

## ☒ SITUATIONAL ASPECTS OF SEXUAL OFFENDING: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENCE RESTRICTION LAWS

Nicole Colombino

Cynthia Calkins Mercado

Elizabeth L. Jeglic

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

### ☒ Abstract

Residence restriction laws, which aim to restrict known sex offenders from residing near child-dense community structures, appear, in part, to be based on the assumption that sex offenders are likely to seek out their victims in public places where children congregate. The current study examined the locations where offenders first came into contact with their victims and the locations where offenders perpetrated offenses. Archival case files ( $N = 405$ ) of adult male sex offenders were analyzed to determine the frequency with which sex offenders met their victims and offended in public, semi-public, or private locations. Descriptive analyses revealed that 76.5% of the sex offenders in this sample *met* their victims in private locations, while 7.7% *met* their victims in semi-public settings, and 15.8% *met* their victims in public settings. Similarly, 82.2% of index offenses *took place in* private locations, while 10.9% and 6.9% occurred in semi-public and public locations, respectively. Given that a minority of offenses occur in public settings, sex offender-specific legislation that restricts offender access to child-dense places may be most effective if tailored narrowly to offender subtypes most likely to seek out victims in public places.

---

*This research was supported by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ 2007-IJ-CX-0037). The authors wish to thank the New Jersey Department of Corrections for its support in providing access to offender records. The views expressed herein are not necessarily those of the New Jersey Department of Corrections or the National Institute of Justice.*

Growing concern about the management of known sex offenders in the community has led to a number of sex offender-specific policy measures, including legislation that aims to keep sex offenders a prescribed distance away from areas frequented by children. Residence restriction laws, which restrict where sex offenders may live, have increasingly been implemented on state and local levels (Nieto & Jung, 2006). Despite the proliferation of residence restriction statutes, there is a lack of research examining whether these policies are effective in preventing or reducing recidivism (Levenson & D'Amora, 2007), though numerous studies have examined the collateral consequences of these laws (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson, 2008; Tewksbury, 2005, 2007). No study has yet examined, however, the frequency with which sexual offenses occur in the particular locations that are statutorily defined as off limits for sex offenders under residence restriction policies.

### ☒ Residence Restrictions

Currently more than 30 states, as well as many local municipalities, have implemented residence restriction laws that prohibit individuals convicted of certain statutorily defined sex crimes (e.g., child molestation, rape, exhibitionism) from residing within a specified distance from places where children congregate (e.g., day cares, schools, parks, bus stops) (Durling, 2006; Meloy, Miller, & Curtis, 2008; Nieto & Jung, 2006). Despite these restrictions, some research suggests that residence location may have little, if any, role in sex offender recidivism. The Colorado Department of Public Safety (2004), who examined the proximity of sex offender residences to schools and day care centers, concluded that sexual offenders who had recidivated appeared to be “randomly located” throughout the area studied rather than being clustered near child-dense facilities (p.30). Similarly, the Minnesota Department of Corrections (2003) found that residential proximity to places where children congregate did not appear to play a part in sexual reoffense, suggesting that residential proximity may not be a salient risk factor for sexual recidivism.

In addition, there appears to be unintended collateral consequences associated with residence restrictions that could serve to increase, rather than decrease, likelihood of recidivism. For instance, many sex offenders who are subject to residence restriction laws report difficulty in finding housing (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Tewksbury, 2005, 2007). Studies that have used geospatial analyses to examine the impact that residence restrictions have on housing availability substantiate these offender self-reports. For example, Chajewski and Mercado (2008) found that only 7% of land space would remain available for sex offenders were a 2,500-foot ordinance passed in Newark, New Jersey. Similarly, Zandbergen and Hart (2006) found 95% of residential dwellings to be located within 1,000 feet of commonly defined exclusion zones, and Zgoba, Levenson, and McKee (2009) found that 88% of sex offenders

live within 2,500 feet of residence restriction “hot spots” (e.g., schools, parks, churches, or day care centers). Though residence restriction laws may especially limit housing availability in more urban areas (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009), examinations of the impact of residence restrictions across varied types of jurisdictions consistently demonstrate that these policies substantially diminish housing availability (Zgoba et al., 2009).

