

TRAVEL-TO-CRIME: HOMING IN ON THE VICTIM

SARAH HODGKINSON[†] and NICK TILLEY[‡]

[†]*University of Leicester*

[‡]*Nottingham Trent University**

ABSTRACT

Environmental criminology focuses on the intersection in time and place of the offender and victim. Patterns of crime are generally explained in terms of the routine activities of the offender. His or her travel to crime distances are short and crimes are committed within the offender's 'awareness space'. It has generally been theorised that victims also have short journeys to crime, associated with their routine behaviour. This review, however, suggests that occupancy of 'unawareness space', where people are away from familiar surroundings, may confer heightened risk. This is supported in research in the special case of crime and tourism, though other travelling victim patterns have been largely ignored. This paper postulates that crime risk increases at the intersection of offender awareness and victim unawareness spaces. The 2002–3 British Crime Survey provides some suggestive evidence on this. Its analysis reveals that 26.9% of self-reported victimisation occurs more than 15 minutes away from the victim's home. For personal theft crimes over 70% of the victims were outside their immediate locality, suggesting a stronger link between victim mobility and certain types of offence. This finding is discussed in light of the literature reviewed and some implications for crime prevention are considered.

Keywords: travel-to-crime — victims — mobility — environmental — tourist crime

INTRODUCTION

There is a long history of interest in travel-to-crime patterns. This has largely focused on offenders, and in particular the distance between the crime event and their place of residence. Some of the literature makes use of Rational Choice Theory (RCT), and discusses the decisions made by offenders about where to commit their crimes. Recent study of travel-to-crime patterns has come to be strongly rooted in 'environmental criminology', spearheaded by the work of Paul and Patricia Brantingham (1978, 1981, 1985, 1991). Environmental criminology has integrated RCT models of criminal behaviour and the use of spatial and temporal information to predict the pattern of crime events (Brantingham and Brantingham, 2003). In this way it is a departure from most mainstream criminology, which focuses on legal aspects of crime or on causes of criminality. Environmental criminology, to which this paper is a

* Correspondence to Dr Sarah Hodgkinson, Dept. of Criminology, University of Leicester, The Friars, 154 Upper New Walk, Leicester, UK. LE1 7QA. Email: sf101@leicester.ac.uk. The authors would like to thank the reviewers of this article whose insightful comments we found very constructive.

contribution, stresses the importance of incorporating an understanding of the targets and locations of crime, and the selection of these by offenders.

By looking at offenders' customary movements insights can be revealed into the range of possible crime locations. Locations of criminal events are best understood as a function of people's normal actions – where they live, work and play and the routes between these (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1991). This is consistent with routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Felson, 1987) which argues that direct contact predatory crime occurs during the everyday activities of the victim and offender, and that it is only possible at the intersection in time and space of them both, in the absence of agents of control. Therefore offenders tend to commit crimes in those places where they spend most of their time and on the journeys in-between these places. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991; 2003) talk about this in terms of the offender's 'awareness space' – the space in which they spend a lot of time and with which they are therefore most familiar. More precisely offences tend to be committed in places familiar to offenders but where they are unlikely to be recognised. This means they tend to avoid acting criminally on their own doorsteps. They tend to offend in places where, whilst they know the place, they are not themselves known there.

The interest in journey to crime is by no means new. It began in the early 1930s (e.g. White, 1932), and became quite popular in the 1970s. However, with technological advances in geographic profiling it has become much easier to study the spatial dynamics of crime and determine the probability of an offender and victim coming together in a specific space and time. Inexpensive, high-power computer systems, increasingly sophisticated mapping software, and GPS systems are all facilitating spatial analysis. Crime pattern analysis using Geographical Information Systems (GIS) can now be used to determine the probability of an offender living within various areas, which has been found particularly advantageous to the police in cases of serial murder, rape and arson (Rossmo, 1995, 2000).

This paper begins by discussing the literature on offenders' travel patterns, moving on to the less extensive literature on victims' travel patterns. Because the latter are so rarely considered, the discussion then turns to the special case of tourist victimisation as an example of literature largely to be found outside mainstream criminological discourses. Following this it presents some suggestive material on victim travel patterns, using data from the 2002–3 British Crime Survey.

OFFENDER TRAVEL-TO-CRIME PATTERNS

Although situational approaches to crime prevention point out the importance of the interaction between the offender, the victim and the location, travel-to-crime research has been almost exclusively preoccupied with the offender's movement from his/her home to the crime location. There is now a substantial body of

literature relating to offender mobility patterns (largely in North America), and how these may differ dependent upon the type of criminal offence committed and the specific geographical location.

The general consensus is that offenders will more frequently commit crime in places around their own home, but the distance travelled will be related to the type and complexity of the offence committed (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1978, 1981). So typically the journey to crime for the offender is short and the further they are from home the less crime they commit. This is known as the 'distance-decay relationship' or 'distance-decay hypothesis' – most offenders commit a large number of offences a short distance from home and as the distance becomes greater the volume of crime they commit lessens (Baldwin and Bottoms, 1976; Phillips, 1980; Rand, 1984). Evidence suggests that this is a linear relationship (Turner, 1969).

There is substantial empirical evidence for the distance-decay relationship. For example, Phillips (1980) found that very few offences by juveniles were committed beyond six miles from their home, and offences were most common within two miles. Measures of the average distance travelled by the offender do, however, vary considerably dependent upon the crime type. As early as the 1930s White (1932) hypothesised that for crimes against the person the distance the offender travels will be shorter than for property crime. This is supported by studies that have compared the average distance travelled across different categories of crime within one specific geographical area (e.g. Phillips, 1980; Rand, 1986; Rhodes and Conly, 1991), and by the body of literature focusing on one particular type of offence.

