



University of HUDDERSFIELD

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/>

**DISTINGUISHING STALKER MODUS OPERANDI: AN EXPLORATION OF THE
MULLEN ET AL (1999) TYPOLOGY IN A LAW-ENFORCEMENT SAMPLE**

ABSTRACT

Effective management of stalking cases relies upon distinguishing different forms of the offence. In the clinical context, Mullen et al's (1999) typology of stalkers is the most widely used classification system, the basis of the Stalking Risk Profile assessment tool. The present study explores the detailed patterns of stalking behaviour observed in a law enforcement context to explore the applicability of the Mullen et al clinical framework. Data are derived from 50 stalking cases obtained from the Threat Management Unit of the Los Angeles Police Department. Twenty-six offence variables were submitted to a Multidimensional Scaling Procedure, namely Smallest Space Analysis (SSA). Results showed that, as Mullen et al. posited, while some support for the *incompetent* and *rejected* types could be found, this clinical typology of stalkers did not hold in the law enforcement sample. An alternative framework for distinguishing detailed stalking offending styles and a common basis for understanding the development of these in an increasing *intrusiveness* is proposed.

The Mullen, Pathé, Purcell and Stuart (1999) typology is the most cited stalker classification, widely used in clinical and other applied contexts. As MacKenzie, McEwan, Pathé, Ogloff & Mullen (2009) note it is currently the classification system recommended by the American Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry's Committee on Psychiatry and the Law and has been used in research and practice in different settings (James & Farnham, 2003; MacKenzie et al, 2009; McEwan, Mullen & MacKenzie, 2009; Morrison, 2007; Whyte, Petch, Penny & Reiss, 2008). It is the basis for the Stalking Risk Profile clinical assessment tool (MacKenzie et al, 2009). Although many cases that come to clinical attention are referred from the criminal justice system, the question arises from an Investigative Psychology perspective (Canter 2011; Canter & Youngs 2009) as to how generalizable the clinical distinctions Mullen et al. proposed will be to the distinguishing of detailed behavioural patterns in a law enforcement context. The present study therefore explores the applicability of the distinctions drawn by Mullen et al. for clinical treatment purposes to the identification of offending patterns among stalking cases faced by police.

Mullen et al. clinical typology of stalkers

Mullen et al. (1999) identified five types of stalkers: the rejected, intimacy seeker, incompetent, resentful and predatory. The classification was based on data gathered from 145 stalkers (115 men and 30 women) referred for treatment to a forensic psychiatry centre in Australia between 1993 and 1997 and assessed by two of the authors (M.P. and P.E.M). Referrals came from throughout the state of Victoria from courts, community correction services, police, and medical practitioners and, in three cases, following self-referral. The study examined the stalkers' demographic characteristics, duration and nature of stalking behaviour, associated behaviours,

threats and violence, relationship to the victim, criminal histories, motivation and psychiatric status. The five types identified in the Mullen et al (1999) typology are the basis of approaches to the clinical management of stalking (Mullen, Pathé and Purcell 2001; Mullen, Mackenzie, Ogloff, Pathé and Purcell 2006) and the Stalking Risk Profile (MacKenzie et al, 2009).

The *rejected stalker* (N=52 in their study) has had an intimate relationship with the victim (although occasionally the victim may be a family member or close friend), and views the termination of the relationship as unacceptable. Their behaviour is characterised by a desire for either reconciliation or revenge for rejection or a mixture of both. Stalking is sustained by becoming a substitute for the lost relationship. *Intimacy seekers* (N=49), responding to their loneliness, attempt to bring to fruition a relationship with a person who has engaged their affection, and who they are convinced already does, or will, reciprocate that love despite obvious evidence to the contrary. *Incompetent stalkers* (N=22) tend to seek to develop relationships but they fail to abide by social rules governing courtship. Unlike the intimacy seeker, they are simply seeking a date or a sexual encounter. They are usually intellectually limited and/or socially incompetent and have been rejected by suitors. They usually gain little satisfaction from their approaches and so they usually rapidly abandon the pursuit. But very soon they turn their unwanted attentions to new victims. *Resentful stalkers* (N=16) harass their victims with the specific intention of causing fear and apprehension out of a desire for retribution for some actual or supposed injury or humiliation. The harassment is sustained by the satisfaction the stalker obtains from the sense of power and control. This group frequently issues overt and covert threats but rarely resorts to physical violence, though again, there are rare and terrible