In addition to limiting housing availability, some research suggests that residence restrictions negatively affect sex offenders’ ability to access treatment or other social services, which is of significant concern, as these supports are generally considered essential for successful community reintegration (Levenson, 2008). Similarly, sex offenders affected by residence restrictions report difficulty finding employment, as well as difficulty maintaining supportive family and social networks (Levenson, 2008; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mercado et al., 2008). Given that social isolation and interpersonal difficulties appear to play a role in sexual recidivism (Hanson & Harris, 1998), some have suggested that residence restriction laws may have the paradoxical effect of increasing risk of future sex crimes (Levenson & D’Amora, 2007).

### ☒ Assumptions Underlying Sex Offender-Specific Legislation

The extent to which residence restriction policies are effective in reducing recidivism may be contingent upon the extent to which geography plays a role in offending patterns. Laws that geographically restrict sex offenders appear to be based, in part, on several assumptions regarding the behavior of sexual offenders, including the assumption that sex offenders are likely to seek out victims in public locations. Research suggests, however, that sex offenders who perpetrate offenses against children tend to know their victims (Smallbone & Wortley, 2000; Snyder, 2000). According to Snyder (2000), over a quarter (26.7%) of all sex offenders have a familial relationship with their victims and more than half (59.6%) are acquaintances of the victim, while only 13.8% victimize strangers. Similarly, the Minnesota Department of Corrections (2007) found that 79% of the sex offenders examined had victimized someone they knew. Further, some evidence suggests that sex offenders tend to locate and offend against their victims in private settings. Forty percent (40%) of the convicted child molesters in Smallbone and Wortley’s (2000) sample met their victims in a friend’s home, for example, whereas only 10.3% of offenders met their victims at a park. In addition, the majority of the sex offenses in Smallbone and Wortley’s (2000) sample took place in private settings, with 68.9% of offenses occurring in the offender’s home, while a minority of offenses (9.5%) took place in a park (Smallbone & Wortley, 2000). Similarly, the Minnesota Department of Corrections (2007) found that 85% of the sex crimes they examined took place in private locations, namely residential locations (e.g., offender’s home). Further, in an examination of 330 sex offenders in Florida,

Zandbergen, Levenson, and Hart (in press) found that recidivists did not live closer to schools and day cares than non-recidivists, suggesting that residential location is not a prominent factor in recidivism.

An additional assumption that may underlie residence restrictions and other forms of sex offender legislation is that situational patterns of offending are consistent across offender type. Craissati and Beech (2004) found, however, that rapists were more likely to offend in outdoor settings (71%) than were child molesters (22%), and while ample research has demonstrated that rapists tend to commit crimes within close proximity of their homes (Beauregard, Proulx, & Rossmo, 2005; Santtila, Laukkanen, Zappala, & Bosco, 2008; Santtila, Zappala, Laukkanen, & Picozzi, 2003; Warren, Reboussin, Hazelwood, Cummings, Gibbs, & Trumbetta, 1998), few studies have directly examined where other types of sex offenders (e.g., child molesters) are likely to commit offenses (Duwe, Donnay, & Tewksbury, 2008; Smallbone & Wortley, 2000). Sex offenders may vary with regard to where they locate victims and select offense locations, suggesting geographical restrictions could be more suitable for offenders who commit particular forms of offenses.

