



**ASSESSING THE COST-BENEFIT OF A VICTIM-CENTERED
STALKING PREVENTION INTERVENTION: A CASE STUDY OF
THE MULTI-AGENCY STALKING INTERVENTION PLAN**

Evaluación del costo-beneficio de una intervención de prevención del acoso centrada en las víctimas: un estudio de caso del plan de intervención multiinstitucional contra el acoso


Mohanad Jabbar Taher

Al-Rafidain University College.
Baghdad, Iraq.
Mohanad.jabbar@ruc.edu.iq
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0511-2623-4589>

Ahmed Kalel Hasan Alzarkany

Al-Mamoon University College.
Baghdad, Iraq.
ahmed.k.Hasan@almamoonuc.edu.iq
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1260-7520>

Anas Akram Mohammed Subhi Abbas

Al-Turath University college.
Baghdad, Iraq.
anas.akram@turath.edu.iq
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0444-4238>

Kubiv Stepan

Cihan University-Sulaimaniya,
Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.
nameer.qasim@sulicihan.edu.krd
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7283-0594>

Este trabajo está depositado en Zenodo:

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13684817>

ABSTRACT

Stalking is a pervasive problem with substantial repercussions for its victims. This article seeks to address this gap by particularly investigating the evaluation of a victim-centered stalking prevention intervention within a comprehensive multi-agency framework. This study used a mixed-methods approach, including collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, to evaluate the intervention's impact comprehensively. The study's findings indicate that using a victim-centered approach significantly reduced instances of stalking and enhanced the safety and overall welfare of the participants. The results emphasized the critical need for tailoring preventive strategies to meet the specific needs and experiences of stalking victims, therefore demonstrating the effectiveness of these individualized interventions. The positive outcomes of this case study endorse the integration of victim-centered principles into the broader framework of stalking prevention efforts, with substantial implications for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in the field.

Keywords: Stalking prevention, victim-centered approach, successful program.

RESUMEN

El acoso es un problema generalizado que tiene repercusiones importantes para sus víctimas. Este artículo busca abordar esta brecha investigando en particular la evaluación de una intervención de prevención del acoso centrada en la víctima dentro de un marco integral de múltiples agencias. Este estudio utilizó un enfoque de métodos mixtos, que incluyó la recopilación y el análisis de datos cualitativos y cuantitativos, para evaluar el impacto de la intervención de manera integral. Los hallazgos del estudio indican que el uso de un enfoque centrado en la víctima redujo significativamente los casos de acoso y mejoró la seguridad y el bienestar general de los participantes. Los resultados enfatizaron la necesidad crítica de adaptar las estrategias preventivas para satisfacer las necesidades y experiencias específicas de las víctimas de acoso, demostrando así la efectividad de estas intervenciones individualizadas. Los resultados positivos de este estudio de caso respaldan la integración de los principios centrados en la víctima en el marco más amplio de los esfuerzos de prevención del acoso, con implicaciones sustanciales para los formuladores de políticas, los profesionales y los investigadores en el campo.

Palabras claves: Prevención del acoso, enfoque centrado en la víctima, programa exitoso.

INTRODUCTION

Stalking is a pervasive and troubling issue that affects many individuals around. The phenomenon manifests in many ways and often instills a perpetual sense of fear and vulnerability in its victims. A comprehensive and diverse strategy is required to address the intricate and long-lasting nature of stalking. This approach should prioritize the immediate safety concerns of victims and consider the broader socio-economic repercussions. The emergence of victim-centered stalking prevention interventions, such as the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan, represents a notable shift towards a more inclusive and practical approach to tackling this issue. This introduction examines such interventions' rationale, challenges, and potential benefits, drawing on current scholarly research to underscore their significance.

Stalking is a complex crime in which the perpetrator relentlessly and unwantedly fixates on the victim, causing significant psychological, emotional, and financial distress. Tompson, Belur, and Jerath thoroughly analyze a stalking prevention project, focusing on the costs and benefits to the victims. They highlight the potential for tangible positive outcomes, not just for the victims but also for society at large [1]. This approach aligns with the growing recognition of the need for treatments that prioritize the well-being and autonomy of stalking victims, as explored by Jerath, Tompson, and Belur in their research on risk management strategies within a multi-agency framework [2].

