

**STALKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES:  
IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFICACY**

by

Jennifer Elizabeth Storey

B.A., Carleton University, 2006

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

in the Department  
of  
Psychology

**© Jennifer Elizabeth Storey 2009  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
Spring 2009**

All rights reserved.

This work may not be reproduced in whole or part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

## APPROVAL

**Name:**

**Jennifer E. Storey**

**Degree:**

Master of Arts (Experimental Psychology)

**Title of Thesis:**

***Stalking Management Strategies: Implementation  
and Efficacy***

**Examining Committee:**

**Chair: Dr. Wendy Thornton**

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology

---

**Dr. Stephen Hart**

Senior Supervisor

Professor, Department of Psychology

---

**Dr. Randall Kropp**

Supervisor

Adjunct Faculty, Department of Psychology

---

**Dr. Kevin Douglas**

Supervisor

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

---

**Dr. Barry Rosenfeld**

External Examiner

Professor, Department of Psychology, Fordham  
University

**Date Approved**

---



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

## Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <[www.lib.sfu.ca](http://www.lib.sfu.ca)> at: <<http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library  
Burnaby, BC, Canada

## ABSTRACT

The stalking literature lacks research regarding how stalking cases are resolved and which management strategies precipitate resolution. The present study focused on three aspects of case management; i) the management strategies employed, ii) the process by which police utilize management strategies, and iii) the efficacy of management strategies at promoting desistance. On average 19 management strategies were employed per case. Certain strategies (e.g. legal strategies), were more commonly employed than others. Some categories of strategies were employed more often with certain types of stalkers. Grounded Theory analysis uncovered themes regarding the process of the case including, employing strategies that corresponded with the risk level of the case. Themes were also uncovered regarding the efficacy of management strategies. For example, police monitoring of the perpetrator facilitated case management, whereas contact between the victim and perpetrator negatively affected case resolution. Results present avenues for future research and implications for practice.

**Keywords:** stalking; risk management strategies; law enforcement; case management

## **DEDICATION**

To my parents whose help, support and example are the reasons that I am in this position today. My only regret is that frogs do not engage in stalking because then we could have collaborated.

To Kate, thank you for your support and encouragement.

To Sean who has done so much to help me and made sure that I had fun along the way.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to thank all of those in the DAVCH unit at VPD for their help and for the experience that they have given me, without which this thesis would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Andrea Gibas and Kim Reeves for assisting me with data collection. Finally I would like to thank Stephen Hart for his valuable guidance, feedback and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Approval.....</b>	ii
<b>Abstract.....</b>	iii
<b>Dedication.....</b>	iii
<b>Acknowledgement.....</b>	iv
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	vi
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	viii
<b>Introduction .....</b>	1
Management strategy and tactic use .....	2
Strategy and tactic reccomendations.....	4
Efficacy of stalking management tactics .....	5
Restraining orders .....	6
Alarm systems.....	7
Other tactics .....	8
Police tactics .....	9
Current study.....	10
<b>Method .....</b>	12
Cases .....	12
Measures .....	12
Management strategies and tactics .....	12
Stalking risk factors.....	15
Procedure.....	17
Data analysis.....	18
Research question 1 .....	18
Grounded theory .....	19
Reseach question 2 .....	22
Reserch question 3.....	24
Description of the sample .....	26
Question 1: What strategies and tactics do police, victim and others use to manage stalking cases?.....	28
Question 2: What is the process used by police to hadle stalking cases?.....	32
Risk principle .....	33

Escalation .....	34
Joint effort.....	34
Victim contribution.....	35
Monitoring .....	36
Impediments .....	37
Question 3a: What management strategies and tactics assist police in resolving stalking cases? .....	37
Legal strategy .....	38
Congenial relationship .....	38
Informal strategies .....	39
Outside assistance.....	39
Mental health services .....	39
Victim implementation.....	40
Perpetrator implementation.....	40
Family implementation .....	40
Question 3b: What management strategies and tactics had a negative effect on the case? .....	40
Contact .....	41
Open to contact .....	42
Informal police warnings .....	43
United front .....	43
Collaboration with internet companies.....	44
Rational discussion.....	44
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Data alignment with previous research.....	45
New management tactics identified .....	49
Future research directions .....	51
Implications for policy, police, victims, and practice .....	55
<b>References .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>68</b>
Appendix A: Literature review of suggested risk management tactics.....	69
Appendix B: Coding manual .....	79

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Defining management tactics, strategies and principles .....	2
Table 2	Management Strategies and Examples .....	14
Table 3	SAM Domains and Factors.....	16
Table 4	Stalking Management Strategy Frequency of Use.....	29

## INTRODUCTION

Stalking is defined as the “unwanted and repeated communication, contact, or other conduct that deliberately or recklessly causes people to experience reasonable fear or concern for their safety or the safety of others known to them” (Kropp, Hart, & Lyon, 2008, p. 1). The lifetime prevalence rate of stalking victimization in Canada is approximately 4% for women and 2% for men (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2005). Some estimates from the United States place the rate of violence in stalking cases between 25%-35% (McFarlane et al., 1999; Rosenfeld & Harmon, 2002). Thus, stalking is a pervasive crime that often results in violence. These findings beg the question, how can we stop stalkers? Unfortunately, there is not yet an answer to this question.

Stalking is a difficult crime to manage due, in part, to the heterogeneity of stalkers. The most common type of stalker of a female victim is a former intimate partner, for example, a former husband, or boyfriend while an acquaintance stalker is most likely for a male victim (Kropp, Hart, & Lyon, 2002). But stalkers can also be friends, family members or complete strangers (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). The motives of stalkers also vary a great deal; they include love, revenge or a delusional belief. Numerous other factors also combine to make each stalking case unique; including, victim access, drug or alcohol abuse, and access to weapons. Providing further complexity is the fact that stalking is typically an ongoing offence. This means that unlike a crime such as robbery, which is an isolated incident, stalking can persist anywhere from a few days to decades. As such, management strategies and tactics must both deter perpetrators and protect victims (Kropp, et al., 2002). Therefore, it is not surprising

that there are a large number of suggested management strategies and tactics to deal with stalking.

## **Management Strategy and Tactic Use**

A relatively small number of empirical studies have examined management tactics and management strategies, however, these terms have yet to be clearly defined. Herein a management tactic refers to a specific maneuver or act. Tactics are actions or behaviours designed to reduce or end stalking behaviour. For example, calling the police or changing one's phone number are management tactics. A management strategy is a broader concept that is comprised of several tactics. For example, securing one's home is a strategy that can be made up of several different tactics such as installing locks or light, purchasing a guard dog or trimming hedges to increase visibility. An additional term that will be used is management principles. Management principles are principles meant to guide how management strategies and tactics are implemented and utilized. They can be thought of as the level above management strategies just as management strategies are a level above management tactics (see Table 1).

**Table 1 Defining management tactics, strategies and principles**

	Description	Example
Management tactics	Actions or behaviours that are designed to reduce or stop stalking behaviour	Obtaining an unlisted phone number
Management Strategies	A set of behaviours designed to increase safety or reduce stalking behaviour in a specific area	Increasing vehicle security
Management Principles	An overarching philosophy designed to guide how management tactics and strategies are implemented	Using tactics and strategies that match the level of risk involved in the case

Several studies have examined the frequency with which different management strategies and tactics are employed in stalking cases. For example, Bjerrgaard (2000) found that the most common tactic reported by victims was changing their phone number and that females were more likely to report stalking to police and employ more and varied tactics. Conversely Nicastro, Cousins, and Spitzberg (2000) found that the most common tactic was calling police, which occurred in 96% of cases. This finding was not surprising as their sample consisted of police case files, thus it is not representative of the general frequency of reporting. They also found that the most common tactic that was unrelated to police was for the victim to "physically confront" the perpetrator (p. 76), which occurred in 18% of the cases. Brewster (2003) found that most victims attempt to deal with stalking on their own before involving police. She found that 73% of the victims surveyed increased security measures, 70% tried to reason with the stalker, 70% curtailed social outings, 53% changed or quit their job, and 39% relocated. Overall, the victims employed 408 types of discouragement but found that only 37 types (9.1%) helped to deter the stalker (Brewster, 2003). Most victims reported that their efforts had no effect or a negative effect on the stalker's behaviour. In spite of this lack of efficacy, many victims still did not call police. It should be noted that within this document the term efficacy is defined by its lay definition (the power to produce an effect), not the definition commonly used in the treatment literature.

Brewster (2003) found that the primary reasons cited by the victims for not calling police were that they felt that the situation was not a police matter and that they feared reprisal from the stalker. Another study by Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found that victims most commonly failed to report stalking because they felt police could not assist them (100%) and would not believe them (98.2%). Despite these reasons not to involve police, Brewster (2003) found that most victims (72%) eventually contact police.

However, it should be noted that rates of reporting vary greatly across studies from 17% to 35% (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000, as cited in Logan, Walker, Jordan & Leukefeld, 2006) up to a much higher range of 72% to 96% (Blaauw, Winkel, Arensman, Sheridan & Freeve, 2002; Brewster, 2001; Nicastro, et al., 2000). Several studies have shown that reporting tends to be higher in cases where the victimization is more severe and frequent (Brewster, 2001; Nicastro, et al., 2000).

Brewster (2003) found that, once involved, police arrest 28% of perpetrators, but charge less than 25%. In the end, less than half of those individuals charged are convicted of stalking. This means that convictions were obtained in less than 2.5% of all cases sampled. Similar results were also found in a national study from the U.S.A. (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). In fact, Jordan, Logan, Walker and Nigoff (2003) found that the most common outcome of prosecution was dismissal. By 1995, five years after stalking was first criminalized in California, reporting to police had increased; however, arrests did not follow suit (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Since arrests have not increased, it is important to determine the other strategies and tactics that victims and law enforcement are using and whether they are successful.

## **Strategy and Tactic Recommendations**

Several authors have reported strategies and tactics they deem to be effective in combating stalking. Alison and Alison (2005) list tactics for handling stalking behaviours such as direct contact, phone calls, and threats, when discussing their management program for stalking. The strategies and tactics that they suggest as a part of their management program are based on the principles of reinforcement and punishment.

Broadly, Alison and Alison state that the victim should avoid all contact with the perpetrator (both positive and negative), as this will only serve to reinforce the

perpetrator's behaviour and make it more difficult to extinguish. McCann (2001) also endorses the position that contact of any sort can increase the likelihood of further stalking behaviour. Although these suggestions are based solidly in psychological theory and make intuitive sense, no empirical studies have been conducted to test them. In addition, neither Alison and Alison (2005), nor McCann (2001) discuss the management of stalking cases by police in any detail. The lack of empirical evidence is not exclusive to these studies. The majority of suggested strategies and tactics reported in the literature lack empirical testing. Having said that the few tactics that have been tested empirically will now be discussed.

## **Efficacy of Stalking Management Tactics**

An effective management strategy or tactic is one that causes or facilitates desistance of stalking. While not perfect, it is best to measure desistance from the victims' perspective as well as from written records in order to avoid memory bias. However, it may be the case that the victim is unaware of the stalker's actions. In such a case, the stalker's perspective would be of most use, but this would likely be difficult to obtain and might lack sufficient insight to be of use.

Despite the numerous suggestions and theories about which strategies and tactics are best, empirical research on efficacy is rare. The few tactics whose efficacy have been examined include: restraining orders, the AWARE program, a victim moving residence, police warning, arrest, conviction, the stalker or victim obtaining a new love interest, or the stalker receiving help. The first two tactics have received the most attention.

## Restraining Orders

Restraining orders are also known, depending on the jurisdiction and whether they are issued by civil or criminal courts, as protective orders or peace bonds. Overall, approximately 25% of female and 10% of male stalking victims obtain restraining orders (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) but this statistic varies from study to study. For example, in a sample of stalking victims who were female college students only 3% obtained a protective order (Fisher et al., 2000), whereas when the victims were intimate partners 37% did (Tjaden & Theonnes, 2000), and in a sample of cases from a domestic violence unit 76% of victims did (Nicastro, Cousins & Spitzberg, 2000).

Although restraining orders have been the subject of the greatest amount of research on efficacy, the results of different studies conflict and this has sparked a major debate. The researchers on the two sides of this debate hold diametrically opposing positions. One side maintains that restraining orders reduce stalking. For example, Meloy (1997) found that restraining orders reduced the amount of approach behaviour in 80% of cases. In addition, research conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice (1997, as cited in Brewster, 2003) found that for cases of both domestic violence and stalking, 72% of victims had no problems after obtaining the orders and stated that their situations improved.

Those on the other side of the debate claim that restraining orders may provoke the stalker, resulting in further harassment of the victim and retaliatory violence (B. J. Hart, 1996, as cited in McCann, 2001). For example, Brewster (1998) found that 62% of victims with restraining orders found that they had no effect or felt that the order had caused the stalker's behaviour to worsen. Nicastro et al. (2000) found that 67% of the orders in their sample were violated. Furthermore, in their national survey, Tjaden and

Thoennes (1998) found that 60% of women and 81% of men who obtained an order of protection against their stalker were subsequently victims of violence at the hands of that stalker. It has also been shown that mutual restraining orders (obtained by both parties) are more effective than nonmutual ones (Meloy, 1997). However, this finding is of limited use in cases of stalking since stalkers seldom obtain restraining orders against their victims.

Overall, then, the evidence on this, the most studied management tactic for stalking, is still contentious. This disagreement in the literature demonstrates the need for further studies on efficacy, which will be made possible by the current study. With further research it may be possible to determine when restraining orders should be utilized and when their use may have negative consequences for the victim.