### ☒ The Present Study: Situational Aspects of Sexual Offending

While previous research has assessed the geographical application of residence restriction laws (e.g., Barnes, Dukes, Tewksbury, & DeTroye, 2009; Chajewski & Mercado, 2008; 2009; Zgoba et al., 2009), the collateral consequences of sex offender legislation (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Tewksbury, 2005, 2007), and the importance of victim-offender relationship in sex offenses (Bagley & Pritchard, 2000; Smallbone & Wortley, 2000; Snyder, 2000), few studies have specifically examined the locations where sex offenses occur (Beauregard et al., 2005; Craissati & Beech, 2004; Duwe et al., 2008; Smallbone & Wortley, 2000) and where sex offenders first come into contact with their victims (Duwe et al., 2008; Smallbone & Wortley, 2000). Although the assumption that schools and other child-dense community areas create opportunity structures for offenders to commit their offenses may lie at the foundation of residence restriction laws, it is not clear whether these policy measures are consistent with the empirical data regarding sex offending patterns. Tewksbury and Mustaine (2006) note that successful management of sex offenders in the community requires an understanding of “where sex offenders commit offenses” (p.62). Thus, the current study aims to address assumptions underlying sex offender legislation by examining the locations (1) where sex offenders first *meet* their victims, and (2) the locations where sex offenses *occur*. Further examination of whether victim-offender relationship relates to offense location patterns will also be conducted. There has been no direct examination

addressing the assumption of consistency across offender types in regard to perpetration patterns; therefore, this study will further examine whether there are differences between sex offenders who perpetrate offenses against children and those who perpetrate offenses against adults with regard to the location of their sex crimes.

## ☒ Method

### *Participants*

Data pertaining to offense locations was extracted from the archival records of a convenience sample of 405 adult male sex offenders, all of whom were released from prison between the years 1996 and 2006. The offenders ranged in age from 14 to 71 years ( $M = 32.76$ ,  $SD = 11.25$ ) and were African American (43.2%;  $n = 175$ ), white (33.6%;  $n = 136$ ), Latino (22.5%;  $n = 91$ ), or of other/unknown race or ethnicity (0.7%;  $n = 3$ ). Sex offenders were categorized based upon the nature of the index offense, with child molesters ( $n = 293$ , 72.3%) defined as those who have been convicted of sexually victimizing a minor (defined as a person under 17 years old) and adult sexual assault offenders ( $n = 112$ , 27.7%) defined as those who have been convicted of sexually victimizing an adult.

### *Procedure*

Files were obtained from the archives of a correctional facility through a non-random selection technique that included sampling based upon date of release from the prison facility. These records were the initial files coded as part of a larger research project examining more than 3,000 sex offenders in New Jersey. Files, reviewed by a team of trained graduate assistants, typically included a record of criminal history (i.e., “rap sheets”), index offense police reports, psychiatric reports, prison records, and intake and termination reports. The data collection tool included items pertaining to demographics and elements of the index offense, such as victim-offender relationship and location of crime events. The situational aspects of the index offense were coded as occurring in a “public,” “semi-public,” or a “private” location. *Public* locations were operationally defined to include schools, bus stops, parks, day care centers, playgrounds, or, in other words, places often included in the statutory language of residence restriction laws. Movie theaters, restaurants or bars, and parking lots were also considered to be public locations. *Semi-public* locations were considered to be areas other than a private home that offer a degree of privacy, such as a motor vehicle, hotel room, or house party (occurring in a location other than the offender’s or victim’s home). *Private* locations were operationally defined as either the offender’s or victim’s own home, a home shared by the offender and the victim, a home of a relative or acquaintance of the offender or the victim, or a home of some other person. Notably, the location where the offender first met the victim was defined as the location where the

victim and offender first came into contact, whereas the location where the crime was perpetrated was defined as the location where the sex crime occurred. For example, if the offender abducted his victim from a school and brought the victim to his home, this was coded as the offender having met the victim in a public location (school) and the offense occurring in a private location (offender's home). Further, the victim-offender relationship was coded as the offender being a family member (e.g., biological relationship, step-relationship, spouse), an acquaintance (i.e., offender had a relationship with the victim prior to the offense, such as a friend of the family), or a stranger to the victim (i.e., the offender knew his victim for less than 24 hours).