Rand (1986) explored travel-to-crime patterns using the 'mobility triangle' which takes into account the offender's place of residence, the crime location, and the victim's residence. Most emphasis is placed upon the relationship between offender home and crime location. She concluded that the offender generally commits offences against the person close to their own home. This tendency was especially pronounced in cases of homicide and rape (both with 53% of crimes occurring in the same census tract to the offender's home). Rhodes and Conly (1991) found that robbers travelled furthest to commit their crimes with an average of 2.10 miles from their home to the crime location. In contrast rapists travelled the least distance; on average travelling 1.15 miles from home with almost half of recorded rapes occurring within half a mile. They concluded that more 'spontaneous' crimes such as rape tend to occur closer to home whilst those that involve more planning can take place further away.

The situational and temporal dynamics of stranger rape are well-documented (e.g. LeBeau, 1979, 1987; Painter, 1992) and there is considerable evidence that rapes occur close to the offender's home. In the US Amir (1971) used the mobility triangle approach and found that offender residence, victim residence and crime location were all within the same census tract for two thirds of rapes. More recently, Warren *et al.* (1998) found that half of 108 serial rapists committed a rape within half a mile of their home, with an average journey of

3.14 miles. LeBeau (1979, 1987, 1992) studied the individual patterns rather than average distances travelled and discovered that rapists committed rapes in familiar spaces with serial rapists returning to the same geographic area to commit their offences. Research in the UK has also found that rapists offend close to home, and in the same familiar areas. For example, Canter and Larkin's (1993) study of 45 serial rapists revealed that 91% committed their rapes within a precise circular region, and furthermore 87% of them lived within that circle. Davies and Dale (1995) similarly found that 29% of rapes occurred within one mile of the rapist's home, 51% within two miles and 76% within five miles.

Homicide is another crime against the person where the journey to crime has reportedly been found to be short and to follow the distance-decay pattern of offending (e.g. Bullock, 1955). Most attention has been paid to the relationship between place and offender in cases of serial murder within the US. Godwin and Canter (1997) concluded that serial killing is strongly related to the daily patterns and activities of the offender, and the space that they traverse whilst carrying out these activities. The victims are more likely to be people that they come across in this awareness space. Even in the disposal of the body they are likely to make use of such familiar territory. Tita and Griffiths (2005) looked at the mobility patterns of both victim and offender, finding that the amount of mobility is highly dependent upon the homicide motive.

Crimes against the person that involve strangers as victims appear to be quite opportunistic in nature, and decisions are made about where to offend (and who to victimise) as the offender goes about his or her 'normal' non-criminal life (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1981, 2003). This may be because these crimes are emotionally motivated. In contrast, property crimes are likely to be instrumentally motivated with deferred gratification, and offenders are therefore more willing to travel further if the ends justify this (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1981; Rhodes and Conly, 1991). Although property crime is still generally consistent with the distance-decay hypothesis, evidence does suggest that property offenders can obtain a greater value of goods if they are prepared to travel further afield (Pyle, 1974; Reppetto, 1974).

Estimates of the average distance travelled to commit burglary and vehicle theft vary across studies and across geographical areas (e.g. Capone and Nichols, 1976; Gabor and Gottheil, 1984; Phillips, 1980; Pyle, 1974; Reppetto, 1974; Rhodes and Conly, 1991; White, 1932) from under a mile to over three miles from the offender's home. In the UK Wiles and Costello (2000) investigated travel-to-crime patterns for burglary and car crime. Despite police concern over travelling criminals, and the increasing ease of travelling greater distances, they found that the offender travels only a short distance to crime. For cars Taken Without the Owner's Consent (TWOC) the average distance to crime was 2.36 miles, whilst for domestic burglary it was as little as 1.88 miles. Hearnden and Magill (2004) found that generally domestic burglars offend in and around their own neighbourhoods because they need to obtain money

quickly, are not able to carry heavy stolen items far, and find it advantageous to know the area in great detail.

For offenders familiarity with the crime location is obviously of importance, allowing them to optimise their chances of success. They will also have a good idea of where likely targets can be found and will know escape routes. Therefore crime location should fall within the offender's awareness space – the areas they traverse in the course of their regular work and leisure activities (Bichler-Robertson and Potchak, 2002; Brantingham and Brantingham, 2000). In this sense crime is opportunistic. Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) found that for burglars in employment their criminal activities were oriented around their place of work, whereas for those unemployed crime tended to take place around their recreational sites. Further evidence shows that when offenders do leave their own neighbourhood to commit crime, they will still go to places with which they are familiar. Wiles and Costello (2000) found that the crime site may be a place that has a close connection to their home area (such as local seaside resorts or tourist sites) and tended to be places they have previously visited. They may also choose an area that serves as a 'regional activity node' such as an entertainment district or shopping centre that becomes crimogenic – attracting or even generating crime (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995). This research has clear implications for crime prevention, as if we know an offender's awareness space we can predict the areas in which he/she is likely to commit a crime (Brantingham and Brantingham, 2003).

The literature on repeat victimisation is consistent with the finding that offenders favour familiar places. They know the risks. they know the potential benefits; they have an idea of escape routes; so they return to the same address, or one very close by (Bowers and Johnson, 2004; Everson and Pease, 2001; Farrell *et al.*, 1995).