## **Alarm Systems**

Another tactic that has been evaluated is a personal and home alarm system, paid for by the government, which notifies police directly when activated by the victim. In Canada this program is called the Domestic Violence Emergency Response System (DVERS; Victim Services Toronto). The same program in Denmark is called AWARE and was evaluated by Römkens (2006). After a lengthy screening process, the system was given to nine female stalking victims and consisted of a house alarm and a personal alarm pendant. The expectation was that the system would protect the women and facilitate the arrest of the stalkers. Over the six month trial period three women activated the alarm and one stalker was arrested (Römkens, 2006). The women found the program to be effective because they said it made them feel safe. On the other hand, police reported that they did not find the program to be practical as only a single arrest was made. In addition, Römkens (2006) noted that the screening process was difficult to

get through and biased. Of 148 women who applied only 9 received the system.

Therefore, this tactic also has mixed reviews.

## Other Tactics

Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) conducted a national survey that examined the efficacy of several tactics. The survey asked victims to report why they believed their stalker had stopped stalking them and divided the reported management tactics into two categories, formal and informal management tactics. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) define formal tactics as formal justice system interventions such as arrest, conviction and peace bonds. Conversely, informal tactics include warnings and tactics that do not involve the typical legal procedures.

In their study Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found that victims reported informal tactics to be more effective than formal ones. Of those who reported being the victim of stalking, 19% indicated that the stalking ended when they moved and kept their new residential information confidential. For 15% of victims, stalking ended after the police warned the stalker. Less than 1% of victims reported that stalking ended after they obtained a restraining order. A further 9% reported that the stalker stopped following arrest, and 1% reported cessation following the conviction of the stalker. Victims stated that 6% of stalkers stopped when the stalker got help, another 6% stopped when the stalker moved, and 18% stopped when the stalker found a new love interest. Another 4% of stalking cases ended when the victim obtained a new love interest, 3% ended spontaneously, and 1% ended when the stalker died.

While these results provide useful information, they all rely on victim assumption and recollection. Events determined by the victims to be of importance are not necessarily the same events that had an effect on the stalker. Victims' recollection of

stalking events and tactics may also be faulty. In addition, victims and law enforcement cannot actively employ all of the tactics mentioned in the survey. Due to these limitations, a study of the tactics that police can and do employ would be of use. In addition, a study that obtained data from written records would reduce the degree of faulty recollection.

## **Police Tactics**

An international survey of 50 police agencies in Canada, Australia, and Great Britain as well as 95 U.S. police agencies found that departments in areas with anti-stalking laws relied on alternative responses to the same extent as did departments in areas without such statutes (National Institute of Justice, 1993). For example, 81% of areas with anti-stalking laws charge stalkers with trespassing compared to 74% of areas without such laws. Researchers also determined that in areas with anti-stalking laws, agencies found that charging offenders with multiple offences increased the likelihood that the stalker would desist. Finally, the officers surveyed had several suggestions regarding management tactics. These included a court mandated psychological evaluation and electronic bracelet as well as monitoring of the accused by uniformed patrol officers (National Institute of Justice, 1993).

Thus, evidence regarding the efficacy of some stalking tactics does exist. The evidence, however, only speaks to a small portion of the large number of potential tactics, is conflicting, or comes from a single study. There have also been many calls by researchers and agencies for more work in this area. For example, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) called for more research on both formal and informal interventions in stalking cases. Brewster (2003) also stated that any conclusions regarding the efficacy police tactics in cases of stalking are premature due to the lack of empirical evidence.

In addition to scientific enquiry and the obvious benefits of reducing the length of stalking victimization, there are a number of other practical benefits to determining the efficacy of tactics for deterring stalkers. Firstly, many of the tactics currently utilized by victims or suggested by police are very isolating for victims. Victims often feel that their liberty is restricted and that the sacrifices that they are forced to make are unfair. Thus, it would be beneficial to determine which tactics are not effective so that fewer demands and restrictions are placed on victims. Determining efficacy would also provide police and other agencies that provide assistance to victims with persuasive evidence to give victims when advising them on different tactics.

The second benefit of more research on stalking deterrence could be a reduction of discrepant advice given by different agencies. Victims often complain about receiving conflicting advice from police and other agencies. The debate over the use of restraining orders discussed above is a key example of this.

Finally, stalking is extremely stressful to victims even when it does not result in violence. On average, stalking continues for 1.8 years (Tjaden, & Thoennes, 1998) and can cause a great deal of disruption to the victim and those around them. By determining the most effective management tactics, these tactics could then be employed as early as possible and hopefully decrease the duration of the stalking.

## **Current Study**

Before a quantitative determination of the efficacy of management strategies and tactics can be ascertained, a clear idea of what police and victims are doing to combat stalking must first be obtained. This includes determining what types of management strategies and tactics are employed and the process by which police handle stalking cases. The current study examines three research questions:

- 1) What strategies and tactics do police, victims and others use to manage stalking cases?
- 2) What is the process used by police to handle stalking cases?
- 3) What management strategies and tactics assist police in resolving stalking cases?

A major goal of this study is to provide a general base of knowledge regarding the management of stalking cases that will help to generate hypotheses for future research on the efficacy of stalking management strategies and tactics.

## METHOD

### Cases

Ethical approval for this project was obtained from the Simon Fraser University ethics board and the Vancouver police department (VPD). The sample contained 32 randomly selected stalking case files from the Domestic Violence and Criminal Harassment Unit (DVACH) of the VPD. This unit is a specialized unit of four detectives who handle stalking cases. The two inclusion criteria for cases in this study were (1) the case fit the definition of stalking cited above, and (2) officers from the VPD had taken some action in the case. The case files primarily contained police reports and victim statements, and none contained psychological assessments. A small sample size was selected for two reasons. First, because this study uses qualitative methods, an in-depth analysis of each case was required and, as such, the sample had to be limited in size. Second, at any given time the four criminal harassment detectives have a case load of at most four stalking cases, each of which can last for several months. Thus, in order to obtain relatively recent cases that had been handled by the current detectives in the unit, the sample had to be small.

### Measures

#### ***Management Strategies and Tactics***

Two measures were used to code the cases. The first was a demographic and management strategy and tactic coding form developed by the author (see Appendix B). The preliminary work to create the coding form began with a comprehensive literature review of the management tactics used to combat stalking (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2005; Collins & Wilkas, 2001; Danto, 2001; Dressings, Kuehner & Gass, 2005; Department of Justice Canada, 2004; Fremouw, Westrup & Pennypacker, 1997;

Geberth, 1992; Hoffmann & Sheridan, 2005; Logan et al., 2006; Logan, Walker, Stewart & Allen, 2006; Maxey, 2001; McCann, 2001; McCann, 2006; Mechanic, 2002; Mester, Birger & Margolin, 2006; Mullen, Pathé & Purcell, 2000ab; Pathé, 2002; Pathé & Mullen, 1997; Römkens, 2006; Sheridan, Blaauw & Davies, 2003; Snow, 1998; Spence-Diehl & Potocky-Tripodi, 2001; Spitzberg, 2002; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2001; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Ugolini & Kelly, 2001). The review uncovered 240 management tactics used by police, victims and others (see Appendix A). It should be noted that some of the tactics were quite similar and others were contradictory.

The tactics were subsequently sorted into 21 strategies based on three factors, i) the place in which the tactics are employed (e.g. the workplace, school), ii) the people involved in implementing them (e.g. police, victims), and iii) the manner in which tactics are grouped in the literature. For example, the strategy 'home security' includes tactics such as installing a peephole or a home alarm system. An additional category was created for miscellaneous tactics that did not fit within the other 21 strategies.

The list of strategies and tactics was reviewed by a group of police officers ( $n=17$ ) from across Canada and they provided feedback on the accuracy and completeness of the list. The final set of 22 strategies (see Table 2) was included in the coding form. When recording management tactics, each rater would write a sentence about the actual tactic used in the case. This was done so that the data could be analyzed qualitatively.

The coding form also contained the RECON (RElationship and CONtext) typology developed by Mohandie, Meloy, McGowan, and Williams (2006). The RECON typology identifies four classes of stalkers based on the relationship held between the stalker and victim and the context in which the stalking occurs. The categories include:

- (a) intimate stalkers who offend against individuals with whom they shared an intimate

relationship, (b) acquaintance stalkers, who had employment-related, friendship or client-based relationships with their victims, (c) public figure stalkers who pursue public figures with whom they have had little or no direct contact; these stalkers are most often psychotic and, (d) private stranger stalkers who pursue strangers with whom they have had minor contact; the majority of these stalkers are also mentally ill. The reason for using a typology is that some researchers have hypothesized that certain management strategies and tactics are likely to be more effective with certain types of stalkers (McCann, 2001).

**Table 2 Management Strategies and Examples**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Example</b>
Vehicle security	The victim switched vehicles with a friend or family member
Managing contact from the offender	The victim avoided and/or never initiated contact with their stalker
Contacting those close to the offender	Contact was made with the parents of the perpetrator
Education	Police helped the victim to develop/learn skills to deal with approaches by stalker
Home security	The victim installed a home security system
Protecting personal information	The victim removed their contact details from public records
Internet security	The victim sought assistance from Cyber Angels or another form of online victim assistance
Legal tactics	Police arrested the perpetrator
Lifestyle changes	The victim moved residence
Contacting the offender	Told victim had a third party communicate to the perpetrator that contact was unwanted
Taking an offensive approach	The victim documented and collected evidence against the stalker
Coping on a personal level	The victim used relaxation training, e.g. meditation
Personal security	The police helped the victim to create a safety plan
Telephone security	The victim changed their phone number

---

Obtaining professional assistance	The victim sought the assistance of a counsellor, psychologist or psychiatrist
Protecting secondary victims/dependents	The victim informed their children of emergency plans, what not to do etc.
Reaching out for the assistance of others	The victim told a friend, relative, neighbour or co-worker about being stalked
School security	The victim provided information or copies of court orders to school officials
Transportation security	The victim waited for transportation in well lit areas
Walking security	The victim avoided distractions when walking, e.g. headphones, jingling purses
Work security	The victim developed safety tactics with workplace security
Miscellaneous tactics	The victim requested financial assistance from the government or other agency

---

### ***Stalking Risk Factors***

The second assessment procedure used was a stalking risk assessment tool, the Guidelines for Stalking Assessment and Management, or SAM (Kropp et al., 2008). The SAM was used to code individual risk factors for stalking and the overall risk level in the case. The SAM is a structured professional judgment instrument with three domains of risk factors: Nature of Stalking, Perpetrator risk factors, and Victim Vulnerability (see Table 3). Each domain contains 10 risk factors that were identified by systematic literature review of both the scientific and professional literature. The presence of each risk factor is coded on a 3-point scale (Absent, Possibly or partially present, Present), as are the final summary risk ratings (low, moderate, high). Based on the three domains of risk factors, the rater is prompted to make ratings regarding case prioritization, risk of continued stalking, the likelihood of serious physical harm, reasonableness of victim fear, and whether immediate action is required. These factors indicate the overall risk

involved in the case. For the purposes of this study, risk level was determined by the level of case prioritization required because it represents the intensity of the case and the effort required to end the stalking behaviour.

As the SAM is a new measure only one study has reported its reliability. The study, by Storey, Hart, Meloy and Reavis (in press) found an ICC of .69 (moderate agreement) between two trained raters on a population of 62 convicted stalkers. The SAM has also undergone pilot testing in Canada and Sweden in both law enforcement and forensic mental health settings (Kropp et al., 2008a, b). Risk is of interest because studies have shown that police take risk into account when deciding what strategies and tactics to employ (Jasinski & Mustaine, 2001).

**Table 3 SAM Domains and Factors**

Nature of Stalking Factors	Perpetrator Risk Factors	Victim Vulnerability Factors
N1. Communicates about victim	P1. Angry	V1. Inconsistent behavior toward perpetrator
N2. Communicates with victim	P2. Obsessed	V2. Inconsistent attitude toward perpetrator
N3. Approaches victim	P3. Irrational	V3. Inadequate access to resources
N4. Direct contact with victim	P4. Unrepentant	V4. Unsafe living situation
N5. Intimidates victim	P5. Antisocial lifestyle	V5. Problems caring for dependents
N6. Threatens victim	P6. Intimate relationship problems	V6. Intimate relationship problems
N7. Violent toward victim	P7. Non-intimate relationship problems	V7. Non-intimate relationship problems
N8. Stalking is persistent	P8. Distressed	V8. Distressed
N9. Stalking is escalating	P9. Substance use problems	V9. Substance use problems
N10. Stalking involves supervision violations	P10. Employment and financial problems	V10 Employment and financial problems

Note. SAM = *Guidelines for Stalking Assessment and Management* (Kropp et al., 2008a).

## Procedure

The case files were selected at random and retrieved by the detectives. The majority of the information was coded directly from the case files. Where gaps or confusion arose the lead detective on the case was asked for clarification. Cases were considered closed for the purposes of the study when the police were no longer employing new management tactics, and as far as the VPD was aware the perpetrator had desisted. Thus, coding ended when the police action and case files did. The only exception to this was one case which appeared to be closed, however, it was later determined that the perpetrator had continued with his stalking behaviour after coding was completed. The recidivism was noted but the coding of the case was not altered.

The author coded all of the cases and two other raters coded a subset of 14 of those cases in order to assess interrater reliability and to create consensus ratings. Both of the other raters were doctoral students, trained in the use of the SAM, and familiar with the procedures of the DVACH unit. Interrater reliability was indexed using intraclass correlation coefficients for single raters and calculated using a mixed effects model (absolute agreement method). Reliability for the SAM was examined for the SAM as a whole as well as for case prioritization (overall risk) and the three domains of the SAM, nature of stalking, perpetrator risk factors and victim vulnerability factors; the results were  $ICC_1 = .92$ ,  $K_w = .65$ ,  $ICC_1 = .95$ ,  $ICC_1 = .96$  and  $ICC_1 = .83$ , respectively. The reliability for the presence of the management strategies was  $ICC_1 = .84$ , and for the number of individual tactics used it was  $ICC_1 = .86$ . Following data analysis, the two raters also coded the presence or absence of themes in the same 14 cases. Themes are akin to patterns in the data and are uncovered through qualitative analysis; they will be

described in more detail later in the method section. The interrater reliability for the themes was  $ICC_1 = .89$ .

## Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to analyze the data. The method of analysis was chosen for each question based upon which method would best answer the question. This combination of methods provided a more complete understanding of the data because it could be examined at different levels (Plano, Clark, Creswell, Green, & Shope, 2008). Quantitative methods allow more detailed examinations while qualitative methods are more general and allow one to analyze the process of the data as a whole and describe its components by drawing commonalities between cases. The use of both types of analyses was also beneficial because the strengths of each approach (e.g. numerical values and generalizability vs. context and meaning) combine and offset each method's weaknesses (Plano et al., 2008). For example, while quantitative methods are able to determine which management tactics and strategies were used most often, qualitative methods were required to uncover patterns in the processes of the cases.

### ***Research question 1***

The first research question concerned the strategies and tactics used by police, victims and others to manage stalking cases. This question was addressed using frequency analysis, descriptive statistics, a One-way ANOVA and the Kruskal-Wallis test of independence. Of interest was the frequency with which each of the 22 management strategies were employed. Frequency analysis was also used to examine the management tactics that victims used prior to calling police. Two variables, the length of time before the victim called police and the relationship held between the victim and the

perpetrator were examined using the Pearson product moment correlation to determine whether they were associated with the type of strategies used in the case. Several variables were also examined using a One-way ANOVA test in order to determine their relationship to the number of strategies utilized in the case. Finally, a Kruskal-Wallis test of independence was used to determine whether an association existed between the number of risk management tactics employed from each management strategy and the RECON typology, the SAM factors or the level of risk involved in the case. It should be noted that this analysis involved a large number of comparisons and as such results should be viewed as exploratory.

### ***Grounded theory***

The qualitative analyses used to examine questions two and three were based on the principles of Grounded Theory (GT) as discussed by several authors including Charmaz (2008a) and Taylor and Bogdan (1998). Qualitative methods are used for several reasons, including to discover theoretical explanations for phenomena that go beyond mere description and to conduct exploratory analyses (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Glaser and Strauss (1967, as cited in Charmaz, 2008b) describe qualitative methods as a way of taking a process that is often carried out implicitly and legitimizing it by making it explicit and structured.

GT is a type of qualitative analysis that permits the researcher to develop theories, hypotheses and concepts from the data rather than from prior assumptions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967 as cited in Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). GT also allows the researcher to pursue uncharted areas of dynamic phenomena (Charmaz, 2008a). A common use of GT is to account for processes in the empirical world and relationships within those processes (Charmaz, 2008b) and the primary objective of GT is to produce theories from the data that account for the data (Charmaz, 2008a). This objective is

accomplished by examining cases as a whole as opposed to the individual variables. A major benefit of GT is that it takes into account the unforeseen, thereby allowing the researcher to pursue discoveries they could not have anticipated prior to conducting their research. These qualities make GT ideal for exploratory analyses (Charmaz, 2008).

Qualitative methods are sometimes viewed as less scientific than quantitative methods of analysis. However, one must keep in mind that all description requires interpretation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967 as cited in Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Researchers interpret their data when using quantitative methods both prior to conducting research (e.g., in choosing how to analyze a phenomena and what data sources to use) and following its completion when they pen their discussion section and provide meaning to their findings. Qualitative research simply tries to achieve a standard and objective way of interpreting data on a larger scale.

There is disagreement between authors regarding the best method by which to analyze data qualitatively. In fact, some authors admit that there is no standard way to analyze qualitative data, instead, the choice is left to the researcher (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Charmaz (2008a) states that GT strategies are few and flexible and researchers may adapt them to suit their purposes. Similarly, Taylor and Bogdan (1998) state that the root sources of theorizing are the insights of the observers themselves. That being said, the basic idea of the GT approach is to closely examine a textual database (such as a case file) and uncover categories or themes and their interrelationships.

The analysis in this study follows the principles laid out by authorities in the area of GT and utilizes common techniques such as memo writing, tables and flow charts to organize and identify patterns in the data. The data were coded and analyzed using the two phases of qualitative research set out by Charmaz (2008a): (1) systematic and

active scrutiny of data; and, (2) successive development and checking of categories.

Each phase will be explained as it relates to the treatment of the data.

There are several parts to the analysis process when using GT. Memo writing was used throughout the analysis process. Memos are meant to capture the researcher's ideas while they are in the process of analyzing and can be written at any time between data collection and writing a manuscript (Glaser 1998, as cited in Charmaz, 2008a). Theoretical memos were written at several stages during data collection and analysis including; i) after each case was coded (this was done to highlight key concepts or note processes that may be emerging), ii) while analyzing the data (in order to summarize key points in each case) and, iii) after themes were discovered in the data (in order to properly define the themes and establish boundaries for inclusion). Glaser (1998, as cited in Charmaz, 2008a) states that you must define each theme according to the elements found in all cases. Memo writing helped to scrutinize the themes and ensure that they were supported by the data and provided useful knowledge about the area of concern.

Theoretical sampling was also used to test themes and categories and establish boundaries. Theoretical sampling involves examining cases that are similar in several aspects (e.g. process, tactics used, etc.) but have different outcomes. This comparison allows the researcher to uncover key causal differences that assist in refining the definition of a theme (Charmaz, 2008a). For example, one theme that will be discussed shortly was that contact with the perpetrator tends to have a detrimental effect on the stalker's behaviour. However, there were a small number of cases in which contact did not have this effect. Upon further examination it was determined that the common thread between the few cases where contact did not have a negative outcome was that the victim and the perpetrator were former intimates who were now involved in a

disagreement over the division of assets or custody of their children. This finding meant that the theme could be refined as contact appeared to have different results based on the nature of the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator.

There are several reasons why GT was appropriate for this study. When using GT methods it is important for the researcher to have an intimate knowledge of their data and the phenomenon that they are studying (Charmaz, 2008b). The author gained this knowledge through the coding and repeated analysis of each case and through working directly with police officers on stalking cases for over a year. This experience offered familiarity with the language, tactics and procedural limitations of police officers. GT was the appropriate method for the data because GT is used to code actions and tactics were the primary variable of interest in this study. General qualitative coding is not meant for actions and uses much broader categories (Charmaz, 2008a). Finally, GT provided answers to the questions posed and hypotheses for future research without requiring that assumptions be made about the area, which would have been unsubstantiated by the literature.

### ***Research question 2***

The process by which police manage stalking cases was the subject of the second research question. The data was analyzed using Charmaz's (2008a) aforementioned two phases. The first phase is initial coding which requires collection and preliminary analysis of the data. The advantage of the preliminary analysis is that one may find meaning in the data early on which can lead to new avenues of investigation within the same study. For the present study the case files were coded as described above and memos were written for each case. The memos were a preliminary analysis of each case and contained notes on the important aspects of the case, including how the case proceeded, relationships between individuals involved in the

case and what was successful and unsuccessful in the management of the case. Using the coded data and memos a timeline was created for each case that described the process of the case and consisted of the tactics that were put in place (primarily by police) and the outcomes of each tactic. This step facilitated the examination of the data as it was collected and also assisted in later analyses.

To complete the next part of phase one, which involved examining the data for patterns of tactics or themes, Charmaz's (2008a) methods of extracting key phrases or words were utilized. Before identifying any themes, the data was re-organized by returning to the original files and creating memos specific to the process through which the each case was resolved. This condensed the important material on process and reduced memory bias. The memos included such things as how the tactics developed over time, the number and severity of the tactics used, and who was involved in the process. Following this each memo was analyzed in search of common ideas or words. A list was created of the common ideas and the ways in which they were defined by the data.

The second phase of qualitative research, as explained by Charmaz (2008a), is focused coding which occurs after the researcher has established which initial codes are the most frequent or significant. The items on the list of commonly noted ideas and words were grouped by ensuring that they had the same definitions. Each group with a uniform definition became a common theme. Finally, every case was examined for a third time to identify which themes were present in each case as well as why certain themes had the potential to be present but were not possible in certain cases. For example, one of the themes was escalation, since the data showed that the management tactics imposed by police and the legal system tended to escalate in

severity, restrictiveness or consequences over time. In some cases this was not possible due to victim refusal.

Grounded theorists promote examining findings through further data collection (Charmaz, 2008a). However, due to the limitations of the original research agreement, new cases were not available, therefore this study is preliminary.

### ***Research question 3***

The third research question was examined by breaking the question into two parts; i) what strategies and tactics assisted in the resolution of the case? and, ii) what strategies and tactics were ineffective in resolving the case? Both questions were examined using GT.

The first sub-question was examined in a similar way to question two. To begin the timeline of tactics was examined and memos were made for each case regarding the final management tactics (and their corresponding strategy) that were implemented, who implemented them and the specific outcome of the case. The outcome for all cases included no further stalking behaviours but in some cases also included management tactics such as treatment and relocation. Final management tactics were defined as those that preceded the perpetrator's desistance and once implemented were not followed by any further stalking behaviour. The remainder of the process was identical to question two. In short, to complete phase one memos were examined for common ideas and words. For phase two a list was created of all of the common words and ideas that shared a common definition. The common words and ideas were then grouped into themes regarding the final tactics or strategies employed in the cases. Again, all of the cases were re-examined by the author to identify which themes were present or absent in order to ensure that common definitions for themes had been used throughout.

The second sub-question concerning strategies and tactics that were ineffective presented some initial difficulties. First, every case had a large number of failed tactics. Second, it was often the case that strategies and tactics that were successful in one case failed in another. This presented a challenge in determining what strategies and tactics were ineffective, as listing all of the strategies and tactics that were at one time unsuccessful would not be highly discriminating. As a result a decision was made to examine which strategies and tactics repeatedly failed to facilitate the stalker's desistance as well as which strategies and tactics had a negative effect on the case. A negative effect was defined as an increase in stalking behaviour, or a statement by the perpetrator that demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the strategy or tactic.

To tease out the ineffective and negative management tactics from the cases, every tactic used in each case and all of the memos were examined. Notes were made about the tactics that had ineffective or negative consequences, the situations in which they occurred and the negative consequence that resulted. The list was then re-examined and recurring words and ideas with common definitions were extracted and grouped into themes.

Throughout the analysis process of both questions two and three Charmaz's (2008b) suggestions regarding how to examine and report findings were utilized. For example, an attempt was made to keep the themes and theories flexible enough to allow for variation over time and across jurisdictions. An effort was also made to ensure that the findings fit the empirical world that was being analyzed. For this study this meant that the suggestions and findings should fit within the legal realm of possibilities, (e.g. time and resource restraints), as well as the restraints on the penalties and restrictions that are possible under the law.

## RESULTS

### ***Description of the Sample***

Demographic information on the 32 cases studied coincided with the literature on stalking (Meloy, 1999; Tjaden, & Thoennes, 1998). Victims were mostly female ( $n = 27$ , 84%), with an average age of 36 years. Perpetrators were primarily male ( $n = 29$ , 91%), with an average age of 42 years; the majority were Caucasian ( $n = 27$ , 84%), single ( $n = 27$ , 84%), and had considerable unemployment ( $n = 13$ , 41%). Serious mental health issues, as defined by the third perpetrator risk factor on the SAM (irrationality) occurred in 14 cases (44%). Ten perpetrators had previously received mental health treatment compared to only four victims. It should be noted that given the source of the data these are likely underestimates of the true prevalence of mental health issues.

The frequency of the types of stalkers as classified by the raters based on the RECON typology (Mohandie et al., 2006) was as follows; 14 (44%) were intimate stalkers, 10 (31%) were acquaintance stalkers, 7 (22%) were public figure stalkers, and one (3%) was a private stranger stalker. In terms of the relationship held between perpetrator and victim, half of the sample were former intimates ( $n = 16$ , 50%). The second most common relationship type was strangers ( $n = 7$ , 22%), followed by acquaintances ( $n = 6$ , 19%), business associates ( $n = 2$ , 6%) and friends ( $n = 1$ , 3%). Evidence of prior intimate partner violence was present in seven cases.

Six perpetrators (19%) had previously been convicted of an offense, five of whom had a conviction for a violent offense. Four (13%) perpetrators had previously been apprehended for committing acts of stalking against a different victim. Two (6%) of the victims had previously been stalked by different perpetrators. However, this was likely due to the fact that they were both celebrities. Nine (28%) of the perpetrators were not

Canadian citizens which meant that several cases were complicated by jurisdictional issues. Fifteen (47%) perpetrators made explicit and credible threats of physical harm towards their victims and three (9%) acted out violently. Violence was defined as the use of weapons, physical injury and/or sexual assault. Using the SAM, 15 cases (47%) were determined to be low risk, 12 (37%) were moderate risk and five (16%) were high risk.

The definition of the commencement of stalking was somewhat flexible due to the varying nature of the cases. For example, in some cases stalking began the moment the victim requested no further contact with the perpetrator. In other cases, when the victim was unaware of the perpetrator's behaviour or never came into contact with the perpetrator, the date that the stalking began was taken to be when the perpetrator's behaviour became inappropriate as indicated in the case notes, e.g. repeated attempts at contact, following, watching, or besetting.

On average, the perpetrator's stalking behaviour lasted 523 days ( $SD = 735$ ) with a range from 23 days to 3726 days or over 10 years. These values are consistent with those presented in the literature (Mullen & Pathe, 1994; Spitzberg, 2000; Zona, Sharma, & Lane, 1993). Victims waited an average of 357 days ( $SD = 698$ ) to report being stalked to police with a very substantial range from the first day that stalking behaviour occurred to over ten years (3702 days). The average length of time that it took for the case to be resolved once police were involved was 165 days ( $SD = 223$ ). Again there was a large range for this parameter which varied from a single day to 1131 days. The mean length of inactivity, defined as an absence of stalking behaviour from the day the file was closed to the final day of coding (May 29, 2008), was 487 days ( $SD = 366$ ) with a range of 28 to 1358 days.