exceptions—for example, several workplace massacres have been the culmination of a campaign of resentful stalking. *Predatory stalkers* (N=6) stalk for information gathering purposes or fantasy rehearsal in preparation for an attack, usually sexual and voyeuristic gratification. The stalking is covert so as not to alert the victim to the impending attack, but some predatory stalkers derive pleasure from making the victim aware of being watched without revealing his or her own (the stalker's) identity.

The Present Study

The framework Mullen et al. advance provides an important step towards understanding the variety of stalkers and therefore has value in indicating the possibilities of different aetiologies. Clearly distinguishing different stalking offending styles and offender types is important for policing and treatment given the breadth of behavioural forms that can be subsumed within this legal category.

The present study seeks to explore the varieties of stalking behaviour drawing in the Mullen et al framework as the dominant hypotheses. As Mullen, Pathé & Purcell (2000) pointed out this system of classification may not be applicable to the policing of stalkers. As the authors themselves note: “our system of classification...works for us but this is in the context of mental health professionals who...have no role in law enforcement” (Mullen et al, 1999, p. 78). The current study explores its applicability to a law enforcement sample.

The Canter et al. Approach to Testing Typologies

In their study of the Organized- Disorganized dichotomy for serial murder, Canter et al. (2004) developed a specific methodology for testing the empirical support for a typology. This method is based upon examination of the evidence that (a) the characteristics within each type of stalker consistently co-occur with one another and are located within the same region of a Multidimensional Scaling Analysis (SSA-I) plot, and (b) these characteristics do not co-occur with characteristics of other types and this region of the SSA-I contains items from that type exclusively. If the patterns of co-occurrences and lack of co-occurrences do not reflect the proposed characteristics of each type, then there is little support for the typology (see Canter, Alison, Alison & Wentink, 2004; Canter & Wentink, 2004; Canter & Youngs, 2009).

METHOD

Sample

The dataset used in the present study was held in the data archives of the International Research Centre for Investigative Psychology at the University of Huddersfield and were collected from the police records of the Threat Management Unit (TMU) of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). Although, the LAPD Threat Management Unit does deal with a number of celebrity stalking cases, only 6 out of 50 in the present study involved famous people, suggesting that the sample was not unrepresentative of those dealt with by many law enforcement units, They consisted of descriptions of 50 recorded incidents of stalking and the variables were recorded in dichotomous form with yes/no values based on the presence/absence of each behaviour in any one offence. This tactic of coding variables dichotomously is one that has been developed for research in this area (cf. Canter, 2000) in recognition of the lack of precision in the data.

Variable selection criteria for each type

Using the content analysis approach adopted in numerous previous investigative studies of offending style (see Canter & Youngs 2009), 26 offence behaviour variables were identified and the 50 cases were coded in terms of the presence or absence of each variable. Full variable descriptions are given in the Appendix.

The 26 variables were classified (Table 1) into one of the five clinical types of stalker (Rejected, intimacy-seeker, incompetent, resentful and predatory) on the basis of the ideas articulated by Mullen et al (1999). The *a priori* basis for each allocation is outlined below.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

According to Mullen et al., the *rejected* stalker operates as a response to a rejection of a relationship. Most frequently offender and victim are ex-partners but here are also included past friendships or work relationships. The rejected group includes the widest range of stalking behaviours. Mullen, Pathé & Purcell (2000) give examples of such behaviours as following, repeatedly approaching the victim, telephoning, letter-writing and leaving notes. Consequently, phones, follows, letters, ex-partner, friendship, co-worker were selected. According to Mullen et al. (1999) 71% of rejected stalkers were threatening their victims, 54% have abused their victims

and 51% had previous criminal convictions. Threats were used to encourage their previous partner to restore the relationship. They provide an example of a female stalker who destroyed her victim's flat, thrashed his car, totally disrupted his work and in many occasions embarrassed him in a public. Consequently, *violence, previous convictions, threats, destroys, confronts, defames* and *accesses house* were also selected.

