

University of Huddersfield Repository

Youngs, Donna E., Ioannou, Maria and Straszewicz, Adam

Distinguishing stalking modus operandi: An exploration of the Mullen et al (1999) typology in a law-enforcement sample

Original Citation

Youngs, Donna E., Ioannou, Maria and Straszewicz, Adam (2013) Distinguishing stalking modus operandi: An exploration of the Mullen et al (1999) typology in a law-enforcement sample. Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 24 (3). pp. 319-336. ISSN 1478-9949

This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/17284/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/

TABLES-FIGURES

Table 1. Mullen et al. stalker types with variables selected for each

Rejected	Intimacy seeker	Incompetent	Resentful	Predatory
Threats (80%) Follows (78%) Phones (76%) Previous convictions (58%) Confronts (52%) Ex-partner (48%) Letters (46%) Accesses house (46%) Violence (42%) Destroys (32%) Defames (28%) Friendship (6%) Co-worker (6%)	Threats (80%) Follows (78%) Phones (76%) Letters (46%) Violence (42%) Love (40%) Threats another (40%) Contacts another (40%) Gifts (28%) Family abuse (10%)	Confronts (52%) Letters (46%) Invites contact (42%) Love (40%) Sexual (32%) Destroys (32%) Stranger (28%)	Threats (80%) Follows (78%) Phones (76%) Letters (46%) Destroys (32%) Co-worker (6%)	Follows (78%) Previous convictions (58%) Surveillance (44%) Violence (42%) Researches (16%) Details (16%) Drives by (14%) Knowledge (12%)

 $\it Note.$ Frequency across the sample of 50 cases indicated in parentheses.