One of the perpetrators was not included in the latter two calculations as it was later discovered that he was continuing to stalk the victim. For several months (during

the data collection phase) it appeared that the perpetrator was compliant with his court ordered conditions. However, more recently evidence surfaced indicating that the perpetrator likely never stopped trying to locate the victim and, at best, may have desisted for a month.

The SAM was used by the detectives in four (13%) of the cases. This low prevalence of use is likely due to the SAM's recent creation and the fact that many of the cases were from years previous to the introduction of the SAM.

### ***Question 1: What Strategies and Tactics do Police, Victims and Others Use to Manage Stalking Cases?***

It was determined that prior to contacting police, victims employed an average of four ( $SD = 3.15$ ) tactics in an attempt to end the stalking behaviour. The range of tactics employed varied from none to 10. The number of tactics employed did not vary as a function of the length of time that victims waited to call police after the stalking began,  $r = .05$ ,  $p > .05$ . The relationship between the victim and the perpetrator was also unrelated to the length of time that victims waited to call police,  $F(4,31) = 1.09$ ,  $p > .05$ .

Following police intervention an average of 19 tactics ( $SD = 11.8$ ) were used in each case by police, victims and others (e.g., employers, friends, family), with a range of 1 to 52. The total number of tactics employed was unrelated to the RECON type of the perpetrator,  $F(3,31) = 2.16$ ,  $p > .05$ . An average of 17 ( $SD = 8.77$ ) tactics were employed in low risk cases, 20 ( $SD = 15.26$ ) in moderate risk cases and 22 ( $SD = 11.53$ ) in high risk cases, however, the differences were not significant,  $F(2,31) = .51$ ,  $p > .05$ . Table 4 shows the number of cases in which each management strategy was employed as well as the total number of times that each strategy was employed throughout all 32 cases.

The most common strategy was that which comprised the legal tactics. This makes intuitive sense but is also likely due to the genesis of the sample. The legal strategy included tactics that dealt directly with the legal system or were performed by those within the legal system. This strategy was broad and included reporting stalking to police, warning letters, arrests and peace bonds.

In total, 18 (56%) perpetrators were arrested, 16 (50%) were formally charged, six (19%) were ultimately convicted of an offence, and two are still awaiting trial. The low conviction rate is notable given that the DVACH unit only handles the most serious stalking cases in Vancouver. It also suggests that police resolve many cases using alternative methods. The most commonly used legal tactic, aside from calling police ( $n = 27$ ) was a formal police warning which was used in 19 cases (59%) and was one of the final tactics employed in nine cases (28%). Formal warnings consisted of a warning letter and a discussion with police which often took the form of an official interview.

**Table 4 Stalking Management Strategy Frequency of Use**

Strategy	Number of cases in which the a tactic from the category was employed	Total number of times that a tactic from the category was employed
Legal tactics	31	209
Managing contact from the offender	27	75
Reaching out for the assistance of others	19	43
Obtaining professional assistance	15	26
Taking an offensive approach	14	36
Personal security	14	29
Telephone security	13	38
Internet security	12	24
Lifestyle changes	11	20
Contacting the offender	9	14

Protecting personal information	9	13
Work security	8	13
Contacting those close to the offender	8	10
Miscellaneous tactics	7	9
Home security	6	17
Walking security	5	7
School security	4	6
Vehicle security	3	4
Education	2	3
Protecting secondary victims/dependents	2	2
Coping on a personal level	1	1
Transportation security	1	1

Peace bonds and a single restraining order were issued in six cases and were subsequently violated in two (33%) cases. Peace bonds place conditions on the offender regarding contact with the victim and sometimes those close to the victim. In Canada, peace bonds are imposed by criminal courts but do not appear on the criminal record of the offender. Restraining orders also place conditions on the offender but the victim can obtain them by making an application through civil court. Of the 18 arrests made, 13 resulted in conditions being placed upon the offender when they were released on bail. In seven (54%) cases the perpetrator violated those conditions, and in two cases the perpetrator did so twice. Furthermore, five perpetrators had both peace bonds and court imposed conditions. Of those five, two violated both their peace bond and their conditions, one violated neither, and two complied with the peace bond but violated their court imposed conditions. No differences were apparent between those who violated peace bonds or those who violated court orders in terms of risk level or RECON typology but the samples were too small to perform statistical tests.

Charges were laid in 16 cases. In one case, a charge was the final tactic and in 5 cases charges led to the final tactic (i.e., conviction). Perpetrators were most often charged with criminal harassment ( $n = 10$ ); only six were charged with multiple offenses.

In spite of the large number of management tactics that were employed there were several tactics suggested in the literature that did not appear in any of the cases. For example, none of the victims filed civil charges, hired a lawyer, or contacted Cyber Angels or any another form of online victim assistance.

Conversely, there were several management tactics employed that were not suggested in the literature. For example, in one case, the police gave the victim an information package to carry with her to other countries. The package was to be given to authorities if the perpetrator continued to engage in stalking and was meant to facilitate case management. The package contained the offender's picture, the lead detective's contact information, and instructions for authorities on how best to manage the perpetrator. In another case the lead detective determined that the victim's level of fear was unreasonably high compared to the risk posed by the perpetrator. This imbalance can be detrimental because it can unnecessarily increase the victim's level of distress and as a result decrease their ability to cope. Therefore, the lead detective chose to de-escalate the victim's fear by discussing the situation and the risk posed with her and directing her to the appropriate resource for her case, which was family court. In yet another case, police convinced the perpetrator (whom they had not charged with an offence) to voluntarily consent to the seizure and destruction of all of his "shrine" material, which consisted of pictures and hundreds of video recordings of the victim. Removing these materials may have decreased the temptation to look at and focus on the victim but would likely have been difficult for the perpetrator to do himself.

The Kruskal-Wallis test of independence showed that three strategies were significantly related to the RECON types. The victims of intimate stalkers and the intimate stalkers themselves were significantly more likely to obtain professional assistance than were the victims of acquaintance stalkers,  $\chi^2(1, N = 24) = 6.78, p < .01$ . The victims of intimate stalkers were also significantly more likely to employ tactics that fell under the telephone security strategy than were public figures dealing with stalkers,  $\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 5.12, p < .05$ . Finally, victims of acquaintance stalkers were significantly more likely to contact those close to the perpetrator than public figure stalkers,  $\chi^2(1, N = 17) = 6.91, p < .01$ . Risk level was significantly associated with only one strategy. Victims whose cases were rated as high risk were significantly more likely to make changes to their lifestyle,  $\chi^2(1, N = 20) = 6.70, p < .05$ . None of the three SAM domains (Nature of stalking, Perpetrator risk factors and Victim vulnerability factors) were significantly associated with the management strategies employed in the cases.

## ***Question 2: What is the Process Used by Police to Handle Stalking Cases?***

Through the use of the GT techniques described above six themes regarding the process of the cases were extracted from the data. The term theme is commonly used in qualitative research. However, some of the themes are more easily conceptualized as patterns or management principles. Thus different terminology will be used in order to facilitate comprehension of the major themes that are discussed.

### ***Risk principle***

The first theme, or principle noted was that the management tactics selected had a tendency to correspond to the level of risk involved in the case. In 24 cases (75%), the

tactics employed by the police were consistent with the overall level of risk involved in the case. Management tactics such as warning letters, interviews and instructions to the victim to make minor alterations to their behaviour were considered to be appropriately matched with low risk cases. Uncovering a consistent difference between moderate and high cases was difficult as both were at times managed by immediately arresting the perpetrator as well as by a more gradual escalation of management tactics (e.g. interview, warning, arrest, peace bond, etc). This difficulty might suggest a threshold effect wherein management tactics change once a certain level of risk is met. Upon further examination, one difference that did emerge was that in moderate risk cases there were two reasons why an arrest was the first management tactic employed. The first reason was that the perpetrator was displaying overt signs of irrationality and arrest was a vehicle to treatment ( $n = 2$ ). The second reason was that the officer made an arrest for strategic purposes in order to have conditions placed on the offender ( $n = 1$ ), not because he was an immediate danger to the victim. Immediate arrest occurred in two high risk cases although it would have occurred in two additional cases if police had not been impeded by a lack of evidence or jurisdictional authority. Mental illness was not absent in these four high risk cases however the immediate purpose of arrest was incapacitation in order to ensure the safety of the victim, not treatment.

In 6 of 8 cases where this risk principle was not present, police were prevented from doing what they thought was necessary in the case. Impediments included; a lack of evidence to proceed with prosecution, a reluctant victim, or a lack of jurisdictional authority. In one of the remaining two cases, the victim was given the choice of having police either warn or arrest her stalker. The victim understandably chose arrest even though to a third party this level of severity was not warranted by the risk level. The second case was the opposite in that the tactic employed appeared too low for the risk

level involved. However, it is likely that due to the victim's high level of fear the case file notes tended to overestimate the risk. The lead detective was aware of the victim's high level of fear as he had had contact with the victim and selected his management tactic accordingly. The management tactic selected preceded the stalker's desistance.

### ***Escalation***

The second theme related to the process of the case was an escalation of the risk management tactics employed. In 11 (34%) cases there was a clear increase over time in the severity of the consequences or restrictions imposed by the management tactics that were implemented. An example of this is an informal warning by phone, followed by an official warning letter delivered by a police officer, followed by an arrest resulting in a conviction for criminal harassment. Although this management principle seems intuitive and likely to be commonly used, it was not implemented in the majority of cases. Reasons for this include; police only needing to employ a single tactic, the use of a cluster of tactics with the same level of severity (e.g. warning, monitoring and suggesting treatment) or police being prohibited from using the tactic of their choice. For example, in one case the detective was forced to warn a perpetrator by phone despite the fact that the perpetrator had been arrested several times. The phone warning was the only feasible tactic because the offender had emigrated from Canada.

### ***Joint effort***

The third theme noted was that in 11 (34%) cases the process of the case involved a joint effort between police officers and other agencies or individuals. Involvement was considered present when the outside agents were integral to the process of the case. Actions were deemed integral when they substantially assisted in getting the perpetrator to cease their behaviour or maintain their desistance. In seven cases mental health professionals were integral to the case, by incapacitating the

perpetrator (e.g. committal) or by implementing tactics that managed underlying issues that may have contributed to the stalking behaviour (e.g. diagnosis and counseling). In five cases, other jurisdictions (e.g. in the U.S.A.) or courts (e.g. family court) were involved. In four cases the parents of the perpetrator were one of the parties involved. In another three cases border officials were involved and in one case school officials were involved. Note that the number of agencies listed exceeds the number of cases where this theme was present; this is a result of multiple agencies being involved in several individual cases.

### ***Victim contribution***

As with almost any crime involving a victim, the process of resolving the case requires a joint effort between the victim and police since there has to be a transfer of information and evidence. In the case of stalking this effort is ongoing and reciprocal in that victims provide police with evidence and information and police in turn provide victims with information on how to remain safe and what management tactics to implement to reduce stalking. The cases in which there was a substantial joint effort between victims and police is the fourth theme. There was a large disparity between victims in terms of their contribution to the process of the case. In nine (28%) cases high levels of victim contribution were noted. In some cases victims made large sacrifices in order to implement management tactics that would terminate the stalking. For example, in one case the victim went into hiding by moving half way across Canada and cutting ties with individuals who knew the perpetrator. Other diligent victims' implemented large numbers of tactics, and/or got other agencies involved (e.g. their work place). In one fairly outstanding case, the victim did a great deal of detective work and uncovered who the previously unknown perpetrator was. However, despite their considerable effort, even some of these exemplary victims made errors in judgment by failing to report

perpetrator's breaches of their conditions to police and by contacting the perpetrator.

Factors including victim vulnerability factors and victim-perpetrator relationship did not distinguish these nine victims from the other victims in the cases reviewed. Victims were not the focus of this study and from the limited information collected on victims there was no clear link between these nine victims that might explain their considerable efforts in the face of a very stressful situation.

### ***Monitoring***

The fifth theme was monitoring the perpetrator which was present in 12 (38%) cases. Monitoring took several forms, sometimes even within a given case. Monitoring was defined as continued contact with the perpetrator or another individual for the purpose of monitoring the perpetrator's behaviour after police were no longer employing new management tactics. In four cases, police monitored the perpetrator through contact with the perpetrator's parents. Four additional perpetrators were monitored through police or border records which were set up to notify the lead detective if the perpetrator (and sometimes the victim) had any contact with police or border services. Three cases involved monitoring via communication with the victim. In a further three cases police monitored the perpetrator through phone conversations with the perpetrators themselves. This final method of monitoring would not be feasible in most cases since it required the detective to have a congenial relationship with the perpetrator. Despite this limitation, in those cases where it was feasible, monitoring the perpetrator via telephone, worked extremely well and did not seem to take up a great deal of the officer's time. Interestingly, in the cases reviewed, the perpetrator's partner was never approached or asked to assist police in monitoring the perpetrator's behaviour. This may be due to the low number of perpetrators with intimate partners ( $n = 5$ ), which is not uncommon for stalkers (Kropp et al., 2002). Again, it should be noted that the number of methods in

which the perpetrators were monitored exceeds the total number of cases where this theme was present. This apparent discrepancy is the result of two perpetrators being monitored through the use of multiple methods.

### ***Impediments***

The sixth theme noted was that in 11 (34%) cases police were prevented from managing the case as they typically would. In six cases the impediment was related to the victim or the victim's family. It was most often the case that the victim refused to comply with the detective's chosen tactic. For example, in one case the victim refused to allow police to issue a warning letter to the perpetrator because she did not want to identify herself to the perpetrator. This prevented police from warning the perpetrator because they could not tell him who he was prohibited from contacting. In three cases, a lack of evidence prevented police and crown from proceeding with prosecution. In the final two cases, police lacked the jurisdictional authority to proceed with the case as they usually would have.