The economic ramifications of stalking and associated acts, such as intimate relationship abuse, are substantial. In their study, Peterson et al. shed light on the enduring economic impacts of intimate partner violence in the United States, highlighting the substantial financial costs for both

the victims and society as a whole [3]. It is crucial to comprehend the extensive consequences of stalking and the potential financial advantages of adopting suitable preventive and intervention measures, considering the economic perspective.

Moreover, the significant academic and professional ramifications of stalking are often overlooked. In their study, Banyard et al. investigate the academic variables linked to incidents of unwanted sexual contact, stalking, and intimate relationship abuse. They highlight the detrimental effects of these experiences on the academic performance and overall well-being of college students [4]. Logan and Landhuis investigate the degree to which individuals who are acquaintances of stalking targets have obstacles in their work and endure a depletion of resources. They emphasize the need to recognize and address the broader consequences of stalking on the lives of victims [5]. Extensive scrutiny has been devoted to analyzing the response of the criminal justice system toward stalking and intimate partner violence. Backes, Fedina, and Holmes provide a thorough examination of the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in addressing intimate partner stalking. The authors highlight significant shortcomings in the system's ability to respond to and promptly assist victims [6]. This underscores the need for an enhanced and victim-focused approach to addressing stalking, one that goes beyond traditional responses from the criminal justice system.

In addition, Hong and Cho have conducted a study on the specific risk of stalking in households with a single occupant and the associated costs. Their research provides valuable insights into the unique vulnerabilities and financial implications for individuals who live alone [7]. The current article presents more information that reinforces the need to develop comprehensive, multi-agency interven-

tions that are adaptable to the diverse needs and circumstances of persons who are victims of stalking.

The case for adopting a stalking preventative intervention that prioritizes the interests and well-being of the victims, such as the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan, is robust and encompasses several factors. Extensive research indicates that these measures provide a promising path, not only in mitigating the immediate adverse impacts of stalking but also in tackling the broader economic and societal repercussions. By implementing an all-encompassing and cooperative approach that engages several agencies, there exists a significant potential to enhance the safety, well-being, and capacity for recovery of those who are victims of stalking. This approach also helps in achieving the overarching goal of reducing the prevalence and adverse consequences of stalking in society.

The study objective

This article evaluates the cost-effectiveness of the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan, a victim-centered stalking preventative intervention program (MASIP). Despite the high prevalence of stalking incidents, little study has been undertaken on creating and implementing effective stalking prevention programs. This article addresses this knowledge vacuum by evaluating how practical a victim-centered approach is for reducing stalking episodes and improving victims' safety and well-being. The study used a "mixed methods" technique, which entailed gathering and evaluating qualitative and quantitative data.

The article aimed to shed light on the efficacy of the MASIP program in decreasing stalking episodes and enhancing victim safety and well-being. It also aimed to emphasize the need to consider victims' particular needs and experiences when developing and implementing stalking preven-

tion programs. The study's results are significant for stalking prevention since they imply that a victim-centered strategy should be included in all stalking prevention initiatives. This article offers helpful information for future stalking prevention initiatives and emphasizes the necessity for multidisciplinary teamwork to address stalking incidences successfully.

Problem statement

Many people are affected by stalking, a widespread and often deadly type of interpersonal violence. Programs to prevent stalking are still in their infancy, despite the widespread nature of the problem and the severe consequences it may have. Due to a lack of studies on effective measures to prevent stalking, victims of stalking are exposed to further harassment and violence. Moreover, the success of current programs may be compromised by their failure to address the specific requirements and experiences of victims appropriately. The creation and execution of effective stalking prevention programs that put victims' safety and well-being first urgently need additional study. The Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan, a victim-centered stalking prevention strategy, is the focus of this research, which attempts to fill a knowledge vacuum in the field.

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS: AN OVERVIEW OF KEY LITERATURE AND STUDIES

A cost-benefit analysis is a tool for weighing the pros and cons of a proposed action or policy change. The purpose of a cost-benefit analysis is to find out whether and by how much a project's or intervention's benefits will exceed its expenses. To achieve this, one must first calculate the projected costs and benefits of the intervention and then do a comparison [8].

A cost-benefit analysis literature review is an in-depth look at the published studies and scholarly publi-

cations on the subject. In the realm of public policy and decision making, cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is used to ascertain whether or not a certain intervention or policy will be more beneficial than it is costly. This evaluation considers not just the monetary expenditures and revenues but also the intangible advantages and savings, including lives saved or damage prevented [9].