## ☒ Results

### *Where Offenders Met Victims*

Of the 405 offenses examined in the current study, over three quarters of the offenders ( $n = 310$ ; 76.5%) met their victims in private locations. Some ( $n = 64$ ; 15.8%) of the offenders met their victims in public locations, while a minority of the offenders ( $n = 31$ ; 7.7%) met their victims in semi-public locations. Only 6.8% of offenders first met their victim in a location often defined in residence restriction legislation (see Table 1).

### *Where Offenses Occurred*

Less than 20% of all offenses took place in public ( $n = 28$ ; 6.9%) or semi-public ( $n = 44$ ; 10.9%) locations, while over four fifths ( $n = 333$ ; 82.2%) of the offenses occurred in private settings (see Table 2). In fact, 78.3% ( $n = 317$ ) of all offenses occurred in the home of the offender, the home of the victim, or a home shared by the offender and the victim.

### *Victim-Offender Relationship by Location Where Offenders Perpetrated Offenses*

More than half of the offenders were acquaintances ( $n = 211$ ; 52.1%) of their victims, while just under 40% ( $n = 157$ ; 38.8%) of the sex offenders in this sample were family members of the victim. Relatively few ( $n = 37$ ; 9.1%) of the offenders in this sample were unknown to the victim prior to the offense. When victim-offender relationships were examined, chi-square analyses revealed significant differences among groups with regard to the location where the offenses were perpetrated ( $\chi^2 [4, N = 405] = 94.818, p < .001$ ). Post hoc analyses revealed that individuals who perpetrated offenses against strangers were more likely to offend in public and semi-public locations than those who perpetrated offenses against family members (see Table 3).

Table 1

Location of First Contact Between Offender and Victim ( $N = 248$ )

Location	<i>N</i>	%
<b>Private</b>		
Victim's home	72	29.0%
Offender's home	44	17.7
Home of an acquaintance or relative of the offender or victim	25	10.1
Home of offender and victim <sup>a</sup>	12	4.8
<b>Semi-Public</b>		
Workplace	7	2.8
House party at a home other than victim or offender	7	2.8
Residential common area <sup>b</sup>	6	2.4
Hospital	3	1.2
Hotel	3	1.2
Abandoned building	2	0.8
Juvenile facility	2	0.8
Offender's vehicle	1	0.4
<b>Public</b>		
Street / Neighborhood	30	12.1
School	9	3.6
Bar / Restaurant	6	2.4
Park	5	2.0
Gas station / Convenience store	4	1.6
Church	2	0.8
Movie theater	2	0.8
Skating rink	1	0.4
Camp	1	0.4
Youth organization	1	0.4
Carnival	1	0.4
Bus stop	1	0.4
Boardwalk	1	0.4

*Note.* This table excludes intra-familial offenses, since the offender and victim inherently first met within the family home ( $n = 157$ ).

<sup>a</sup> The victim and offender lived together in the same residence (excludes biological relationships).

<sup>b</sup> Area shared by a group of people in a residential community (i.e., common area in an apartment building or college dormitory).

Table 2

Location Where Sex Offenders Perpetrated Offense ( $N = 405$ )

Location	N	%
<b>Private</b>		
Home of both the offender and victim <sup>a</sup>	121	29.9 %
Offender's home	108	26.7
Victim's home	88	21.7
Home of an acquaintance or relative of the victim or the offender	16	4.0
<b>Semi-Public</b>		
Offender's vehicle	16	4.0
Hotel	9	2.2
Abandoned building	4	1.0
Workplace	4	1.0
Apartment building	3	0.7
House party at a home other than victim or offender	3	0.7
Hospital	3	0.7
Juvenile facility	2	0.5
<b>Public</b>		
Street	8	2.0
Park / Playground	5	1.2
School	4	1.0
Bar / Restaurant	2	0.5
Gas station / Convenience Store	2	0.5
Woods	1	0.2
At a lake	1	0.2
Parking lot	1	0.2
Camp	1	0.2
Carnival	1	0.2
Movie theater	1	0.2
Boardwalk	1	0.2

<sup>a</sup> The victim and the offender live together in the same residence.