According to Mullen et al. the *intimacy seeker* stalker seeks intimacy with the object of his/her unwanted attention, which they identify as their true love. Intimacy seeker stalkers have erotomaniac delusions and believe that their love is reciprocated. Fifty percent of intimacy seekers were found to threaten their victims, 75% were sending letters, 75% were phoning the victim and 60% were following their victims. Occasional violence was indicated as a possibility of a response to a rejection. This may be towards a victim or third parties if the stalker believes that someone stands on their way to a relationship with a victim. Therefore, *letters, gifts, phones, follows, threats, violence, love, threatens another, family abuse* and *contacts another* were selected as appropriate behaviours for this type of offender.

The *incompetent* type usually favours direct approaches to forms of communication such as letter writing. In some cases these stalkers make crude and sexually explicit approaches to women to whom they are attracted. The incompetent stalkers are impaired in social skills. Stalking is a response to their failure to form a relationship. Variables chosen as representative of this type of offender are: *letters, sexual, stranger, destroys, love, confronts* and *invites contact*.

For Mullen et al. the *resentful* stalker is motivated by the desire to put the victim into fear and distress. His/her actions are the response to a previous event that hurt the stalker. This could explain why resentful stalkers often choose their victims from their work environment. The vengeful desire drives them to threaten their victims and carry out criminal damage. They also

tend to communicate by letters or phone calls and follow their victims. Consequently, the variables *threats*, *destroys*, *co-worker*, *phones*, *letters* and *follows* were selected.

The *predatory* type consists of a wide spectrum of behaviours. This is the most dangerous type. They use direct violence against victims, previously carefully planned. Communication with victims occurs less likely than within other types but predatory stalkers are more likely to be previously convicted, following or driving by the victims' houses and maintain surveillance. Mullen, Pathe & Purcell (2000) have indicated that predatory stalking is a combination of gathering information, rehearsal, intrusion through observation, and exercise of power. In their sample (Mullen et al, 1999) all six predatory stalkers were preparing a sexual attack. Therefore *sexual*, *confronts*, *violence*, *researches*, *surveillance*, *previous convictions*, *follows*, *details*, *knowledge* and *drives by* were selected as appropriate behaviours for this type of offender.

Analyses

Smallest Space Analysis (SSA) represents the co-occurrence of variables, in our present study stalking characteristics, as distances in a geometrical space. The SSA program computes association coefficients between all variables. It is these coefficients that are used to form a spatial representation of items with points representing variables. The closer any two points are to each other on the spatial configuration, the higher their associations with each other, in this case the higher their frequency of co-occurrence. Similarly, the farther away from each other any two points are, the lower their association with each other. To test hypotheses, an SSA configuration is visually examined to determine the patterns of relationships between variables and identify thematic structures.

RESULTS

A data matrix was prepared in which the presence or absence of each of the 26 variables listed in Table 1 was noted for all 50 cases. Thus, yes (1) or no (0) values were given for each variable. The power of this form of recording police data has been proved in Canter and Herritage's (1990) study. The matrix then was used to derive an association matrix, using Jaccard's coefficient, to measure the degree of co-occurrence between every variable and every other variable. This association matrix was then subjected to a two and three dimensional SSA. The two dimensional solution offered an equally interpretable but more parsimonious solution. The degree of fit between the association matrix and the spatial representation of SSA-I is given by the Gutman-Lingoes coefficient of alienation (Canter & Wentink, 2004). The coefficient of alienation of 0.208 in 22 iterations in our case indicates a good fit for this type of data.