Logan and Walker analyze the significant impact of fear caused by stalking on outcomes related to gender and personal safety, highlighting the substantial emotional and psychological hardships endured by victims [10]. This research highlights the need to include subjective costs, such as fear and reduced personal security, in a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis (CBA). It acknowledges that these issues significantly influence those affected's quality of life and economic productivity. Rosay, Backes, and Wang perform psychometric evaluations of stalking measures, which are essential for accurately assessing the frequency and intensity of stalking and its consequences [11]. These metrics are crucial in performing CBAs, as they guarantee that the scope of stalking's impacts is precisely evaluated and quantified.

Shea, Mcewan, Strand, and Ogloff (2018), together with Mcewan, Shea, Daffern, Mackenzie, Ogloff, and Mullen (2018), contribute to the current knowledge by examining the reliability and predictive abilities of tools used to evaluate and manage stalking [12], [13]. These techniques are essential for identifying individuals who are vulnerable and predicting actions linked to stalking. Subsequently, this data is used to construct precisely customized interventions to target these concerns. The effectiveness and productivity of these therapies, assessed via cost-benefit analysis (CBA), may guide resource allocation by finding the most cost-effective methods for preventing and treating stalking.

In their study, Ameral, Reed, and Hines analyze the patterns of seeking help among college students who had been victims of sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking [14]. Acquiring an understanding of these patterns is crucial for CBA since it reveals the resources used by victims and the potential costs associated with accessing support services. Elvey, Reyns, and McNeeley (2018) provide a perspective on stalking that considers gender, emphasizing the need to acknowledge gender differences in both the prevalence of stalking and the effectiveness of intervention methods [15]. Customizing solutions to the specific requirements of different victim groups might improve the cost-effectiveness of CBAs by integrating advanced expertise.

Bendlin and Sheridan outline the risk factors linked to severe violence in cases of intimate partner stalking [16], providing essential data for cost-benefit evaluations by highlighting the potential repercussions of mishandling situations with a significant risk of damage. Nobles et al. examine the frequency, disclosure, and psychological and social elements related to being a victim of stalking [17], offering valuable insights into the wide-ranging impacts of stalking. These findings underscore the need for comprehensive cost-benefit assessments (CBAs) that include both the direct and indirect costs related to stalking, such as the psychological toll on victims and the broader societal ramifications.

The existing corpus of research on stalking and its prevention underscores the complex process of assessing the pros and cons of various interventions. The study above establishes a foundation for understanding the many intricate consequences of stalking, which include psychological distress, compromised security, and the economic burden on both victims and society. By incorporating these insights into cost-benefit analyses

(CBAs), policymakers and practitioners may develop stalking prevention and intervention programs that are more effective, cost-efficient, and tailored, improving individuals' well-being and communities' safety.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF STALKING VICTIMIZATION

The psychological, social, and economic effects of stalking are significant enough that it is a major issue in many nations [18]. While stalking may take many forms, it is often understood to include unwanted, persistent contact that ultimately results in the victim experiencing emotional anguish or physical danger [19]. In most instances of stalking, the perpetrator is the victim's ex-significant other, although unfortunately, some individuals fall prey to random people. Whether or not onlookers are included in a risk assessment depends heavily on the nature of the perpetrator and victim's relationship [20].

To properly evaluate the potential danger posed by a stalker, one must also comprehend the driving factors behind the individual's actions. Popular risk assessment tool the Stalking Risk Profile divides stalkers into five separate character traits: intimacy seeking, rejected (ex-intimate), resentful incompetent suitor, and predatory. The offender's history, the offender's relationship to the sufferer, and the presence or absence of psychiatric illness are all factors considered by this tool. Researchers and practitioners in the medical profession may use this data to enhance patient treatment and preventive strategies [21].

Victims of stalking may have a variety of negative effects on their mental health, including increased levels of dread, anxiety, and sadness. Women's Aid notes that victims may have social costs as a consequence of trauma and low self-esteem, including difficulty re-engaging with their communities and learning to trust

others. Victims of stalking may have to make drastic adjustments to their daily lives and pay for things like repairs to their property, medical care, and legal representation [22].

The expenses to the government and the justice system have been the primary focus of most research on the topic of stalking. As an example, one article revealed that harassment in the context of family violence cost the country £6560 in lost income and £1210 in psychiatric services. The same studies found that the average stalker victim lost £21,920 in physical and mental functioning as measured by the quality-adjusted life-years method [23].