VICTIM TRAVEL-TO-CRIME PATTERNS

There has been little theory or research relating specifically to victim travel patterns. What literature there is tends to focus on specific groups of victims away from home and the crime risks faced by them. The lack of attention is rather surprising, given the emphasis that has been placed upon the interaction between the offender, victim and location in situational crime prevention. In order for a crime to take place the offender and victim have to come together at a specific place at a specific time. Establishing the spatial patterns of victimisation is therefore of considerable significance both in understanding and in preventing crime (Brantingham and Brantingham, 2003; Wiles and Costello, 2000).

Such research findings as there are about victim travel-to-crime patterns are less consistent than those relating to offenders. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991, 2003) argue that the victim's travel-to-crime patterns will be similar to those of the offender' with victims most likely to be victimised within their awareness space, but they also point out the current limitations of knowledge in

this area. There is mixed empirical support for the Brantinghams' view. For example, Amir (1971) found that in two thirds of cases both the rapist and the rape victim lived within the same census tract as the crime location. Tita and Griffiths (2005) explored evidence of total mobility patterns in homicide cases (where both the victim and offender travel outside of their area of residence to the crime location), and found it more common for the offender to travel and the victim to be killed in or around their home. Rand (1986), however, found that in 45% of crimes the victim and offender came from outside the crime location area. Wiles and Costello (2000) found that generally the victim travels further than the offender to the crime location. They focused on crime occurring at a large out-of-town shopping centre, finding that although the offenders were local the victims were not. They argue that in such a location the people there will be a mixture of locals and non-locals, but the selected victims are more likely to be non-locals. This, they suggest, may be because non-locals are more likely to travel with larger amounts of money and more valuables.

In addition to the small volume of general work on victim travel-to-crime patterns, there are suggestive findings from other literature on specific victim groups. The most significant of this deals with crimes against tourists.

CRIMES AGAINST TOURISTS

The literature on tourism and crime suggests that there is a heightened risk of victimisation risk for those away from home, which is somewhat at odds with the speculations concerning victims' short travel-to-crime patterns (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1991, 2003).

Ryan (1993) suggested that there are five possible types of relationship between tourism and crime; (1) that the victim being a tourist is incidental; (2) that the offender chooses a tourist site but not necessarily a tourist as the victim; (3) that the offender chooses tourists because they are easy victims; (4) that crime arises in tourist areas to fulfil a demand of the tourist (e.g. prostitution and drug markets); and (5) some crimes are organised specific attacks on tourists to make a political statement (e.g. terrorism). He concludes that tourism is often the 'provider of victims'. Tourists comprise suitable victims to be targeted. Incidental victimisation of tourists occurs only when a tourist site is newly established. As it matures, criminal activity in this area, and the targeting of victims, becomes more purposeful, and tourists come to be selected as targets because of their specific suitability. This is consistent with a study by Florida Corrections Division (1974) which found that the tourist is typically the prey of offenders. The offender tends to be a resident and the tourist a victim. The tourist victim travels; the offender is on home turf.

There is further evidence to suggest that the tourist is purposefully targeted by the offender. Inciardi (1976) showed that pickpockets choose their victim very carefully. They are able easily to tell from their behaviour, attitude and dress whether the potential victim is a tourist. This was rated as the first attribute the

offender looked for, along with any additional signs of wealth. Wright and Decker (1997) found similar targeting of victims by armed street robbers, who look for signs of wealth that may well also indicate that the person is 'out-of-place'.

Tourist areas are clearly hotspots for certain forms of crime, with personal theft/robbery being most prevalent (Harper, 2001; Sherman *et al.*, 1989). Walmsley *et al.* (1983) reviewed over 1,700 incidents in Australia and found that tourist areas have relatively high rates of day-to-day crimes such as shop-lifting and personal theft, although they have lower levels of drug offences and sexual assaults. In addition, several studies have demonstrated the link between tourism and car crime (e.g. Gomez, 1972; The Netherlands Ministry of Justice, 1994) and residential burglary (Stangeland, 1998). Walmsley *et al.* (1983) revealed that when the offence takes place in a tourist area the offender is less likely to be caught and prosecuted, and it takes longer on average for the offender to be caught. The targeting of tourists therefore has considerable advantages for the offender. Relatively high rates of crime in tourist areas are not, of course, solely explained by the victimisation of tourists themselves. Some tourists, whilst on holiday, may take part in atypical behaviours including committing offences. For example some groups go to resorts to drink heavily or to behave antisocially, as happened in at least some rallies of 'mods' on scooters in the 1960s, and more recently in groups of football supporters involved in drinking and violence at matches abroad.

Studies comparing the victimisation rates of tourists with those of residents in a specific tourist location have, however, repeatedly shown that tourists are disproportionately represented as victims of crime. This trend is more evident in property crime statistics. It is clearly demonstrated both in terms of overall crime rates and specific offence categories. For example, De Albuquerque and McElroy (1999) found that in Barbados tourists had a higher victimisation rate, and were more likely to experience property crimes, whilst residents were more susceptible to violent crime. Chesney-Lind and Lind (1986) in Hawaii found higher victimisation rates for tourists in cases of larceny, robbery, burglary and rape. Harper (2001) reviewed the literature from five international tourist locations and identified higher tourist victimisation in four of these (especially for larceny, theft and robbery), with tourists clearly being singled out for victimisation.