### *Where Offenders Met Victims by Offender Type*

Significant differences were found among offender groups with regard to where offenders met their victims ( $\chi^2 [2, N = 405] = 21.420, p < .001$ ). Post hoc analyses revealed that offenders who perpetrated offenses against adults were significantly more likely to meet their victims in semi-public locations ( $n = 19$ ; 17.0%) than

☒ Table 3

Location Where Sex Offenders Perpetrated Offenses by Victim-Offender Relationship

Location	Victim-Offender Relationship		
	Family Member <sup>a</sup> ( <i>n</i> = 157)	Acquaintance ( <i>n</i> = 211)	Stranger ( <i>n</i> = 37)
Public	2 (1.3%) <sup>b</sup>	13 (6.2%)	13 (35.1%) <sup>b</sup>
Semi-Public	5 (3.2%) <sup>b</sup>	26 (12.3%)	13 (35.1%) <sup>b</sup>
Private	150 (95.5%)	172 (81.5%)	11 (29.7%) <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Family members included immediate, extended, and step-family. Chi-square analyses revealed statistical significance among offender groups with regard to location where offenders perpetrated offenses and the victim-offender relationship ( $\chi^2 [4, N = 405] = 94.818, p < .001$ ).

<sup>b</sup> Post hoc test determined difference greater than expected at  $< .05$  significance level.

☒ Table 4

Location Where Sex Offenders Met Their Victims by Offender Type

Location	Type of Offender <sup>a</sup>			
	Child Molester <i>n</i> = 293		Adult Sex Assaulter <i>n</i> = 112	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Public	43	14.7 %	21	18.8 %
Semi-Public	12	4.1	19	17.0 <sup>b</sup>
Private	238	81.2	72	64.3

<sup>a</sup> Type of offender was determined by the nature of the index offense. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences among offender groups with regard to where offenders met their victims ( $\chi^2 [2, N = 405] = 21.420, p < .05$ ).

<sup>b</sup> Post hoc test determined difference greater than expected at  $< .001$  significance level.

were those who offended against children ( $n = 12$ ; 4.1%; see Table 4). More than three quarters of those who perpetrated offenses against children met their victims in private locations ( $n = 238$ ; 81.2%), while a lesser 64.3% ( $n = 72$ ) of those who perpetrated an index offense against an adult met their victims in private locations. Lastly, 18.8% ( $n = 21$ ) of those who perpetrated offenses against adults met their victims in public locations, while 14.7% ( $n = 43$ ) of those who offended against a child met their victims in a public location.

### *Where Offenses Occurred by Offender Type*

Differences were found between sex offenders who perpetrated offenses against adults and sex offenders who offended against children with regard to the location where the crimes occurred ( $\chi^2 [2, N = 405] = 15.446, p < .001$ ). Post hoc analyses revealed that offenders who perpetrated offenses against adults were significantly more likely to offend in semi-public locations than were those who offended against children. Indeed, 19.6% ( $n = 22$ ) of those who perpetrated offenses against adults offended in semi-public locations, whereas only 7.5% ( $n = 22$ ) of sex offenses against children occurred in semi-public locations. Nearly 9 out of 10 ( $n = 254$ ; 86.7%) child molesters offended against their victims in private settings, while 70.5% ( $n = 79$ ) of adult sexual assault offenders perpetrated their offenses in a private location. Finally, 9.8% ( $n = 11$ ) of adult sexual assault offenders offended against their victims in public locations, while 5.8% ( $n = 17$ ) of child molesters offended in public locations (see Table 5).