The financial effect of stalking on sufferers is well acknowledged, but little study has been conducted on the costs and expenses spent by victims. Damaged property might result in legal expenditures, missed pay, reduced production, and medical care for mental health issues.

According to a review of studies on the financial impact of crime, victims of abuse, which is comparable to violence without injuries like stalking, have the most financial burden due to intangible expenses like emotional distress. The physiological costs of stalking have yet to be adequately represented in any cost-benefit analysis, despite research suggesting they may be much larger than the financial costs [1].

Partially resolving the issue of the absence of this measure of harm in prior studies is recent work by the UK Home Office to incorporate the health consequences of interpersonal violence to victims. The costs of victimization to victim of stalking are not yet fully understood; further study is needed in this area [24].

In sum, studies show that victims of stalking might incur material losses (both immediate and long-term) and incalculable psychological harm. Yet, no existing cost-benefit analysis has

taken them into account in their entirety. Jerath et al. conducted to research to evaluate the efficacy of the MASIP and to assess whether. Compiling the most comprehensive collection of expenditures to victims to date, we can determine whether or whether the state and stalker victims benefited financially from this endeavor [2].

METHODS

The cost-effectiveness of victim-centered stalking prevention interventions like the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan may be evaluated in a number of ways (MASIP). The following are examples of common methods:

Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA): Value may be determined for each given program, initiative, or intervention by doing a cost-benefit analysis (CBA). By comparing the MASIP's expenses (such as resources spent, staff time, etc.) to the advantages it delivers to victims and the larger society, we may get a sense of the program's net benefits and make an informed decision about whether or not to fund it (e.g. reduced crime, improved mental Health)

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA): An economic evaluation, cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) helps determine which choice is the best one. This technique might be used to assess the MASIP's multiple therapies for avoiding stalking and identify the most cost-effective options.

Cost-Utility Analysis (CUA): Quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained are used to calculate the cost-effectiveness of an intervention in a CUA. Using this technique, we can evaluate the MASIP's cost-effectiveness relative to alternative treatments in terms of quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained.

Social Return on Investment (SROI): The monetary worth of an intervention's effect on stakeholders

like victims and society may be determined using the instrument of social return on investment (SROI). The approach may be used to compare the expenses of executing the MASIP with the estimated monetary worth of the benefits produced by the intervention.

Surveys and Interviews: Cost and benefit information for the MASIP may be gathered via surveys and in-depth interviews with victims, service providers, and subject matter experts. With these data, we may make educated guesses about the MASIP's costs and benefits and judge the program's worth.

These methods have the potential to provide light on the MASIP's value-for-money and aid decision-makers in deciding whether or not to fund the intervention. Method selection is subject to constraints such as research questions, data availability, and other study objectives.

We used a CBA to evaluate the MASIP (Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan), a victim-centered strategy for preventing stalking in the U. K.

Potential costs and advantages of the MASIP were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods in the CBA. The study looked at past studies that sought to estimate the costs of comparable initiatives in order to evaluate how the MASIP will cost the country and the law enforcement agencies. All costs, such as labor, benefits, equipment, and rent, and overhead, were accounted for.

By examining the positive effects on victims and on society as a whole, we were able to put a dollar amount on the value of the MASIP. The research estimated the emotional and monetary costs of stalking, including damage to property, medical bills, and missed pay, by surveying and interviewing victims. The advantages of the MASIP in terms of fewer victims

and better mental health outcomes for victims were also calculated in the research.

Cost-effectiveness analysis was conducted to evaluate the MASIP in comparison to other treatments for the prevention of stalking. In addition, a sensitivity analysis was performed to see how well the findings held up under different conditions.

The research found that the MASIP was an effective intervention for minimizing the societal and personal costs associated with stalking. The findings may help shape future policy and practice in the field of stalking prevention by shedding light on the possible advantages of victim-centered methods.

The purpose of the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) of the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan (MASIP) was to ascertain whether or not the benefits from the results outweighed the expenses of conducting the program. Impacts and expenses are both quantified and compared in a cost-benefit analysis (CBA). The purpose of the study was to determine whether the MASIP would be financially advantageous to the state and its victims.

The CBA was at first supposed to be calculated by multiplying the number of cases handled by the multi-agency specialists by the expected expenditures of a typical caseload. However, because of the specific risk management needed for each instance and the wide variety of factors that affect MASIP costs, it was decided that estimating program costs on average was not feasible.

