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Stalking Typology

- Some general presentations (Sheridan et al)

- Ex-intimate (50%)
- Infatuation (18.5%)
- Delusional fixation Dangerous (15.3%)
- Delusional fixation Non dangerous (15.3%)
- Sadistic (12.9%)

• The Coalition Government continues to support embedding and expanding IOM:
  ‘Local approaches where police and partners manage the most harmful and prolific offenders, such as Integrated Offender Management and Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements schemes, will continue to be vital.’ (A New Approach to Fighting Crime, Home Office 2011)

• The application of IOM to broader offenders types, in addition to PPOs, is also supported nationally:
  ‘…New joined up ways of managing offenders with the collective name of Integrated Offender Management…to tackle the offenders who cause most harm in their communities. This is based on a joint analysis of the crime and offending problems in their community, whether or not they are subject to statutory supervision.’ (Green Paper on Sentencing, Ministry of Justice 2010)
Violent Crime – Integrated Offender Management
IRiS (Integrated Response – Integrated Services)

The Scoping Project for IRiS in Bristol for Dangerous Offenders aims to:

‘Identify a cohort of dangerous violent and sexual offenders and their relevant characteristics, to inform and propose processes for the IOM of the cohort.’
Identified trends in Avon and Somerset highlight what other research has shown: violent offenders offend against a range of people in a range of ways:

- 50% of high risk Sexual violence cohort members were also domestic violence.
- 70% of high risk SV cohort members also had violence against person record.
- 46% of high risk SV cohort members also had record for other types of criminality (i.e. burglary, drugs etc.)
Stalking Risk Assessment

• S – DASH consists of 11 screening questions devised by Dr Lorraine Sheridan, Karl Roberts.
• This screening process should lead to the use of a more detailed structured professional judgement tool where appropriate
• The two leading methods are the Stalking Assessment Manual (SAM) (Kropp et al) and the Stalking Risk Profile (Mullen et al)
• The following are key areas included in the SAM
Stalking Assessment Manual (SAM) Kropp et al
Nature of stalking

• Communicates about victim
• Communicates with victim
• Approaches victim
• Direct contact
• Intimidates victim

• Threatens victim
• Violent towards victim
• Stalking is persistent
• Stalking is escalating
• Stalking involved supervision violations
Perpetrator risk factors

- Angry
- Obsessed
- Irrational
- Unrepentant
- Antisocial lifestyle
- Intimate relationship problems
- Non-intimate relationship problems
- Distressed
- Substance use problem
- Employment and financial problems
Stalking Risk Assessment Manual (SAM) Kropp et al

Victim vulnerability factors

- Inconsistent behaviour towards perpetrator
- Inconsistent attitude towards perpetrators
- Inadequate access to resources
- Unsafe living situations
- Problems caring for dependants
- Intimate relationship problems
- Non-intimate relationship problems
- Distressed
- Substance use problem
- Employment and financial problems
Nature of Risk Factors
Hart, Kropp et al

- Risk factors influence decisions about violence
Nature of risk factors

• Causal roles
  – *Motivators* increase the perceived benefits or rewards of violence
  – *Disinhibitors* decrease the perceived costs or punishments of violence
  – *Destabilizers* generally impair the person’s decision making abilities or psychosocial adjustment
Lethality Factors
Hart, Kropp et al

Acute Conflict

Severe Disinhibition

Capacity for serious violence
Scenario Planning
Hart, Kropp et al

- Used under conditions of complexity and unbounded uncertainty.

- Goal is to speculate systematically about “possible futures”
  - Avoid tunnel vision
  - Strive for desired outcomes
  - Avoid undesired outcomes
Developing Scenarios
Hart, Kropp et al

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat</th>
<th>Twist</th>
<th>Escalation</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider all past violence, not just most recent.</td>
<td>• Change in motivation, victimology, behaviour topography</td>
<td>• Include lethal or “worst case”</td>
<td>• Including desistence or “best case”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies
Hart, Kropp et al

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Victim Safety Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surveillance or repeated assessment</td>
<td>• Imposition of controls or restriction of freedoms</td>
<td>• Rehabilitation, therapy, further assessment</td>
<td>• Enhancement of security resources for identifiable targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Principles
Kemshall et al

- Risk assessments updated
- Proper allocation of cases
- Well matched RM plans
- Deliver with integrity
- Respond to esc and det risk
- Swift enforcement
- Prompt action
- Clear responsibility
Positive risk management
Kemshall et al