### ***Question 3a: What Management Strategies and Tactics Assist***

#### ***Police in Resolving Stalking Cases?***

Drawing a causal link between a particular management strategy or tactic and a stalker's desistance is impossible given this research design and without knowledge of what was in the perpetrators' mind. As such, no definite causal conclusions can or will be made here. Instead, this analysis will examine which strategies and tactics assisted in the resolution of stalking cases. In order to do this the individuals who implemented tactics just prior to the stalker's desistance and the tactics or strategies that were implemented were examined using GT as described above.

A total of eight themes were uncovered. In the majority of cases ( $n = 19$ ) more than one management tactic was implemented immediately prior to a stalker's desistance. As a result there are some cases in which more than one theme is present.

### ***Legal strategy***

The first pattern, present in 28 cases (88%), was that at least one of the final tactics employed was a legal strategy. Legal tactics are those that are enforced or implemented by individuals in the criminal justice system such as a warning letter, monitoring, a peace bond, or conviction.

### ***Congenial relationship***

The second theme is also a legal tactic. In four (13%) cases the lead detective deliberately developed a congenial relationship with the perpetrator or with a family member of the perpetrator. This allowed the detective to keep lines of communication open so that they could monitor the perpetrator's disposition and activities. All four cases were low risk. In three cases, the relationship was between the lead detective and the perpetrator. When interviewed, the perpetrator responded very positively when the detective explained that their behaviour was illegal and was negatively affecting the victim. In one case, the detective used this tactic to monitor the perpetrator's priorities through phone calls and find leverage to motivate the perpetrator to not behave criminally. In another case, the perpetrator chose to inform the detective about all of the progress he had made, including going to therapy, abstaining from alcohol, returning to school and spending time outside of his home. In the fourth case the detective maintained a relationship with the perpetrator's parents and through that relationship received updates on the perpetrator's whereabouts and mental state.

***Informal tactics***

The third theme encompassed by legal strategies was the use of informal tactics that closely fit the details of the case ( $n = 5$ , 16%). For the purposes of this study informal tactics were defined as tactics that are not necessarily taught as standard procedure but are the product of experience in managing individual cases that prove difficult to manage. For example, in one case the perpetrator had a history of stalking professionals with whom they came into contact. This same pattern was present in their current stalking behaviour. In addition, the perpetrator's actions were placing the victim and the victim's coworkers at risk of harm. The perpetrator was also unresponsive to several standard police tactics and so the lead detective chose to use an informal tactic. The lead detective surmised that he could facilitate desistance and prevent future stalking by preventing the perpetrator from obtaining further information from the police department about the victim or other professionals involved in the case. Following the use of this informal tactic, the stalking ended and the perpetrator has not come to the attention of police since that time.

By comparison, formal tactics are conventional tactics that tend to generalize across cases and are often taught as part of general procedure. Examples include warning letters and arrest.

***Outside assistance***

The fourth theme, also a legal strategy was that in five cases (16%), the final tactic employed required police to enlist the assistance of border services and law enforcement agents from other jurisdictions.

***Mental health services***

The fifth theme constituted cases in which the final tactic involved mental health services which ranged from counseling to involuntary inpatient treatment ( $n = 7$ , 22%).

For example, in one case police suggested, and the crown agreed, to drop all charges when they learned that the perpetrator was receiving inpatient mental health treatment.

#### ***Victim implementation***

In four (13%) cases at least one of the final management tactics was implemented by the victim. In two cases the victim relocated and did not disclose the location of their new residence. In the additional two cases the victim reached a settlement with the perpetrator. Only victims who had previously been in an intimate relationship with the perpetrator and who were in the process of dividing assets or determining custody utilized the latter tactic.

#### ***Perpetrator implementation***

The seventh theme involved perpetrators who had a hand in their own desistance. This occurred in three cases (9%). For example, in one case the perpetrator relocated and found a job; interestingly part of his anger towards the victim was due to the loss of his previous job.

#### ***Family implementation***

Finally, in three cases (9%), family members implemented one of the final tactics. In one case it was a family member of the victim and in the other two cases it was the perpetrator's family.

### ***Question 3b: What Management Strategies or Tactics had***

#### ***Negative Effects on the Cases?***

A total of six ineffective or negative themes were uncovered.

**Contact**

The first pattern that arose was the negative effect of contact between the victim and the perpetrator. Victims' having purposeful contact with the perpetrator occurred in 12 (37.5%) cases and had a negative effect in eight cases (25%). An example of such contact would be a victim who responded to an email or spoke with the perpetrator on the phone. In four of the eight negative cases the negative outcome associated with the contact was an escalation in the stalking behaviour. For example, in one case, the victim willingly met with the perpetrator in a public place. The meeting ended with an angry confrontation in which the perpetrator sexually assaulted the victim. In another case the victim sent the perpetrator an angry email telling him to never to contact her again. As a result the perpetrator escalated his stalking behaviour by no longer sending emails and gifts but instead anonymously vandalizing the victim's property. In the second half of cases the victim's contact with the perpetrator prompted continued contact by the perpetrator. This connection is only speculative but one case did provide fairly convincing evidence in the form of a naturally occurring ABAB design. Please note that all of the names used in this paper have been changed to protect the identities of those involved. At the commencement of the case the perpetrator (Greg) was maintaining regular mutual contact with a member of the victim's family (Carly). After several weeks of stalking behaviour by Greg towards the victim, Carly cut contact with Greg. Almost immediately, Greg ceased his stalking behaviour. The stalking resumed several months later when Carly resumed contact with Greg. Finally, Carly cut all contact with Greg and told him never to contact anyone in the family again. The stalking ended and has not resumed.

The exceptions to this negative management principle were two types of contact that seemed to assist in the resolution of a subset of cases. The first type of contact,

which occurred in two cases, was between couples going through a divorce where contact was limited to court or when the couple reached a settlement themselves. Contact in this context seemed to facilitate the desistance of stalking behaviour in three cases. The second type of contact was implemented for strategic purposes and was suggested and overseen by police in two cases. An example of this is that in one case where the victim had been receiving anonymous death threats, police had her call the suspected perpetrator. Police remained on the line during the phone call and coached the victim on what to say. The phone call did not result in an admission of guilt by the perpetrator, but it clarified his motive for making the death threats.

### ***Open to contact***

A related theme or management principle that was also ineffective was when victims left themselves open to contact from the perpetrator. Seven (22%) victims left themselves open to contact (e.g. by phone or email), often because they thought this would provide a venue for the perpetrator to vent their feelings. Another victim continued to enter the chat room that their stalker frequented. The chat room was the only means by which the stalker could contact the victim. Because the victim left herself open to contact by voluntarily entering the chat room, the police were unable to press charges. In seven cases the actions of the victim resulted in continued contact. However, under a very unique set of circumstances, the seventh victim deliberately left herself open to contact by phone and used that contact to her advantage. In this case the perpetrator was unknown and their stalking behaviour consisted solely of anonymous obscene phone calls. The victim, through a great deal of detective work used the phone numbers she gathered from her caller ID to determine who the perpetrator was. Police subsequently arrested the perpetrator.

***Informal police warnings***

The third ineffective management principle was informal police warnings, which were often conducted over the phone, without a formal warning letter. This type of warning was only effective in one of the six (19%) cases in which it was employed. Moreover, the only time that the informal warning was effective, the officer making the call enhanced the warning by likening the perpetrator's circumstances to those of another perpetrator who had recently been incarcerated for stalking the same victim. The nil effect in the other five cases of the phone warnings was evident in that on several occasions the perpetrators used the warning as an excuse to contact the victim. After receiving the informal warning the same perpetrators contacted the victim to say that they did not believe a real police officer had made the call.

***United front***

The fourth ineffective management principle concerned the process by which the case was managed, namely that it lacked a united front between the police and the victim. A united front is present when the police and the victim are sending the perpetrator the same message regarding the hurtfulness and illegality of their behaviour. Such a front avoids confusion and strengthens the message being sent to the perpetrator. In four cases (13%), a united front was not presented and its absence had a detrimental effect on the case. In all four cases the front was broken when the victim failed to report an offense or contact by the perpetrator to police. For example, in one case the perpetrator made it clear to police that when the victim did not report his violation of a police warning he took it as a sign that the victim enjoyed his efforts and that the police were unfairly persecuting him.

***Collaboration with internet companies***

The fifth theme involves obtaining assistance from internet-based companies. Police and victims requested the assistance of internet companies such as Yahoo and the companies that sponsor Facebook on four occasions. In three of those cases the companies lacked the requested information, completely ignored police requests or failed to follow through on their promise to investigate. In the remaining case, the company eventually provided the information that police requested. However, three separate police forces had to become involved before this occurred.

***Rational Discussion***

The final theme, having a rational discussion with the perpetrator, is somewhat different from the aforementioned themes in that it is only ineffective in a minority of cases. When police interview perpetrators they generally spend a substantial amount of time explaining to the perpetrator both why their behaviour is illegal and that the victim does not appreciate, and/or is frightened by their behaviour. In almost all cases this management tactic provided police with insight into the perpetrator and their behaviour. For some perpetrators this is a light bulb moment and for others this news is somewhat informative but for most perpetrators it is redundant. However, four individuals (13%) strongly re-buffed the information delivered by the police. In three cases this was likely due to the fact that the perpetrators' held strong delusional beliefs about the victim, the legal system and/or the government. For example, in one case the perpetrator (Peter) was romantically interested in the victim (Jeff). The police explained that Jeff was not a homosexual and as such not interested in people of Peter's orientation. Peter refused to believe the police and instead decided that the government was conspiring to ruin his life and keep him from Jeff. In the fourth case where this principle was ineffective, the perpetrator was communicating with an individual who was close to the victim. This

communication led him to hold a fixed belief that was unchanged by discussions with police.

## DISCUSSION

### ***Data Alignment with Previous Research***

The 32 cases reviewed revealed a large and diverse number of management strategies and tactics that were employed and the lengthy duration of the many forms of stalking behaviour. This supports the conclusion that stalking is a complex crime. Adding to the complexity is the heterogeneity of the perpetrators (strangers, former intimates, mentally ill individuals, etc.) and the need for case management strategies and tactics that serve the dual purpose of bringing about desistance and protecting the victim (Kropp et al., 2002). However, despite the complexity of the cases and the large number of tactics that were employed, all of the cases in the present study were resolved. This indicates that police, victims and others have at their disposal and employ efficacious management tactics.

Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found that victims reported that stalking ended after police warned the perpetrator in 15% of cases. In the present study, formal police warnings were more common, they were the final tactic in 6% cases and one of multiple final tactics in 22% cases. In addition to being both commonly used and fairly efficacious, the formal warning also accomplished several other important ends. Firstly, and importantly, this warning could be carried out without requiring the victim to make contact with the perpetrator. Secondly, the letter and the police officers who delivered it clearly defined, both verbally and in writing, the boundaries regarding the perpetrator's behaviour. This approach also afforded perpetrators the opportunity to correct their behaviour which was especially fitting in cases where the perpetrator seemed genuinely

unaware that their behaviour was inappropriate or illegal. The third achievement of the letter was that, with a warning firmly in place, it became easier for police to charge the perpetrator or proceed with harsher punishment if the perpetrator chose to ignore the warning and continue their illegal behaviour. Finally, the warning letters gave the detectives an opportunity to speak with perpetrators without imposing charges. This most likely increased the probability that perpetrators would be willing to speak with police. From this interaction, police could then obtain more information about the perpetrators which in turn could facilitate more case-specific management, such as suggesting treatment for those who appeared mentally ill.

The results of this study concurred with previous research in finding that a substantial proportion (33%) of peace bonds and restraining orders were violated in the cases in which they were employed. However, the data also revealed that a greater proportion of perpetrators (58%) violated their bail conditions. In fact, two perpetrators chose to abide by their peace bonds, but violated their court conditions. Some authors have argued that peace bonds can enrage stalkers. The present results indicate that charging the stalker with an offence may be even more enraging. Another possible conclusion is that offenders are more apt to comply with a peace bond because peace bonds do not appear on a person's criminal record and they realize if they continue their behaviour their criminal record may be affected. As previously mentioned several authors have made arguments against the use of peace bonds; however, it seems unlikely that they would advise the same about charging the offender. Thus, instead of arguing over the utility of peace bonds, it might be more prudent for police and researchers to focus on methods that will minimize the risk of retaliation and to also take steps to prepare victims for the possible outcomes of taking *any* legal action against their stalker.

Legal charges were laid only about half as often in this sample as they were in a previous study by the US National Institute of Justice (1993). In that study, police also frequently used the tactic of charging a perpetrator with multiple offenses in order to increase the likelihood of desistence. In the present study, this did not appear to be the case as only six offenders were charged with multiple offenses. A possible reason for the divergent findings may be that the National Institute of Justice study was conducted fifteen years ago at a time when stalking had only recently been criminalized in the US. Police officers today may be better equipped to handle stalking cases by using alternative management tactics as opposed to multiple legal charges. Another possibility is simply that there is a difference in how Canadian and US police services manage cases of stalking.

Another key principle in case management was also highlighted in this study in that police appropriately matched the risk involved in the case to the management tactics that they employed. This is a promising finding because corrections-based research has shown that matching intervention with the risk level of an offender, as well as their needs and responsibility leads to decreased recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). Employing this principle is also efficient because it indicates that police attention and other criminal justice resources are being allocated appropriately. For example, low risk perpetrators are managed using tactics that require less time and effort, e.g. warning letters, whereas high risk perpetrators are managed with tactics that require more effort and resources such as arrest and/or conviction.