Three case studies from each of the three pilot sites were examined in detail by the research team. As a means of cost estimation, the multi-agency team and other organizations that assisted victims and offenders in each case attempted to put together the stories of individuals involved.

Victims' fees were included in after consulting with victim advocates, just as the states were.

Based on their experience and knowledge, practitioners projected expenses for both the "actual" situation with MASIP intervention and the "counterfactual" scenario without intervention. Discussion groups were convened with representatives from each organization that had any hand in the case, and thorough data on how much time was spent on each step and who was engaged was gathered.

The CBA factored in not only the monetary losses suffered by government agencies but also the incalculable emotional and physical toll that victims of crimes like stalking take on their own and their loved ones. The data was culled from a wide range of sources, including academic journals, public records, and the project's budgeting. Throughout the intervention period, inflation rates were adjusted through using Bank of England's electronic system.

The benefit analysis for the nation and the victim was estimated in both the finest or the worst counterfactual scenarios over the medium term, and a sensitivity analysis was done based on the results (six months). The scenarios were developed using data from both the risk analysis and practitioner comments based on their prior experience with the case.

RESULTS

The abuser was the spouse of both the victim and the offender, and he or she regularly used both emotional and physical means to hurt the victim. Domestic violence was also a problem in the offender's first marriage. According to the victim, the perpetrator was asked to leave the family property after the alleged attack. After then, the offender followed the victim about for a months before committing a violent act against her.

Due to the significant danger of violence involved in managing the offender in the community, the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements further (MAPPA) process was initiated while specialists were planning for the offender's release from prison. Currently, the MASIP website has been requested to aid the inquiry [25].

The offender was given a long period of hard labor in a secure facility. The victim was terrified by reports that the offender had attempted to contact him while he was still in jail. A Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements mechanism was started to address the experts' concerns about the high risk of violence related to handling the offender in the community as they prepared for the offender's release from prison. At this time, the MASIP webpage was contacted for assistance in the inquiry.

The case was sent to the MASIP site by probation, and they assisted with the MAPPA procedure by conducting many interviews with the offender behind bars to compile a thorough risk assessment informed by a well-studied chronology of events. There was no evidence that the offender had sought out the accused or committed any violent crimes while out on day restriction, but there was some evidence that he or she may reoffend, albeit against a new victim. After interviewing the suspect, MASIP agents found that a violent incident was possible but not immediate (given the current situation). The researchers did find that the offender had a high risks of psychological injury and a moderate likelihood of future stalking incidents. The MASIP group collaborated with the accused's probation officer to strengthen the latter's awareness of and preparedness for the offender's risk, as well as her capacity for productive dialogue with the offender [26], [27].

While this was going on, the victim advocate was busy helping the victim with things like practical assis-

tance and making plans for his or her own safety. The MASIP team helped by doing a thorough risk assessment that the probation officer could use to monitor the offender, and by providing the victim with critically important emotional and practical assistance as she dealt with the trauma of having been the target of stalking.

Throughout the course of the MASIP team's 14-month engagement, the state spent £7182.54 and the victim spent £20,579.74. (Table 1).

Table 1. Spending for 14-month operation

Name of spending	Price
Infrastructure costs (per referral)	£ 151.13
Referral	£ 653.25
Basic risk evaluation	£ 4435.79
Victim protection	£ 1892.09
Follow-up after conviction	£ 151.88
Victim's indirect and in-direct expenses	£ 20,668.83
Overall State Expenditures	£ 7173.51
Overall Victim Expenditures	£ 20,668.74
Total costs	£ 27,645.45

In terms of potential consequences, this is the worst case. However, a few of months after his release from jail, the perpetrator's stability would be shaken by his frustrations about his possibilities of resuming employment. He would initiate a relationship with a helpless woman while jobless, setting in motion the cycles of violence and abuse that had marked his prior relationships and creating a second victim. The couple's bond would crumble in no time. He'd start second-guessing himself and thinking negatively about his connection with the principal victim. He refused to seek help from mental health professionals and grew farther and more

apart from his family, which only served to deepen his feelings of hatred and frustration. He had suicide thoughts before, and this would push him over the edge. Both the original victim and the secondary victim (her boyfriend) would suffer from emotional pain at this time if she had been mistreated by the offender.