Figures 1 to 5 depict the original SSA-I configurations. Each plot contains the same variables in the same positions. The variables are represented as circles or triangles. These symbols were used to indicate which variables are being discussed in relation to a particular stalker type proposed by Mullen et al. Each figure has the particular variables that were identified for each of the stalker types represented as triangles. For example, when the rejected stalker is discussed, the variables that were hypothesised to relate to this stalker are indicated with a triangle.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Rejected

The *rejected* type contains the greatest number of variables among the five types, with 13 out of the 26 variables selected in total. Interestingly the combination of phone calls, following the victim, threatening the victim, offender destroys personal property, previous convictions, violence, offender confronts the victim and ex-partner, typical of a rejected stalker seem to form a distinct region as they appear very close to each other on the plot lending credence to these being aspects of a distinct type of crime. However, most of these variables appear to be at the heart of stalking as it will be shown later.

While it appears that some of the rejected variables are close to each other the rest are scattered across the plot close to other variables and did not form a distinct region. Notably, the variables of ex-partner, friendship and co-worker, were placed on extreme opposites something worth noting when considering the nature of the relationship offender-victim.

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

Intimacy Seeker

Mullen et al (1999) describe that the purpose of the *intimacy seeking* stalker is to establish a relationship with the victim. Ten variables were included here that characterise this type of stalker. Most of these ten variables can be found in other types of stalkers according to the Mullen typology. For example threatening content, following and telephoning the victim are also common in the rejected and resentful types of stalkers. Sending letters is a common behaviour of

the rejected, the resentful and predatory types of stalkers. Violence is a behaviour that appears as typical of the rejected and predatory stalkers. Believing that the victim is in love with the stalker is also very common of the incompetent type of stalker. Only three of the ten variables were typical of the intimacy seeker stalker. These are sending gifts, threatening third parties and abuse to family. However none of them has co-occurred with each other. These three variables were dispersed across the plot in opposite directions and did not form a distinct type as did not all ten variables selected to represent this type of stalker.

INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE

Incompetent

Seven variables were included in the *incompetent* type of stalker. As discussed in previous types most of the variables overlap with other types of stalkers. The variables typical of the incompetent type were not found to form a distinct region in the SSA configuration. However, offender inviting contact, believing that the victim is in love with the offender, sexual content in communication and sending letters formed a reasonably distinct region, lending credence to these being aspects of a distinct type of crime.

INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE

Resentful

None of the selected variables exclusively belonged to this type of stalker. All six variables were also typical of the *rejected* type of stalker. They did not form any distinct region on the plot; especially co-worker and letters were in opposite areas of the plot and further away from the rest. Threatening content, following and phone calls were found to be very close to each other forming a small region.

INSERT FIGURE 5 HERE

Predatory

Most of the ten variables included for this type are spread throughout the plot. For example, items 'asking details' and 'researches' are located in the right left area close to a number of 'intimacy seeker' variables. However, these two variables together with gathering knowledge about the victim were found to be close to each other.

Previously convicted, following the victim were also close to each other. While these two variables were also characteristic of the *rejected* stalker, making phone calls is absent here. In addition, maintaining surveillance on the victim was close to those two mentioned above ('previous convictions' and 'follows'). However, most variables indicative of this type of offender were scattered across the plot giving no indication that any distinct aspects of a '*predatory*' stalker can be distinguished as characteristic for any separate type in the present sample.

In sum, while support of some elements of the five types, especially the *incompetent* and *rejected* can be found, Mullen et al's clinical typology of stalkers seems not to apply to the detailed offending styles indicated within the present law enforcement sample . Rather, as Canter and Youngs (2012) have argued recently in their Victim Role model, there are some indications that the offending action patterns relate to the interpersonal approach to the victim, not the underlying motivation of the action. This is clear for example in relation to the proposed Intimacy-seeking type. The behaviours within this hypothesized common motivational theme but reflecting very different interpersonal approaches to the victim (Threats v Sending gifts v Abusing family) are located in separate regions of the SSA plot. In the same way, the coherence indicated here for the *incompetent* and *rejected* types may be a reflection of the tendency for these motivations to necessarily imply only one interpersonal approach to the victim. So for example, the 'incompetent type' offender will tend to adopt an interpersonal style characterized by an inappropriate assumption of intimacy, a mode that interestingly this has much in common with the Victim as Person mode suggested by Canter and Youngs (2012). Similarly, the (limited) coherence of the *rejected* mode may be a reflection of the common angry interpersonal style that makes sense for such offenders. This latter interpersonal approach to the victim has been articulated by Canter and Youngs as a Victim as Vehicle mode.

