

Stalking and Serious Violence

David V. James, MA, MB, BS, and Frank R. Farnham, MB, BS

Studies of violence in stalking have treated interpersonal violence as a homogeneous phenomenon. This study was conducted to ascertain whether the associations of serious violence in stalking are the same as those of general violence in stalking. Of 85 stalkers referred to a forensic service, those who had committed acts of serious violence (homicide and serious assaults) were compared with those who had not on preselected clinical, demographic, and criminological variables. Associations of serious violence were found to differ from those reported for general violence. In particular, serious violence was significantly associated with an absence of criminal convictions and the presence of employment. There was no association with substance abuse, previous convictions for violence, or personality disorder. Different degrees of violence have different associations. This has implications for the development of violence prediction instruments and for violence prevention in stalking.

J Am Acad Psychiatry Law 31:432–9, 2003

Stalking, sometimes known as “obsessional following,”¹ describes behavior characterized by the repeated unwanted intrusion of one person into the life of another, by either direct contact or communication.² A characteristic of the behavior is that it occasions fear or apprehension in the victim. Dramatic incidents of stalker violence brought stalking to public prominence and were the impetus to the introduction of antistalking legislation that, in most jurisdictions, is framed in terms of a behavior that places a person in fear of physical harm.^{2,3}

However, most stalkers are not violent; rates for violent behavior range between 30 and 40 percent in most reported series.² Violence infrequently results in serious physical injury, with most victims being grabbed, punched, slapped, or fondled by the stalker.^{4,5} Serious violence is rare. It has been suggested that the homicide rate in stalking is probably less than two percent,^{4–6} but an analysis of prevalence rates of stalking and homicide illustrates that this percentage is a gross overestimation.²

The purpose of studying violence in stalking is to assist in its prevention. Such study is at an early stage. To work toward a predictive algorithm, it is necessary to establish risk factors by identifying statistically

significant associations between violence and characteristics of stalkers and stalking behavior. Few studies have involved sufficiently large samples or sufficient incidence of violence within the sample to allow statistically significant associations to emerge.

Several studies have suggested possible risk factors for violence, without demonstrating significant statistical association. These include some of the pioneering early investigations of stalking. Suggested risk factors have included closer level of contact proximity,^{7,8} regular use of physical approach as a means of contact,⁹ psychiatric history,^{1,7,8} depressive symptoms and suicidal threats,⁶ absence of psychosis,¹⁰ presence of a personality disorder,^{1,11} and previous intimacy between stalker and victim.^{7,10,12} A statistically significant association between violence and former intimacy has been confirmed in other samples^{9,13–17} and is the most robust finding in studies to date.

Two major studies, based on the psychiatric examination of series of stalkers, involved large enough samples to provide statistically significant associations between stalking and violence.^{14,15} Harmon *et al.*¹⁴ examined the records of 175 stalkers, collected over a 10-year period. Eighty-one exhibited violent behavior. Significant associations with such behavior were previous relationship to victim, threats of violence, and substance abuse. Mullen *et al.*¹⁵ examined 145 stalkers, of whom 52 (36%) were assaultive. Sig-

Dr. James and Dr. Farnham are Consultant Forensic Psychiatrists at the North London Forensic Service, Chase Farm Hospital, Enfield, UK. Address correspondence to: David V. James, MA, MB, BS, North London Forensic Service, Chase Farm Hospital Campus, The Ridgeway, Enfield, EN2 8JL, UK. E-mail: david.james5@ntlworld.com

nificant associations were found between assault and previous threats, previous convictions, substance abuse, and the authors' stalking typology. Only previous convictions remained significant when all variables were considered in a regression analysis. Stalkers of different motivational types evidenced different frequencies of assault.