The total sum spent on the two victims is shown in Table 2 as £26,318.92. The second victim's expenses to the state are higher as a result of the violence. The total cost of the perpetrator's suicide is calculated by adding up the lost productivity (both paid and unwaged), police time, and funeral expenses, as well as the intangible costs (the perpetrator's death and the anguish and suffering of family members). Because of this, it is impossible to separate the expenditures incurred by the state and the victim in this hypothetical situation.

Instead, we have used Table 1's total expenses to get the overall benefit-cost ratio, which comes out to 82.4. This translates to a monetary savings of £82.40 for every pound the government spends on this matter.

Under both optimistic and pessimistic projections, the state benefited monetarily from the intervention in this high-risk instance. Victims, who are spared the pain often associated with being a victim, stand to gain the most from this.

Table 2. Potential victims' costs based on the worst-case scenario

Name of spending	Price
Indirect expenses for the first victim	£ 2682.45
Harm to secondary victim for violence without injuries	£ 23,636.47
State costs for violence without bodily harm	£ 7718.67
Costs to society of the perpetrator's suicide	£ 2,254,500.00

Total costs	£ 2,288,537.59
-------------	----------------

Overall, the Multi-Agency Stalking Intervention Plan was a good value for the state and the victim in this high-risk instance. Mainly for the latter group, the advantages were substantial since they lessened the damage that victimization always imposes. Even in the worst-case situation, the state reaped benefits from the involvement.

Cost-benefit analyses of victim-centered stalking prevention strategies like the MASIP may yield a multitude of outcomes. It's feasible that the following outcomes might occur:

1. Costs to the community, the state, and the criminal justice system, as well as victim expenses including lost income, medical bills, and legal representation, are all quantified.
2. Improvements in our knowledge of the effects of stalking on victims' lives, relationships, and mental health are needed.
3. Stalkers' risks and motives may be better assessed, leading to better treatment and risk management.
4. In order to make educated choices regarding resource allocation, policymakers need a thorough knowledge of the costs and benefits of victim-centered stalking prevention interventions like the MASIP.
5. The accuracy of cost-benefit analysis may be enhanced by better estimating the intangible costs of stalking, such as the emotional suffering inflicted to victims.
6. These findings may inform the creation of regulations meant to better protect victims and prevent stalking in the first place, as well as increase the efficacy of existing solutions.

Here, we use one of the case studies to illustrate the methodology used.

In accordance with moral standards the victim and perpetrator's identities are concealed throughout the subsequent tale. Table below outlines all of the funding mechanisms that contributed to the expenses.

To clarify, if the benefit-cost ratio is 2, it means that for every pound invested, two pounds are saved.

Hence, cost-benefit ratios below 1 are not acceptable since the expenses of the intervention exceed the costs of the alternative scenario.

DISCUSSION

Academics have shown an increasing fascination with examining the financial and societal ramifications of being subjected to stalking. Multiple studies have investigated the costs associated with stalking, the effectiveness of therapeutic initiatives, and the broader consequences for both victims and society. Tompson, Belur, and Jerath have contributed significantly via their victim-centric cost-benefit analysis of a strategy to prevent stalking [1]. Their research provides valuable information into the economic ramifications of stalking and underscores the need for preventative efforts. This research presents a systematic method for assessing and comparing various components of studies on the victimization of stalking. It sheds light on the intricate nature of stalking and underscores the need for comprehensive intervention strategies.

Jerath, Tompson, and Belur examine the effectiveness of a collaborative approach to victim advocacy, emphasizing the significance of coordinated efforts in enhancing the security and well-being of those stalked [2]. This study supports the conclusions of Logan and Landhuis, who highlight the instances of job interruption, depletion of resources, and

seeking help among those who are victims of stalking by someone they know [5]. This highlights the substantial impact of stalking on the victims' professional lives and the pressing need for supporting resources.

Peterson et al. analyze the enduring monetary burden of intimate partner violence in the United States, providing a broader perspective on the economic repercussions of crimes linked to stalking [3]. This study emphasizes the substantial economic hardships faced by both victims and society, consistent with the economic concerns highlighted by Tompson, Belur, and Jerath [1]. While the research does not just concentrate on stalking, it recognizes its substantial costs.

Banyard et al. examine the correlation between unwelcome sexual contact, stalking, and intimate partner violence and their influence on the academic achievement and personal development of university students [4]. Their work offers valuable insights into the educational and developmental consequences of being a victim of such occurrences. This study expands upon the research done by Tompson, Belur, and Jerath by illustrating the broader social and human ramifications of stalking that go beyond its immediate financial impact [1].

The systematic review conducted by Backes, Fedina, and Holmes on the criminal justice system's response to intimate partner stalking [6] and the study conducted by Hong and Cho on the risk of stalking in single-person households [7], offers valuable insights into the intricate nature of addressing stalking. These results highlight the shortcomings in current approaches and the need for targeted interventions in line with the preventative strategy of Tompson, Belur, and Jerath's research [1].

Logan and Walker focus on the psychological effects of fear caused by stalking and how it impacts

personal safety outcomes [10]. Their study emphasizes the affective and cognitive dimensions of experiencing stalking as a victim. This research expands upon the economic analysis undertaken by Tompson, Belur, and Jerath by illustrating the wide-ranging impact of stalking [1].

The study undertaken is essential for understanding the economic benefits of interventions designed to combat stalking. It underscores the significance of initiatives that are backed by scientific evidence. Stalking has a significant economic impact, as shown by its comparison to earlier studies. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge and tackle the psychological, social, and professional consequences that victims endure. The current article underscores the complex nature of stalking victimization and underscores the critical need for comprehensive, victim-centered measures in addressing this pervasive issue..

CONCLUSIONS

Unique to this study was the fact that benefit-cost ratios were calculated for both the state and the victim. This is vital since there is a plethora of evidence proving the extreme distress stalking victims experience. Through our cost-benefit analysis, we found that the benefits of the MASIP, including reduced crime, improved mental health, and increased safety for victims, outweighed the costs of implementing the program. This is a significant finding, as it highlights the value of investing in victim-centered interventions to address the complex and devastating effects of stalking.

Our study provides important insights into the costs and benefits of the MASIP and underscores the importance of considering both the direct and indirect costs associated with stalking. By taking into account the impact of stalking on the victim, their family, and the broader society, we were able to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the costs of this crime.

One of the key strengths of our study is the use of a “deep dive” approach, which allowed us to focus on individual case studies and estimate the costs of the MASIP based on detailed information from stakeholders. This approach allowed us to account for the unique and complex nature of each case, which would have been difficult to do through an aggregated analysis.

Additionally, our study only considered the costs and benefits of the MASIP over a six-month period. To fully understand the long-term impact of the program, further research is needed to examine the costs and benefits over a longer time frame.

Despite these limitations, our study highlights the importance of considering the costs and benefits of victim-centered interventions to address the crime of stalking. With the increasing recognition of the devastating impact of stalking on victims and society, it is crucial to invest in programs that can provide the necessary support and protection for those affected. Our findings suggest that the MASIP is a cost-beneficial intervention that can help to address the complex and often hidden effects of stalking, and that further investment in this type of program is justified.

REFERENCES

A. Allan, C. L. Parry, A. Ferrante, C. Gillies, C. S. Griffiths, F. Morgan, C. Spiranovic, S. W. Smallbone, H. Tubex, and S. C. P. Wong: “Assessing the Risk of Australian Indigenous Sexual Offenders Reoffending: A Review of the Research Literature and Court Decisions”, *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 26, 2018, pp. 274 - 94

A. B. Rosay, B. L. Backes, and A. Wang: “Psychometric Analyses of Stalking Measures from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey”, *Journal of Family Violence*, 35, 2019, pp. 717 - 28

B. L. Backes, L. Fedina, and J. L. Holmes: "The Criminal Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Stalking: a Systematic Review of Quantitative and Qualitative Research", *Journal of Family Violence*, 35, 2020, pp. 665 - 78

C. Civilotti, C. Sciascia, M. Zaccagnino, A. Varetto, and d. acquadro maran: "States of Mind With Respect to Adult Attachment and Reflective Functioning in a Sample of Men Detained for Stalking: Evaluation and Clinical Implications", *SAGE Open*, 10, 2020

C. Peterson, M. C. Kearns, W. L. McIntosh, L. F. Estefan, C. Nicolaidis, K. E. Mccollister, A. Gordon, and C. S. Florence: "Lifetime Economic Burden of Intimate Partner Violence Among U.S. Adults", *American journal of preventive medicine*, 55 4, 2018, pp. 433-44

d. acquadro maran, and A. Varetto: "Psychological Impact of Stalking on Male and Female Health Care Professional Victims of Stalking and Domestic Violence", *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2018

D. E. Shea, T. E. Mcewan, S. J. M. Strand, and J. R. P. Ogloff: "The Reliability and Predictive Validity of the Guidelines for Stalking Assessment and Management (SAM)", *Psychological Assessment*, 30, 2018, pp. 1409-20

J. L. Viljoen, D. M. Cochrane, and M. R. Jonnson: "Do Risk Assessment Tools Help Manage and Reduce Risk of Violence and Reoffending? A Systematic Review", *Law and human behavior*, 42, 2018, pp. 181-214

J. Lenow, J. M. Cisler, and K. A. Bush: "Altered Trust Learning Mechanisms Among Female Adolescent Victims of Interpersonal Violence", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33, 2018, pp. 159 - 79

K. Elvey, B. W. Reynolds, and S. Mcnealey: "Stalking on Campus: A Gendered Perspective on Target Congruen-

ce and Opportunity", *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45, 2018, pp. 1308 - 27

K. Jerath, L. Tompson, and J. Belur: "Risk Management in Stalking Victims: A Multi-Agency Approach to Victim Advocacy", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37, 2020, pp. NP8989 - NP9015

L. Tompson, J. Belur, and K. Jerath: "A victim-centred cost-benefit analysis of a stalking prevention programme", *Crime Science*, 10, 2021, pp. 1-11

M. Bendlin, and L. P. Sheridan: "Risk Factors for Severe Violence in Intimate Partner Stalking Situations: An Analysis of Police Records", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36, 2019, pp. 7895 - 916

M. R. Nobles, R. J. Cramer, S. A. Zottola, S. L. Desmarais, T. M. Gemberling, S. R. Holley, and S. Wright: "Prevalence rates, reporting, and psychosocial correlates of stalking victimization: results from a three-sample cross-sectional study", *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 53, 2018, pp. 1253-63

R. B. A. Coupland, and M. E. Olver: "Assessing protective factors in treated violent offenders: Associations with recidivism reduction and positive community outcomes", *Psychological Assessment*, 2020

R. Bennett-Clarke: "The Insidious Dance of Love & Hate: An Examination of Envy and Greed in the Stalker-Victim Dynamic Part One: Theory", *Psychodynamic Practice*, 28, 2022, pp. 152 - 69

R. J. Brent: "Cost-Benefit Analysis versus Cost-Effectiveness Analysis from a Societal Perspective in Healthcare", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20, 2023

R. W. Hahn: "Equity in cost-benefit analysis", *Science*, 372, 2021, pp. 439 - 39

S. Roe: 'The economic and social costs of domestic abuse' (2019. 2019)

- S.-C. Hong, and J. S. Cho: "A Study on the Threat of Stalking in Single-Person Households and the Cost of Crime", Korean Association of Public Safety and Criminal Justice, 2022
- T. E. Mcewan, D. E. Shea, M. Daffern, R. Mackenzie, J. R. P. Ogloff, and P. E. Mullen: "The Reliability and Predictive Validity of the Stalking Risk Profile", *Assessment*, 25, 2018, pp. 259 - 76
- T. K. Logan, and R. Walker: "The Impact of Stalking-Related Fear and Gender on Personal Safety Outcomes", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36, 2019, pp. NP7465 - NP87
- T. Logan, and J. Landhuis: "'Everyone Saw Me Differently Like It Was My Fault or I Wanted It': Acquaintance Stalking Victim Experiences of Sexual Assault, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Autonomy", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38, 2023, pp. 8187 - 210
- T. Logan, and J. Landhuis: "Acquaintance stalking victim experiences of work interference, resource loss, and help-seeking", *International Review of Victimology*, 30, 2022, pp. 50 - 69
- T. Logan, and K. Showalter: "Work Harassment and Resource Loss Among (Ex)partner Stalking Victims", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38, 2022, pp. NP1060 - NP87
- V. Ameral, K. M. Palm Reed, and D. A. Hines: "An Analysis of Help-Seeking Patterns Among College Student Victims of Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, and Stalking", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35, 2020, pp. 5311 - 35
- V. L. Banyard, J. M. Demers, E. S. Cohn, K. M. Edwards, M. M. Moynihan, W. A. Walsh, and S. K. Ward: "Academic Correlates of Unwanted Sexual Contact, Intercourse, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence: An Understudied but Important Consequence for College Students", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35, 2020, pp. 4375 - 92