Stalking

ARTICLE *in* TRAUMA VIOLENCE & ABUSE · MAY 2003

Impact Factor: 3.27 · DOI: 10.1177/1524838002250766 · Source: PubMed

3 AUTHORS:

Lorraine Sheridan
Curtin University
67 PUBLICATIONS **886** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Eric Blaauw
Hanzehogeschool Groningen
47 PUBLICATIONS **713** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Graham M. Davies
University of Leicester
160 PUBLICATIONS **3,274** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Stalking: Knowns and Unknowns

Lorraine P. Sheridan, Eric Blaauw and Graham M. Davies

Trauma Violence Abuse 2003 4: 148
DOI: 10.1177/1524838002250766

STALKING
Knowns and Unknowns

LORRAINE P. SHERIDAN
University of Leicester, United Kingdom

ERIC BLAAUW
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands

GRAHAM M. DAVIES
University of Leicester, United Kingdom

The current work reviews literature on the nature of stalking. Despite its nebulous nature and differing legal and clinical definitions of stalking, researchers and practitioners are referring to the same phenomenon. Stalking is chronic, consisting of a number of nuisance behaviors that appear consistent over countries and samples. Different categorizations of stalkers and their victims exist, but ex-partner stalkers are a distinctive category with respect to their prevalence, violence risk, and attrition rate. Different samples and definitions and false victimization reports obscure reliable lifetime prevalence estimates, but these appear to be around 12%-16% among women and 4%-7% among men. Stalking has deleterious effects on victims but some of the effects may be the result of stalking's exacerbating of existing vulnerabilities. Future research should focus on subgroups of stalkers and their victims, on cross-cultural investigations, and on the co-occurrence of stalking with other crimes.

Key words: *stalking, stalkers, victims, prevalence, categories, violence*

THE 1990S SAW SUDDEN MOVES by the developed world to legislate against stalking, such that legislators failed to take into account the nature of the crime and essentially outlawed an unknown quantity (Sheridan & Davies, 2001a). As such, many articles on stalking begin by stating that stalking is a "new crime" and that we know relatively little about it. Whereas it is certainly true that the nebulous nature of stalking has been associated with difficulties in both pigeonholing and legislating against it, it may no longer be the case that stalking research is in its infancy and that we are feeling our way in the dark. Since stalking was first outlawed in 1990, over 150 academic studies, articles, books, reviews, and reports on stalking have been pub-

AUTHORS' NOTE: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Lorraine Sheridan, School of Psychology, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, England; telephone: +44 (0)116 223 1012; fax: +44 (0)116 252 2067; e-mail: lph1@leicester.ac.uk.

TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE, Vol. 4, No. 2, April 2003 148-162
DOI: 10.1177/1524838002250766

lished in the social sciences alone. Although this by no means represents a comprehensive literature, these publications have at least amassed sufficient information to provide a basis for understanding the nature of stalking. The current work will provide an overview of the most important interdisciplinary research on stalking to date and aims to offer a review of what is known about stalking, while identifying what remains to be newly chartered or further investigated.

Although stalking was only recently accorded criminal status, it soon became clear that it represented a significant social problem, rather than an exaggeration of a small number of celebrity cases fueled by significant media coverage. Stalking is typically a chronic, rather than an acute, issue—both overall and in terms of individual cases. Overall, stalking behaviors have been perpetrated for centuries, with Mullen, Pathé, and Purcell (2000) noting elements of what we may now consider to be unacceptable stalking behavior in the work of Dante Alighieri (circa 1292), and Skoler's (1998) highlighting the same in William Shakespeare's Dark Lady sonnets (circa 1592). Louisa Mae Alcott's 19th-century novel *A Long and Fatal Love Chase* bears strong resemblance to many contemporary accounts of stalking. Stalking was even outlawed in ancient times. Within Book 4 of the Ancient Roman legal tome Institutes of Justinianus (approximately 550 AD) one can read the passage "Iniuria commititur . . . si quis matrem familias aut praetextatum praetextatumve adsectatus fuerit," which roughly means that it is prohibited to inflict injury or cause hindrance by following a married woman, boy, or girl. With regard to the chronicity of individual cases, victims are typically targeted for periods of months, if not years, and subjected to a variety of intrusive, distressing, and sometimes life-threatening experiences. This pervasive nature of stalking warrants significant multidisciplinary interest and helps explain why it has attracted so much attention since 1990.

KEY POINTS OF THE RESEARCH REVIEW

- Sufficient research now exists to provide a basis for understanding the nature of stalking.
- Although no satisfactory definition of stalking exists, researchers and practitioners are referring to the same phenomenon and there exists a shared literature.
- Stalking is a chronic problem in which multiple stalking tactics are employed by the stalker, but certain types of conduct tend to occur uniformly.
- Lifetime prevalence rates of stalking appear to be 12%-16% among women and 4%-7% among men, but these rates are dependent on the population of interest and the definition employed and are also obscured by false victimization reports.
- Stalking victims have severe economical, psychological, and social problems, some of which may be the result of stalking compounding on existing vulnerability.
- Anyone may become the victim of a stalker, but people in highly visible jobs, vulnerable people, and people who have a high likelihood of engaging in contacts with single people appear to be at higher risk.
- Many different stalker categorizations exist. Ex-partner stalkers represent a large subcategory of stalkers. Because their tactics, mental health, and risk of violence appear to differ from those of other stalker subtypes, further research is indicated on the evolution of stalking behaviors and tailored intervention strategies for different stalker categories.
- Relatively little is known about how to stop stalkers, but strategies may be victim directed, stalker directed, and stalking directed.

ISSUES OF DEFINITION

There has been much debate over what elements or processes comprise stalking. Legal definitions vary between countries and states. Some legislation comprehensively describes which behaviors are punishable, whereas other legislation applies only broad terms. In the United States, most legislation depicts stalking as an intentional pattern of repeated or unwanted pursuit that a "reasonable person" would consider threatening or fear inducing (Miller, 2001). The South Australian Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, s19AA, defines stalking as

> following a person, loitering outside the person's place of residence or another place frequented by the person, entering or interfering with property in the possession of the person, giving offensive material to the person, keeping the person under surveil-

> lance, or acting in a way that could reasonably be expected to arouse the person's apprehension or fear.

In England and Wales, the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 makes no attempt to define stalking but rules that a person must not pursue a course of conduct that amounts to the harassment of another person.