Intrusiveness

Figure 6 shows the original SSA-I configuration, with frequencies of occurrence in the sample noted (see Table 1 for frequencies for each variable within each Mullen et al type of stalkers).

The contours have been added to indicate the frequency structure. The circle contains those variables with the highest frequencies of occurrence in the present study. The contours of frequency have also been found in a number of other studies of criminal actions, indicating a lawful consistency to this empirical finding (Canter, 2000; Canter & Fritzon, 1998; Canter & Heritage, 1990).

INSERT FIGURE 6 HERE

At the core of the SSA are the actions that occur in above 50 per cent of the cases; the ones with the dominant role in stalking. Threatening the victim, in essence the key defining act of stalking, occurs in 80% of cases; following or visiting the victim, another key aspect for the event to be regarded as harassment, in 78% of cases, telephoning the victim in 76% of cases, the stalker having previous convictions in 58% of cases and confronting the victim in 52% of cases. These variables reveal a confrontational aspect of stalking and appear to be at the heart of stalking. They are not typical of any one type of stalker but of stalking in general. Around these are actions that happen in 20 to 49 per cent of the cases. Farthest from the focus are those that occur in less than 20 per cent of the cases.

The facet depicted by these frequency contours can be conceptualised as one of increasingly intrusive behaviour, as we move out from the centre. One hypothesis is that this facet represents stages in the progression of a stalking case.. The first stage involves the initial, relatively normal attempts at contact: telephoning, following/visiting, confronting and threatening. The next stage contained within the 20-49% involves a more intrusive form of contact: the offender tries to

come closer to the victim by sending letters, making sexual remarks in communication, accessing the victim's house, inviting contact, destroying personal property or belongings of the victim, carrying out surveillance of the victim, contacting the victim after he/she has intervened, threatening another person, contacting another person, defaming the victim, sending gifts to the victim and finally by perpetrating physical violence to the victim. A third stage is represented by the less than 20% contour. In this stage the behaviour becomes even more intrusive as the offender reveals personal knowledge about the victim, researches the victim, asks for personal details, drives by the victim's place of residence or workplace and abuses the victim's family. In line with Canter's Radex hypothesis of criminal differentiation (Canter 2000) it is within these low frequency variables that lie in the outer contours that the qualitative variations in stalking style are most marked.

DISCUSSION

The present study sought to explore the applicability of clinical stalking types, drawing in the well established Mullen et al (1999) framework as the dominant hypotheses, to the detailed offending styles observed in a sample drawn from a law enforcement context. An MDS analysis showed that while support of some elements of the five types, especially the incompetent and rejected types can be found, Mullen et al's typology of stalkers and their clinical needs ,does not provide a basis for distinguishing stalking modus operandi. This finding is consistent with Mullen and colleagues statement that their typology applies best to the forensic mental health context in which it was developed.

The structure of the MDS revealed a pattern of frequency contours across the offending behaviours that mirrored the structure found in a number of offending style models for other

crime types (see Canter 2000; Canter & Youngs 2009). In the context of stalking, these bands of lower frequency behaviours may be interpreted in terms of an increasing intrusiveness. One possibility is that this reflects different degrees of advancement along the stalking trajectory; the lower frequency behaviours capturing the most advanced stages of stalking. Such a possibility draws attention to the dynamic quality of the stalking activity, requiring multi-faceted models. From this perspective the MDS structure would suggest that while many stalking offences will be homogeneous in their early stages, rather distinct forms of offending action develop as the offence progresses. The indications here are that this development although taking a number of different behavioural forms will be underpinned by an increase in intrusiveness. Further study is needed to explore the temporal dimension of stalking and the issues it raises about the appropriateness of different forms of intervention at different stages.