☒ Table 5

Location Where Sex Offense Occurred by Offender Type

Location	Type of Offender <sup>a</sup>			
	Child Molester <i>n</i> = 293		Adult Sex Assault <i>n</i> = 112	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Public	17	5.8 %	11	9.8 %
Semi-Public	22	7.5	22	19.6 <sup>b</sup>
Private	254	86.7	79	70.5

<sup>a</sup> Type of offender was determined by the nature of the index offense. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences between type of offender and location where offenses were perpetrated ( $\chi^2 [2, N = 405] = 15.446, p < .001$ ).

<sup>b</sup> Post hoc test determined difference greater than expected at <.05 significance level.

### ☒ Discussion

The present study examined the perpetration patterns of 405 adult male sex offenders to evaluate various assumptions that may underlie residence restriction legislation, namely, that sex offenders seek out their victims in public locations where children congregate. Findings suggest, however, that sex offenders do not meet or perpetrate offenses in public or semi-public locations with great frequency. Specifically, the

overwhelming majority (76.5%) of sex offenders in this sample met their victims in private settings, with fewer than 25% of offenders meeting their victims in semi-public or public locations. Results indicated that a minority (6.8%) of extra-familial offenders first came into contact with their victim in one of several locations often statutorily defined as residentially off limits for sex offenders, including schools, parks, churches, and bus stops. This pattern was similar for location where the offense took place, with 17.8% of offenses occurring in either public or semi-public locations and the majority (82.2%) of offenses occurring in private locations. Thus, these findings comport with previous research (Duwe et al., 2008; Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2007; Smallbone & Wortley, 2000) suggesting that the majority of sexual offenses occur in private locations, most typically the home of the victim or the offender.

The majority of offenders (90.9%) in this sample were family members or acquaintances of the victim, with only 9.1% of offenders being strangers or someone otherwise unknown to the victim. Consistent with prior research (Smallbone & Wortley, 2000; Snyder, 2000), these findings suggest that relational proximity plays a more significant role in offending than geographic proximity (to places where children congregate). Similarly, significant differences were found when victim-offender relationship was examined in regard to location where offenses were perpetrated. Specifically, offenders who perpetrated against strangers were significantly more likely to offend in semi-public or public locations and least likely to offend in private settings than offenders who perpetrated offenses against family members or acquaintances, suggesting that the location where sex offenders meet their victim is linked to the location where the offense is perpetrated.

The consistency in offending patterns across offender type was also examined. Although there may be differences in offending patterns for subtypes of sexual offenders (Craissati & Beech, 2004), there has yet to be a direct assessment of offense location differences between child molesters and rapists. The present study suggests that offenders who perpetrate offenses against adults are more likely to first come into contact with their victim and perpetrate offenses in semi-public (e.g., apartment building, hotel) and public locations than are those who offend against children, suggesting that restricting known offenders from loitering or residing near particular sorts of public spaces may be a more suitable strategy for reducing the risk among those who perpetrate offenses against adults, rather than those who perpetrate offenses against children.

### *Limitations*

Despite the importance of these findings in adding to our understanding of assumptions that may underlie sex offender-specific legislation, several limitations should be noted. Although the authors sought to define location types in accordance with specific statutorily defined settings often included in residence restriction laws, some subjectivity in coding remained. While places such as bus stops, schools,

parks, and day cares are clearly public locations, our operationalization of public, semi-public, and private locations did not always accurately portray offense details. For example, while an offense occurring in a vehicle may be very public in certain circumstances, it may be more aptly described as private in other offense circumstances. For the purposes of this study, however, we consistently identified specific settings as public, semi-public, or private (e.g., always coding a vehicle as semi-public). Moreover, only a minority of the offenses examined in this study ( $n = 34$ , 8.4%) involved a recidivistic sexual offense. Although there is little reason to suggest that recidivistic sexual offense patterns are different from initial sexual offense patterns, this question has not yet been empirically examined.