As Blaauw, Sheridan, and Winkel (2002) discuss, antistalking laws differ not only with regard to what behaviors comprise stalking but also with regard to the minimum number of occasions required before a person's conduct is considered to constitute stalking (not specified, 2, 3, or more than 3 occasions) and the issue of stalker intent (e.g., no intent required versus the intent to place the target in reasonable fear for his or her safety or the safety of his or her immediate family). Blaauw et al. (2002) argue that it is advisable to exclude specific behaviors, a minimum number of occasions or behaviors, and consequences for the victim from antistalking laws. Instead, it is suggested that legislators adhere to the requirement that is stated in the England and Wales Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and label a case as stalking where "a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct amounted to stalking of the other." Finch (2001a) notes, however, that in England and Wales, relatively few stalkers are handed custodial sentences. She argues that an inherent prioritization of physical over psychological harm toward the victim leads to a minimization of the damage that stalking causes and allows stalkers to walk free. Further research is necessary to ascertain what proportion of the general population views seriously the psychological harm that may result from stalking victimization.

Stalking is an extraordinary crime, given that it may often consist of no more than the targeted repetition of an ostensibly ordinary or routine behavior.

Obviously, differing legal definitions are associated with differing problems and outcomes. For instance, given that under the England and Wales Act any persistent, unwanted behavior can amount to harassment, police may intervene before behavior escalates to violence (Metropolitan Police Service, 1997). Conversely, the liberty of people to pursue everyday activities or sincerely seek to initiate a relationship may be compromised (e.g., Daly, 1996). Differing definitions of criminal stalking clearly also lead to differing perceptions of what it constitutes. For any individual who seeks to quantify stalking, his or her endeavors are further compounded by the fact that researchers and clinicians do not share a common definition. Not all investigators even employ the word *stalking*. For example, Meloy (1996) and others (e.g., McCann, 1998) use the term *obsessional following*, Rosenfeld (2000) refers to *obsessional harassment*, and Cupach, Spitzberg, and colleagues (e.g., Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998) investigate *obsessive relational intrusion*. There are several reasons why no one definition of, or even term for, stalking exists. One reason involves the motivations of the definer. Those who seek to legally define stalking have evidential and judicially based aims, whereby researchers are often interested in how stalking is perceived by its victims (Mullen et al., 2000; Spitzberg, 2002). The main problem, however, concerns the nebulous nature of stalking. Stalking is an extraordinary crime, given that it may often consist of no more than the targeted repetition of an ostensibly ordinary or routine behavior (Sheridan & Davies, 2001a). It does not apply to a distinct single action or actions: rather, it embraces a multitude of activities. Stalkers can harass victims using unequivocally illegal actions, such as breaking and entering or committing acts of violence, but many stalkers do not overtly threaten, instead using behavior that is ostensibly routine and harmless. Examples of this might include standing near somebody in a public place, or frequently walking past his or her house.

Although it is accepted that there exists no satisfactory definition of stalking (e.g., Badcock, 2002; Kamphuis & Emmelkamp, 2000; Perez, 1993; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000), it is clear that researchers and practitioners are referring to the same phenomenon and that there exists a shared literature. Several studies have attempted to quantify the similarities between

various works that have stalking as their primary focus. In 1996, Meloy reviewed 10 studies published between 1978 and 1995 that provided data on 180 stalkers, concluding that although similarities were seen across studies, further data collection was necessary. A review of 12 studies carried out on three continents between 1978 and 1998 revealed that stalkers engage in very similar patterns of activities (Sheridan & Davies, 2001a). By far the most extensive work, however, is that recently conducted by Spitzberg (2002) who undertook a meta-analysis of 103 studies representing 68,615 respondents or cases. The following section will examine the main findings from these and other works in an attempt to clarify what the course of stalking actually involves.

THE NATURE OF STALKING

In the introduction, it was stated that stalking is a chronic phenomenon, given its protracted nature. Stalking represents a course of deviant conduct, rather than an isolated activity, and this has been demonstrated by victim studies that have provided duration periods for stalking cases. A study conducted prior to the introduction of the term *stalking* as it is understood in the current context (Jason, Reichler, Easton, Neal, & Wilson, 1984) interviewed 50 Chicago women who had been harassed either after a relationship had ended or after they turned down romantic overtures. They were harassed for an average of 13 months, with an upper range of 120 months. Pathé and Mullen (1997) reported a median stalking duration of 24 months in a sample of 100 Australian victims. Blaauw, Winkel, Arensman, Sheridan, and Freeve (2002) reported a mean duration of 58 months, with 13% reporting a period of more than 10 years, in a sample of 241 Dutch victims. In Hall's (1998) sample of 145 victims in the United States, 13% had been stalked for more than 5 years. Similarly, 13% of Sheridan, Davies, and Boon's (2001a) British sample of 95 victims had been stalked for 12 years or more (mean of 52 months for ongoing cases, 76 months for historical cases).

It is evident that stalking is a long-term problem, but what actually does the stalking victim experience? Several studies have reported actual stalking behaviors as part of their results. Blaauw, Sheridan, et al. (2002) compared four studies and noted that "many stalking behaviors have fairly equal distributions in different samples of victims" (p. 55). For instance, Mullen, Pathé, Purcell, and Stuart's (1999) study of 145 stalkers found the most common stalking behaviors to include repeated public approaches, telephoning, assaults, and surveillance and following. The British Crime Survey (Budd & Mattinson, 2000) found that the most common stalking behaviors experienced by their 1,262 stalked respondents were being forced to talk to the stalker, telephone calls, and being physically intimidated and followed. Taking a different approach, Sheridan, Davies, and Boon (2001b) presented a population sample with a continuum of 42 intrusive behaviors and asked them to indicate those they believed to constitute stalking. The highest consensus (above 95%) was found for loitering near and telephoning the target's workplace, following the target, taking furtive photographs of the target, and constantly watching/spying on the target. Unsurprisingly, Spitzberg's (2002) meta-analysis also found the most common stalking behaviors to include telephone calls, personal appearances and contact, and following and surveillance.

Stalking behaviors do not occur on single occasions, nor do they occur in isolation. The victims in Blaauw, Winkel, et al.'s (2002) investigation experienced a median and mean number of six stalking behaviors, whereas in Mullen et al.'s (1999) study, 63% of stalkers employed between three and five methods. The British Crime Survey reported that almost 50% of victims had been subjected to between two and five distinct stalking behaviors. Thus, it may be concluded that stalkers employ multiple stalking tactics and that certain types of conduct tend to occur uniformly and may be considered as examples of common stalking behavior (see also Finch, 2001b). What remains to be clarified, however, is whether duration and diversity are constant for all types of victims and stalkers and whether there is consistency in the evolution of stalking behaviors over time.