Most of the high frequency behaviours were characteristic of the distinct treatment types of 'rejected', 'intimacy seeker' and 'resentful' stalkers. Thus rather than distinct types, the indications are that in behavioural terms these are typical components of many stalking offences. While the distinct motivations implied by these types may provide useful foci to treatment programs, they are not the basis for detailed specialized modus operandi. Thus although the widely cited Mullen et al. model may be useful for distinguishing the treatment needs of stalkers, an alternative model is required for the differentiation of stalking offending styles.

This raises the question of alternative psychological frameworks for understanding the behavioural details of this complex form of interpersonal offending. Although there have been a number of other attempts to classify stalking and stalkers, for example in terms of the psychopathology of the offender (Geberth, 1992; Zona et al, 1994), or on the location of the

stalking incidents (Hendricks & Spillane, 1993) or on the type of the initial relationship (Harmon et al, 1995; Wright et al, 1996), a framework that is proving useful across the range of interpersonal offending forms is the Victim Role model (Canter 1994; Canter and Youngs 2012). Working from the premise that the offending actions can be understood as a form of social transaction, the Victim Role model emphasizes ideas about the central control and empathy-deficit components of the interpersonal transaction. (Canter, 1994; Youngs and Canter, 2011; 2012; Canter and Youngs, 2012). The meaning and significance of the offender's actions, especially where the interpersonal transaction is explicit, as in violent and sexual crime, will be derived from this interaction with the victim. The variations in the form this interaction takes are the basis for differentiating offending styles.

For Canter (1994) the offender's interpersonal treatment of the victim through his offending actions can be understood in terms of three distinct roles assigned to the victim: Victim as Object, Victim as Vehicle and Victim as Person . Canter and Youngs (2012) postulate a Victim as Object role that draws together the direct possession and subjugation form of control with an empathy deficit that takes the form of the objectification of the victim. . The Victim as Object role relies on total, physical forms of control so in the context of stalking, whether the nature of contact the offender seeks is 'love' based or destructive, the hypothesis would be that this offending style will be characterised by actions that force this upon the victim directly. This may be through for example watching the victim and contacting her family and friends.

Canter's (1994) Victim as Vehicle role integrates an abusive form of control with an exploitative approach to the victim that is based on a lack of empathy for his/her suffering (Canter and

Youngs 2012). In stalking then, the offender uses the victim to express his own desires and/or anger, deriving satisfaction from her/his reactions. This produces offence actions that are not about the victim and relating to, or even controlling, her/him but are rather concerned with the offender imposing unwanted, often sexual, feelings upon a victim. Canter's (1994) Victim as Person role draws together the coercive approach to control with a form of empathy deficit based upon a general undervaluing of the individual (Canter and Youngs, 2012). This combination is integrated by a narrative in which the victim, although recognised as completely human, remains a person to be handled and manipulated. In the context of stalking then, an activity that may be considered essentially an attempt to force an engagement/relationship with or an impact upon a victim, this victim role is likely to emerge as an attempt to develop a 'normal' personal relationship through a strategy of 'stealing' it; gaining personal, intimate information without her consent (Canter and Youngs, 2012).

Mullen et al recommend distinct treatment options based on their five types. So, for example, the recommended treatment focus with the 'rejected' stalker is on therapy to get the stalker to 'fall out of love' with the victim, for 'resentful' the concern should be not with the stalking situation as such but the general internal often depressive problems of the individual, while for 'intimacy-seekers' the posited underlying typically erotomantic mental disorder is the focus. The empirical overlapping of behavioural aspects of the 'rejected' , 'intimacy seeker' and 'resentful' types implies that clinicians should be aware that all these approaches may be useful for a given stalker. The Victim Role framework opens up additional treatment possibilities for stalkers. It suggests approaches based on targeting the particular forms of control tendency and specific varieties of empathy deficit that have been associated with the Object, Vehicle and Person role

assignments (Canter and Youngs, 2012). It offers the possibility of re-casting the underlying narrative that has given rise to the particular role assignment. Perhaps most intriguingly it offers a nuanced framework for predicting risk that draws on an understanding of the offender's perspective of his relationship with the victim. This may allow richer predictions of when, how and what sort of violence may arise in that relationship.