Police use of management tactics that escalate in severity also mirrors other areas of the justice system. In particular, the increasingly severe management tactics echo sentencing practices whereby judges impose more severe sentences on repeat offenders. For stalking cases this management principle also gives some perpetrators

the opportunity to correct behaviour that they may not have realized was illegal and upsetting to the victim. This may be particularly important for those individuals who are socially incompetent or mentally ill, both common characteristics of stalkers (Meloy, 1999; Mullen, Pathé, Purcell, & Stuart, 1999; Mullen et al., 2000a; Sheridan et al., 2003). The only caveat to utilizing this management principle is that it requires that police officers strike a balance between reprimanding the perpetrator and protecting the victim. It is not clear from the present study whether this skill of balancing needs is developed through experience, obtained from training in risk assessment, or both.

Perhaps equally as important as knowing what management strategies and tactics to implement in stalking cases is knowing what not to do. Contact between the victim and the perpetrator was one such negative theme. In the present study, contact between the victim and the perpetrator was ill-advised if not sanctioned by police or performed through an intermediary such as the court or a lawyer. These results support the theories of Alison and Alison (2005) as well as McCann (2001) which liken contact to positive reinforcement. When victims make sporadic contact with their stalkers, the perpetrators then cannot know when their stalking behaviour will be rewarded with attention from the victim and this initiates a type of reinforcement that is called intermittent reinforcement. It has long been known in psychology that intermittent reinforcement is the type of reinforcement schedule that is the most resistant to extinction (Skinner, 1938), which in this instance means that it would encourage continued stalking. These results are interesting in light of the fact that Nicastro et al. (2000) found that the most common non-legal tactic used by victims was physical confrontation of the perpetrator. The findings of this study (detrimental effect of contact) coupled with those of Nicastro et al. (common use of contact as a management tactic) demonstrate the need to reinforce to victims that they should not initiate contact with

their stalkers, except under very limited circumstances (e.g. via court or police instruction). Methods of delivering this message to victims will be discussed shortly.

### ***New Management Tactics Identified***

Several new management tactics and strategies were identified in this study. One novel principle was a united front between the police, the victim and others involved in the case (e.g. the victim's family). This principle is notable because it was unearthed due to the detrimental consequences that occurred when it was absent from a case. It is possible that this principle may also be overlooked frequently in practice until it becomes apparent that it is absent. Comments made by perpetrators indicated that they interpreted the lack of a united front as evidence to support their belief that the victim condoned their behaviour. Due to the detrimental effect that the absence of a united front can have on a case, police should actively take steps to reinforce its presence and importance. A potential solution to this and other issues related to contact are discussed below.

One of the more inventive management tactics employed by detectives was developing a congenial relationship with perpetrators or their families. A relationship with the perpetrator was usually established during the first meeting between the detective and the perpetrator, demonstrating the ability of officers to determine the applicability employing this tactic in a short period of time. While these relationships were not intended to elicit desistance they did serve two other purposes. First, they established an appropriate relationship within which the perpetrator had someone to talk to. Perpetrators tend to lack such relationships due to their poor social skills (Mullen et al., 2000a). Second, and more importantly, this relationship provided police with a great deal of useful information regarding the perpetrator's mood, their progress, whether further

intervention was needed, as well as a venue to suggest appropriate community services. This type of relationship will only be useful in a minority of cases (most likely those that are low risk, such as socially incompetent or isolated perpetrators) but where possible it is worth the added police effort.

Although not a new strategy per se, the research to date has not highlighted officers' use of the mental health care system. The DVACH detectives placed a great deal of importance on appropriate mental health care for perpetrators who demonstrated signs of mental illness. Mental health services were also included among the final tactics of several cases. Additionally, in more than one case, police were amenable to dropping charges when mental health treatment was the best option for the perpetrator. The detectives who handled the cases reviewed in this study had all received training in issues related to mental illness as part of risk assessment training offered by professionals in the Vancouver area. It is unclear whether this training is the reason for their response to mental illness or if it is the result of experience, or perhaps both. Whatever the reason, an understanding of mental illness is important to possess in this area of criminal behaviour as it is an underlying factor in many cases (Meloy, 1999; Mullen, et al., 1999; Sheridan, et al., 2003). The knowledge the officers possessed regarding mental illness and their understanding of the benefits of proper treatment was advantageous when utilizing this management strategy, particularly when selecting the most appropriate management tactics for cases where mental illness was a factor. This is evidenced in part by the fact that all of the stalkers desisted, including those that the detectives chose not to charge in favour of allowing the mental health system take over.

## ***Future Research Directions***

As in any study, the data for this study were collected and analyzed in a specific fashion and had certain limitations. For example, the small sample size and use of a single police unit reduced generalizability. The use of qualitative methods can also inject certain types of researcher bias into the analysis of the data, such as a particular view regarding how the data collection, analyses or outcomes should be structured and interpreted. While it is important to be cognizant of and try to control these biases, the effect of this limitation can also be diminished by performing quantitative studies on similar research questions. Quantitative methods can more easily accommodate large samples and comparison groups. However, it should be noted that with any method there will be bias imposed by the researcher. In quantitative research the investigator imposes a structure by selecting how to collect and analyze the data as well as when interpreting meaning from the data.

Another limitation of this research was the use of closed case files. Closed case files were useful in that they allowed the author to examine what tactics and strategies might have resulted in desistance. However, a close examination of active files while they were in progress might have uncovered why police employ certain tactics and strategies and the short term effects of those tactics and strategies on stalking behaviour.

Despite the limitations the methods chosen strengthened the study, because the small sample size allowed in-depth analysis of each case and a thorough exploration of a relatively unstudied area. One of the major goals of this study was to provide a foundation of knowledge that would guide future research in the area. The following are research topics that arose from this study.

The detectives of the DVACH unit, with the assistance of others, had at their disposal sufficient management tactics to resolve all of the cases. However, it should be noted that this sample contained only closed cases. This study highlighted which tactics and strategies seemed to be most effective. This included the identification of some effective tactics and strategies that have not been previously reported and some negative tactics and strategies that need to be discouraged.

Future research could expand on the present results by gathering large sample sizes from multiple police jurisdictions in order to provide strong statistics and clear rankings of the efficacy of different tactics and strategies. This would be of great assistance to law enforcement as it would provide the officers with firm information on which tactics and strategies are the most effective and, furthermore, which are the most effective at deterring different types of stalkers, or stalkers who pose different levels of risk. This information could hasten the resolution of cases by reducing the number of tactics that police must employ in each case and consistently employing the most effective strategies throughout a case. In turn, this would reduce the strain on victims and on police resources. This information could also be used to provide victims with persuasive evidence that proves the efficacy of tactics and strategies that they might otherwise be reluctant to undertake or follow.

Future studies that endeavor to evaluate the efficacy of management tactics or strategies should also note that there is more than one way for a tactic or a strategy to be effective. The formal warning letter is a perfect example of this. The warning letter, as previously stated, was a useful and important tactic in several respects, even when it was not the final tactic employed. Future studies should employ a broad definition of efficacy that includes facilitating desistance, facilitating the progress of the case, and

increasing the knowledge that police possess regarding the perpetrator and thereby enhancing their ability to select effective tactics and strategies.

Researchers who study stalking case management should also be mindful of the fact that while the present study found that the legal tactics were highly important in facilitating the desistance of stalkers, this strategy is very broad. Merely examining the efficacy of general legal tactics that are applied to all crimes (as previous studies have done), such as arrest, peace bond and conviction, fails to provide a complete picture of the full range of tactics that police are actually employing. Legal tactics such as warnings, monitoring, congenial relationships, and informal tactics, need to also be examined because they all assisted police in resolving cases in this sample. It is also important not to limit the tactics examined to those implemented by the legal system, since a subset of cases in this sample required strategies that could only be employed by mental health services, the victim, the perpetrator or a member of one of their families.

Although some significant associations were uncovered in this study, the dataset as a whole was not well suited to statistical tests. However, the associations found were notable and they point to areas that need additional research, such as differences in management based on the typology of the stalker. There are several possible explanations for the associations that were uncovered. Victims of intimate stalkers and intimate stalkers themselves may be more likely than other RECON types to seek professional assistance for reasons associated with their relationship breakdown. For example, some of the female victims sought assistance from victim services for domestic violence issues. Telephone tactics such as changing one's phone number were more common among victims of intimate stalkers than public figure stalkers. This makes intuitive sense as most public figure stalkers fail to obtain their victim's direct phone

number. For example, in this sample public figure stalkers tended to carry out their stalking behaviour through written communication. Finally, victims of acquaintance stalkers were more likely to make contact with those close to the stalker than were public figure stalkers. This again may be due to the more remote connection between public figure stalkers and their victims.

In terms of risk, only lifestyle changes were differentially associated with risk level, with these changes being more likely to occur in high risk cases than low risk cases. This finding makes intuitive sense since lifestyle changes are difficult to make and therefore are less likely to be undertaken by victims if there was not a considerable amount of risk and/or victim fear involved in the case. For example, some of the lifestyle changes made included; moving out of the city, not going to work, and restricting when one leaves the house.

Mental illness affects a substantial number of stalkers and mental health services played an instrumental role in several of the cases reviewed. As such, a future study that examined the role of mental health services in the management of stalking cases would be beneficial particularly since very few articles on the treatment and management of stalkers exist.

It was apparent from the results that a disparity existed between victims with regard to the process by which they managed the stalking situation. Some victims were receptive to police suggestions and did a great deal to deter their stalker's behaviour while others did not. Due to the small amount of victim information collected in this study, the differences between the two types of victims could not be examined. Examination of these differences might be a valuable avenue of future research as it could shed light on how best to motivate or guide victims to comply with the suggestions made by police and other professionals.

As previously mentioned, some studies have found that almost half of stalking victims never report their victimization to police. Thus, a large number of effective tactics, employed by victims may not have been identified by this study. A similar study using self-identified victims, including both those who did and did not call police, could provide additional key information regarding tactics and their efficacy. This information would be beneficial to all victims and might provide police with new tactics to suggest to victims. A study of this nature might also shed light on why victims either choose or do not choose to involve police and could provide better information to the public at large about this issue.

On a related topic, this study showed that on average victims of stalkers waited almost a year before contacting police. This finding raises several questions such as; why did they wait so long, what made them decided to involve police, were they unaware that the police could or would offer assistance? In addition, the length of the stalking period itself was often quite substantial, averaging almost 18 months. This figure underlines the fact that, for most cases, police files only describe a portion of the entire stalking campaign. Police files are also condensed for practical purposes and by their nature are written from the officers' perspective. Hence, in order to more fully understand a given case, it may be necessary to also speak with the victim, or at the very least watch or read the transcripts of police interviews with the victim.

### ***Implication for Policy, Police, Victims, and Practice***

It should be noted for the purpose of generalizing the results of this study that the cases reviewed were drawn from the DVACH unit which is a specialized stalking unit. The DVACH detectives participate in risk assessment training offered by expert psychologists in the field, have close ties to a number of psychologists who work in the

area of stalking, and have access to the SAM, a risk assessment tool which has not yet been widely disseminated. Thus, the unit has several advantages in the area of stalking risk assessment which are, most likely, not currently available to other police units. However, whereas other police forces may not be comparable to the DVACH unit, they will certainly be able to learn from an advanced and specialized unit and adopt suggestions drawn from the cases handled by the unit. While there will clearly be some differences among units from different jurisdictions, the cases reviewed were taken directly from police files in a major metropolitan area and thus they are widely generalizable to the cases that other units would encounter.

Not surprisingly, legal tactics were both the most common tactics used during the process of handling a stalking case and the most common final tactic. These findings indicate that third parties in positions of authority deliver the most effective tactics in cases like the ones examined here. The use of a third party avoids the need for any contact between the victim and the perpetrator and eliminates the possibility that the perpetrator will misinterpret the victim's behaviour. In addition, having an authority figure act as the third party makes it clear to the perpetrator that their behaviour is illegal and has been reported to authorities. One caveat to this finding is that in the cases reviewed it was important for the perpetrator be aware of the authority of the third party. In most of the cases where police used informal telephone warnings, the perpetrators ignored the warnings and sometimes used it as a reason to contact the victim to say that they did not believe that the call had been made by a real police officer. Thus, where possible police should warn the perpetrator in person.

As noted previously, even some of the most conscientious victims made errors in judgment, such as failing to report a perpetrator's breach of their conditions to police. In one case even the victim's therapist erred by encouraging the victim not to involve police

stating instead that she would handle the situation (the perpetrator was also her client). Ultimately the therapist was unsuccessful and the stalker's behaviour escalated. These findings indicate that managing cases of stalking is neither easy nor intuitive. In fact, one's first instinct may be to confront the stalker, as was most common tactic used by the victims surveyed by Nicastro et al., (2000). However, as demonstrated from the case files in the present study, contact has detrimental effects on the stalker's behaviour. Thus, there exists a need, on the part of both victims and professionals, for guidance on how to handle stalkers.

This need for guidance is also reflected in those cases where a united front was not maintained between the victim and the police, as well as when victims left themselves open to contact from the perpetrator. Victims are also likely to be unaware that their behaviour is reinforcing the perpetrator. Thus, in addition to not contacting the offender, victims should also be counseled on how to act so as to reduce the likelihood that the perpetrator will misconstrue their behavior.

To resolve issues relating to victims (e.g., contacting the perpetrator, leaving themselves open to contact, not presenting a united front, etc.), police should consider making it standard practice to have a discussion with all victims about (a) what they can do to facilitate the stalker's desistance, and (b) the ways in which their behaviour can be misconstrued by the perpetrator. When educating victims on how to facilitate a stalker's desistance police should stress messages including; adhering to the management tactics suggested, not acting in a way that might undermine the police message to the perpetrator, and applying tactics in a consistent manner. Police may also want to advise victims that appropriate changes in their behaviour can sometimes play a large role in resolving the case. In order to teach victims how to avoid having their behaviour

misconstrued by the perpetrator, police may find it useful to describe the general thought process of a stalker to victims.