### *Policy Implications*

Though the current study may be important to the evaluation of a number of sex offender-specific policies (such as GPS monitoring and community notification), these findings have the most direct implications for sex offender residence restrictions. Because the majority of the offenders in this sample met their victims in private settings, committed their offenses in private locations, and knew their victims prior to the offense, the data demonstrate that most sexual offenses, and particularly child sexual offenses, stem from social rather than geographic proximity (Duwe et al., 2008). It should be noted that upon closer examination to case details, cases operationally defined as public often did not involve predatory “stranger danger” type offenses, but more typically involved offenders who groomed their victims over extended periods of time and who had reason (e.g., through their employment) to be at the school or other public location. Given that most sex crimes take place in private settings perpetrated against victims who have a relationship with the offender, policy measures that aim to prevent sexual victimization in the home may have broader utility than legislative aims that restrict offenders from public places where children congregate.

As noted, prior research suggests that residence restriction laws may destabilize offenders (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson & Hern, 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Tewksbury, 2005, 2007) and inadvertently increase risk for sexual recidivism (Levenson & D’Amora, 2007). Though research suggests that residence restriction legislation significantly reduces housing availability (Chajewski & Mercado, 2008, 2009; Zandbergen & Hart, 2006; Zgoba et al., 2009), little research has directly examined whether these measures are linked to lower rates of sexual recidivism. Because the goal of sex offender-specific legislation is to reduce the occurrence of sex crimes, the present findings on where sex crimes most frequently occur may assist in these prevention efforts. Similarly, given that skewed views on the reality of sexual offending may impact policy (Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, & Baker, 2007), empirical research on patterns of sexual offending may assist in public awareness or public education campaigns.

*Future Research*

While the current study examined locations of index offenses, future studies might examine the situational aspects of sexual reoffenses to explore whether, and if so, how, the perpetration patterns of sexual recidivists differ from those of non-recidivists. Similarly, future research might include an examination of non-contact offenses (e.g., exhibitionism, voyeurism), given that these crimes may occur with greater frequency in public locations and thus be more suitable for geographically based forms of sex offender legislation. Finally, it is most critical that the effectiveness of residence restrictions be empirically examined. The present study, in tandem with data on the effectiveness of legislation, would allow policymakers to make more informed decisions about how best to reduce the incidence of sexual violence.

## References

- Bagley, C., & Pritchard, C. (2000). Criminality and violence in intra- and extra-familial child sex abusers in a 2-year cohort of convicted perpetrators. *Child Abuse Review, 9*, 264–274.
- Barnes, J. C., Dukes, T., Tewksbury, R., & DeTroye, T.M. (2009). Analyzing the impact of a statewide residence restriction law on South Carolina sex offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*, 21–43.
- Beauregard, E., Proulx, J., & Rossmo, D. K. (2005). Spatial patterns of sex offenders: Theoretical, empirical, and practical issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10*, 579–603.
- Chajewski, M., & Mercado, C. C. (2008). An analysis of sex offender residence restrictions in Newark, NJ. *Sex Offender Law Report, 9*(1), 1–16.
- Chajewski, M., & Mercado, C.C. (2009). An impact evaluation of sex offender residence restrictions in rural, urban, and county-wide jurisdictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*, 44–61.
- Colorado Department of Public Safety. (2004). *Report on safety issues raised by living arrangements and location of sex offenders in the community*. Denver, CO: Sex Offender Management Board.
- Craissati, J., & Beech, A. (2004). The characteristics of a geographical sample of convicted rapists: Sexual victimization and compliance in comparison to child molesters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 371–388.
- Durling, C. (2006). Never going home: Does it make us safer? Does it make sense? Sex offenders, residence restrictions, and reforming risk management law. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 97*, 317–363.
- Duwe, G., Donnay, W., & Tewksbury, R. (2008). Does residential proximity matter? A geographic analysis of sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*, 484–504.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (1998). *Dynamic predictors of sexual recidivism* (User Report 1998-01). Ottawa, Canada: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Levenson, J. S. (2008). Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies, 21*, 153–166.