Evidence also comes from studies that have surveyed holidaymakers' experiences whilst abroad. Mawby *et al.* (1999) identified that UK holidaymakers were susceptible to victimisation, the most common crime experienced being burglary. Brunt *et al.* (2000) compared their experiences of victimisation away from home with British Crime Survey rates of victimisation at home. They found that an individual was more likely to be victimised as a tourist than at home, and also suggested that tourism contributes to an increase in crime in an area. In this way tourist sites can be described as crimogenic; attracting and generating crime (Ryan and Kinder, 1996). Special events that

attract large groups of people from a distance to the local area have also been found to lead to a noted rise in crime (Barker *et al.*, 2002; Burns and Mules, 1989; Hall *et al.*, 1995). There has however been less research into what lies behind this (Barker and Page, 2002), and the rise in crime rates may well include cases where the tourist is the offender, where such events attract hedonistic activity (e.g. drinking and drug consumption, violence, etc.).

The finding that tourists are disproportionately at risk is not reflected in their perceptions of their vulnerability. Although generally people's fear of crime is found to be higher than their actual risk of victimisation, in tourists this is reversed; the risk of victimisation greatly exceeds tourists' fear of crime (Mawby, 2000; Mawby *et al.*, 2000). Fear of crime has been identified as unrealistically low in a number of studies (e.g. George, 2003a, 2003b; Brunt *et al.*, 2000; Mawby *et al.*, 2000), and even when tourists experience victimisation they still tend to report that the holiday location was safe (Brunt *et al.*, 2000). This has led to recommendations to increase tourist awareness of victimisation risk (Ryan, 1993).

Some literature has explored the reasons for the relatively high crime amongst tourists and within tourist areas. Brantingham and Brantingham (1995) discuss the criminogenic nature of tourist locations: they attract large numbers of people, including offenders and victims, and they also tend to encourage activities associated with certain crimes, such as heavy drinking and associated anti-social behaviour and violence. Other researchers have discussed various elements of 'tourist culture' and how this relates to higher risks of victimisation, for example the supply of large numbers of visitors for short durations, transient populations of tourists and workers, high levels of anonymity, high spending, and the open accessibility of the area (Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Pearce, 1982; Ryan, 1991, 1993). Tourists are easily recognisable as outsiders from obvious signs of wealth and tourism; for example they do not speak the native language; they are seen with large amounts of cash; they have cameras hanging around their necks; they use maps or ask directions; and they appear less confident in their surroundings (Ryan, 1993). When unfamiliar with an environment a person's fear is increased and they feel less secure and emotionally stable, which could well be evident in their non-verbal behaviour (Lynch, 1960). To the offender an outsider may therefore be very conspicuous and recognised as 'out-of-place', especially if the offender is within his awareness space. Some tourist locations are more susceptible to crime than others (Barker and Page, 2002); for example those with high tourist influx and density (George, 2003a; Pearce, 1982) and those where the gap between the wealthy and the poor is very great (George, 2003a; Olsen and Pizam, 1999).

There is ample evidence that tourists are more vulnerable to being the victims of crime. Moreover, this heightened vulnerability varies by the type of crime and the nature of the geographical location itself. The tourism and crime literature provides some evidence about a particular category of travelling victim. There are, though, many other reasons why people may be away from familiar

surroundings. Shopping expeditions, business needs, conferences, sports events, concerts and so on all comprise routine occasions for many people to go to unfamiliar places where they may become victims of crime.

As the following section shows, the British Crime Survey provides some more general evidence of victim travel-to-crime patterns. The findings can only be suggestive. There are no questions about victim familiarity with their surroundings, or about the reasons why they were where they were at the time of the crime.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

The British Crime Survey (BCS) is undertaken at the behest of the Home Office. Individuals are interviewed about their victimisation experiences over the previous 12 months. The BCS is now run continuously with about 40,000 respondents per annum. It is an extensive survey, which collects data about the victims, the behaviour of the offenders and the circumstances of the offence. It covers a representative sample of the population of England and Wales. Addresses are selected from residential postcodes, and individuals within households are chosen in ways designed to generate a quasi-random sample of respondents aged 16 or over. The data used here are from the victim form – so only data where the respondent reports being victimised within the past 12 months have been used. The total sample size is 15,919, comprising incidents against adults aged 16 and over residing within England and Wales.

The BCS has two questions of particular relevance to victim travel-to-crime patterns. Firstly it asks whether the crime occurred within 15 minutes walk of where the victim lives. Secondly, when the crime occurred more than 15 minutes walk away from home the respondent is asked whether the crime occurred within England and Wales. Crimes occurring outside England and Wales are not followed up, as they fall outside the remit of the survey. The BCS gives us some indication of how locally the crime occurred in relation to the victim's home. In addition data are collected on the type of crime, which can be cross-tabulated with the locality of the offence.

Table 1 shows the percentage of crimes that occurred within and outside the victim's local area. Almost three quarters of crimes (72.4%) occurred in the immediate vicinity of the victim's home: within a 15 minute walk. Just over a quarter (26.9%), however, occurred outside that local area.

Table 2 shows the percentage of non-local crimes that took place within and outside England and Wales. The overwhelming majority of these crimes were experienced within England and Wales (95.9%) with only 4% reported as occurring elsewhere. Although small in proportion to crimes occurring within England and Wales, these crimes are still of importance when trying to understand where crimes occur and who is at risk of victimisation.