REFERENCES

Canter, D. (1994). *Criminal Shadows*. London: Harper Collins.

- Canter, D. (2000). Offender profiling and criminal differentiation. *Journal of Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 5(1), 23-46.
- Canter, D., & Heritage, R. (1990). A multivariate model of sexual behaviour: Developments in 'Offender Profiling' I. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 1, 185-212.
- Canter, D., & Fritzon, K. (1998). Differentiating Arsonists: A model of firesetting actions and characteristics. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3, 73-96.
- Canter, D., & Wentink, N. (2004). An empirical test of Holmes and Holmes's serial murder typology. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 20(10), 1-26.
- Canter, D., Alison, L. J., Alison, E., & Wentink, N. (2004). The organized / disorganized typology of serial murder. Myth or model? *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 10(3), 293 - 320.
- Canter, D. and Youngs, D. (2009). *Investigative psychology: Offender profiling and the analysis of criminal action*. Chichester: Wiley
- Canter, D. and Youngs, D. (2012). Sexual and violent offenders' victim role assignments: A general model of offending style. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 23 (3), 297-326.
- Geberth, V. J. (1992). Stalkers. *Law and Order*, October, 138 - 143.
- Harmon, R.B., Rosner, R. & Owens, H. (1995). Obsessional harassment and erotomania in a criminal court population. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 40 (2), 188-196.
- Hendricks, J.E. & Spillane, L. (1993). Stalking: what can we do to forestall tragedy. *The Police Chief*, December, 68-71.
- James, D.V. & Farnham, F.R. (2003). Stalking and serious violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, 31, 432-439.
- McEwan, T.E., Mullen, P.E. & MacKenzie, R. (2009). A study of the predictors of persistence in stalking situations. *Law and Human Behavior*, 33(2), 149-158.
- MacKenzie, R.D., McEwan, T.E., Pathé, M.T., James, D.V., Ogloff, J.R., & Mullen, P.E. (2009). *Stalking Risk Profile: Guidelines for the assessment and management of stalkers*. Melbourne: StalkInc, Pty Ltd. & Monash University.
- Morrison, K.A. (2007). A case of stalking in the workplace and subsequent sexual homicide. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 52 (3), 726-730.
- Mullen, P.E., MacKenzie, R., Ogloff, J.R.P., Pathe, M., McEwan, T. & Purcell, R. (2006). Assessing and managing the risks in the stalking situation. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, 34, 439-450.
- Mullen, P., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G. W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156 (8), 1244 - 1249.
- Mullen, P.E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their victims*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mullen, P.E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2001). The management of stalkers. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 7, 335-342.
- Whyte S, Petch E, Penny C, Reiss D. (2008). Who stalks? A description of patients at a high security hospital with a history of stalking behaviour. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 18 (1), 27-38.
- Wright, J.A., Burgess, A.G., Burgess, A.W., Laszlo, A.T., McCrary, G.O., & Douglas, J.E. (1996). A typology of interpersonal stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11(4), 487–502.
- Zona, M.E., Sharma, K.K. & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomaniac and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 38 (4), 894-903.