This information could be derived from the literature or from the experience of the police officer and could be delivered by an officer or another professional working with police, such as a counselor. Officers should bear in mind that while they may not feel like experts in this particular area their experience with stalkers far exceeds that of the victim who is also highly agitated and trying to quickly learn how navigate new territory. Officers need also be aware that things which are intuitive to them are not so for victims since stalking is fairly distinct from other social interactions. Some points that should be highlighted for victims include; (a) often any attention that they give to the perpetrator is considered positive regardless of its content, and (b) even the failure to act (e.g. by not changing their phone number or not calling police) can be construed as a positive sign. Describing specific behaviours and using hypothetical examples might help to clarify the points being made. For example, a failure by the victim to report a breach might be interpreted as the victim not wanting to press charges because they enjoy the perpetrator's persistence. A nasty letter might indicate to the perpetrator that the victim was thinking of them, or chose to take the time to respond. Conversely, such a letter might be perceived as humiliating or as a personal slight and might be met with retaliation by the perpetrator. However, there are also cases in which contact and other negative themes discussed above will not have negative results, such as the victim who left herself open to contact in order to ascertain the identity of the perpetrator. Nevertheless it should be stressed that these situations are rare and victims should be counseled to not place themselves in unnecessary danger or act so as to inadvertently cause the stalking behaviour to escalate. This discussion need not take long and police could create a standardized format for all victims. The result of having this short

discussion with victims may facilitate case resolution as well as decrease the number of cases in which police are blocked from using their tactic of choice.

Police may also want to share with victims that, in a small subset of cases, the victim, perpetrator or a family member implemented one of the final tactics. This finding is not surprising in light of the fact that studies have shown that almost half of victims do not involve police, indicating that someone else must implement the final tactics. While uncommon, it might make victims feel less helpless to know that they or their families may have the potential to influence their stalker's desistance. This practice should not be encouraged however, due to the potential risk involved.

Officers should also make use of risk assessment tools, like the SAM to identify vulnerable victims in need of additional assistance. The SAM is also designed to help officers identify appropriate risk management strategies based on the risk involved in the case. Thus, they can facilitate the achievement of several principles such as the risk and escalation principles. Conversely, stalker typologies offer a broad understanding of most cases but do not provide guidance in the selection of risk management strategies, likely due to their lack of specificity and focus on risk factors.

Due to the nature of stalking, there will always be a need for police to collaborate with other agencies during the management of some cases. For example, high rates of mental illness among perpetrators will mean collaboration with mental health services whereas movements of perpetrators or victims across borders can require the involvement of border agencies and law enforcement from other jurisdictions. In the present study, all of these collaborations were needed, worked well and were instrumental to case resolution.

Conversely, only a minority of collaborations between police and internet companies even got started and the responses of the majority of internet companies

were at best unhelpful. This finding is especially concerning due to the exponential increase in the use of the internet including interactive sites such as friendship sites and online chat rooms. While these sites provide an avenue to stay in touch with old friends and meet new friends, they also create a new medium for stalkers to harass their victims. For example, Sheridan and Grant (2007) found that 48% of self-reported stalking victims said they had been harassed via the internet. The law is always struggling to catch up with new technologies that are being exploited for criminal use. If internet providers are unwilling to assist police or the victims who use their services this may be an area that will require attention from lawmakers in the future.

In summary, this study provided evidence regarding which management tactics and strategies assisted in the resolution of stalking cases. Although some desirable statistical testing could not be conducted due to small sample sizes, it nonetheless provided strong qualitative information about many aspects of stalking behaviour, set up a number of questions for future research, and identified critical principles of case management that can be used to better inform police and victims in order to successfully handle stalking cases.

With respect to victim strategies and tactics, these principles include:

1. Do not make contact with the perpetrator or leave yourself open to contact,
2. Adopt tactics suggested by police,
3. Report breaches and violations by the stalker to police when they occur, and
4. Do not rely on internet companies to protect you or provide required evidence.

With respect to police strategies and tactics, the principles identified include:

1. Discuss with victims how their behaviour can influence the case,
2. If possible, develop a congenial relationship with the perpetrator in order to allow assessment of the individual,
3. When possible, begin the use legal tactics with a warning letter that alerts the perpetrator to the seriousness of the problem without plunging them directly into the judicial system, and
4. Provide officers with some training in mental illness or with easy access to consultation with individuals who are trained so that cases where mental illness is an issue can be identified and appropriately managed.
5. Use risk assessment tools (not typologies) to guide your selection and employment of risk management strategies.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Alison, E., & Alison, L. (2005). A stalking management programme: Preparing advisory material for non-psychologists. In L. Alison (Ed.), *The Forensic psychologist's casebook: Psychological profiling and criminal investigation* (pp.334-367). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- AuCoin, K. (Ed.). (2005). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 389-406.
- Blaauw, E., Winkle, F., 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.
- Brewster, M. P. (1998). *An exploration of the experiences and needs of former intimate stalking victims* (Doc. No. 175475). West Chester, Pennsylvania: West Chester University, Department of Criminal Justice.
- Brewster, M. P. (2001). Legal help-seeking experiences of former intimate-stalking victims. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 12, 91-112.
- Brewster, M. P. (2003). The criminal justice system's response to stalking. In M. Brewster (Ed.), *Stalking: Psychology, risk factors, interventions, and law* (pp. 3-1 – 3-21). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.
- Canadian Center for Justice Statistics. (2005). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile*. Ottawa: Author.
- Charmaz, K. (2008a). Grounded theory as an emergent method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods*, (pp. 155-170). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2008b). Grounded theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. C. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 3rd ed. (pp. 507-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Collins, M. J., & Wilkas, M. B. (2001). Stalking trauma syndrome and the traumatized victim. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment, and case management* (pp. 317-334). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Danto, B. L. (2001). Minimizing potential threats and risks to stalking victims: Case management, security issues, and safety planning. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment, and case management* (pp. 283- 298). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2004). *A handbook for police and crown prosecutors on criminal harassment* (ISBN 0-662-28212-4). Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Dressings, H., Kuehner, C., & Gass, P. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and impact of stalking in a European population: Epidemiological data from a middle-sized German city. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 187, 168-172.
- 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 Magazine*, 40, 138.
- Hoffmann, J. M. & Sheridan, L. P. (2005). The stalking of public figures: Management and intervention. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 50, 1459-1465.
- Jasinski, J. L., & Mustaine, E. E. (2001). Police response to physical assault and stalking victimization: A comparison of influential factors. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 23-40.
- Jordan, C., Logan, T., Walker, R., & Nigoff, A. (2003). Stalking: An examination of the criminal justice response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 148-165.
- Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., & Lyon, D. R. (2002). Risk assessment of stalkers: Some problems and possible solutions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 590-616.
- Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., & Lyon, D. R. (2008a). *Guidelines for Stalking Assessment and Management (SAM)*. Vancouver, Canada: ProActive Resolutions Inc.
- Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., & Lyon, D. R. (2008b). Risk assessment of public figure stalkers. In J. R. Meloy, J. Hoffman, & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking, threatening, and attacking public figures* (pp. 343-361). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kuennen, T. (2003). Civil legal options for victims of stalking. In M. Brewster (Ed.), *Stalking: Psychology, risk factors, interventions, and law* (pp. 4-1 – 1-15). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.
- Logan, T. K., Walker, R., Jordan, C. E., & Leukefeld, C. G. (2006). *Women and victimization: Contributing factors, interventions, and implications*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Logan, T. K., Walker, R., Stewart, C., & Allen, J. (2006). Victim service and justice system representative responses about partner stalking: What do professionals recommend? *Violence and Victims*, 21, 49-66.
- Maxey, W. (2001). Stalking the stalker: Law enforcement investigation and intervention. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment, and case management* (pp. 354-360). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- McCann, J. T. (2001). Legal responses. In J. T. McCann (Ed.), *Stalking in children and adolescents: The primitive bond* (pp. 227- 250). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McCann, J. T. (2006). Bullying and stalking in children and adolescents: Assessing obsessional harassment. In S. N. Sparta & G. P. Koocher (Eds.), *Forensic mental health assessment of children and adolescents* (pp. 301-310). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Stalking victimization: Clinical implications for assessment and intervention. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 31-61). New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Meloy, J. R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 1, 147-162.
- Meloy, J. R., (1997). The clinical risk management of stalking: "Someone is watching over me...". *Journal of Psychotherapy*, 51, 174-184.
- Meloy, J. R. (1999). Stalking: An old behavior, a new crime. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 22, 85-99.

- Mester, R., Birger, M., & Margolin, J. (2006). Stalking. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 43, 102-111.
- Mohandie, K., Meloy, J. R., McGowan, M. G., & Williams, J. (2006). The RECON typology of stalking: Reliability and validity based upon a large sample of North American stalkers. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 51, 147-155.
- Mullen, P. E., & Pathé, M. (1994). The pathological extensions of love. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 165, 614-623.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000a). *Stalkers and their victims*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000b). Stalking. *The Psychologist*, 13, 454-459.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G.W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 1244-1249.
- National Institute of Justice (1993). *Project to develop a model anti-stalking code for states* (NCJ 144477). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Nicastro, A., Cousins, A., & Spitzberg, B. (2000). The tactical face of stalking. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 69-82.
- Pathé, M. (2002). *Surviving stalking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 12-17.
- Plano Clark, V. L., Creswell J. W., Green, D. O., & Shope, R. J. (2008). Mixing quantitative and qualitative approaches: An introduction to emergent mixed methods research. In Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (Eds). *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 363-388). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ravensberg, V., & Miller, C. (2003). Stalking among young adults: Review of the preliminary research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8, 455-469.
- Römkens, R. (2006). Protecting prosecution: Exploring the powers of the law in an intervention program for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 160-186.
- Rosenfeld, B., & Harmon, R. (2002). Factors associated with violence in stalking and obsessional harassment cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 671-691.

- Sheridan, L. P., Blaauw, E., & Davies, G. M. (2003). Stalking: Knowns and unknowns. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 4, 148-162.
- Sheridan, L. P., & Grant, T. (2007). Is cyberstalking different? *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 13, 627-640.
- Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Snow, R. L. (1998). *Stopping a stalker: A cop's guide to making the system work for you*. New York: Plenum Trade.
- Spence-Diehl, E. (1999). *Stalking: A handbook for victims*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.
- Spence-Diehl, E. & Potocky-Tripodi, M. (2001). Victims of stalking: A study of service needs as perceived by victim services practitioners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 86-94.
- 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: Towards a relational model of stalking related phenomena. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment, and case management* (pp. 97-136). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Storey, J. E., Hart, S. D., Meloy, J. R., & Reavis, J. A. (in press). Psychopathy and stalking. *Law and Human Behavior*.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the national violence against women survey* (NCJ 169592). Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature and consequences of intimate partner violence* (NCJ 181867). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ugolini J. A. & Kelly, K. (2001). Case management strategies regarding stalkers and their victims: A practical approach from a private industry perspective. In J. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection: Prevention, intervention, threat assessment, and case management* (pp. 301-316). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Victim Services Toronto. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from  
[http://www.victimservicestoronto.com/dv\\_emergency\\_response.htm](http://www.victimservicestoronto.com/dv_emergency_response.htm)

Zona, M. A. Sharma, K. K., & J. Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 38, 894-903.

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix A: Literature review of suggested risk management strategies

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Tactics</b>
<b>Vehicle security</b>	<p>Did not park car on street or in unattended garage</p> <p>Always parked in well lit areas</p> <p>Had a locked gas cap</p> <p>Inspected car before entering</p> <p>Drove with doors locked and windows up</p> <p>Did not stop if had a minor accident or breakdown and carried tools</p> <p>Used a rental car</p> <p>Did not put your name or identifiers on your keys</p> <p>Did not use a valet</p> <p>Walked away if there was a van parked next to your car</p> <p>Walked away if there was an individual standing near your car</p> <p>Asked your auto mechanic to keep your information confidential</p> <p>If followed went directly to a police or gas station</p> <p>Got the license plate of anyone you thought was following you</p>
<b>Managing contact from the offender</b>	<p>Avoid and/or never initiating contact</p> <p>Ignore (phone, email etc.)</p> <p>Communicating that attention was unwanted (i.e. asking them to stop)</p> <p>Refraining from sending unclear signals</p> <p>Did not show any reaction to the stalker and did not retaliate</p> <p>Not using threatening or humiliating language</p> <p>Keeping self from become angry</p> <p>Did not open or handle things from stalker, gave to police</p> <p>Returned communications to stalker, unopened.</p>

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Education</b>     | <p>Did not return items from the stalker</p> <p>Made contact with parents (in case of young offender)</p> <p>Made offender's parents recipients of any legal or court notifications</p>  |
| <b>Home security</b> | <p>Outlined for victim the limits to the law's ability to provide protection</p> <p>Learned to recognize dangerous times/situations and signs that indicate the potential for violence</p> <p>Learned about trauma and traumatic responses</p> <p>Obtained an understanding of the stalker's communications</p> <p>Developed/learned skills to deal with approaches by stalker - MOVE UNDER SAFETY PLANNING</p> <p>Enhanced home, work or vehicle security (lights, locks, alarm, panic alarm)</p> <p>Trimmed trees and shrubs around house</p> <p>Installed electric garage door opener</p> <p>Locked fuse box and had alternative light sources</p> <p>Made sure house number was clearly visible</p> <p>Drew blinds before turned on inside lights</p> <p>Put lamps near windows to decrease shadows</p> <p>Did not place phone near window</p> <p>Put timers on indoor lights, left radio on</p> <p>Made sure that you could escape from your own house</p> <p>Made sure that you had a working smoke alarm</p> <p>Installed a peephole</p> <p>Installed metal stoppers in sliding doors and windows</p> <p>Supervised any tradesmen that entered your home, got ID</p> <p>Installed surveillance cameras</p> <p>Learned tools for managing stress and anxiety symptoms</p> <p>Had keys ready when entering house or car</p> |

- Made a safe/panic room in your house
- Removed name from anything that you were throwing out or recycling
- Did not accept packages that you did not order (at home or work)
- Removed your name from your buzzer
- Protecting personal information**
  - Having one's contact details removed from public records
  - Got a private box service for mail
  - Did not have your name on anything that was delivered to your home
  - If travelled kept plans confidential and had mail collected
  - Listed utilities under the name of a trust or friend
  - Avoided giving out address
  - Avoided giving out SIN number
  - Were aware of who was around when discussing plans
- Internet security**
  - Obtained helpful information from the internet
  - If stalked online contacted site administrator or stalker's internet service provider
  - Contacted Cyber Angels/online victim assistance
- Legal tactics**
  - Obtaining a restraining order (peace bond, civil protection order)
  - Kept copies of protection orders with you
  - Made sure your protection order was registered in a central registry
  - Permanent civil protection order
  - Filed for a violation of a protective order
  - Order to keep the peace
  - Leave at request order
  - Monitoring the case
  - Increased monitoring during dramatic moments
  - Police warned stalker (face to face)
  - Police conducted surveillance of the stalker
  - Stalker was arrested (for criminal harassment)

Stalker was charged for criminal harassment  
Stalker was charged/arrested for another offence; intimidation uttering threats etc.