Table 3 shows, by broad offence grouping, the percentage of all crimes occurring within and beyond the local area as defined in the British Crime

TABLE 1
Distribution of crimes within and beyond 15 minutes walk from home

Location of crimes	Percentage N = 15,752
At or near the victim's home	72.4
At least 15 minutes walk from the victim's home	26.9
Respondent didn't know or refused to answer	0.7
Total	100

Note: Unweighted data

TABLE 2
Distribution of crimes occurring beyond 15 minutes from home, within and beyond England and Wales

Location of crimes	Percentage N = 4,240
Within England and Wales	95.9
Outside England and Wales	4.0
Respondent didn't know or refused to answer	0.1
Total	100

Note: Unweighted data

Survey. Clearly a sizable minority of offences are committed beyond the immediate locality of the victim's home. Also, certain crime types are more likely than others to occur away from the locality of the victim's home.

There are three broad families of crime target: the home, the vehicle and the person. The proportion of crimes at least 15 minutes away from home is clearly lowest in relation to crimes against the home, rather higher for crimes against vehicles and highest for crimes against the person. It is obvious that some types are very likely to occur close to home; for example burglary from a dwelling or outbuilding and other household thefts, where more than nine out of ten are said to occur nearby. Presumably they only occur at some distance from the victim's home address in rather specific circumstances, for instance where the victim owns more than one house or is living temporarily away from home (see Mawby, 2001, for a discussion of this in the case of burglaries against weekend

TABLE 3
Type of offence by whether or not it occurs within 15 minutes of where the victim lives

Type of crime	Total offences	Per cent occurring beyond 15 minutes of where the victim lives
Snatch with stealth (including attempts)	408	72.8
Personal theft (excluding snatch with stealth)	730	70.8
Robbery (including attempts)	157	49.0
Common assault (including attempts)	668	42.8
Wounding (including sexual)	283	41.7
Threats	851	39.1
Theft from vehicles	1,440	32.2
Theft of vehicle	337	28.5
Attempted theft of vehicle	622	25.7
Bike theft	1,384	20.8
Vehicle vandalism	431	20.2
Other vandalism	992	8.3
Burglary in dwelling	864	5.7
Burglary in outhouse	468	4.3
Other household theft	965	3.4

Note: Unweighted data

homes in Hungary). For vehicle crimes the rates fall roughly between a fifth and a third, with the higher proportions for thefts from vehicles. For personal crimes, in the case of threats and violent crimes about two fifths occur beyond the victim's home area and in the case of street crime the proportion goes from about half (for robbery) to almost three quarters (for snatch thefts).

These data suggest that though crime victimisation overall tends to occur close to home, for some crime types risk increases with distance from home. Unfortunately denominators showing relative rates of exposure to risk – the proportions of time during which respondents were, in principle, susceptible to

offences of various kinds – are unavailable. It is not possible, thus, to determine the extent to which these distributions of crime event location in relation to home address simply reflect the distribution of potential victim availability (see Fattah, 1991).

DISCUSSION

Most of the travel-to-crime literature relates to patterns of offender movement. Most of the discussion of crime control within police services and local communities appears also to focus on travelling offenders coming from outside to commit crimes in local neighbourhoods. Images of crime and travel appear from the evidence drawn together here to be partial and misleading. The now quite substantial offender travel-to-crime literature suggests that distances are typically quite small. Most offending is relatively local. For many offences such evidence as there is finds that victims too tend also to be locals, but there are important exceptions. The crime and tourism literature suggests that those away from home are at high risk, notwithstanding their apparent failures to recognise that this is the case. There is a higher risk to them in particular from street robbers and pick-pockets (Chesney-Lind and Lind, 1986; Harper, 2001; Sherman *et al.*, 1989; Walmsley *et al.*, 1983). The BCS also shows that for some offence types being away from one's home area when victimised is the norm, though the data only allow the crudest of measures. There is no measurement of how far respondents are from home when they become victims. There is also little systematic research on non-tourist travelling victims.

Victim travel patterns are potentially of both theoretical and policy interest. If risks of victimisation, at least for some crime types, increase as distance from home neighbourhood grows, important questions about prioritisation for prevention and detection arise. For some places, such as city centres, tourist destinations, university towns, motorway service areas, sporting arenas, shopping centres, transport hubs and networks, casinos etc. which are heavily populated by non-locals, it seems likely that strangers/travellers may comprise the main target group, in particular for personal crimes. The policy movement towards local prioritisation and problem-solving, of the sort planned in neighbourhood policing, risks overlooking high risk groups if local residents are relatively unconscious of or uninterested in crimes committed against outsiders. It may in this context be worth remembering Jane Jacobs's admonition in 1961 that:

[T]he streets of a city must do most of the job of handling strangers for this is where strangers come and go. The streets must not only defend the city against predatory strangers, they must protect the many, many peaceable and well-meaning strangers who use them, insuring their safety too as they pass through. (Jacobs, 1961: p. 36)

Orchestrating collective attention to the risks faced by non-residents in high crime areas comprises a significant challenge for policy and practice, which will be relevant in many neighbourhoods. Further research is needed in order more precisely to understand and predict traveller risks and victim travel patterns in order most effectively to target preventive attention.

What might explain the relationships between travel and crime risk? Both the nature of the relationship and the explanation are likely to vary by crime type. For example, as already noted certain crimes, such as burglary, are intrinsically linked to the home address of the victims. The travel to crime distances will be greater for offenders than victims, even if offenders do not typically travel far. Vehicle crimes will clearly occur where the vehicle is located. Around the home there is little choice and some homes are rather better designed to avoid crime than others. Cars in garages, for example, are targets much less frequently than cars parked out of sight in communal parking areas (1.5 car thefts per 100,000 cars per day as against 101.4, according to BCS analysis by Clarke and Mayhew, 1998). Away from home, potential victims may appreciate less the risky locations for parking their cars than local people and hence may inadvertently put themselves at risk. Though the data are unavailable to test the hypothesis, one might expect a bimodal distribution of distances travelled by victims, and characteristic short travel-to-crime distances by offenders. Domestic violence, and assaults associated with entertainment areas where both victim and offender have been drinking heavily are liable to occur at varying distances from home but where both victim and offender will stand in a similar relationship to home location. At any rate there is no reason to believe that the one will tend to be closer or further than the other. Hence, no difference in travel to crime distances would be expected for victims and offenders.