APPENDIX

Variable Content Dictionary

1. **Family abuse** - The stalker makes threats, abusive remarks or harasses persons connected to the victim. This may include children, partners, friends, work colleagues and/or neighbours. These may include threats to harm or kill
2. **Co-worker** - Stalker and victim were co-workers having a professional relationship
3. **Drives by** - Stalker repeatedly drives by, or passes victims' place of residence or work place. This may occur on foot or in a vehicle
4. **Defames** - The stalker leaves offensive, untrue and/or inappropriately personal notes in public about the victim. This includes graffiti
5. **Violence** - The stalker perpetrates physical violence upon the victim. This may include punching, stabbing or any other kind of physical assault. The act of homicide should be included in this category
6. **Confronts** - The stalker makes a physically immediate confrontational threat of violence towards the victim. (This may occur separately from or in conjunction with actual violence; however only the immediacy of the threat content should be coded here.) The threat(s) may be verbal, physically with fists, with weapons and/or arson (whereby the victim is physically threatened but not physically harmed)
7. **Ex-partner** - Stalker and victim were ex-partners married, engaged, cohabiting, dating or having casual sex
8. **Threats another** - The stalker threatens to harm or kill persons connected to the victim. This may include relatives, partners or friends
9. **Details** - The stalker asks via letter, phone, email and/or in person for personal details about the victim. This may include questions about what they like to wear in bed (which also should be coded as sexual content), where they live or work, or any similar questions
10. **Threats** - A threatening or abusive content is observed in communications from the stalker. This may be within letters, phone calls, e-mails, graffiti, and gifts. The threat content may include threats to harm or kill (towards the victim), or indirect threats such as sending severed animal heads or coffins. Direct physical confrontations between the stalker and victim should not be coded here, but under Violence (20)
11. **Contacts Another** - Stalker contacts a person connected to the victim. This may be in order to elicit information about the victim, to pass on messages to the victim or to threaten abuse or converse with the receiver of the call
12. **Researches** - Offender researches the victim. This can be done by means of contacting and questioning those connected to the victim, accessing recorded information pertaining to the victim, or surveilling the victim. The knowledge of this research is imparted through correspondence with the victim/others connected to the victim
13. **Phones** - The stalker makes phone calls (verbal or silent) or leaves messages on victim's answer phone. This includes any calls at the victim's home, workplace or mobile telephone

14. **Destroys** - The stalker destroys or attempts to destroy property belonging to the victim or associated with the victim (such as neighbour's car tyres being slashed). Any attempt that could endanger life (i.e. arson) should not be coded here
 15. **Follows** - The stalker follows the victim and/or visits them at their house, estate, and place of work or in transit. This may be on foot, via public transport and/or by vehicle. The victim is aware of this behaviour
 16. **Previous convictions** - The stalker has been convicted previously. This includes any sort of previous convictions regardless of violent or non-violent offences
 17. **Surveillance** - The victim may or may not be aware of the following surveillance types (which can become apparent during police investigations, court cases or subsequent discoveries); electronic bugging of their house or telephone, the stalker taking photographs or film of the victim and/or the stalker spying on the victim successfully concealing their activity or without revealing their presence
 18. **Accesses house** - The stalker gains entrance to the victim's house or private estate through illegal entry or con-approach (such as getting victim's children to let in stalker as their mother's friend)
 19. **Love** - The stalker believes that victim loves him or her. Any kind of response, even negative, from a victim may be interpreted as encouragement
 20. **Invites Contact** - The stalker indicates via communication that they would like/expect to meet the victim, that they expect a future relationship and/or invites the victim to make contact with them. (Any such statement, which includes sexual or threatening contents, should also be coded under the appropriate category)
 21. **Letters** - The stalker sends written material to their victim. This includes letters, cards, and electronic mail sent via the Internet
 22. **Sexual** - An obscene or sexual content is observed in communications from the stalker. This includes sexual remarks in letters, phone calls and/or e-mails, heavy breathing during telephone calls. Also includes acts such as the stalker throwing underwear at the victim
 23. **Stranger** - The stalker was a complete stranger to the victim
 24. **Gifts** - This includes gifts sent to the victim at home, at work and/or via another address. Gifts may be left near the victim's home, work, car and/or where the victim will find them. Gifts include flowers, chocolates, photographs, and clothing. Gifts, which infer threat, should not be counted here but within Threats (10). These may include dead animals or parts of animals, the delivery of coffins and/or any other unusual object
 25. **Knowledge** - The stalker reveals knowledge about the victim via letter, phone, e-mail or directly. This may include knowledge about the victim's family, workplace, activities, colour of clothing or location at specific times and/or photographs that the victim was unaware of being taken
 26. **Friendship** - The stalker was a friend to the victim. This may be a past or existing friendship. Schoolmates and roommates were also coded here
-