PREVALENCE OF STALKING

Studies in representative samples have yielded fairly stable lifetime prevalence rates of stalking victimization: approximately 12% to 16% among women and 4% to 7% among men. An Australian study found that 15% of more than 6,000 women reported having ever been stalked by a man (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996). The British Crime survey, sampling almost 10,000 inhabitants of England and Wales in 1998, revealed a lifetime prevalence of 16% among women and 7% among men (Budd & Mattinson, 2000). A study among 1,171 women in Louisiana showed that 15% of the women reported having been stalked during their lifetime (Kohn, Flood, Chase, & McMahon, 2000). Finally, a study of 16,000 citizens in the United States revealed that 12% of women and 4% of men reported experiences of stalking (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

An actual prevalence rate for stalking victimization remains unknown due to differing requirements in terms of what behaviors constitute stalking, what consequences are necessary to ensure victim status, and the required minimal duration and number of occasions.

Studies in nonrepresentative samples and studies relying on the return of distributed questionnaires have shown more variable figures (there is reason to believe that a high nonresponse rate in questionnaire research leads to overestimation of prevalence rates because nonvictims are less motivated to return questionnaires than are victims). Lifetime prevalence rates were found to be as high as 24% among 348 female public services trades union members in England and Wales (Sheridan et al., 2001b), 31% among females and 17% among males in a sample of 299 college undergraduates in the United States (Fremouw, Westrup, & Pennypacker, 1997), 32% among 257 female college students in the United States (Blackburn, 2000), 27% in another sample of 130 undergraduate students (Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000), 33% among 105 politicians and public figures in the Netherlands (Malsch, Visscher, & Blaauw, 2002) and 76% among 141 women who had been killed by their partner (McFarlane et al., 1999). Conversely, rates of stalking were found to be as low as 5.6% among 178 university counseling center staff members in the United States (Romans, Hays, & White, 1996), 13% among over 4,000 female college students in the United States (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000) and 5.1% among 721 teachers in British Columbia (Lyon & Douglas, in press). Finally, a large community sample study of 1,844 Australian citizens revealed a lifetime prevalence rate of 23.4% (Purcell, Pathé, & Mullen, 2002), but the nonresponse rate stood at 39%.

The findings demonstrate that women are victimized significantly more frequently than are men and that certain community groups have a higher likelihood of victimization than other groups. The findings also indicate that many people at some point in their lives become the victim of stalking behaviors. However, an actual prevalence rate for stalking victimization remains unknown due to differing requirements in terms of what behaviors constitute stalking, what consequences are necessary to ensure victim status, and the required minimal duration and number of occasions. In the Australian national study, stalking by females was omitted and the respondents were not required to have experienced fear as the result of stalking (60% did not acknowledge having experienced safety fears). In the British Crime Survey, only one occasion was required, harassment before the age of 16 was excluded, and rates did drop when respondents were required to have experienced associated distress or upset. Similarly, in the United States research, prevalence rates dropped several percentage points with the introduction of a more stringent requirement for induced fear. In the Louisiana study, a minimal duration of 1 month was required. Thus, prevalence rates of stalking victimization are highly dependent on the definition that is employed.

Prevalence rates are also obscured by false reports of stalking. Clearly, questionnaire studies are hampered by response biases, such as the tendency to respond positively to whatever is being asked. Additionally, reports of stalking can be false when (a) stalkers claim to be victims, (b) people have delusions that encompass stalking, (c) those who have previously been

stalked have become hypersensitive to recurrence, (d) people seek gratification of dependency needs through adopting victim status, and (e) people consciously fabricate or exaggerate victimization for external incentives (Pathé, Mullen, & Purcell, 1999; for another categorization of false victimization see Mohandie, Hatcher, & Raymond, 1998). In a sample of 95 stalking victims who had identified themselves as such to a London-based charity, 20% were considered to be false claims of stalking and in a sample of 262 self-proclaimed victims who had identified themselves to a similar foundation in the Netherlands, 10% of the cases were considered to represent false claims (Sheridan, Blaauw, & Winkel, 2002). Two percent of stalking reports made to the Los Angeles Police Department involved stalkers who presented themselves as victims (Zona, Lane, & Moore, 1996), which leads to an estimated 10% false claims when other categories of false claims of stalking are also taken into account. Thus, false reports of stalking appear to occur reasonably often but as none of these studies were conducted on a representative community sample, there is no way of telling how many reports may be false.

IMPACT ON VICTIMS

Clearly, traumatic events can have severe economical, psychological, and social impacts on victims. With regard to economical matters, stalking victims have reported suffering financial losses due to a decrease of work hours or cessation of work or school attendance (23%-53%), spending money on increasing security at home, at work, or in their vehicles (22%-73%), replacing broken or stolen property, and so forth (Blaauw, Winkel, et al., 2002; Brewster, 1997; Kamphuis & Emmelkamp, 2001; Pathé & Mullen, 1997; Purcell et al., 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). With regard to social consequences other than changes in work or school attendance, victims reported about acquiring unlisted telephone numbers (64%-81%), avoiding social activities (63%-82%), and going underground or relocating residence (11%-66%) (Blaauw, Winkel, et al., 2002; Brewster, 1997; Pathé & Mullen, 1997; Purcell et al., 2002; Sheridan et al., 2001a; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). With regard to psychological complaints, victims reported on increased distrust (44%), paranoia (36%-39%), confusion (28%), fear (21%-57%; fear is more common among female victims than male victims) (Bjerregaard, 2000; K. E. Davis, Coker, & Sanderson, 2002), nervousness (31%), anger or aggression (10%-27%), depression (21%-28%) (Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 1997; Hall, 1998; Sheridan et al., 2001a) and chronic sleep disturbance (74%), excessive tiredness or weakness (55%), appetite disturbance (48%), frequent headaches (47%), and persistent nausea (30%) (Pathé & Mullen, 1997). Additionally, Pathé and Mullen (1997) found that 55% of the victims suffered from symptoms associated with a diagnosis of post–traumatic stress disorder, Kamphuis and Emmelkamp (2001) noted that 59% reported symptoms comparable to those reported in samples of victims of generally recognized traumata, and Blaauw, Winkel, et al. (2002) noted that 78% of victims had symptom levels that indicated the presence of a diagnosable psychiatric disorder. As shown by K. E. Davis et al. (2002), stalking victims are more likely to report poor current health status, to develop a chronic disease, and to report depression. All these findings suggest that stalking has deleterious effects on its victims.

Blaauw, Winkel, et al. (2002) noted that some victims were exposed to a horrifying experience but nonetheless displayed only a few symptoms, whereas others were exposed to only a limited degree of stalking but nonetheless displayed many symptoms of psychopathology. Additionally, several victims did not report about having experienced economical and social consequences due to the stalking experiences. Moreover, stalking features explained only 9% of the variance of the level of distress. Inspection of other studies, too, shows that there are often victims without apparent psychological, economical, or social deterioration (e.g., Brewster, 1997; Sheridan et al., 2001a). These findings indicate that stalking has varying levels of severity and also suggest that some symptoms in victims may be the result of stalk-

ing compounding on already existing vulnerability.

CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMS

Despite the fact that studies have adopted different definitions of stalking and have employed different types of samples (e.g., community samples, student samples, the very young, celebrities), it is clear that stalking affects a large variety of people. Victims are both females and males but Spitzberg's (2002) review of 103 studies showed that a mean of 75% of victims are females. Victims are found to be as young as two (Sheridan et al., 2001a) and as old as 82 years (Blaauw, Winkel, et al., 2002), but the largest group of victims is usually between 18 and 30 years old (Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), although older (Mullen et al., 2000) and younger (Budd & Mattinson, 2000) high-risk groups have also been identified. Victims are found across the socioeconomic continuum, but they appear to be more often highly educated (Brewster, 1997; Hall, 1998) and in high-level professions (Hall, 1998; Pathé & Mullen, 1997).

As suggested by the high proportion of female victims, most recorded stalkers are male.

Stalking victimization occurs among unmarried people, married people, and couples, but risk appears to be high among those who are single and who live alone (Budd & Mattinson, 2000; Hall, 1998). Furthermore, high-risk groups have been identified as homosexual men (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), those with a history of childhood sexual abuse or sexual assault by a relative (K. E. Davis et al., 2002), students (Blackburn, 2000; Budd & Mattinson, 2000; Fremouw et al., 1997; Logan et al., 2000), and people working in public services (Sheridan et al., 2001b) or politics or mass media (Dietz, Matthews, Martell, et al., 1991; Dietz, Matthews, Van Duyne, et al., 1991; Malsch et al., 2002). Research has also shown that a prior history of physical abuse is very common among female victims of stalking (Blackburn, 2000; Brewster, 1997; Coleman, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; see also Baldry, 2002), that many stalking victims have children with their stalker (e.g., Blaauw & Winkel, 2002; Brewster, 1997), and that the ending of their prior relationship with the stalker causes the onset of stalking in many cases (e.g., Brewster, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; see also K. E. Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000; Langhinrichsen, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000).

Altogether, the research has demonstrated that essentially anyone may become the victim of a stalker. However, it appears that people in highly visible jobs (e.g., politics, media, public services) and people who have a high likelihood of engaging in contacts with single people (i.e., students, young people) are at higher risk of stalking victimization. Additionally, it appears that prior vulnerability and subjection to domestic violence increases the chances of becoming a victim of stalking, especially when potential stalkers perceive that there are reasons to keep contact with victims (e.g., following a close relationship and when children are involved).

CHARACTERISTICS OF STALKERS

As with victims, recognizing a potential stalker is not always a simple matter. As suggested by the high proportion of female victims, most recorded stalkers are male. Meloy's (1997) review indicated that 72% of stalkers were male, whereas Spitzberg's (2002) meta-analysis produced a mean figure of 79% across 47 studies. Stalkers tend to be older than other criminals, with the studies reviewed by Meloy (1997) reporting mean ages of, for example, 35 and 40. Similarly, the median age of Mullen et al.'s (1999) stalker sample was 38 years (range 15-75). Kordvani (2000), however, found that 71% of 100 Iranian stalkers were between ages 17 and 22. It has been noted that failed relationships are a common feature among criminal stalkers (e.g., Meloy, 1999), which is unsurprising considering that many stalkers are former partners of their victim. Mullen et al. (1999) noted that over half of their sample of 145 stalkers had never entered into a long-term relationship and that 30% were divorced or separated.

Mullen et al. (1999) reported that 42% of their sample were given a *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (fourth edition)

(*DSM-IV*) (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) Axis I diagnosis, primarily for a delusional disorder, but that the primary diagnosis for this group was a personality disorder, present in 51%. One quarter of stalkers had a comorbid substance-related disorder, and 41% were psychotic. Meloy (1999) also noted that most stalkers will have both Axis I and II diagnoses, reporting that the most common Axis I diagnoses, in descending order of frequency, are drug abuse or dependence, mood disorder, and schizophrenia. On Axis II, stalkers are most likely to be diagnosed with cluster B personality disorders (narcissistic, histrionic, antisocial, borderline) and are not as likely to be psychopathic as other criminals. Farnham, James, and Cantrell (2000) examined 50 British pretrial stalkers, more than half of whom were found to be suffering from a psychotic illness. A criminal history is a common feature among those stalkers who have been acknowledged in the literature. For example, 39% of Mullen et al.'s (1999) sample had previous convictions, relating primarily to interpersonal violence and sexual offenses. Blaauw and Winkel's (2002) victim sample reported that 50% of their stalkers had a criminal record.

Meloy (1999, p. 86) neatly summarized the "modal stalker" as an

> unemployed or underemployed man in his fourth decade of life. He is single or divorced and has a prior criminal, psychiatric and drug abuse history. He has a high school or college education, however, and is significantly more intelligent than are other criminals. He does not disproportionately appear in any ethnic or racial group.

Of course, not all stalkers fit this mold, and a number of studies have identified less archetypal stalker groups. For instance, McCann (1998, 2000, 2001, 2002) has demonstrated that not only do children engage in stalking behavior but that their activities are consistent with those of adult stalkers (McCann, 2000). Pathé, Mullen, and Purcell (2000) examined 29 same-gender stalking cases, comparing the results with a sample of 134 more prototypical opposite-gender stalkers, again finding the two groups to be similar in many respects. Finally, Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001) compared female with male stalkers, finding that group demographics did not differ but that more males reported criminal histories. Contrary to popular belief, stalkers do not necessarily operate in isolation. Budd and Mattinson (2000) found that 79% of stalkers were said to have acted alone, whereas Sheridan et al.'s (2001a) victim sample identified just 59% as lone offenders.

The literature has indicated that although the majority of stalkers do tend to share certain characteristics, many outliers exist, meaning that it is not possible to readily identify a stalking offender. Furthermore, the following section indicates that victims may first come into contact with their stalker in a broad range of contexts.

STALKER CLASSIFICATION AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EX-PARTNER STALKERS

Diverse attempts have been made to produce classificatory systems of stalkers—each with differing objectives. The majority of classification systems distinguish between subtypes on the basis of particular characteristics of stalkers or their victims, whereas others have made distinctions according to the nature of the prior relationship between the two. Early attempts include the work of Dietz (Dietz, Matthews, Martell, et al., 1991; Dietz, Matthews, Van Duyne, et al., 1991) who distinguished between those who target celebrities and other public figures and "normal persons" and Geberth (1992) who established a typology of stalkers based solely on their mental states, labeling his stalker types as psychopathic personality stalkers and psychotic personality stalkers. Following a literature review, Holmes (1993) suggested there were six different types of stalkers based on the nature of the victim. These comprised celebrity (who stalks someone famous), lust (who is a serial sexual predator), hit (a professional murderer for hire), love scorned (who had a nonintimate relationship with the victim), political (precipitated by political ideology) and domestic (ex-intimate) stalkers. Kienlen, Birmingham, Solberg, O'Regan, and Meloy (1997) divided stalkers into two groups simply according to whether they were or were not

judged to be psychotic. Zona, Sharma, and Lane (1993) created a dominant forensic classification system of stalkers, placing cases into three categories: erotomanic, love obsessional, and simple obsessional. A more recent taxonomy aimed at law enforcement was provided by Boon and Sheridan (2001). This system partitioned offenders according to their motivational orientations and identified four principal classifications: ex-partner harassment/stalking, infatuation harassment, delusional fixation stalking, and sadistic stalking.

Many of the approaches to classifying stalkers have shortfalls and are incomplete. Some are too simple, given that the population is heterogeneous and is likely to include individuals who are mentally ill and/or personality disordered and those who are not. Others are difficult to decipher and many stalkers may fall either between two categories or may fit into more than one. The reliability of such ad hoc typologies may be questioned, given that the number of cases on which they are based is not always clear and as some are of an arbitrary and impressionistic nature. It is important to remember however, that any classification of stalkers will likely vary in accordance with the goals of the group who develop it (Mullen et al., 2000).

Zona, Palarea, and Lane (1998) posited that the relationship (real or imagined) between stalker and victim best informs an understanding of stalker motivations. As with classifications based on stalker or victim characteristics, however, there is no one relational category accepted by all professionals. Zona et al. (1993) divided their sample of stalkers into two categories, prior relationship and no prior relation- ship, with the former grouping being further subdivided into acquaintance, customer, neighbor, professional relationship, dating, and sexual intimates. Harmon, Rosner, and Owens (1995) classified the type of prior interaction between 48 stalkers and their victims into personal, professional, employment, media (where the target is a celebrity with no connection to the stalker), acquaintance, none, or unknown. After examining the harassment experiences of college students, Fremouw et al. (1997) produced four victim-stalker categorizations: friend, casual date, serious date, and stranger. Finally, Emerson, Ferris, and Gardner (1998) collected opportunistic victim and archival data from a variety of sources and produced the following relational categories: unacquainted, pseudo-acquainted and semiacquainted stalking.

It is now widely recognized that ex-partner stalkers represent a large, if not the largest, relational subcategory of stalkers.

It should be noted that the current overview of stalker and victim typologies is nonexhaustive. There exist additional single-axial categorizations to those cited above, and J. A. Davis and Chipman (2001), Hargreaves (in press), and Spitzberg and Cupach (2001) have all provided biaxial systems. Only one categorization system to date is triaxial, however (Mullen et al., 2000). For each of the five stalker subtypes recognized by this taxonomy (rejected, intimacy seeking, resentful, predatory, and incompetent), the context for the stalking and stalker motivations, the stalker's psychiatric status, and the prior stalker-victim relationship are incorporated. What is clear from the majority of stalker categorizations, regardless of their aims or format, is the important role of ex-partner stalkers. This is despite the possibility that ex-intimates were underrepresented in early works due to a focus on erotomanic disorders and a selection bias on the part of law enforcement officers to arrest and prosecute high-profile or stranger stalkers (Meloy, 1997). It is now widely recognized that ex-partner stalkers represent a large, if not the largest, relational subcategory of stalkers, with Spitzberg (2002) reporting a mean proportion of 49% over 40 studies. Furthermore, ex-intimates appear to be more likely to act out violently than stranger or acquaintance stalkers (e.g., Farnham et al., 2000; Harmon, Rosner, & Owens, 1998; Kienlen et al., 1997; Meloy, Davis, & Lovette, 2001; Mullen et al., 1999; Palarea, Zona, Lane, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1999; Pathé & Mullen, 1997; Schwartz-Watts & Morgan, 1998; Sheridan & Davies, 2001b; Zona et al., 1993). Farnham et al. (2000) found ex-intimate stalkers significantly less likely to be psychotic than past acquaintances or strangers. Similarly, Coleman (2000) reported that ex-intimate stalkers were

more likely to be diagnosed with substance abuse and antisocial and narcissistic personality disorders, whereas nonintimate stalkers were more likely to be diagnosed with schizoid personality disorder. Community samples, however, have stated that they would be less frightened of an ex-intimate stalker than a stranger stalker (Hills & Taplin, 1998) and have judged victims to bear greater responsibility for their stalking where they were previously close to the stalker (Sheridan, Gillett, Blaauw, Davies, & Patel, in press). Blaauw and Winkel (2002) also noted that ex-intimate stalkers had a higher likelihood of engaging in violence against their victims but additionally noted that such stalkers displayed a larger diversity of stalking behaviors and that these behaviors had a faster attrition rate when compared with those of other relational subgroups. These findings warrant further research on the evolution of stalking behaviors and appropriate intervention strategies for different stalker categories.

PREVENTING AND ENDING STALKING

Despite the bulk of literature pertaining to various aspects of stalking, very little is known about how stalking may be curtailed or prevented. Those few studies that have addressed this issue found that victims predominantly reported that their stalking ended because the victim moved away from his or her house, because the stalker entered a new relationship, or because the police warned or arrested the stalker (Sheridan et al., 2001a; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Nonetheless, from a logical point of view it would seem that measures to halt stalking exist within three areas: victim directed, stalker directed, and stalking directed. The notion that the chances of becoming a victim of stalking are related to preexisting vulnerability (such as living alone or having celebrity status) and subjection to domestic violence (which has also been found to be associated with vulnerability; see, e.g., Wileman & Wileman, 1995) suggests that victim safety planning should focus on victims' resilience (see also Blaauw, Winkel, et al., 2002; Kropp, Hart, Lyon, & LePard, 2002). The primary goal should be to prevent (further) impacts on the victim's well-being, but in some cases this might also lead to a cessation of the stalking as the victim may become a less obvious target. A secondary goal could be to encourage victims to take appropriate security measures and to inform their social network (see also Kropp et al., 2002). In certain cases, however, victim-directed strategies could mean that the victim is encouraged to change his or her residence, job, or leisure activities due to the ineffectiveness of less radical strategies (Boon & Sheridan, 2001).

With regard to stalker-directed interventions, it is important to bear in mind that stalkers are likely to be comorbid for a range of disorders (e.g., Farnham et al., 2000; Kamphuis & Emmelkamp, 2000; Mullen et al., 2000). A positive prospect for the treatment of stalkers is that they as a group do not appear to be very psychopathic (Kropp et al., 2002; Meloy, 1999), which is known to be extremely difficult to treat. However, the apparently high prevalence of personality disorders (e.g., Meloy, 1999; Mullen et al., 1999) does not offer much hope to victims as such disorders tend to be resistant to treatment. Conversely, stalkers without clear psychopathology, psychotic stalkers, and stalkers with Axis I disorders may be receptive to pharmacological (for psychoses, depression, etc., but maintenance may be problematic) and psychotherapeutic interventions (see also Mullen et al., 2000) such as therapy based on a functional analysis approach (see Westrup, 2000) or a cognitive approach (see Lindsay, Olley, Jack, Morrison, & Smith, 1998). Further research, however, is necessary to clarify which treatments are most appropriate for different stalker subtypes.

Stalking-directed interventions are the responsibility of the criminal justice system. Research has shown that reporting to the police differs between samples with either the minority (e.g., 18%, Bjerregaard, 2000; 35%, Blackburn, 2000) or the majority reporting to the police (e.g., 89%, Blaauw, Winkel, et al., 2002; 96%, Nicastro, Cousins, & Spitzberg, 2000; 60%, Pathé et al., 2000). It is a consistent finding, however, that far from all cases result in criminal justice responses such as criminal charges, restraining orders, and imprisonment (e.g., 9%, Bjerregaard, 2000; 45%, Blaauw, Sheridan, et al., 2002; 33%, Blackburn, 2000; 56%, Nicastro et al.,

2000). It is also consistently found that restraining orders are often violated by stalkers (with Spitzberg's [2002] meta-analysis providing an overall figure of 40%) and that other criminal justice responses also frequently fail to curtail the activities of stalkers. An important question that remains to be answered is whether the success of criminal justice responses is dependent on the nature of stalking and the type of stalker and victim.

CONCLUSIONS

The current work has reviewed the main areas so far covered by research into stalking by providing overviews of what is now understood about stalkers, their victims, and the stalking process. Additionally, indications have been given as to which issues require further examination. Not all stalking-related work has been included, as lengthy discussions of the most appropriate legal sanctions and debates surrounding the complex area of stalker motivations are beyond the remit of this general review article.

There are other issues associated with stalking that so far have barely been addressed. For instance, there exists very little research on stalking that has been conducted outside Western countries, the authors only being able to identify two such studies: that by Kordvani (2000), who carried out preliminary work on 100 stalking cases in Iran, and Suzuki's (1999) population study of 600 Japanese women. Neither could the authors identify any published cross-cultural studies (but see Jagessar & Sheridan, 2002). It is important that stalking be examined in non-Western countries to identify whether it is a global phenomenon, particularly given that many countries have not yet legislated against this form of harassment. One recent work (Human Rights Watch, 2001) however, has identified two serious cases of stalking in Uzbekistan, noting that the victims were not protected by criminal law.

It is important that stalking be examined in non-Western countries to identify whether it is a global phenomenon, particularly given that many countries have not yet legislated against this form of harassment.

Still other aspects of stalking prove unequivocal. It is not known how far stalking is linked to other crimes and how often it stands alone. Questions arise such as How many victims of domestic violence become victims of stalkers? (see, e.g., Baldry, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Walker & Meloy, 1998). How many murder victims have been stalked first? How frequently does stalking facilitate other criminal acts, such as fraud or professional "hits"? These questions are unlikely to be answered in the near future, given that the most dangerous and violent stalkers are difficult to identify within the criminal justice system as they may have been charged with crimes other than stalking or harassment, such as rape, assault, or murder.

One contentious issue that may be raised is that of whether stalking is overrated as a criminal act and social problem, with the subsequent effect that the gravity of more serious stalking cases may not be appreciated. Large-scale representative surveys have indicated that stalking is a widespread problem, affecting up to 1 in 6 women and 1 in 14 men at some point in their lives, but also that the majority of cases are not judged (either by the authorities or, more frequently, by the victims themselves) to warrant criminal investigation. Issues of definition and measurement affect tremendously how prevalent and serious stalking is judged to be, given its nebulous quality (see, e.g., Hills & Taplin, 1998; Sheridan & Davies, 2001a; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2000). As a result, researchers need to be continually aware of the possibility of applying overinclusive definitions and rendering acceptable behavior unacceptable.

The most encouraging aspect of the material reviewed is that it demonstrates a huge advancement in awareness of the course and nature of stalking since 1990. Despite the difficulties inherent to providing a definition of stalking, the current state of knowledge has revealed that stalkers do in fact engage in similar patterns of behavior and that researchers and practitioners alike are addressing the same issues within a shared literature. This research

into the general features and diverse aspects of stalking has allowed practical progress to be made in recognizing, understanding, and intervening in stalking cases, both at individual and state or national levels. Of course, this advancement does not suggest that stalking research has reached a peak. Rather, it implies that because we now possess a basic knowledge of the fundaments of criminal stalking, research needs to move on to address more specific issues and to uncover new ways of tackling this chronic problem.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, POLICY, AND RESEARCH

- Research and practice should not consider stalkers and victims as homogeneous groups but should pay attention to different subgroups. Certain subgroups of stalkers are more often mentally disordered or violent and persistent than others and certain subgroups of victims appear to suffer more from their experiences than others.
- Given the different types of stalkers and their differential risk of violence, research and clinical practice should focus more on risk assessment.
- Prevention strategies should not focus on victims, stalkers, or criminal justice responses alone but rather on interactions between the three.
- Research should address the extent to which stalking is linked to other crimes and also perceptions and prevalence of stalking in non-Western countries, to identify whether it is a global phenomenon.
- Researchers should be wary of providing overinclusive definitions of stalking that may result in inflated prevalence estimates and the labeling of routine behavior as deviant.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1996). *Women's safety, Australia 1996*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Badcock, R. (2002). Psychopathology and treatment of stalking. In J. C. W. Boon & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing and treatment* (pp. 125-139). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Baldry, A. (2002). From domestic violence to stalking: The infinite cycle of violence. In J. C. W. Boon & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing and treatment* (pp. 83-104). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 389-406.

Blaauw, E., & Winkel, F. W. (2002). *Stopping stalking*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Blaauw, E., Sheridan, L., & Winkel, F. W. (2002). Designing anti-stalking legislation on the basis of victims' experiences and psychopathology. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *9*(2).

Blaauw, E., Winkel, F. W., Arensman, E., Sheridan, L., & Freeve, A. (2002). The toll of stalking: The relationship between features of stalking and psychopathology of victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*, 50-63.

Blackburn, E. J. (2000). Forever yours: Rates of stalking victimization, risk factors and traumatic responses among college women. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*, 5763.

Boon, J. C. W., & Sheridan, L. (2001). Stalker typologies: A law enforcement perspective. *Journal of Threat Assessment*, *1*, 75-97.

Brewster, M. P. (1997). *An exploration of the experiences and needs of former intimate stalking victims: Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice*. West Chester, PA: West Chester University.

Budd, T., & Mattinson, J. (2000). *Stalking: Findings from the 1998 British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office.

Coleman, F. L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*, 420-432.

Coleman, F. L. (2000). Clinical characteristics of stalkers. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, *60*, 5766.

Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1998). Obsessional relational intrusion and stalking. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 233-263). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Daly, E. (1996, December 17). Sweeping penalties in new laws on stalkers. *The Independent*, p. 9.

Davis, J. A., & Chipman, M. A. (2001). Stalkers and other obsessional types: A review and forensic psychological typology of those who stalk. In J. A. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment and case management* (pp. 3-18). Boca Raton, FL: CRC.

Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners:

Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and break-up context. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 407-425.
Davis, K. E., Coker, A. L., & Sanderson, M. (2002). *Physical and mental health effects of being stalked for men and women*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
Dietz, P. E., Matthews, D. B., Martell, D. A., Stewart, T. M., Hrouda, D. R. & Warren, J. (1991). Threatening and otherwise inappropriate letters to members of the United States Congress. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *36*, 1445-1468.
Dietz, P. E., Matthews, D. B., Van Duyne, C., Martell, D. A., Parry, C. D. H., Stewart, T. M., et al. (1991). Threatening and otherwise inappropriate letters to Hollywood celebrities. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *36*, 185-209.
Emerson, R. M., Ferris, K. O., & Gardner, C. B. (1998). On being stalked. *Social Problems*, *45*, 289-314.
Farnham, F. R., James, D. V., & Cantrell, P. (2000). Association between violence, psychosis, and relationship to victim in stalkers. *The Lancet*, *355*, 199.
Finch, E. (2001a, September 21). Is stalking a violent crime? *Police Review*, pp. 25-26.
Finch, E. (2001b). *The criminalisation of stalking: Constructing the problem and evaluating the solution*. London: Cavendish.
Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics,.
Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *42*, 666-669.
Geberth, V. J. (1992). Stalkers. *Law and Order*, *10*, 1-6.
Hall, D. M. (1998). The victims of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 113-137). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Hargreaves, J. (in press). Stalking behaviour. In D. V. Canter & L. Alison (Eds.), *Profiling rape and murder* (Offender profiling series V, pp. 1-16). Aldershot: Ashgate.
Harmon, R. B., Rosner, R., & Owens, H. (1995). Obsessional harassment and erotomania in a criminal court population. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *40*, 188-196.
Harmon, R. B., Rosner, R., & Owens, H. (1998). Sex and violence in a forensic population of obsessional harassers. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, *4*, 236-249.
Hills, A. M., & Taplin, J. L. (1998). Anticipated responses to stalking: Effect of threat and target-stalker relationship. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *5*, 139-146.
Holmes, R. H. (1993). Stalking in America: Types and methods of criminal stalkers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *9*, 317-327.
Human Rights Watch. (2001). Sacrificing women to save the family? Domestic violence in Uzbekistan. *Human Rights Watch*, *13*, 1-54. Retrieved October 11, 2002, from http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/uzbekistan/uzbek0701.pdf.
Jagessar, J., & Sheridan, L. (2002). *Cross-cultural aspects of stalking*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
Jason, L. A., Reichler, A., Easton, J., Neal, A., & Wilson, M. (1984). Female harassment after ending a relationship: A preliminary study. *Alternative lifestyles*, *6*, 259-269.
Kamphuis, J. H., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2000). Stalking: A contemporary challenge for forensic and clinical psychiatry. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *176*, 206-209.
Kamphuis, J. H., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2001). Traumatic distress among support-seeking female victims of stalking. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *158*, 795-798.
Kienlen, K. K., Birmingham, D. L., Solberg, K. B, O'Regan, J. T., & Meloy, J. R. (1997). A comparative study of psychotic and nonpsychotic stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *25*, 317-334.
Kohn, M., Flood, H., Chase, J., & McMahon, P. (2000). Prevalence and health consequences of stalking—Louisiana, 1998-1999. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *49*(29), 653-655.
Kordvani, A. H. (2000). *Women stalking in Iran*. Paper presented (by proxy) to the Criminal Justice Responses to Stalking Conference, Australian Institute of Criminology, Sydney, Australia.
Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Lyon, D. R., & LePard, D. A. (2002). Managing stalkers: Coordinating treatment and supervision. In J. C. W. Boon & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing and treatment* (pp. 141-163). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
Langhinrichsen, R. J., Palarea, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 73-90.
Lindsay, W. R., Olley, S., Jack, C., Morrison, F., & Smith, A. H. W. (1998). The treatment of two stalkers with intellectual disabilities using a cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *11*, 333-344.
Logan, T. K., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 91-111.
Lyon, D. R., & Douglas, K. S. (in press). *Violence against educators: The British Columbia Teacher's Federal Violence Survey*. Vancouver: BCTF.
Malsch, M., Visscher, M., & Blaauw, E. (2002). *Stalking van bekende personen* [Stalking of celebrities]. Den Haag, the Netherlands: Boom.
McCann, J. T. (1998). Subtypes of stalking (obsessional following) in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *21*, 667-675.
McCann, J. T. (2000). A descriptive study of child and adolescent obsessional followers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *45*, 195-199.
McCann, J. T. (2001). *Stalking in children and adolescents: The primitive bond*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
McCann, J. T. (2002). The phenomenon of stalking in children and adolescents. In J. C. W. Boon & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing and treatment* (pp. 125-139). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

McFarlane, J. M., Campbell, J. C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C. J., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies*, *3*, 300-316.

Meloy, J. R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *1*, 147-162.

Meloy, J. R. (1997). A clinical investigation of the obsessional follower: "she loves me, she loves me not . . .". In L. Schlesinger (Ed.), *Explorations in criminal psychopathology* (pp. 9-32). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Meloy, J. R. (1999). Stalking: An old behavior, a new crime. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *22*, 85-99.

Meloy, J. R., Davis, B., & Lovette, J. (2001). Risk factors for violence among stalkers. *Journal of Threat Assessment*, *1*, 3-16.

Metropolitan Police Service. (1997). *The Protection from Harassment Act 1997: A guide* (Version 2.0). London: New Scotland Yard.

Miller, N. (2001). Stalking investigation, law, public policy and criminal prosecution as problem solver. In J. A. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection* (pp. 387-426). Boca Raton, FL: CRC.

Mohandie, K., Hatcher, C., & Raymond, D. (1998). False victimization syndromes in stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 225-256). San Diego: Academic Press.

Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their victims*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G. W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *156*, 1244-1249.

Nicastro, A. M., Cousins, A. V., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2000). The tactical face of stalking. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*, 69-82.

Palarea, R. E., Zona, M. A., Lane, J. C., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1999). The dangerous nature of intimate relationship stalking: Threats, violence and associated risk factors. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *17*, 269-283.

Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *170*, 12-17.

Pathé, M., Mullen P. E., & Purcell, R. (1999). Stalking: False claims of victimisation. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *174*, 170-172.

Pathé, M. T., Mullen, P. E., & Purcell, R. (2000). Same-gender stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *28*, 191-197.

Perez, C. (1993). Stalking: When does obsession become a crime. *American Journal of Criminal Law*, *20*, 263-280.

Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2001). A study of women who stalk. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *158*, 2056-2060.

Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2002). The incidence and nature of stalking in the Australian community. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *36*, 114-120.

Romans, J. S. C., Hays, J. R., & White, T. K. (1996). Stalking and related behaviors experienced by counseling center staff members from current or former clients. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, *27*, 595.

Rosenfeld, B. (2000). Assessment and treatment of obsessional harassment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *5*, 529-549.

Schwartz-Watts, D., & Morgan, D. W. (1998). Violent versus non-violent stalkers. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *26*, 241-245.

Sheridan, L., Blaauw, E., & Winkel, F. W. (2002). *Characteristics of false stalking allegations*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sheridan, L., & Davies, G. M. (2001a). Stalking: The elusive crime. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *6*, 133-147.

Sheridan, L., & Davies, G. M. (2001b). Violence and the prior victim-stalker relationship. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, *11*, 102-116.

Sheridan, L., Davies, G. M., & Boon, J. C. W. (2001a). The course and nature of stalking: A victim perspective. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *40*, 215-234.

Sheridan, L., Davies, G. M., & Boon, J. C. W. (2001b). Stalking: Perceptions and prevalence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 151-167.

Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., Blaauw, E., Davies, G. M., & Patel, D. (in press). "There's no smoke without fire": Are male ex-partners perceived as more "entitled" to stalk than stranger or acquaintance stalkers? *British Journal of Psychology*.

Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 23-40.

Skoler, G. (1998). The archetypes and psychodynamics of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 113-137). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2002). The tactical topography of stalking victimization and management. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *3*, 261-288.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2001). Paradoxes of pursuit: Toward a relational model of stalking-related phenomena. In J. A. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment and case management* (pp. 97-136). Boca Raton, FL: CRC.

Suzuki, S. (1999). Victimization by stalkers among young females. *Reports of the National Research Institute of Police Science*, *40*, 53-66.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, T. J. (2000). Comparing stalking victimization from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 7-22.

Walker, L. M., & Meloy, J. R. (1998). Stalking and domestic violence. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 140-159). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Westrup, D. (2000, December). *Stalking in the U.S.: Time to focus on treatment*. Paper presented to the Criminal Jus-

tice Responses Conference, Australian Institute of Criminology, Sydney, Australia.
Wileman, R., & Wileman, B. (1995). Towards balancing power in domestic violence relationships. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, *16*, 165-176.
Zona, M. A., Lane, J., & Moore, M. (1996). *The psychology and behavior of stalkers*. Paper presented at the American Academy of Forensic Sciences Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
Zona, M. A., Palarea, R. E., & Lane, J. C., Jr. (1998). Psychiatric diagnosis and the offender-victim typology of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 70-83). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Zona, M. A., Sharma, K. K., & Lane, J. C. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *38*, 894-903.

SUGGESTED FUTURE READINGS

Boon, J. C. W., & Sheridan, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing and treatment*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
McCann, J. T. (2001). *Stalking in children and adolescents: The primitive bond*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Meloy, J. R. (Ed.). (1998). *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their victims*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lorraine P. Sheridan is a lecturer in psychology at the University of Leicester, United Kingdom. She wrote her Ph.D. dissertation on psychological aspects of stalking and harassment and has published several articles, book chapters, and an edited book on this topic. Dr. Sheridan's other research interests include understanding racist and Islamophobic behavior and the psychological correlates of violent crime.

Eric Blaauw, Ph.D., is a senior lecturer in forensic psychology at the Department of Clinical Psychology of the Vrije University Amsterdam. Dr. Blaauw has conducted research on prison suicides, police custody procedures, mental illnesses among prisoners, and stalking. He has published several books and articles on these areas and provides postgraduate courses on these topics.

Graham M. Davies is a professor of psychology at the University of Leicester, United Kingdom. He has published widely in the area of witness testimony, in particular on the fallibility of eyewitness identification and the reliability of children as witnesses. His most recent work has concerned the use of CCTV footage in police investigations and on memory for motor vehicles.