In contrast, for property crimes involving theft from the person or robbery it is suggested that, corresponding to the hypothesis that offenders tend to operate within their awareness space since they are able to assess potential risks and rewards there, likely victims tend to be found within their 'unawareness space'. The reasons for their location in unawareness space are counterparts to the awareness space of offenders. Travellers away from their homes are less likely to know the potential risks they are liable to face. They will be less aware of risky places and behaviours. Where the unaware victim enters the offender's awareness space then predatory crime becomes more likely. Moreover the aware offender is likely to search out spaces where unaware potential victims are liable to stray and where there are no third parties to provide protection. There are clear advantages to the offender in some crimes for them to have high awareness of the area, whilst the victim has much less awareness, and this is not confined to theft from the person and robbery. For example a stranger-rapist rape would know where to attack (e.g. lighting poor, area isolated from public view), and the quickest and most successful route of escape, but a non-local victim would not be aware of the dangerous places they should avoid, and the safer routes to take alone at night. They may also show more non-verbal cues of fear. Offences such

as stranger murder, personal theft, assault and personal robbery would also seem to be more weighted in the offender's favour when they are local and the victim is not.

A key difference between offenders' and victims' travel to crime is that whilst victims will not travel into their unawareness spaces in order to be victimised, offenders will, at least sometimes, travel to specific awareness spaces with the intention of committing crime in the expectation that opportunities will present themselves. The places may be ones where offenders expect that there will be traveller victims in particular, or it may be that in those places travellers tend to be amongst the most suitable targets. Examples might include city centres and entertainment areas. Another way in which offender awareness space may meet victim unawareness space is where areas in which those liable to offend live or habitually hang out coincide with ones into which naïve, suitable victims move, and then comprise suitable targets. An example here might include some inner-city neighbourhoods with a high supply of resident offenders. A third possibility is that suitable targets are lured deliberately into unfamiliar space where crimes may be committed against them. Examples here might include some rapes and some serious, planned, gang-related, violent offending. The distribution and dynamics of these crime conditions are in need of further research.

The types of prevention that are suitable where victims are away from their own familiar areas will differ from those that may be applicable where both they (and offenders) have travelled short distances and are locals. In the latter case community-related activities may plausibly have a role to play. When the victim is not local external importation of guardianship, warnings to travellers and situational measures are more appropriate crime prevention strategies. It is likely that there are specific locations within every town or city that attract a high number of people from outside the area (e.g. shopping districts, entertainment districts, casinos, airports, train and bus stations, hotels, etc.), and there will also be various special events attracting outsiders unfamiliar with the area (e.g. conferences, exhibitions, sporting events, etc.). Travel-to-crime research would therefore benefit from an investigation into victim mobility patterns for specific crimes and examining different types of locations. At present there is very little empirical data available on crime location in relation to the place of residence of the victim. Although the British Crime Survey does give us some indication of how much crime occurs within the victim's immediate locality and within England and Wales, it falls short of what is needed to identify and understand in any detail victim travel patterns.

CONCLUSION

There is a plethora of evidence about offenders' travel-to-crime patterns, but it is the intersection of the offender's and the victim's movements at the same time and place that presents the opportunity for crime to occur. Victim

travel-to-crime patterns have been neglected for too long. There needs to be a synthesis of environmental criminology's focus on offender mobility, choice of victim and location, and routine activities theory's focus on the victim's mobility creating opportunities for crime (Tita and Griffiths, 2005). In light of the lack of knowledge about victims' movements in relation to crime, and the inconsistency between theory regarding victim mobility and evidence from tourist victimisation studies, systematic empirical research is required. This would greatly enhance our understanding of the spatial dynamics of crime and the relationship between offender and victim mobility patterns. It would also have clear implications for crime prevention, in particular situational crime prevention.

REFERENCES

- Amir, M. (1971). *Patterns in Forcible Rape*. University of Chicago Press; Chicago.
- Baldwin, J. and Bottoms, A.E. (1976). *The Urban Criminal: A Study in Sheffield*. Tavistock; London.
- Barker, M. and Page, S.J. (2002). Visitor Safety in Urban Tourism Environments: The Case of Auckland, New Zealand. *Cities*, **19** (4), 273–282.
- Barker, M., Page, S.J. and Meyer, D. (2002). Modeling Tourism Crime: The 2000 America's Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **29** (3), 762–782.
- Bichler-Robertson, G. and Potchak, M.C. (2002). Testing the Importance of Target Selection Factors Associated with Commercial Burglary Using the Blended Approach. *Security Journal*, **15** (4), 41–61.
- Bowers, K.J. and Johnson, S.D. (2004). A Test of the Boost Explanation of Near Repeats. *Western Criminology Review*, **5** (3), 12–24.
- Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1978). A Theoretical Model of Crime Site Selection. In *Crime, Law and Sanctions* (M. Krohn and R. Akers, eds). Sage; Beverly Hills. PL PROVIDE PAGE NOS.
- Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1981). *Environmental Criminology*. Sage; Beverly Hills.
- Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1991). Introduction to the 1991 Reissue: Notes on Environmental Criminology. In *Environmental Criminology* (P.J. Brantingham and P.L. Brantingham, eds) pp. 1–6. Waveland Press; Prospect Heights, ILL.
- Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (2003). Anticipating the Displacement of Crime Using the Principles of Environmental Criminology. In *Theory for Practice in Situational Crime Prevention* (M.J. Smith and D.B. Cornish, eds) pp. 119–148. Criminal Justice Press; Monsey, NY.
- Brantingham, P.L. and Brantingham, P.J. (1985). Burglar Mobility and Crime Prevention Planning. In *Coping with Burglary* (R. Clarke and T. Hope, eds) pp. 77–95. Kluwer-Nijhoff; Boston, MA.
- Brantingham, P.L. and Brantingham, P.J. (1995). Criminality of Place: Crime Generators and Crime Attractors. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, **3**, 5–26.

