapes were committed with the blitz methods of "illegal entry of residence" and "kidnap attack" (Table 5). One-half of all open rapes were the result of the illegal entry of residence method. As indicated by the methods utilized, the open rapists tended to control or limit their interaction with the victim.

2.   *The Single Offenders*

The portrait of the single offenders' methods (Table 6) represent a stark contrast to that of the open offenders. The variety of methods employed by this group is, in part, a reflection of the relationship between the participants. For example, the "known to victim" method is the most frequent method used by single offenders. At the other extreme, a little over 20% of the single rapes were committed by strangers using the blitz methods. The blitz methods represent 26.6% of all methods, but two capturing the victim methods, "accept ride hitchhike" and "meet party/bar," exceed this proportion when combined (27.5%). Except for the strangers, the offenders involved in less intimate relationships of casual acquaintance and acquaintances preferred to use the "capturing the victim" methods rather than the blitz methods. It is very safe to assume that the casual acquaintances started out being strangers to their victims; their methods of approach, however, detracted from the maximization of interpersonal distance.

3.   *The Serial Offenders*

As previously discussed, a very striking similarity between open and serial offenders is that both sets of offenders are overwhelmingly strangers to their victims. Another similarity is that the serial offenders, like the open offenders, indicate a strong preference for the blitz methods of "illegal entry of residence" and "kidnap attack" (77.3%)(compare Tables 5 and 7). The only difference between the

TABLE 5
OPEN/UNKNOWN OFFENDERS: METHOD OF APPROACH AND VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP 1971 - 1975

METHOD OF APPROACH	VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP						
	STRANGER	CASUAL ACQUAIN.	ACQUAIN.	FAMILY FRIEND	CLOSE FRIEND	FAMILY	TOTAL
Illegal Entry	102 (50.7)						102 (50.7)
Kidnap-Attack	51 (25.3)						51 (25.3)
Meet Outdoors	8 (3.9)	2 (.9)					10 (4.9)
Accept Ride-Hitchhike	19 (9.5)	1 (.5)					20 (10.0)
Public	8 (3.9)						8 (3.9)
Meet Party Bar		3 (1.5)					3 (1.5)
Third Person							
Known to Victim							
Unknown	1 (.5)						1 (.5)
Other	1 (.5)	1 (.5)					2 (1.0)
Total	190 (94.5)	7 (3.5)					201[1]

[1] Total includes four events of unknown relationship and unknown method
Note: $X^2 = 309.62$; $P < .001$; Contingency coefficient = .77946; Expected cell frequency less than 5; ( ) = Proportion of all Open rapes.

two groups, as previously noted, is that the serial offenders are not always strangers to their victims.

C.   OFFENDER STATUS AND NUMBER OF SCENES

Table 8 depicts the offender status groups and the number of scenes involved in the rape. For each group, the two scene rape is the predominant form, but this situation is only marginal for the single offenders. The single group group contains more rapes involving three, four, and five scenes than does the open or serial group. Initially, the proposition that more scenes lead to more apprehensions is verified with the single offenders. By comparing the open and serial offenders, it is apparent that apprehended serial of-

TABLE 6
SINGLE OFFENDERS: METHOD OF APPROACH AND VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP 1971 - 1975

METHOD OF APPROACH	VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP						
	STRANGER	CASUAL ACQUAIN.	ACQUAIN.	FAMILY FRIEND	CLOSE FRIEND	FAMILY	TOTAL
Illegal Entry	21 (8.8)	2 (.8)	8 (3.3)				31 (12.9)
Kidnap-Attack	29 (12.0)	1 (.4)	1 (.4)	2 (.8)			33 (13.7)
Meet Outdoors	7 (2.9)	6 (2.5)	1 (.4)	1 (.4)	1 (.4)		16 (6.7)
Accept Ride-Hitchhike	13 (5.4)	17 (7.1)	2 (.8)				32 (13.3)
Public Building	5 (2.1)	7 (2.9)	4 (1.7)			1 (.4)	17 (7.1)
Meet Party Bar	2 (.8)	19 (7.9)	11 (4.6)		2 (.8)		34 (14.2)
Third Person		2 (.8)	4 (1.7)	2 (.8)			8 (3.3)
Known to Victim				14 (5.8)	16 (6.7)	12 (5.0)	42 (17.5)
Unknown							
Other	3 (1.2)	7 (2.9)	12 (5.0)	1 (.4)	4 (1.7)		27 (11.2)
Total	80 (33.3)	61 (25.4)	43 (17.9)	20 (8.3)	23 (9.6)	13 (5.4)	240

Note: $X^2 = 242.82$; $P < .001$; Contingency Coefficient $= .70917$; Expected cell frequency less than 5; ( ) = Proportion of all Single rapes.

fenders are less likely to have engaged in multiple scene rapes than the open offenders. About 81.7% of the serial rapes involve two or three scenes, compared to 75.1% of the rapes committed by open offenders. In turn, the open offenders are numerically and proportionally more likely than are the serial offenders to engage in the mobile four and five scene rapes (Table 8). From these data, two points require further clarification: how many offenders actually move their victims and the quantity or distance of such movement.

D. MOVING THE VICTIM: OFFENDER STATUS AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTANCE

Table 9 depicts the number of incidents, across the offender status groups, that involve the joint movement of the victim and of-

TABLE 7
SERIAL OFFENDERS: METHOD OF APPROACH AND VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP 1971 - 1975

METHOD OF APPROACH	VICTIM—OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP						
	STRANGER	CASUAL ACQUAIN.	ACQUAIN.	FAMILY FRIEND	CLOSE FRIEND	FAMILY	TOTAL
Illegal Entry	90 (52.6)		1 (.6)		4 (2.3)		95 (55.6)
Kidnap-Attack	36 (21.1)		1 (.6)				37 (21.7)
Meet Outdoors	8 (4.7)	3 (1.8)		1 (.6)			12 (7.0)
Accept Ride-Hitchhike	9 (5.3)	3 (1.8)			1 (.6)		13 (7.6)
Public Building	7 (4.1)		1 (.6)				8 (4.7)
Meet Party Bar			1 (.6)				1 (.6)
Third Person			2 (1.2)				2 (1.2)
Known to Victim					1 (.6)		1 (.6)
Unknown	.						
Other	1 (.6)		1 (.6)				2 (1.2)
Total	151 (88.3)	7 (4.1)	10 (5.8)	1 (.6)	2 (1.2)		171

Note: X^2 = 150.78; P < .001; Contingency Coefficient = .68454; Expected cell frequency less than 5; ( ) = Proportion of all Series rapes.

fender. Single offenders are more likely to engage in assaults where the victim travels with the offender to a different scene or scenes. This generalization holds true for the single stranger offenders as well, with one-half of them moving their victims. And, as implied from the examination of the number of scenes in each offender status, the open offenders are more likely, numerically and proportionally, to move their victims than is the serial offender, although the differences between the two are slight.

An examination of the average distances traveled jointly by the victim and the offender provides important and interesting contrasts among the offender groups (Table 10). The open and single offenders represent extremes. The former group travels the shortest distances with their victims, while the latter group travels the long-

TABLE 8
OFFENDER STATUS AND NUMBER OF SCENES

	NUMBER OF SCENES				
OFFENDER STATUS	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Open Offenders	110 (54.7)	41 (20.4)	33 (16.4)	17 (8.5)	201
Single Offenders	81 (34.8)	73 (31.3)	51 (21.9)	28 (12.0)	233
Serial Offenders	97 (56.7)	43 (25.1)	22 (12.9)	9 (5.3)	171
Total	288	157	106	54	605

Chi-square = 28.13; Significance = .0001; ( ) = % of row total

Note: Seven cases of one scene — single rape are excluded

est. When both groups are strangers or when interpersonal distance between the participants is maximized, the open offenders tend to minimize geographic distance while the single offenders

TABLE 9
OFFENDER STATUS AND JOINT VICTIM — OFFENDER MOVEMENT

	OPEN	SINGLE	SERIAL
Number of Incidents	201	233	171
Number Joint Movement	56	119	43
Percent Joint Movement	27.8	51.0	25.1
Number of Stranger Incidents	190	80	151
Number Joint Movement	50	40	34
Percent Joint Movement	26.3	50.0	22.5

Note: Seven cases of one scene-single rape are excluded

tend to maximize geographic distance. This generalization is appropriate for comparing the serial offenders with the single offenders as well.

Statistically, the open and serial distances are homogeneous; there is no difference between the groups. In fact, restricting the analysis to only the stranger assaults increases the average open distance and decreases the average serial distance, thereby enhancing

this homogeneity. Moving the victim, therefore, is an example of another behavior shared by the open and serial offenders.

TABLE 10
AVERAGE DISTANCE OF JOINT VICTIM AND OFFENDER MOVEMENT (MILES)

OFFENDER STATUS	VICTIM — OFFENDER RELATIONSHIPS		
	ALL RELATIONSHIPS	STRANGERS & ACQUAINTANCES	STRANGERS ONLY
Open	.79 mi. (56)	.74 mi. (55)	.84 mi. (50)
Single	2.13 mi. (119)	2.12 mi. (102)	2.34 mi. (40)
Serial	1.30 mi. (43)	1.34 mi. (41)	1.00 mi. (34)
Total	1.50 mi. (218)	1.47 mi. (198)	1.23 mi. (124)

Note: (#) = n

Anova (All Relationships) distance by offender status: d.f. (2,215); F = 5.69; Significance = .0039. Significant pairwise group comparisons Scheffe (.05): Serial & Open vs Single.

Anova (Strangers & Acquaintances) distance by offender status: d.f. (2,195); F = 6.52; Significance = .0018. Significant pairwise group comparisons Scheffe (.05): Serial & Open vs Single.

Anova (Strangers Only) distance by offender status: d.f. (2,121); F = 3.73; Significance = .0266. Significant pairwise group comparisons Scheffe (.05): Serial & Open vs Single.

Although few conspicuous differences exist between the open and serial offenders, both groups contrast greatly with the single offenders. However, a distinctive feature of chronic serial offenders, found previously by LeBeau, is the tendency to restrict their attacks to a small geographic area.[29] Table 11 displays the measures of spatial patterning by chronic serial offenders.

Two distance measures appear in Table 11. The first is the mean distance from the offender's residence to the crime scene. The average distances from the residences to the crime scenes range from .3 miles to almost 30 miles.[30] These figures reflect no consistency in the travel distances among the serial offenders. The mean

[29] *See* LeBeau, *Measuring and Describing Rape, supra* note 6, at 397.

[30] In some instances, it would be erroneous to assume that the offender left his residence and went immediately to the initial meeting place or crime scene. It is possible the offender's journey began at his work place or some other nonresidential setting. The residence location, however, is used for two major reasons: the location of the offender prior to the rape is very difficult to retrieve from documents, and research on the daily movement patterns of individuals indicates that the residence is the ultimate

distances between crime scenes present a more homogeneous picture. These distances range from .12 miles to .85 miles with a group average of .37 miles. On the average, therefore, the chronic serial offender will restrict his attacks to within one-half of a mile from his previous attacks.

All but two of the eighty-nine assaults listed in Table 11 were committed between strangers, and all but six of the assaults involved the blitz methods. Therefore, the potential information source that led to the apprehension of these individuals was that the offenders patterned themselves geographically and thus indicated where they were going to attack or concentrate their activities.

TABLE 11
DISTANCE MEASURES OF CHRONIC SERIAL OFFENDERS

YEAR	NUMBER OF ASSAULTS	MEAN DISTANCE TO CRIME SCENE (MILES)	MEAN DISTANCE BETWEEN CRIME SCENES (MILES)
1971	5	2.06	.81
1971	8	15.74	.34
1971	11	.69	.21
1971	6	29.97	.34
1972	7	.32	.14
1973	6	9.00	.23
1974	14	.30	.12
1974	5	1.65	.51
1974	5	13.02	.23
1975	8	.75	.27
1975	14	2.47	.85

[1] This is the average distance from the offender's residence to the crime scene

VI.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

From this analysis, it is quite obvious that strangers dominate the different offender status groups. As might be expected, however,the open and serial groups are almost the exclusive domains of stranger rapists. Assessing the factors that lead to apprehension must begin with a review and contrast of the behaviors of the open and single offenders.

The open offenders remain at large because they do not execute their assaults in ways that produce tangible information about their identities or make their behaviors predictable. They maximize interpersonal distance by overwhelmingly being strangers to their victims. They are able to maintain this distance by employing pre-

origin and destination of all trips and that the location of the residence serves as an anchor of one's daily travels. *See* J. LOWE & S. MORYADAS, *supra* note 26, at 140.

dominately the blitz methods and by not interacting with their victims before the assault. If the open offenders move their victims, they do so for shorter distances than the single offenders.

With the single offenders, the sources of tangible information are the more intimate relationships involved. There are, however, indications that the employment of the capturing the victim methods can reduce the anonymous relationship between the participants. The single offenders have a strong tendency to move their victims. Moreover, half the stranger single offenders move their victims for much greater distances than do the open strangers or the serial strangers. This maximization of spatial distance is a potential source of tangible information that leads to an apprehension. Other factors, such as witnesses and other evidence, are responsible for explaining the apprehension of single stranger blitz rapists who do not move their victims.

The serial rapists are an anomaly. On the surface, this group appears similar to the open group. They are predominately strangers who employ the blitz methods, and they do not move their victims for long distances. In spite of the fact that this group maximizes interpersonal distance and minimizes spatial distance, the offenders are still apprehended. There are two sources of tangible information that lead to the apprehension of the serial offender. The first and most obvious source is the tendency of the chronic offenders to use the same space repeatedly so as to pattern themselves geographically. The second source of information is that, while some of the serial offenders will behave like open offenders and attack only strangers, there is a tendency for some serial offenders in subsequent attacks, to prey on nonstrangers and, therefore, to behave like single offenders.

There are many other factors, variables, and circumstances that lead to the apprehension of an offender. This Article suggests that the way a person commits his offenses has some influence on whether he remains at large or is apprehended. Future research should combine personal characteristics of the offender with measures of how he commits his offense. The research question should focus on determining if the socio-economic, demographic, and motivational background of an offender influences how he commits his offense.