- Levenson, J. S., Brannon, Y. N., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 7, 1–25.
- Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005). The impact of sex offender residence restrictions: 1,000 feet from danger or one step from absurd? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49, 168–178.
- Levenson, J. S., & D'Amora, D. (2007). Social policies designed to prevent sexual violence: The emperor's new clothes? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 18, 168–199.
- Levenson, J. S., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Sex offender residence restrictions: Unintended consequences and community reentry. *Justice Research and Policy*, 9, 59–73.
- Meloy, M. L., Miller, S. L., & Curtis, K. M. (2008). Making sense out of nonsense: The deconstruction of state-level sex offender residence restrictions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 209–222.
- Mercado, C. C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. S. (2008). The impact of specialized sex offender legislation on community re-entry. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20, 188–205.
- Minnesota Department of Corrections. (2003). *Level three sex offenders' residential placement issues*. St. Paul, MN: Author.
- Minnesota Department of Corrections. (2007). *Residential proximity and sex offense recidivism in Minnesota*. St Paul, MN: Author.
- Nieto, M., & Jung, D. (2006). *The impact of residence restrictions on sex offenders and correctional management practices: A literature review*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.
- Santtila, P., Laukkanen, M., Zappala, A., & Bosco, D. (2008). Distance travelled and offence characteristics in homicide, rape, and robbery against business. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 13, 345–356.
- Santtila, P., Zappala, A., Laukkanen, M., & Picozzi, M. (2003). Testing the utility of a geographical profiling approach in three rape series of a single offender: A case study. *Forensic Science International*, 131, 42–52.
- Smallbone, S. W., & Wortley, R. K. (2000). *Child sexual abuse in Queensland: Offender characteristics and modus operandi*. Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Crime Commission.

- Snyder, H. N. (2000). *Sexual assault of young children as reported to law enforcement: Victim, incident, and offender characteristics* (A National Incident-Based Reporting System Statistical Report). Annapolis Junction, MD: Bureau of Justice Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446834)
- Tewksbury, R. (2005). Collateral consequences of sex offender registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21, 67–81.
- Tewksbury, R. (2007). Exile at home: The unintended collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 42, 531–540.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. F. (2006). Where to find sex offenders: An examination of residential locations and neighborhood conditions. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19, 61–75.
- Warren, J., Reboussin, R., Hazelwood, R. R., Cummings, A., Gibbs, N., & Trumbetta, S. (1998). Crime scene and distance correlates of serial rape. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 14, 35–59.
- Zandbergen, P. A., & Hart, T. C. (2006). Reducing housing options for convicted sex offenders: Investigating the impact of residence restriction laws using GIS. *Justice Research and Policy*, 8, 1–24
- Zandbergen, P. A., Levenson, J. S., & Hart, T. C. (in press). Residential proximity to schools and day care centers: Influence on sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*.
- Zgoba, K. M, Levenson, J. S., & McKee, T. (2009). Examining the impact of sex offender residence restrictions on housing availability. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20, 91–110.

Nicole Colombino, M.A., is a Project Manager on a National Institute of Justice-funded grant examining sex offenders in the New Jersey criminal justice system. Her research interests include sexual offending, specifically sex offender perpetration patterns and the evaluation of sex offender legislation. Further, Ms. Colombino's research interests expand to the investigation of sexual offending within homicide crime scene behaviors.

Cynthia Calkins Mercado, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of psychology at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York. Her research broadly encompasses sex offenders, risk assessment, and the evaluation of sex offender-specific legislation, including residence restrictions, community notification, and sexually violent predator (SVP) statutes. Moreover, Dr. Mercado is involved in a major study of the causes and context of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy.

Elizabeth L. Jeglic, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Her research interests include the development and evaluation of treatment programs for offending populations. She is currently the principal investigator on a National Institute of Justice-funded grant examining how placement decisions are made for sex offenders in the criminal justice system.