- Brantingham, P.L. and Brantingham, P.J. (2000). Police Use of Environmental Criminology in Strategic Crime Prevention. *Police Practice*, **1** (2), 211–240.
- Brunt, P., Mawby, R. and Hambly, Z. (2000). Tourist Victimization and the Fear of Crime on Holiday. *Tourism Management*, **21** (4), 417–424.
- Bullock, H.A. (1955). Urban Homicide in Theory and Fact. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, **45**, 565–75.
- Burns, J.P.A. and Mules, T.J. (1989). An Economic Evaluation of the Adelaide Grand Prix. In *The Planning and Evaluation of Hallmark Events* (G. Syme, B. Shaw, D. Fenton and W. Mueller, eds) pp. 172–185. Gower Publishing Company; Aldershot.
- Canter, D. and Larkin, P. (1993). The Environmental Range of Serial Rapists. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, **13**, 63–69.
- Capone, D.L. and Nichols, W.W. (1976). Urban Structure and Criminal Mobility. *American Behavioral Scientist*, **20**, 199–213.
- Chesney-Lind, M. and Lind, I.Y. (1986). Visitors as Victims: Crimes against Tourists in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **13** (2), 167–191.
- Clarke, R.V. and Mayhew, P. (1998). Preventing Crime in Parking Lots: What We Know and What We Need to Know. In *Reducing Crime Through Real Estate Development and Management* (M. Felson and R. Peiser, eds). ULI – the Urban Land Institute; Washington DC. PAGE NOS PLEASE
- Cohen, L.E. and Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activities Approach. *American Sociological Review*, **44**, 588–608.
- Davies, A. and Dale, A. (1995). *Locating the Stranger Rapist*. Police Research Group Special Interest Series, Paper 3. Home Office; London.
- De Albuquerque, K. and McElroy, J. (1999). Tourism and Crime in the Caribbean. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **26** (4), 968–984.
- Everson, S. and Pease, K. (2001). Crime Against the Same Person and Place. In *Repeat Victimization*. Crime Prevention Studies Volume 12 (G. Farrell and K. Pease, eds). Criminal Justice Press; Monsey NY. PAGE NOS PLEASE.
- Farrell, G., Phillips, C. and Pease, K. (1995). Like Taking Candy: Why Does Repeat Victimization Occur? *British Journal of Criminology*, **35** (3), 384–99.
- Fattah, E.A. (1991). *Understanding Criminal Victimization: An Introduction to Theoretical Victimology*. Prentice-Hall; Scarborough, ONT.
- Felson, M. (1987). Routine Activities and Crime Prevention in the Developing Metropolis. *Criminology*, **25**, 911–931.
- Florida Corrections Division (1974). *The Relationship between Tourism and Legal Residence of Inmates in the Division of Corrections*. PUBLISHERS PLEASE
- Gabor, T. and Gottheil, E. (1984). Offender Characteristics and Spatial Mobility: An Empirical Study and Some Policy Implications. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, **26**, 267–281.
- George, R. (2003a). Tourists' Fear of Crime While on Holiday in Cape Town. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, **5** (1), 13–25.
- George, R. (2003b). Tourists' Perceptions of Safety and Security while Visiting Cape Town. *Tourism Management*, **24**, 575–585.
- Godwin, M. and Canter, D. (1997). Encounter and Death: The Spatial Behaviour of US Serial Killers. *Policing*, **20** (1), 24–38.

- Gomez, S. (1972). Motor Vehicle Thefts in Spain in 1969 (Part I). *International Criminal Police Review*, **27**, 94–101.
- Hall, C.M., Selwood, J. and McKewon, E. (1995). Hedonists, Ladies and Larrikins: Crime, Prostitution and the 1987 America's Cup. *Visions in Leisure and Business*, **14** (3), 28–51.
- Harper, D.W. (2001). Comparing Tourists' Crime Victimization. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **28** (4), 1053–1056.
- Hearnden, I. and Magill, C. (2004). *Decision-making by House Burglars: Offenders' Perspectives*. Home Office Findings 249. Home Office; London.
- Inciardi, J.A. (1976). The Pickpocket and his Victim. *Victimology*, **1** (3), 446–453.
- Jacobs, ?? (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Vintage Books; New York. INITIALS PLEASE
- LeBeau, J.L. (1979). *The Spatial Dynamics of Rape: The San Diego Example*. Thesis Dissertation, Michigan State University. University Microfilms International; Ann Arbor, MI.
- LeBeau, J.L. (1987). The Methods and Measures of Centrography and the Spatial Dynamics of Rape. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **3** (2), 125–142.
- LeBeau, J.L. (1992). Case Studies Illustrating Spatial-temporal Analysis of Serial Rapists. *Police Studies*, **15** (3), 124–145.
- Lynch, K. (196). *The Image of the City*. Technology Press; Cambridge, MA.
- Mathiesen, A. and Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism, Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. Longmans; Harlow.
- Mawby, R. (2000). Tourists' Perceptions of Security: The Risk–fear Paradox. *Tourism Economics*, **6** (2), 109–121.
- Mawby, R. (2001). The Impact of Repeat Victimization on Burglary Victims in East and West Europe. In *Repeat Victimization* (G. Farrell and K. Pease, eds) pp. 69–82. Crime Prevention Studies Vol. 12. Criminal Justice Press; Monsey NY.
- Mawby, R.I., Brunt, P. and Hambly, Z. (1999). Victimization on Holiday: A British Survey. *International Review of Victimology*, **6** (3), 201–211.
- Mawby, R.I., Brunt, P. and Hambly, Z. (2000). Fear of Crime among British Holidaymakers. *British Journal of Criminology*, **40**, 468–479.
- Olsen, M.D. and Pizam, A. (1999). *Think Tank Findings on Safety and Security*. International Hotel and Restaurant Association; Paris.
- Painter, K. (1992). Different Worlds: The Spatial, Temporal and Social Dimensions of Female Victimization. In *Crime, Policing and Place: Essays in Environmental Criminology* (D.J. Evans, N.R. Fyfe and D.T. Herbert, eds) pp. 164–195. Routledge; London.
- Pearce, P. (1982). *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour*. Pergamon Press; Oxford.
- Phillips, P.D. (1980). Characteristics and Typology of the Journey to Crime. In *Crime: A Spatial Perspective* (D.E. Georges-Abeyié and K.D. Harries, eds) pp. 167–180. Columbia University Press; Guildford, Surrey.
- Pyle, G. (1974). *The Spatial Dynamics of Crime*. Department of Geography Research Paper 159. University of Chicago Press; Chicago.
- Rand, A. (1984). *Patterns in Juvenile Delinquency: A Spatial Perspective*. Thesis Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. University Microfilms International; Ann Arbor, MI.

- Rand, A. (1986). Mobility Triangles. In *Metropolitan Crime Patterns* (R.M. Figlio, S. Hakim and G.F. Rengert, eds) pp. 117–126. Criminal Justice Press; New York.
- Rengert, G.F. and Waslichick, J. (1985). *Suburban Burglary: A Time and a Place for Everything*. Charles Thomas; Springfield, IL.
- Repetto, T.A. (1974). *Residential Crime*. Ballinger; Cambridge, MA.
- Rhodes, W.M. and Conly, C.C. (1991). Crime and Mobility: An Empirical Study. In *Environmental Criminology* (P.J. Brantingham and P.L. Brantingham, eds) pp. 167–188. Waveland Press; Prospect Heights, ILL.
- Rossmo, K.K. (1995). Place, Space, and Police Investigations: Hunting Serial Violent Criminals. In *Crime and Place* (J.E. Eck and D. Weisburd, eds) pp. 217–236. Criminal Justice Press; Monsey, NY.
- Rossmo, D.K. (2000). *Geographical Profiling*. CRC Press. LOCATION PLEASE
- Ryan, C. (1991). *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective*. Routledge; London.
- Ryan, C. (1993). Crime, Violence, Terrorism and Tourism: An Accidental or Intrinsic Relationship? *Tourism Management*, **14**, 173–183.
- Ryan, C. and Kinder, R. (1996). The Deviant Tourist and the Crimogenic Place: The Case of the Tourist and the New Zealand Prostitute. In *Tourism, Crime and International Security Issues* (A. Pizam and Y. Mansfeld, eds) pp. 23–36. John Wiley and Sons; Chichester.
- Sherman, L.W., Gartin, P.R. and Buerger, M.E. (1989). Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place. *Criminology*, **27**, 27–55.
- Stangeland, P. (1998). Other Targets of Other Locations? An Analysis of Opportunity Structures. *British Journal of Criminology*, **38** (1), 61–77.
- The Netherlands Ministry of Justice (1994). *Car Burglary: Extent, Background, Distribution and Prevention of Theft from and Vandalizing of Cars*. Department of Crime Prevention, The Netherlands Ministry of Justice.
- Tita, G. and Griffiths, E. (2005). Traveling to Violence: The Case for a Mobility-based Spatial Typology of Homicide. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, **42** (3), 275–308.
- Turner, S. (1969). Delinquency and Distance. In *Delinquency: Selected Studies* (T. Sellin and M. Wolfgang, eds) pp. 11–26. Wiley; New York.
- Walmsley, D.J., Boskovic, R.M. and Pigram, J.L. (1983). Tourism and Crime: An Australian Perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, **15** (2), 136–155.
- Warren, J., Reboussin, R., Hazelwood, R.R., Cummings, A., Gibbs, N. and Trumbetta, S. (1998). Crime Scene and Distance Correlates of Serial Rape. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **14** (1), 35–59.
- White, R.C. (1932). The Relations of Felonies to Environmental Factors in Indianapolis. *Social Forces*, **10**, 498–509.
- Wiles, P. and Costello, A. (2000). *The 'Road to Nowhere': The Evidence for Travelling Criminals*. Home Office Research Study 207. Home Office; London.
- Wright, R.T. and Deckere, S.H. (1997). *Armed Robbers in Action: Stickups and Street Culture*. Northeastern University Press. LOCATION PLEASE.