Two further important studies found significant associations with violence.^{9,18} These studies were based primarily on victim reports of stalking violence, rather than examination of stalkers. The study of 223 cases from the Los Angeles Police Department's Threat Management Unit (TMU) found a significant relationship between violence and former intimacy and between a history of general violence and violence committed during the stalking campaign.⁹ The association with former intimacy was positively influenced by the suspect's level of proximity to the victim and by threats to the victim and property. A study based on the interview of 187 former intimate victims of stalking¹⁸ found a significant correlation between verbal threats and subsequent violence. There were also significant relationships between drug and alcohol use and the occurrence of violence resulting in physical injury.

Mullen *et al.*,² in their review of the literature, summarized the personal characteristics of stalkers likely to be associated with a higher risk of assault. Principal among these were substance abuse; a history of criminal offenses, particularly violent or sexual offenses; male gender; threatening the victim; presence of a personality disorder; pursuit of an ex-intimate; unemployment; and social isolation. Less easy to measure were the presence of high levels of anger at the victim, an intense sense of entitlement, and fantasies about assaulting the victim. There is an assumption that risk factors for violence in stalking samples are likely to have much in common with risk factors in nonstalking samples. Meloy¹⁹ concludes along similar lines that the "very limited predictive research to date" has produced three variables "which significantly and strongly predict personal and/or property violence among stalkers: prior criminal convictions, substance abuse and prior sexual intimacy with the victim" (Ref. 19, p 119). It is assumed that all violence, to persons or property, is a homogeneous entity, with one set of predictive factors.

The violence in the major studies of stalkers appears to have been general violence, which was predominantly minor in nature. Harmon *et al.*¹⁴ de-

defined a stalker as violent if the stalker "physically assaulted" the target or an associate, or "attacked or damaged" the property of the target, "including any physical contact—i.e. the defendant banging on the door repeatedly"; or "making physical contact with the target, someone close to the target, or a surrogate for the target" (Ref. 14, p 240). This definition fails to differentiate between repeatedly banging on a door and homicide, of which there were two instances in their study. Mullen *et al.*¹⁵ restricted their definition to physical assault on the person. Among the incidents involving 52 assaultive stalkers, there was one fractured jaw, one stab wound, six indecent assaults, and eight attempted or accomplished rapes. However, overall, "physical injuries were largely confined to bruises or abrasions." In studies based largely on victims' reports, Brewster's¹⁸ definition of reported violence ranged from "pushing, slapping, kicking and biting, to rape, assault with a weapon etc." Physical injury ranged from "small cuts and bruises" to "broken bones" (Ref. 18, p 45). Palarea *et al.*⁹ separated violence against the person from violence against property, but did not offer definitions of these categories.

Violent behavior is not homogeneous,²⁰ and the predictors of one form of violence may be quite different from the predictors of other types.^{21,22} There is no reason to assume that the associations of minor assault in stalking should, for instance, be the same as those of homicide. Yet, there are no results in the stalking studies just cited to indicate whether different degrees of violence in stalking may have different associations.

Our study examined the hypothesis that the risk factors for serious violence in stalking are the same as those reported for general violence. We examined a series of stalkers in which there was a high incidence of serious, as opposed to minor, violence.

Methods

Cases were collected of stalkers subject to psychiatric evaluation by a forensic service in north London. Cases were identified both retrospectively from case files and prospectively from referrals to the service. Stalking was defined as repetitive unwanted intrusions or communications that occurred at least 10 times over a period of at least four weeks and occasioned fear or alarm in the victim. The definition closely followed that used by Mullen *et al.*^{2,15} The project was approved by the Enfield Research Ethics Committee (the appropriate institutional review board).

Demographic data and psychiatric histories were taken from the assessment file. Diagnoses at assessment were recorded using DSM-IV. Records of convictions were obtained from criminal records printouts, supplemented by information from the Police National Computer. Cases were classified according to two stalking typologies: those of the TMU^{7,23} and of Mullen *et al.*^{2,15}

Details of stalking activities were gathered from witness statements and police records, when stalking had led to criminal prosecution, and from other sources available in the clinical file on all cases, including those in which no criminal charges had been filed. Cases in which no charges were filed were included only when admission or convincing evidence of stalking behavior (e.g., detailed witness statements or physical evidence, such as letters or recordings of telephone conversations) was available. In those cases in which arrest had occurred, the most serious charge against the stalker was recorded as the index charge. A subgroup of cases was identified in which serious violence had occurred. Serious violence was defined as that which caused serious physical harm. For the purposes of the study, this subgroup comprised homicide, attempted murder, wounding, assault occasioning grievous bodily harm (GBH), and assault occasioning actual bodily harm (ABH). To permit some comparison with previous studies, the stalking cases were also classified in terms of the definitions of violence used by Harmon *et al.*¹⁴ and Mullen *et al.*^{2,15}

The results were analyzed with the SPSS (version 11.0.1) and StatCalc (version 4.1) computer programs. Associations between serious violence and preselected factors, suggested by the literature, were examined using the chi-square test and *t* test (two-tailed). Where appropriate, relative risks (RR) are given with 95 percent confidence intervals (CI). A multivariate analysis of variables proving significant in univariate analysis was conducted by logistic regression (forced-entry method). Possible associations between factors in the multiple-regression model were explored with analysis of variance. Associations with homicide were analyzed with Fisher's exact test (two-tailed).

Results

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample comprised 85 stalkers, of whom 67 (79%) were identified prospectively and 18 by exam-

ination of 600 case files. Stalking cases represented three percent of referrals to the service. Seventy-two (85%) stalkers in the sample were male. Ages ranged from 18 to 67 years (mean, 34.3 ± 10.6 [SD]). Forty-two (49%) had no educational qualifications of any sort, 8 (9.4%) had university degrees, and the remainder had basic high-school or trade qualifications. Twenty-four cases (28%) involved immigrants to the United Kingdom and 21 (25%) spoke a first language other than English. Fourteen percent were of Afro-Caribbean origin, eight percent of Indian origin, and the remainder of white European origin. Immigrants and minority ethnic groups were over-represented compared with local population norms.

Seventy-four percent (63) were unemployed, and 76.5 percent were single, 6 percent married, and 17.5 percent divorced or separated. Fifty-two percent (44) had a history of previous contact with psychiatric services, and 43 percent (36) remained, at least nominally, under the care of psychiatric services in the community, such care having continued for a median of four years (range, 1–30).

Offending History

Fifty-two percent (44) had a criminal record. Of those, 17.6 percent (15) had convictions for violence against the person, and 21 percent (18) for violence to property. Twenty-eight percent (24) had engaged in previous stalking behavior, whether or not it resulted in a conviction.

Relationship to Victim

There were 17 cases of same-gender stalking (20%), 13 being male-on-male and 4 female-on-female. In 33 cases (39%), the victim was a former sexual intimate, in 37 (43%) an acquaintance, and in the remainder (15 cases), a stranger. Seventy-four percent (63) of cases involved a female victim. One male victim was a 12-year old child. Stranger-victims included a film director, an actor, and two members of the Royal Family. No other victims had public profiles. Acquaintances included neighbors, former classmates, social contacts, work mates, employers, and health care professionals. Fourteen victims (17%) were health care professionals.

Types of Stalking Behavior

Only 12 percent (10 cases) limited themselves to one form of harassment; mean and median per stalker was three forms. Ninety-five percent (81

cases) made unwanted intrusions into their victims' lives by following them, approaching them, and/or visiting them at home or work. Only one person used equipment to intrude (cameras). Unwanted communications (letters, notes, telephone calls, gifts, e-mails) were made in 68 (80%) cases. Written forms of contact were used in 43 (51%) cases. In only two cases were e-mail messages, in two, faxes; and in two, text-messages used. Unwanted telephone calls were made in 56 percent (48) of the cases. In 37 percent (31), there was damage to property during the stalking, which preceded and was separate from the events that triggered psychiatric assessment.

Unwanted gifts were features in 15 (18%) cases. These included predictable items, such as chocolates, flowers, underwear, perfume, ornaments, and jewelry (including a wedding ring). There were also threatening items, the meaning of which was in some cases later specified by the stalker at interview: a skeleton ("you're as good as dead"); a used sanitary napkin; a child's potty filled with ping-pong balls ("you're a pervert"); dog biscuits ("you're a bitch"); a mug with voodoo motif; and a wreath.

Threats

Verbal or written threats were made to the victim in 60 (71%) cases.

Use of Weapons

Twenty (24%) of the persons were known to have carried weapons at some point during the stalking, and 30 (35%) used weapons in the incident that brought them to the attention of the police. In all, 24 (28%) stalkers had carried or used knives and 2 (2.5%) firearms. Other weapons included an iron bar, broken bottle, axe, brick, screwdriver, and scissors. Three cases involved the carrying or use of fire accelerants.

Violence and Index Charges

Twenty-seven (32%) cases fulfilled the criteria for serious violence. These comprised seven cases of homicide, five of attempted murder, seven of GBH, and eight of ABH. The ABH cases were all toward the serious end of the category. Of the homicide cases, six involved knives, one a hammer and a knife, and one a victim who was beaten to death by smashing her head repeatedly against the sidewalk. One victim (and stalking target) was a child, stabbed multiple times. Two cases involved multiple homicides.

In one case the parents of the stalking target and the family dog were killed, one parent with a knife, the other with a hammer, and the family dog with both. In the second case, the stalker stabbed to death his estranged wife, his 18-month-old child, and both his parents-in-law, probably in a single incident.

Of the cases that did not involve serious violence, 20 were of harassment, 6 threats to kill, 1 common assault, 4 carrying offensive weapons, 5 criminal damage, 3 breaches of injunctions, 2 theft, 2 breaches of the peace, 1 contempt of court, 1 bomb hoax, and 1 attempted arson. Of the 85 cases, 12 (14%) did not result in formal charges.

According to the definition of violence used by Mullen *et al.*,^{2,15} only one case not in the serious violence group would have been included (the common assault). In terms of the broad definition used by Harmon *et al.*,¹⁴ which included any physical contact and repeated banging on doors, only 12 (14%) cases of the 85 in the series would not have qualified as violent.

Psychiatric Diagnosis

Axis I diagnoses were present in 56 cases (66%). Twenty cases (24%) had a primary diagnosis of personality disorder and two of mental impairment. Axis I disorders comprised schizophrenia (27 cases), delusional disorder (13 cases), bipolar disorder (manic episode; 2 cases), major depression (8 cases), substance-related disorders (3 cases), and organic brain disorder/dementia due to head trauma (3 cases). In seven cases, no mental disorder was identified.

Motivation/Typology

According to the TMU classification,⁷ 3 (3.5%) cases fell into the erotomanic category, 32 (37.5%) involved love obsessionals, and 50 (59%) simple obsessionals. According to the classification of Mullen *et al.*,^{2,15} 38 (45%) stalkers were intimacy seekers, 30 (35%) were rejected, 15 (18%) were resentful, and 2 (2.5%) were incompetent. There were no predatory stalkers.

Associations with Serious Violence

These are summarized in Table 1.

Characteristics of Stalkers

In contrast to previous studies of violence in stalking, serious violence was significantly associated with

Stalking and Serious Violence

Table 1 Associations With Serious Violence in Stalking

	Chi-Square (1 df)	<i>p</i> <	Relative Risk† (95% CI)
Characteristics of stalker			
Previous convictions	8.631	.003*	0.46 (0.25–0.86)
Previous convictions for violence against others	1.234	.267	—
History of substance abuse	0.033	.856	—
Substance abuse at time of index episode	0.168	.682	—
Being unemployed	7.107	.008*	0.39 (0.19–0.78)
Diagnosis of personality disorder	1.513	.219	—
Diagnosis of depression	Fisher's exact (2-tailed)	.001	3.37 (1.62–4.02)
Male gender	4.103	.043	1.21 (1.05–1.41)
An ex-intimate of victim	12.916	.000	3.15 (1.55–6.63)
Characteristics of stalking			
Verbal or written threats during stalking	4.061	.044	1.34 (1.04–1.71)
Earlier violence in stalking (toward people or property)	5.486	.019	2.21 (1.05–5.04)
Going to victim's home earlier in stalking	11.870	.001	4.48 (1.45–13.81)
	Mean Difference		<i>t</i> , <i>df</i> , <i>p</i>
Number of types of stalking behavior	0.71		2.537, 45.66, .015
Length of pursuit (months)	–11.55		–2.23, 63.12, .030*

* Significant negative association.

† Relative risk is given only for significant results.

the absence of previous convictions ($\chi^2 = 8.631$, $df = 1$, $p = .003$, RR = 0.46 [0.25–0.86]) and of unemployment ($\chi^2 = 7.107$, $df = 1$, $p = .008$, RR = 0.39 [0.19–0.78]). There was no significant association between serious violence and previous convictions for violence against others ($\chi^2 = 1.234$, $df = 1$, $p = .267$); history of substance abuse ($\chi^2 = 0.033$, $df = 1$, $p = .856$); substance use around the time of the offense ($\chi^2 = 0.168$, $df = 1$, $p = .682$); or the presence of a personality disorder ($\chi^2 = 1.513$, $df = 1$, $p = .219$). There were significant, though weaker, associations with male gender ($\chi^2 = 4.103$, $df = 1$, $p = .043$) and previous verbal or written threats ($\chi^2 = 4.061$, $df = 1$, $p = .044$).

The presence of major depression was associated with serious violence (Fisher's 2-tailed, $p = .001$, RR = 3.37 [1.62–4.02]). The most significant association was with a previous sexual relationship between victim and stalker ($\chi^2 = 12.916$, $df = 1$, $p = .000$, RR = 3.15 [1.55–6.63]). This was reflected in associations with groups within the two stalking typologies examined. The group in the Mullen *et al.*^{2,15} typology that was significantly associated with serious violence was the rejected stalkers ($\chi^2 = 12.157$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$). In the TMU classification, simple obsessives were more likely to commit serious violence ($\chi^2 = 5.869$, $df = 1$, $p = .015$), this being the grouping in which former intimates are classified.

Characteristics of Stalking

Significant associations were found between serious violence and going to and/or attempting to gain entry to the victim's home earlier in the stalking ($\chi^2 = 11.870$, $df = 1$, $p = .001$, RR = 4.48 [1.45–13.81]); violence against people (stalking victim or proxy) or property earlier in the stalking ($\chi^2 = 5.486$, $df = 1$, $p = .019$, RR = 2.21 [1.05–5.04]); more types of stalking behavior used (mean difference = .71, $t = 2.537$, $df = 45.66$, $p = .015$); and shorter duration of stalking pursuit (mean difference = –11.55, $t = –2.23$, $df = 63.12$, $p = .030$).

Associations between former sexual intimacy and other factors under study were examined. There were significant associations between pursuit of a former sexual intimate and previous attempts to gain entry to the victim's home ($\chi^2 = 8.707$, $df = 1$, $p < .003$), previous violence against persons or property during the stalking ($\chi^2 = 6.947$, $df = 1$, $p < .008$), and the making of verbal or written threats ($\chi^2 = 10.729$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). There was no association with the duration of stalking ($t = –1.535$, $df = 83$, $p = .129$).

Multivariate Analysis

A multivariate analysis was conducted to establish which of these factors were the most powerful predictors of serious violence (Table 2). The final model comprised three factors: previously appearing at vic-

Table 2 Logistic Regression: Model for the Prediction of Serious Violence

Criterion	Logistic Regression— Forced Entry		Univariate Analysis
	Wald <i>p</i>	exp β (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Previously appearing at victim's home	14.618 .000	52.6 (7–500)	8.9 (2–44)
Criminal record	5.405 .020	0.18 (0.04–0.76)	0.3 (0.1–0.9)
Duration of stalking (months)	7.827 .005	0.85 (0.75–0.95)	
Difference in means (95% CI)			–11.55 (–1.18––21.91)

tim's home during the stalking, absence of a criminal record, and shorter duration of stalking. The exponent of the regression coefficient (exp β in Table 1) is an odds ratio that describes the relationship of the dependent to the independent variable. Previously appearing at the victim's home during the period of stalking increases the odds of serious violence by a factor of 52.6, whereas the presence of previous convictions decreases the odds of serious violence by a factor of 0.18. For continuous variables, the exponential of the regression coefficient describes the effect of increasing by one unit the dependent variable. Each additional month of stalking behavior decreases the risk of serious violence by a factor of 0.85.

The model correctly classified 84 percent of cases and was robust, in that it was consistent between forward and backward methods. A three-way analysis of variance was conducted to investigate possible inter-relationships between the predictor variables. There was evidence of a relation between previously appearing at the victim's home and longer duration of stalking ($F = 5.538$, $p = .022$): this relation was the inverse to that in the model, which it therefore strengthens.

Associations with Homicide

Results of Fisher's exact test showed significant associations between homicide and absence of substance abuse ($p = .044$), absence of psychosis ($p = .045$), being employed ($p = .011$), and going to the victim's home earlier in the stalking ($p = .042$). Perpetrators of homicide were more likely to be classified in the Mullen *et al.*^{2,15} rejected category ($p = .045$).

Discussion

The main finding of this study of stalkers referred to a forensic psychiatry service was that the associations of serious violence were different from those reported for general or minor violence. Specifically, there was no association between serious violence and substance abuse, previous convictions for violence against the person, or the presence of a personality disorder. Whereas a history of previous conviction and unemployment are significantly associated with general violence in stalking, they were significantly associated with the absence of serious violence in this study.

It might be postulated from these findings that those who commit the most serious assaults in stalking have a different profile from the perpetrators of minor assaults. Serious assaults appear likely to be catastrophic events, involving those with no history of convictions or of violence predating the stalking and who are outwardly socially integrated in terms of factors such as employment. This contrasts with the perpetrators of less serious assaults, for whom violence is more likely to be a habitual style of social interaction and who tend to have criminal records and to be socially marginalized and prone to disinhibition by substance abuse or psychosis. It is notable that there was a significant association between serious violence and depressive illness in the stalker at the material time.

Associations common to both general and serious violence were a previous intimate relationship between stalker and victim and greater number of different types of stalking behavior. There were weaker associations between serious violence and both male gender of the stalker and the making of threats. Both are also presumed to be correlates of general violence in stalking.

In addition, this study found that serious violence was associated with previous visits to the victim's home and previous violence against people (stalking victim or proxy) or property during the stalking period. Previous visits to the victim's home and previous violence during stalking were both significantly associated with former intimacy, which may be reflected in terms of knowledge of address and opportunity for personal contact. Previous visits to the victim's home may represent a factor similar to those noted by other authors—close level of contact proximity^{7,8} and regular use of physical approach as a

means of contact.⁹ There is some evidence in the literature that posing a threat, of which visiting the victim's home would be an example, is a more important predictor of violence than making a threat by verbal or written means.²⁴ The association with previous violence during the stalking may indicate a propensity toward violence that had not previously resulted in a conviction, an opportunistic action, or simply a propensity specific to the stalking situation. The role of situational factors is under-researched in violence studies.^{25,26}

Serious violence was also significantly associated with shorter duration of stalking. Shorter duration of pursuit does not appear to be related to former intimacy. It may be linked with other factors, such as anger, that are more difficult to measure but may be associated with a more rapid escalation to serious violence.²⁷

The strengths of the study lay in its use of a stalking sample in which the incidence of serious violence was sufficiently large to permit meaningful analysis. It is the first study to examine the associations of serious violence in stalking. The level of serious violence available for consideration is unusual among studies of predictive factors for violence in the psychiatric literature. One of the study's limitations concerns its modest sample size, which is reflected in relatively wide confidence intervals. The sample was not random but was taken from persons referred for psychiatric evaluation. Factors for study were preselected and limited in number to avoid the pitfalls of multiple testing, but no correction for multiple testing has been applied to the significance values. These problems also affect other published studies of stalking.

Threat management is a central problem in stalking,⁶ and serious violence creates the most concern. On the evidence of this study, it cannot be assumed that the associations of serious violence in stalking are the same as those of general or minor violence. In other words, the associations of banging on the door repeatedly¹⁴ are probably different from those of, for instance, cutting someone's throat (the final event in two cases in the current study). The absence of the usual markers of general violence cannot be taken as reassuring in predicting serious violence in stalkers. That duration of stalking was significantly shorter in cases of serious violence indicates that early intervention may be of particular importance in prevention.

Our study indicates that actuarial approaches to violence may be limited in application, if different levels of violence are not treated separately. The predictors of one form of violence may be quite different from the predictors of another.²¹ Although the importance of this in the construction of predictive instruments has been emphasized,²² even the most sophisticated studies^{28,29} have nonetheless tended to use relatively wide definitions of violence, incorporating types of threat as well as a range of injury,²⁶ possibly because of the low prevalence of serious violence in the study samples.

Much of the recent work on prediction of violence concerns the evaluation of risk in the mentally disordered. Although the main predictors of criminal recidivism are the same in those without mental disorder as in those with such a disorder,³⁰ it may be unwise to consider predictive factors in stalkers in terms of such factors in populations with a history of psychiatric admission. In addition, studies on prediction tend to examine the risk of repeated violence or offending in those who have already exhibited violent or offending behavior. This may be inappropriate for groups with no offending history, in that the associations of initial violence are probably different from those of repeated violence,³¹ and prediction instruments based on populations who have already offended may be inapplicable to those who have yet to offend.²²

Neither stalking nor violence is a homogeneous behavior. Different motivational types of stalking have been shown to have different risks of violence,^{2,15} and the current study suggests that different degrees of violence in stalkers have different associations. Further study of violence in stalking should take account both of stalking type and degree of violence. Such analyses are likely to require large samples, necessitating the pooling of data. It is difficult to see how this will be possible, unless researchers adopt compatible definitions of the matters under study. It is toward this end that in the current study we adopted a previously published definition of stalking, defined our cases in terms of two published typologies, and related our definitions of violence to those of other authors.

References

1. Meloy JR, Gothard S: Demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *Am J Psychiatry* 152:258-63, 1995

2. Mullen PE, Pathé M, Purcell R: Stalkers and Their Victims. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000
3. Saunders R: The legal perspective on stalking, in *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives*. Edited by Meloy JR. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998, pp 28–49
4. Meloy JR: A clinical investigation of the obsessional follower: 'she loves me, she loves me not. . .', in *Explorations in Criminal Psychopathology*. Edited by Schlesinger L. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Press, 1998, pp 9–32
5. Meloy JR: Stalking: an old behavior, a new crime. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 22:85–99, 1999
6. White SG, Cawood JS: Threat management of stalking cases, in *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives*. Edited by Meloy JR. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998
7. Zona M, Sharma K, Lane J: A comparative study of erotomaniac and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *J Forensic Sci* 38: 894–903, 1993
8. Harmon RB, Rosner R, Owens H: Obsessional harassment and erotomania in a criminal court population. *J Forensic Sci* 40:188–96, 1995
9. Palarea RE, Zona MA, Lane JC, Langhinrisichsen-Rohling J: The dangerous nature of intimate relationship stalking: threats, violence and associated risk factors. *Behav Sci Law* 17:269–83, 1999
10. Kienlen KK, Birmingham DL, Solberg KB, O'Regan JT, Meloy JR: A comparative study of psychotic and non-psychotic stalkers. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 25:317–34, 1997
11. Meloy JR: Stalking (obsessional following): a review of some preliminary studies. *Aggress Violent Behav* 1:147–62, 1996
12. Schwartz-Watts D, Morgan DW: Violent versus non-violent stalkers. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 26:241–5, 1998
13. Pathé M, Mullen PE: The impact of stalkers on their victims. *Br J Psychiatry* 170:12–17, 1997
14. Harmon RB, Rosner R, Owens H: Sex and violence in a forensic population of obsessional harassers. *Psychol Public Policy Law* 4:236–49, 1998
15. Mullen P, Pathé M, Purcell R, Stuart GW: Study of stalkers. *Am J Psychiatry* 156:1244–9, 1999
16. Farnham FR, James DV, Cantrell P: Association between violence, psychosis and relationship to victim in stalkers. *Lancet* 355: 199, 2000
17. Meloy JR, Davis B, Lovette J: Risk factors for violence among stalkers. *J Threat Assess* 1:3–16, 2001
18. Brewster MP: Stalking by former intimates: verbal threats and other predictors of physical violence. *Violence Vict* 15:41–54, 2000
19. Meloy JR: Stalking and violence, in *Stalking and Psychosexual Obsession*. Edited by Boon J, Sheridan L. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 2002, pp 105–24
20. Côté G: Commentary, in *Violence Among the Mentally Ill: Effective Treatments and Management Strategies*. Edited by Hodgins S. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer, 2000, pp 49–57
21. Dietz PE, Matthews DB, van Duyne C, *et al*: Threatening and otherwise inappropriate letters to Hollywood celebrities. *J Forensic Sci* 36:185–209, 1991
22. Monahan J, Steadman HJ: Toward a rejuvenation of risk assessment research, in *Violence and Mental Disorder*. Edited by Monahan J, Steadman HJ. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994, pp 1–17
23. Zona MA, Palarea RE, Lane JC: Psychiatric diagnosis and the offender-victim typology of stalking, in *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives*. Edited by Meloy JR. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998, pp 70–84
24. Fein RA, Vossekuil B: Assassination in the United States: an operational study of recent assassins, attackers, and near-lethal approachers. *J Forensic Sci* 44:321–33, 1999
25. Felson RB, Steadman HJ: Situational factors in disputes leading to criminal violence. *Criminology* 21:59–74, 1983
26. Steadman HJ, Silver E: Immediate precursors of violence among persons with mental illness, in *Violence Among the Mentally Ill: Effective Treatments and Management Strategies*. Edited by Hodgins S. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer, 2000, pp 35–48
27. Novaco RW: Anger as a risk factor for violence amongst the mentally disordered, in *Violence and Mental Disorder*. Edited by Monahan J, Steadman HJ. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994, pp 21–59
28. Steadman HJ, Silver E, Monahan J, *et al*: A classification tree approach to the development of actuarial violence risk assessment tools. *Law Hum Behav* 24:83–100, 2000
29. Monahan J, Steadman HJ, Appelbaum PS, *et al*: Developing a clinically useful actuarial tool for assessing violence risk. *Br J Psychiatry* 176:312–19, 2000
30. Bonta J, Law M, Hanson K: The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull* 123:123–42, 1998
31. Mulvey EP, Blumstein A, Cohen J: Reframing the research question of mental patient criminality. *Int J Law Psychiatry* 9:57–65, 1986