- All reasonable steps have been taken
- Reliable assessment methods have been used
- Information is collected and thoroughly evaluated
- Decisions are recorded-transparent etc.
- Staff work within agency procedures
- Actively seek information/investigative
‘Why didn’t you stop me’ Case study 1987
Case that provided basis for what was known as an Osman warning

• 1986 Headmaster (HM) notes that a teacher has developed an attachment for pupil A
• When confronted by HM the teacher offers to leave
• January 1987 a mother of pupil B at the school telephones the HM that a teacher (same one as above) has been following her son home after school and harassing him. The teacher had been spreading rumours that her son had engaged in sexually deviant practices with another pupil
• March 1987 mother of pupil B lodges a formal complaint
March 1987 pupil A states that the teacher had warned him not to associate with pupil B due to his ‘deviant sexual practices’. Teacher had persistently followed pupil A and pupil B home and had invited pupil A into class at lunchtime and had given him presents and taken some photographs of pupil A.

Teacher told HM that he had told pupil B that he would be ‘very angry’ if anything happened to his relationship with pupil A, although this was not a threat! HM describes the teacher has ‘highly irrational’.
‘Why didn’t you stop me’ Case study 1987

• 9th March 1987 a written statement by the teacher is described by HM as showing the teacher was ‘overpoweringly jealous’ and ‘not in control of his emotions’

• Teacher had admitted telling pupils that A and B had engaged in acts of oral sex and had done this in ‘revenge’ for pupil B spreading rumours about the teacher

• 16th March 1987 mother of pupil B informs Head that the teacher had told pupil B that ‘he knew where his mother worked….’
Why didn’t you stop me’ Case study 1987

• 17th March 1987 graffiti appeared at six locations around the school which read ‘pupil B do not forget to wear a condom when you screw pupil A or he will get aids’

• 19th March 1987 arrangements are in place for pupil A to move to another school. At this point it is discovered that all the files relating to pupil A and B have been stolen

• 14th April 1987 teacher changes name by deed poll to include names of pupil A. The teacher had already changed his name to that of another pupil from a previous school
‘Why didn’t you stop me’ Case study 1987

- May/June brick through window of pupil A and the tyres of the family car burst
- **Teacher** describes a strong urge to see pupil A and is angry that pupil is ‘content’ with no contact
- Whilst **teacher** is off sick during Sept, Oct, Nov there are a series of incidents where engine oil is poured on driveway of pupil A, windscreen smashed, door locks filled with superglue, dog excrement smeared on door step, light bulbs taken from porch and all windows on car smashed
December 1987 pupil B was a passenger in a van that was ‘rammed’ by the teacher in his car. The driver recalled that the teacher said ‘I’m not worried because in a few months I’ll be doing life’.

15th December 1987 teacher interviewed by education authorities who state teacher ‘totally self destructive mood, stating that it was all a symphony and the last chord had to be played.’

Teacher stated he held the HM responsible for his position and knew where he lived and was going to do something...
‘Why didn’t you stop me’ Case study 1987

- March 1988 teacher is seen outside home of pupil B wearing a crash helmet.
- March 1988 teacher shot father of pupil A and seriously wounded pupil B. Teacher then shot head teacher seriously wounding him and then killed his son.
- When arrested teacher said ‘why didn’t you stop me before I did it, I gave you all the warning signs’.
Key Points

- The simple harassment offence does not support the s18 search power.
- The search of the perpetrator’s house is an essential element of any risk assessment/investigation of stalking.
- Always seek to arrest from an offence that provides an option to search.
- Risk must be linked with the person and not the crime.
- Analysis must include a method of monitoring patterns and escalation that trigger intervention or review.
- Interventions provoke a reaction and need planning (scenario planning is a tool that should be used where possible).
- Interventions should be planned along a timeline and linked to therapeutic support where possible.
Key Points

• Increase the use of tactical options, such as ANPR, in enforcing restraining orders
• Improve safety equipment for victims using existing GPS services
• Interview skills so staff have a better understanding of stalking typologies and are able to adapt questioning styles
• Best practice for the wording of restraining orders should be developed in similar fashion to the use of Sex Offender Prevention Orders
• A cohort of specially trained staff able to utilise open source intelligence must be available 24/7 or there is a significant gap in risk assessment
• Services often aligned to the crime and not the perpetrator so patterns are missed and to often services are investigating serious harm rather than early intervention to reduce harm
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