Were aware of dramatic moments (e.g. when restraining order was filed)

Called police

Bring police a written statement and photo of the stalker

Filed a complaint for another offence against the stalker (trespassing, assault)

Filed civil charges

If stalking escalated you did not drop the charges

If moved informed new police of the situation and brought them the file number

Home and personal alarm acquired and monitored by police (DVERS)

Got a preventative prohibition order, section 111 (re guns)

Perpetrators gun was seized

Flagged victim's address in police database

Provided victim with special attention from patrols and notified watch commander

Had an involuntary psychiatric evaluation/hold put on the stalker

Discussed with the prosecutor the likely outcome of charges

Had no one other than the police intervene with the stalker

Decision (by victim) to prosecute

Obtained a lawyer/sought their advice

Had a lawyer write letter to stalker to cease and desist

Negotiated a release notification agreement

If the stalker was charged, kept in contact with probation

Moving residence in same city or moving to a different city

### Lifestyle changes

	<p>Changing identity</p> <p>Altering habits, routines and travel routes</p> <p>Altering lifestyle</p> <p>Avoiding certain places/people</p> <p>Identified safe places, police station, shelter etc.</p> <p>Developing a contingency plan for transportation</p> <p>Restricting when one leaves the house</p> <p>Went underground</p> <p>Stayed at a women's or homeless shelter</p> <p>Changed class schedule</p> <p>Have third party communicate that contact is unwanted</p> <p>Attempting to harm (includes assault), constrain or punish the stalker</p> <p>Confront the stalker</p> <p>Negative affect: yell, threaten, or use hostile voice with stalker</p> <p>Attempting to reason with the stalker</p> <p>Trying to persuade or plead with the stalker to stop</p> <p>Crying in front of the stalker</p> <p>Had third party warn/threaten the stalker</p> <p>Had third party beat up the stalker</p> <p>Not cutting off all avenues of communication with the stalker (in order to get information)</p> <p>Re-negotiating relationship with stalker</p> <p>Reconcile or 'made up' with the stalker (romantically)</p>
<b>Contacting the offender</b>	
<b>Taking an offensive approach</b>	<p>Contacted psychiatric facilities and/or stalker's family</p> <p>Took an active approach to manage the situation (did not rely only on others, e.g. police)</p> <p>Circulated a picture and/or identifying information about stalker to family, daily contacts etc.</p> <p>Did passive research on the stalker (internet, files etc.)</p> <p>Did active research on the stalker (interviews with</p>

- stalker, their family)
- Asked police what evidence was needed to obtain a conviction
  - Take immediate action
  - Document/collected evidence against the stalker
  - Had friends document stalkers actions
  - Make copies of record book
  - Recorded names of witnesses to stalking
  - Requested that police log each call
  - Request that police file a report
  - Got the case number and a record of any police reports for later criminal case
  - Read anti-stalking laws
  - Talked to the prosecutor, asked for a high bond, and showed that you were serious
  - Seeking self control, actualization or empowerment
  - religion
  - relaxation training, e.g. meditation
  - exercise
  - drug/alcohol use
  - Used emotion focused coping
  - Used escape/avoidance focused coping
  - Received emotional support and validation
  - Maintained optimal health
- Coping on a personal level**
- Personal security**
  - Made sure that someone you trust knew where you were at all times
  - Increased vigilance and attention to safety
  - Made a safety plan (advanced scripting)
  - Used code words (for security, for bank accounts etc.)
  - Carried a whistle or personal alarm
  - Duplicated records and left them with a trusted individual
  - Purchased a gun/weapon
  - Carried a weapon or pepper spray

**Telephone security**

- Had emergency contact numbers handy
- Got a guard dog
- Scanned all places that you went for safety and exits
- Pre-planed escape routes
- Had a security agent when left home
- Had an escape kit, in house or car
- Took self defence classes
- Created distance between the stalker and victim
- Screened individuals who had access to the victim
- Changing phone number
- Getting an unlisted phone number
- Putting machine on old number and making calls from new number
- Made and kept copies of messages the stalker left
- Getting caller ID/\*69 or a tracking device \*57
- Got \*67 to block your number from the people you call
- Get 'anonymous call rejection' so stalker cannot block his number
- Established phone lines not from victims' home
- Call screening (screens out certain numbers)
- Three way calling
- Call privacy (caller must identify who they are)
- Identical (multiple numbers to one line with a different ring to identify them)
- Hanging up (gently) on the stalker
- Never answering the phone immediately after hanging up
- Having person of opposite gender to stalker record your answering machine message
- Having a phone programmed to dial 911
- Being discreet in phone conversations (in case stalker was listening)
- Purchased of a mobile phone

**Obtaining professional assistance**

Protected privacy by not calling 1-900 numbers  
 Obtaining a restraining order after being advised to do so by a professional  
 Had home security inspected by a professional  
 Sought opinion of police regarding home security  
 Sought the assistance of a victim advocate  
 Sought the assistance of medical/health care personnel  
 Sought the assistance of a social worker  
 Sought the assistance of a counsellor/psychiatrist/psychologist  
 Sought the assistance of a marriage counsellor  
 Went to a support group  
 Sought the assistance of clergy and/or other religious figures

Called a crisis line  
 Contact victims services

Used an interdisciplinary intervention program (police, social workers etc)

Registered as a victim with an institution  
 Sought expert assistance (e.g. risk assessment, offender profile)  
 Was given an estimated level of risk

Told children not to accept packages, phone calls etc.

Obtained custody of children  
 Helped victim to protect their children  
 Informed kids of emergency plans, what not to do etc.

**Protecting secondary victims/dependents****Reaching out for the assistance of others**

Seeking assistance from others  
 Told friend, relative, neighbour or co-worker  
 Told partner  
 Told door man or property manager  
 Asked others for protection/help (friends, family)  
 Stayed close to others/did not go out alone

	Stayed with friends or family
	Sought help from co-worker or employer
	Joined/formed a neighbourhood watch
	Gave neighbours a picture and asked them to watch your house
	Asked people to be on the lookout for communications
<b>School security</b>	Reported threats or problem to day-care, school etc.
	Provided information or copies of court orders to school officials
	Had an open and supportive relationship between the school and parents
<b>Transportation security</b>	Carry a transportation schedule
	Wait for transportation in a well lit area
	When on public transportation sit near others
	Request that the bus driver make a special stop closer to your destination
	Do not use a cab if you are unsure about the driver
<b>Walking security</b>	Avoid distractions when walking, e.g. headphones, jingling purses
	Wear purse on shoulder, not over neck
	Wear comfortable shoes, e.g. runners
	Walk in well lit areas and in the middle of the sidewalk
	If you think you are being followed always check, if you are go to a safe place
<b>Work security</b>	Quitting or changing career or job
	Decreased attendance at work or school
	If employer did not respond went to someone more senior
	Developed safety strategies with workplace security
	Had personnel files at work secured
	Had a co-worker screen your calls
	Took name off of in and out box
	Told co-workers not to tell others when you are

- expected
- Removed the nameplate from your desk or door
  - Had visitors to work wear name tags
  - Placed real property in a trust
  - Made multiple copies of the restraining order and kept one with you
  - Being discreet in phone conversations (in case stalker was listening)
  - Had a third party make any custody exchanges
  - Ensured that case management and victim had the same goal(s)
  - Contacted politicians or media
  - Asked for financial assistance (from government or other agency)

**Miscellaneous tactics**

## Appendix B: Coding manual

ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

Date completed: \_\_\_\_\_

### Case handling

Number of years of experience of investigator on case:

Were other experts involved in handling the case? Y/N

If yes who (profession/student)?

What are their credentials?

Years of experience of the expert \_\_\_\_\_

Is there any indication that the SAM was used in this case?

Narrative/Notes of case (key dates, long periods of inactivity, judicial sanctions):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Demographics:

Number of primary victims \_\_\_\_\_

Number of secondary victims \_\_\_\_\_

DOB of perpetrator (year):

DOB of victim (year):

Date of complaint to police (DD/MM/YY)

Gender of perpetrator F/M

Gender of victim F/M

### Primary Perpetrator

Canadian citizen? Y/N

English as 1<sup>st</sup> language? Y/N

Visible minority (non European)? Y/N

Aboriginal? Y/N

### Primary Victim

Canadian citizen? Y/N

English as 1<sup>st</sup> language? Y/N

Visible minority? Y/N

Aboriginal? Y/N

Victim current partner?

Perpetrator current partner?

Victim, history of mental health assessment or treatment?  
Date and Inpatient or outpatient?

Perpetrator, history of mental health assessment or treatment? Y/N  
Date and Inpatient or outpatient?

Previous acts of stalking by the perpetrator (mention if they were criminally sanctioned)?

Previous stalking victimization of the victim? Y/N

Employment (at time of complaint/stalking):  
Victim employed/student?  
If yes, describe worksite (where do they work, e.g. office)?

Perpetrator employed/student?  
If yes what is job title (where do they work, e.g. office)?

Perpetrator level of education:  
 Less than high school  
 High school or equivalent  
 Any university  
 Advanced degree

Living Situation (e.g. alone, with partner, shared accommodation) (at time of complaint)  
Victim:

Perpetrator:

Perpetrator and victim relationship until time of complaint, was it intimate partner, former intimate, acquaintance (co-worker, friend, etc specify in the notes section) or stranger?

Relationship type	Length	Notes

Evidence of domestic violence (describe)? Y/N

Duration of stalking: DD/MM/YY

- date victim(s) claims stalking began
- date stalking was reported to police
- end date if available at follow up
- length of inactivity

Criminal record of the stalker:

	Against current victim	Previous stalking/related	Other (NB violent offences & those against people)
Conviction			
Charge			
Arrest			

Type of sentence & duration:

Typology (RECON):

Stalker Types (RECON)	Characteristics/Justification (motive)(context)	Type present (decision)
<b>Intimate stalkers,</b> victims are individuals with whom they shared an intimate relationship		
<b>Acquaintance stalkers,</b> victims share an employment, friendship or client-based relationship with their stalker.		
<b>Public figure stalkers,</b> victims are public figures with whom the perpetrator has little or no direct contact; these		

<i>stalkers are most often psychotic.</i>		
<b>Private stranger stalkers</b> , victims are strangers with whom the perpetrator may have had minor contact; the majority of these stalkers are also mentally ill.		

Did the perpetrator have access to weapons (what kind)?

Victim access: How accessible was the victim? Are they difficult to contact, etc?

List of (failed) strategies used by the victim prior to reporting stalking to police.

(e.g. increased security, tried to reason with the stalker)

Assessment of risk from the SAM (case prioritization):

low/routine

moderate/elevated

high/urgent

All strategies used following complaint to police:

Strategy type	Describe ( include, who suggested it and date of employment)
Vehicle strategies	

Strategies to deal with contact from the offender	
Strategies that involve contacting those close to the offender	
Strategies that involve education	
Strategies for the home	
Strategies to manage personal information	
Strategies involving the internet	
Legal strategies	
Strategies involving lifestyle changes	
Strategies that involve contacting the offender	
Strategies that involve an offensive approach	
Personal Strategies	
Strategies aimed at increasing personal safety	
Telephone strategies	
Strategies involving the use of professionals	
Strategies aimed at protecting secondary victims/dependents	
Strategies that involve	

reaching out for the assistance of others	
Strategies involving school	
Transportation strategies	
Strategies for when one is out walking	
Strategies for work	
Miscellaneous strategies	

### **Outcome**

Active \_\_\_\_ OR Inactive \_\_\_\_

Outcome type of case:

- i) No recent stalking incident  
- length of inactivity: \_\_\_\_\_
- ii) No recent stalking incident but strategies continue to be utilized  
- length of inactivity \_\_\_\_\_
- iii) The nature and/or frequency of the most recent stalking behaviour has remained consistent
- iv) The stalker's behaviour has escalated

Most recent strategy employed in the case:

**Outcome of strategies previously used in the case:**

Inactive Cases:

Outcome of the most recent case management strategy used:

Throughout history of case:

Strategy used	Direct outcome

### **Follow-up**

Notes from updates with officers:

Active Cases:

Outcome of the strategy employed prior to follow-up:

Outcome of other strategies used over the 6 month follow-up period.

Strategy used	Outcome

Notes on final outcome of the case: