

Haunt and Poltergeist Clearing in Australian Residences: A Retrospective Survey

LANCE STORM AND ROBB TILLEY

Abstract: The authors conducted a survey on people (clients) who had their Australian residences ‘cleared’ of haunt and/or poltergeist phenomena. Clients were ‘typed’ in two ways: via Thalbourne’s (1996) Transliminality Scale (a perceptual measure), and the Personal Wellbeing Index (International Wellbeing Group, 2013), which measures quality of life. The typical client was a ‘low transliminal’ who tends to be emotionally stable, passive, and introverted, but not prone to dissociation or unusual experiences. Clients’ scores on subjective wellbeing were on par with corresponding norms, but the authors do not claim that subjective wellbeing was due to clearing. The most common psychic (‘sixth sense’) experiences were a sensed presence, and a sense of being stared at or being watched; the most common sightings were apparitions, and moving objects; the most common noises were footsteps, and banging of doors and/or windows. Many other anomalous experiences were reported. Transliminality correlated significantly with number of ‘sixth sense’ experiences. Findings indicate up to 88% clearing success (partial or complete), more conservatively ranging from 66% for complete haunt clearing to 68% for complete poltergeist clearing, with clients generally describing their lives after the clearing as improved.

Keywords: clearing, haunting, poltergeist, subjective wellbeing, transliminality.

INTRODUCTION

Hauntings and poltergeists are regarded as troublesome, and individuals disturbed by these phenomena may seek assistance from people trained in resolving these problems (Auerbach, 2005; Gauld & Cornell, 1979; Zahradnik & von Lucadou, 2012). We use Thalbourne’s (2003) definition of *haunting*:

The more or less regular occurrence of paranormal phenomena associated with a particular locality (especially a building) and usually attributed to the activities of a discarnate entity; the phenomena may include apparitions, poltergeist disturbances, cold drafts, sounds of steps and voices, and various odors (p. 50)

Thalbourne (2003) defines the *poltergeist* phenomenon as a

disturbance characterized by bizarre physical effects of paranormal origin, suggesting mischievous or destructive intent: these phenomena include the unexplained movement or breakage of objects, loud raps, the lighting of fires, and occasionally personal injury to people. (p. 89)

This research described herein focuses exclusively on the ‘clearing’ work undertaken by Mr. Robb Tilley of the Australian Institute of Parapsychological Research (AIPR, Inc.), a charitable institution registered under the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC). The main reason for conducting this research was to investigate by survey inquiry self-reported claims of haunting and poltergeist experience, with special focus on so-called *psychic clearing* (or *clearing* for short). We aimed to determine possible relationships between clearing success and the mental process known as transliminality (the movement of psychological content such as perceptions, emotions, and cognitions, into and out of consciousness), and personal wellbeing (i.e., people’s feelings about their quality of life).

Tilley (2002) defines the “clearing ceremony” as a “solemn, mysteriously impressive, and somewhat sacred procedure” (p. 128). The clearer acts as an “intermediary asking for help”—that is, “*the clearing of unwanted entities is done by spirits (non-physical beings)*” (p. 128). The following procedure is used to assess the nature of the haunting and poltergeist:

First, visit the site of the disturbance, usually a house, and interview the living persons about their experiences, including the chronological order of events and the frequency with which they occur.

Second, through questioning, ... discover which individual person is apparently psychically sensitive or who seems to be the focus of the disturbances. Sometimes there is no individual focus.

Third, ... check every part of the house: each room, garage and garden, to check psychically for so-called energy wells, or interdimensional tunnels that purportedly connect from this physical dimension to another, unknown dimension.

At this point the clearer has gained a sufficient personal impression of the site, together with information from those being disturbed, to gauge what is causing the disturbance, who the discarnate spirits allegedly are, and why they are troublesome. Tilley (2002) explains that clients are asked “to visualise the room and house as being filled with a brilliant, intense white light” (p. 129). The spirits of the “white light” are asked to protect the clients from evil, and bring Love, Light and Truth. The troublesome spirits are invited by the good spirits to “go to the light”. The references to this light are quite voluminous (e.g., Moody, 1988; Ring, 1984).¹

Although we proposed to take an exploratory approach to clearing based on post-test data, the necessarily *pre-experimental* nature of this study was a cost-effective way to discern whether the findings are worthy of further investigation. However, no study like this has been conducted in Australia, although there are a number of anecdotal cases where psychic clearing or exorcism has been successful. Gauld and Cornell (1979) reported 59 cases where exorcism was attempted, of which 34 (58%) were apparently successful. Gauld and Cornell referred to the “60% success rate” (p. 344) as “surprisingly” high. They were, however, critical of the exorcism procedure, and not unduly for in 2015, it was noted by secular historian Professor Sarah Ferber that exorcisms have accounted for “30 deaths in the past three decades, ... including two in Australia in the 1990s, and the majority of victims were unwilling participants” (Ferber, cited in Munro, 2015; see also Ferber, 2004).

While Gauld and Cornell (1979) have said “there do not appear to be any cases which seriously strain the living agent theory [which attributes the phenomena to psi from living agents; a.k.a. living agent psi]” (p. 343), their general summary of the research is that there *are* cases “both of poltergeists and hauntings, which fulfil our proposed criteria for accepting the intelligence at work as that of a discarnate entity” (p. 359). They muse over the “forces at work in the production of poltergeist phenomena” (p. 337), though that is a more general and complex question about psi processes to be answered by psychics, mediums, parapsychologists, and parapsychicists. Earlier, Stevenson (1972) had already acknowledged the same dual interpretation, which raises the so-called *source-of-psi problem* still debated today, often pitched as an either/or scenario; i.e., survival vs. super-psi in the living (a.k.a. Living Agent Psi; LAP). Braude (2003) states that “the best of these cases (recurrent and unique) pose a clear problem for the super-psi hypothesis, even if they don’t strain it to the breaking point” (p. 227). Braude concurs with Gauld who states that it seems “obviously

¹ This outline of the clearing procedure is necessarily brief; more detail can be found in Tilley (2002).

simpler to suppose that . . . there was at work some further agency, to be identified with a still serving portion of a formerly incarnate human being” (Gauld, 1982, p. 235).

Alternatively, while Roll (2006) points out that ‘poltergeist’ is German for *rowdy ghost*, he argues that most researchers are convinced that “the [poltergeist] incidents are due to psychokinesis by the living people who are at the centre of the turmoil” (p. 6). He reminds us that the commonly-used term recurrent spontaneous psychokinesis (RSPK), as a short-hand term for describing poltergeist phenomena, allows for either interpretation, survival or LAP. For more than 40 years, however, while acknowledging the distinctions between RSPK, poltergeist cases, hauntings, and apparitions, Roll (1983) gives credence to the so-called psychodynamic explanation—as Alvarado (1983) explains:

the generally accepted psychological theory of poltergeist behaviour dictates that these phenomena are PK expressions of repressed conflicts, hostilities and/or sexual problems. This theory is widely held by parapsychologists. (p. 117)

But Alvarado adds: “It is likely though that this conceptual model is based on weak evidence and methodologically invalid research” (p. 117). Alvarado (1983) concludes that “we have no right to accept the psychopathological model of the poltergeist agent without serious qualms” (p. 118)—there are untold millions of people who could be diagnosed as “psychopathological”, yet the number of poltergeist cases is extremely low. Therefore, we should consider other models besides psychodynamic explanations since the latter do not adequately explain poltergeist phenomena. It needs to be stressed, however, that it is theoretically possible for predisposed people to use ESP or PK to produce haunt-like and poltergeist-like phenomena, and successful resolutions to cases that feature parapsychological problems have involved clinical approaches (see Kramer, Bauer, & Hövelmann, 2012).

While some researchers distinguish poltergeists from haunts (e.g., Dixon, 2016; Gauld & Cornell, 1979), researchers like Rogo (1986), and Williams and Ventola (2011), find no way of firming up a distinction given that haunt and poltergeist characteristics “overlap substantially” (Ventola, et al., 2019, p. 145). Therefore, Alvarado’s argument could apply equally as well to haunt phenomena. We also draw a distinction between different types of poltergeist cases—some feature various forms of RSPK, while others may be more complex, and these could include long term domestic events, as well as “haunting cases involving explicit discarnate activity (e.g., apparitions, veridical evidence of events not otherwise known, etc.)”

(A. L. Jinks, personal communication, March 4, 2015). It is expected that our data may help draw out these distinctions.

We acknowledge the above-mentioned survival/LAP debate, but point out that the theoretical impasse poses no imposition on how such surveys as described herein should be run, although the results may help guide that debate. Consequently, we are primarily interested in the phenomenology of the experients, and suggest that issues raised of a personal/psychological nature can be resolved independently of the theoretical considerations. For that reason, we leave the ontological and causal debates for other authors to consider (for a review of theoretical explanations/causes of haunt and poltergeist phenomena, see Chapters 10 and 13 in Irwin and Watt, 2007).

For more than 25 years, Tilley (2002) has been clearing hauntings and poltergeists. Tilley explains that these clearing ‘skills’ were taught to him by experts in the field. Tilley, based on verbal feedback from past clients, estimates that his success rate is about 80% based on follow-up calls three, six, and twelve months apart. However, no formal, independent, retrospective study has been conducted to confirm or deny Tilley’s estimate. Fortunately, Tilley has a substantial record of cases on file, and the people involved in these cases, some of them dating back to the 1990s, were willing to participate in the research. Added to that number were a number of newly acquired clients.

Transliminality

Since we want to know what kinds of people have sought Tilley’s clearing help, we administered Thalbourne’s (1996) Transliminality Scale (TLS) to Tilley’s clients. That decision was made because transliminality is defined as “a hypothesized tendency for psychological material to cross (*trans*) thresholds (*limines*) into or out of consciousness” (Thalbourne & Houran, 2000, p. 853), and the TLS is regarded as a good measure of people’s sensitivity to their surroundings and their psychic environment. As Thalbourne (2010b) points out, so-called ‘high-transliminals’ are more sensitive to touch stimuli than ‘low-transliminals’. Thalbourne adds that “believers in the paranormal [who] report a greater reactivity to perceptual stimuli ... may truly be experiencing what they say they do, rather than simply having a more liberal criterion for saying so” (p. 76).

A number of other studies indicate that the transliminality measure would suit our aims. For example, a questionnaire study by Houran, Kumar, Thalbourne, and Lavertue (2002a), featuring university students, found that transliminality scores predicted self-reports of Poltergeist Experiences, Encounter Experiences, General Paranormal Experiences, and Paranormal

Ability, as measured on the Anomalous Experience Inventory (AEI; Kumar, Pekala, & Gallagher, 1994). These findings are informative, but a more sophisticated study was conducted in an ecologically valid environment which acted as a standardized setting in which responses could be gauged. Thus, in their investigation of Edinburgh's reputedly haunted 'South Bridge Vaults', Houran, Wiseman, and Thalbourne (2002b) found that transliminality scores significantly distinguished haunt experiencers from non-experiencers. They concluded that high-transliminals are not only highly attentive, but they expect to experience stimuli that can form the basis of an anomalous experience. However, Houran (2002) found that people who experienced haunt phenomena at Edwards Place in Springfield, Illinois (USA), only had non-significantly higher transliminality scores than non-experiencers, and although transliminality correlated positively with "number of discrete experiences" and "number of different categories of experiences" (p. 113), the correlations were not significant.

Laythe, Houran, and Ventola (2018) conducted a psychometric study of 'ghost and haunt' percipients by examining transliminality in relation to focus persons in poltergeist disturbances. They found no evidence that self-reported haunt-type experiences were connected to obvious cognitive deficits in their surveyed percipients. Current thinking is that high transliminality should not be regarded as a disease indicator (referring to psychopathological attributes), but should be embraced in a so-called 'disease' model indicating that any previously assumed pathological dimension to transliminality be stripped of the concept, while still allowing for the possibility of "a wide variety of emotional responses" that are subclinical (Ventola et al., 2019, p. 156; see also Evans, Lange, Houran, & Lynn, 2018; Thalbourne & Houran, 2005).

Thus far, TLS measures have been taken of individuals who were randomly-selected students or visitors to alleged haunted public buildings, but certainly not those living in home environments (residences), which are a necessary part of the present study. Therefore, while we argue that transliminality may tend to indicate a certain kind of sensitivity, and therefore proneness to haunt and poltergeist experiences, this study is probably the first to sample a population who had their residences cleared of haunt and poltergeist phenomena; so saying, we do not yet know if they score high on the TLS.

Personal Wellbeing—Quality of Life

Since we are interested in the *current* quality of life of people who have had their homes cleared of hauntings and/or poltergeists, we also administered the *Personal Wellbeing Index* (PWI; International Wellbeing

Group, 2013), which contains seven items that collectively measure subjective wellbeing (SWB)—these are “directed to people’s feelings about themselves” (p. 6), each item corresponding to a quality-of-life domain: standard of living, health, achieving in life, relationships, safety, community-connectedness, and future security. There are two other measures usually administered with these seven items: General Life Satisfaction (a.k.a. Global Life Satisfaction), and Spirituality/Religion (‘How satisfied are you with your spirituality or religion?’).

The PWI has never been used in a parapsychological study. However, on the premise that belief in the possibility of contact with spirits of the dead can be formed from actual experiences with such spirits of a disturbing nature, it is perhaps not surprising Francis and Williams (2009) found believers displayed lower psychological wellbeing, which included high levels of both depression and the feeling that life was not worth living (see also Tomy, Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, & Cummins, 2013). We argue that personal wellbeing may improve with the cessation of haunt and poltergeist experiences, but we do not imply that the wellbeing in our sample is explained partly or entirely by Tilley’s clearing work. In point of fact, in this study, we were merely guided by the assertion made by Francis and Williams (2009) that there is a pre-defined population of believers in ghosts and poltergeists that has low psychological wellbeing.

As already indicated, an inspection of PWI items shows that we are asking Tilley’s sample, drawn from that population, to rate their *current* satisfaction levels of standard of living, health, relationships, safety, etc., as well as life as a whole, and their spirituality. One cannot infer that responses to these items necessarily indicate clearing after-effects, and nor need they, but the ‘AIPR Survey’ component of the questionnaire does address the likelihood of clearing. We argue that the PWI will give us useful information—for example, Tomy et al. (2013) provides Australian norms against which we can compare our sample mean scores. Depending on these scores, and other survey responses, we can make judgements as to whether follow-ups with clients are advisable in order to determine the degree to which clearing-failure (if any), and/or (normal) life events, might account for questionably low levels of wellbeing. There is no other *immediate* means of achieving these aims other than by conducting the proposed survey.

Research Aims

A variety of demographic variables, as indicated in the ‘AIPR Survey’ (see *Measures* in the METHODS section), and two test instruments—*Rasch-scaled Transliminality Scale* (RTS) and Adult version

of the *Personal Wellbeing Index* (PWI; International Wellbeing Group, 2013)—were used in order to achieve the following aims:

1. Determine degree of transliminality in people who request clearing services using the RTS and comparing sample mean scores to the Rasch (theoretical) mean (see Lange et al., 2000);
2. Determine current levels of wellbeing in a ‘clearing’ sample, and compare sample mean scores to corresponding norms (see Tomyn et al., 2013);
3. Determine whether clearing has utility (i.e., is effective), based on sample survey responses, and mean scores in (1) and (2) above, and various correlations.

We expected that a number of important questions relating to haunting, poltergeists, and the clearing process would be answered, such as: Have people’s lives improved?; Did clearing work for everyone, or have only certain types of people benefitted from it?; Did some problems return?; What kinds of problems returned?; and so on (see APPENDIX A for details).

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 30 surveyed cases collected over a five-year period (2015 to 2019). These cases derived mostly from home visits where clearing work was conducted by Robb Tilley (other cases were performed remotely). In 2019, the sample of 30 had a mean age of 50 years ($SD = 14$ years); 8 males, 22 females. The mean ‘Incident Age’ (i.e., age when the haunting and/or poltergeist episode occurred) was 44 years ($SD = 13$ years). Since a number of clients completed the surveys many years after their incident occurred, the mean age when the surveys were signed was higher at 47 years ($SD = 14$ years). The mean ‘Incident Age’ for males was 49 years ($SD = 14$ years), and the mean ‘Incident Age’ for females was 43 years ($SD = 13$ years).

Measures

Three sets of material were used in the study:

(1) *Information Sheet with Consent Form* (see APPENDIX A) and the ‘AIPR Survey’ (see APPENDIX B). The Survey allowed clients to report various demographic details (age, sex, significant others, residence type, etc.), how successful the clearing was (a four-point scale from 0 to 3); duration (how long the residence was haunted); what life was like after the clearing (a

three-point scale derived from self-reported responses: 0 = *no improvement*; 1 = *some improvement*; 2 = *total improvement*). Also, there was provision to classify the problem as either a haunt or poltergeist (Likert-type rating scales were used for both: 0 = *not at all successful* to 5 = *completely successful*). The Survey also asked clients to describe the phenomena experienced, which included anomalies seen, heard, smelled, tasted, touched (felt), as well as physical movements, and a so-called ‘sixth sense’ category, which referred to extra-sensorial perceptions (e.g., déjà vu, discarnate entity contact, sensed presence, psychic assault, etc.);

(2) *Rasch-scaled Transliminality Scale* (RTS; Lange, Thalbourne, Houran, & Storm, 2000; Thalbourne, 1996; see APPENDIX C): The scale consists of 29 true/false items, of which 17 are scored and top-down purified using Rasch-scaling techniques to eliminate age and gender bias from the scale.² Rasch-scaling alters the scoring range and mean. Raw range is 0 to 29; Raw mean = 14.5 (Rasch mean = 25; *SD* = 5). The KR-20 reliability coefficient of the scale is 0.85 (Lange et al., 2000). For the present sample, Cronbach’s alpha = .87;

(3) *Personal Wellbeing Index (Adult) Scale* (PWI; International Wellbeing Group, 2013; see APPENDIX D). The scale consists of seven items which can be totalled, averaged and re-scaled to represent “Subjective Wellbeing” (p. 15). Each item scores on a 11-point (0-10) scale. Thomas (2005; cited in International Wellbeing Group, 2013, p. 11) reported a PWI/Life-Satisfaction correlation of .78 (see Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Cronbach alpha lies between .70 and .85 (Australia and overseas). For the present sample, Cronbach’s alpha = .87. The index has also demonstrated good test-retest reliability across 1-2 week interval with an intra-class correlation coefficient of 0.84 (Lau & Cummins, 2005). The scale is often administered with the ‘General Life Satisfaction’ item, and the ‘Spirituality or Religion’ item.

Procedure

Survey work: The study was approved by the University of Adelaide School of Psychology Human Ethics Subcommittee (Approval Code Number 16/69). A package consisting of the above three sets of materials was

² “Top-down purification” refers to a set of Rasch scaling procedures that identify and remedy differential item functioning in questionnaires, i.e., response biases related to extraneous variables such as respondents’ ages, genders, or even cultures. Furthermore, Rasch scaling yields measures that have *interval-level* properties. These biases can elicit spurious factor structures of test items, as well as erroneous findings from statistical analyses. Therefore, the techniques overcome the limitations of classical test theory.

emailed by the first author (L.S.) to participants who sought help and received it from the second author (R.T.). Some packages were posted out by surface mail to participants who did not have email services. Upon completion of the survey, participants were asked to return them to L.S. who processed the returned survey data.

Data entry and analysis: L.S. entered the data into databases (Excel 2020, and SPSS, Version 26.0). L.S. then checked the database, conducted statistical analyses, and co-wrote the scientific paper with R.T.. The scales of measurement were interval, or nominal, or ordinal. Tests used were appropriately parametric or nonparametric.

RESULTS

Descriptives and Preliminary Findings

The sample. Initially 67 surveys were posted out or emailed to past clients since project start date 2015. Completed AIPR Surveys, and the two scales (RTS and PWI) were returned sporadically over a period of four years since data collection started in 2015. The planned number of 30 clients was reached by mid-2019.

The typical residence was a house (21 clients; 70%), while the remaining 30% were flats, units, or apartments, occupied by nine clients. Only three states were represented out of Australia's six states and two territories: Twenty-five clients (83%) lived in New South Wales, four clients (13%) lived in Queensland, and only one (4%) lived in Western Australia (WA). Thirteen clients (43%) lived with a significant other and one child only; six (20%) lived with a significant other only (a spouse, de facto, or partner); 10 (33%) lived alone; and the remaining occupant (a WA woman) lived with a non-significant other (friend) and a number of her own children. Nine clients (30%) reported having lived in a haunted house before, so for the majority, the haunt/poltergeist experience was new to them.

As surveys were completed at various times after the clearings were done, sometimes years later, the average number of weeks since the clearings were done is quite variable, ranging from 1 week to 728 weeks (or 14 years). The average delay time was 110 weeks ($SD = 214$ weeks). There was no significant relationship between number of anomalies reported and the delay, $r_s(28) = -0.12$, $p = .523$ (two-tailed)—this finding does not support the hypothesis that clients' memories of incidents had lapsed over time. Likewise, we might assume that clients did not forget that any positive effects they felt were the direct result of the clearing. This assumption is

supported by another statistic—a time estimate from clients as to how long it took for the clearing to take effect. The typical response was “immediately or within a week” ($n = 21$).

Before any statistical testing was conducted, we needed to assess two types of clearing: directly by home-visit ($n = 22$), or indirectly at a distance ($n = 8$), the latter of which was an approach adopted by the second author (R.T.) out of necessity since he could not on occasion make home visits due to the great distances involved. R.T. therefore never actually met the so-called ‘distant occupants’, and only communicated with them via email and telephone, and necessarily performed the clearing process from his Sydney home. One multivariate ANOVA was run to see if the two groups (‘home-visited’ and ‘distant’) were different on transliminality, SWB, GLS, and S/R. There were no significant grouping differences. We therefore regarded individuals in both groups as similar, psychologically and demographically.

We then ran a single Mann-Whitney U test, entering the four success differences (‘How successful’; ‘haunt clearing’; ‘poltergeist clearing’; and ‘Life now’), and the seven anomalies listed in Table 1, to test group differences, but there were no significant differences on success, and only one significant difference on the anomalies (namely, Sixth Sense), $z = 2.17$, $p = .03$. Due to multiple testing, the critical α (alpha) was divided by eleven (the number of tests), rendering a new critical $\alpha = .005$, and we see that the p value is no longer significant. We therefore regarded the sample as sufficiently homogeneous for testing.

Table 1
Relative Frequencies: Number of Anomalies Reported (for Males, Female, & Full Sample)

Anomalies	Males	Females	Total
Sixth Sense (15 items)	57 (10%)	138 (25%)	195 (35%)
Seeing (14 items)	25 (4%)	94 (17%)	119 (21%)
Hearing (13 items)	25 (5%)	91 (16%)	116 (21%)
Touch (5 items)	13 (3%)	46 (8%)	59 (11%)
Smells (5 items)	10 (1.8%)	26 (4.2%)	36 (6%)
Physical Movement (4 items)	8 (1.2%)	21 (3.8%)	29 (5%)
Taste (1 item)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.5%)	4 (1%)
Total	140 (25.5%)	418 (74.5%)	558 (100%)

For specific descriptions of anomalies, see APPENDIX B.

The anomalies. One of our first issues of concern was types of phenomena reported in order to determine the nature of the problems experienced. We queried clients on anomalous sightings, sounds, smells, and so on, and these and other phenomena are listed in Table 1 in order of frequency (highest to lowest percentages). Given that females out-numbered males nearly 3:1, the frequency counts invariably show that females reported relatively more anomalies, but a Mann-Whitney U test on the seven anomalies showed that females did not have more experiences than males in absolute terms.

The categories of anomalies refer to seven phenomena listed in APPENDIX B. The average number of anomalies reported per person (rounded up) was 19 ($SD = 8$). The most common anomalies reported were those that pertained to a 'sixth sense' (psychic), and were seen (sightings), heard (sounds), and felt (atmospheric or physical touching). The most common 'sixth sense' experiences were

- 'a sensed presence';
- 'a sense of being stared at or being watched';

The most common 'sightings' were

- 'apparitions (of deceased entities you do not know)';
- 'objects moving/moved';
- 'lights switched on and/or off by themselves';
- 'animals shy[ing] away from specific areas'.

The most common 'sounds' were

- 'banging (doors, windows, etc.)';
- 'footsteps';
- 'name calling, or hearing voices'.

The most common types of atmospheric or physical touching were

- 'touching of the victim';
- 'mysterious sense of cold spot'.

Many other phenomena were reported but these are too numerous to list individually. Many of these are described in the next section (NB: a follow-up article is planned which will detail and analyse specific experiences).

The reports. In accordance with a key aim of the AIPR—“To provide support in matters to do with alleged or actual experiences of a paranormal nature that may require relief of suffering, distress, or helplessness”³—the most important criterion in regard to assessing and taking remedial action, and one which evidently prompts clearing requests in the first place, is the distress, anxiety, and discomfort caused by the anomalous experiences listed in Table 1. These anomalies were specified to considerable degrees by clients, and this section gives a brief summary of the various experiences. While our survey did not ask or expect clients to give quantitative ratings of the cognitive, emotional and physical effects caused by the disturbances, we did let them express their thoughts and feelings in their own words. The following are representative quotes of clients’ responses and reactions:

- Client #3 spoke of a voice called Peter “controlling [his] thoughts”; the “blocking” of “thoughts, memory, and visualizations”; and “violent shaking” of his bed;
- Client #4 referred to “confusion” caused by various psychokinetic (PK) disturbances, his repeated waking in the middle of the night due to voices calling out, culminating in his getting “angry” and the anomalies causing “worry”, and his partner being “scared”;
- Client #5 reported “deep sadness and lethargy” caused by “shadowy figures” and “misplaced items”, etc.;
- Client #6 reacted to PK effects by feeling “dizziness and tingling [*sic*]” as well as “strange dreams and thoughts” that did not seem like her own;
- Client #7 was “scared” and had “nightmares” about a ghost on the premises;
- Client #10 reported “terrifying dreams, feeling of being watched”;
- Client #11 noticed a “feeling of being watched” and, the family having “trouble sleeping”;
- Client #16 felt “terrorized by sudden feelings of being strangled” and experienced “constant mind & body paralysis”;
- Client #18 described the mood of her house as “flat”, her “energy was low”, and her children waking up “scared”;
- Client #20 was “grabbed”, her cat was “thrown into a wall”, and her son and daughter saw “colours” standing for different people at home and in the street, which no one else saw;
- Client #24 had “vivid frightening dreams,” and reported “cold rooms, dark shadows” and “objects being thrown”;

³ See AIPR Home page: <http://www.ai princ.org/>

- Client #25 felt being touched and “things crawling over” him, and being “very confused” after suddenly waking up in the night;
- Client #30 experienced “frequent mental disturbances of reliving unpleasant episodes” and being in a “fog of negativity”;
- Client #41 spoke of her son’s “night terrors/night wakings”, his speaking to various entities (spirits, ghosts, etc.), and their animals getting “anxious and scared”;
- Client #52 experienced physical harm (“scratches” and bruises”) and heard “growling” noises;
- Client #55 suffered “moods of depression & anxiety & despair”, and felt she was “being watched”;
- Client #57 experienced “sleep paralysis” and “fingers grabbing” her;
- Client #64 “felt a presence” that lifted up her bed coverings, and “patted” her back;
- Client #65 experienced fear from seeing “shadows” and things moving around the house; her grandson was “lifted and placed away from his chair”;
- Client #66 was woken by “spooks” standing over her at night;
- Client #67 experienced fear and health problems (e.g., constipation, loss of appetite) from a barrage of anomalies, including threatening nightmares, psychic visions, telepathy, synchronicity, and feelings of being hypnotized.

Planned Analyses

Section 1: Transliminality. Our first aim was determine what types of people request clearing services by measuring transliminality (RTS) and comparing the sample mean score to its Rasch (theoretical) mean which works effectively as a norm (see Lange et al., 2000). In the present sample, the mean RTS score was 23.73 ($SD = 4.00$). This mean score is significantly lower than the Rasch-scaled mean of 25.00 ($SD = 5.00$) given in Lange et al. (2000), $t(29) = -1.74$, $p = .046$ (one-tailed). It is suggested that the typical resident who requests clearing services cannot be designated a ‘high transliminal’ (noted for neuroticism, extraversion, psychoticism, unusual experiences, cognitive disorganisation, and dissociation; see Ventola et al., 2019). The difference between males (22.96) and females (24.00) was not significant, $t(28) = -0.62$, $p = .537$ (two-tailed).

It might be argued that highly transliminal individuals are more susceptible to reporting clearing success based on their hypothesized sensitivity to subtle changes in their home environment. Accordingly, we

ran bivariate correlational analyses on RTS and the following ‘success’ variables: (1) ‘How successful’ (i.e., ‘Describe in your own words how successful the clearing was’); (2) ‘haunt clearing’; (3) ‘poltergeist clearing’; (4) ‘Life now’ (i.e., ‘How has your life improved following the clearing?’). One correlation was marginally significant: ‘poltergeist clearing’, $r_s(28) = 0.38$, $p = .064$ (two-tailed), which only suggests that high-transliminals tended to regard poltergeist clearing as successful.

It might also be argued that highly transliminal individuals report more anomalies due to the same hypothesized sensitivity. Accordingly, we ran a correlational analysis on RTS and each of the seven anomalies listed in Table 1, as well as a new composite variable (i.e., ‘total anomalies experienced’), giving us eight variables altogether. There was only one significant correlation, sixth-sense, $r_s(28) = .57$, $p = .001$, and a marginally significant correlation, total anomalies, $r_s(28) = .35$, $p = .062$. To control for multiple testing, the critical α was divided by eight (the number of tests), rendering a new critical $\alpha = .006$, and we see that the RTS/sixth-sense correlation is still significant. We note that RTS did not correlate with any of the three personal wellbeing measures.

Section 2: Personal wellbeing. The Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) was developed to measure subjective dimensions of Quality of Life (i.e., Subjective Wellbeing). In this section, current levels of wellbeing in our ‘clearing’ sample were determined from: (i) the PWI (a.k.a. Subjective Wellbeing; SWB); (ii) Global Life Satisfaction (a.k.a. General Life Satisfaction); and (iii) Spirituality/Religion. We compared sample mean scores to corresponding norms (see Capic et al., 2017; International Wellbeing Group, 2013).

Before any calculations were made on the sample data, it was found that one client (#57) answered consistently 10/10 across all PWI items, so that client was removed since extreme scoring is “often due to ‘response bias’ (a tendency to respond in an affirmative manner) or misunderstanding” (Capic et al., 2017, p. 6). Each raw score was then converted to “a percentage of scale maximum (%SM) score” (Capic et al., 2017, p. 6), so that it falls within a range of 0 to 100 points. Scores and corresponding Australian norms are listed in Table 2.

For PWI score (i.e., Subjective Wellbeing; SWB), the International Wellbeing Group (2013) states that the “normative range for Western means is 70-80 points”, based on the normal distribution of group means (p. 20). Table 2, under the column ‘Full Sample’, shows that the SWB mean score for the sample falls within that normative range given in the previous quote, but it is slightly lower if we go by “the normative range for Australia”. This range, and its corresponding norm, and the norm and range for GLS, come

from Capic et al. (2017), and they are calculated by “combining data across all surveys to date” (p. 7).⁴ It can be seen that the ranges exclude the sample’s SWB and GLS mean values, both of which are also below their respective norms. We note, however, that Spirituality/Religion is within the normative range, and close to the norm.

Table 2
Quality of Life (Australian Norms): Subjective Wellbeing, Global Life Satisfaction, and Spirituality/Religion

Index	Full Sample	Reduced Sample	Norm	Normative Range
Subjective Wellbeing (SWB)	70.8	75.1	75.5*	74.2 to 76.8*
Global Life Satisfaction (GLS)	68.4	74.6	75.9*	76.2 to 79.0*
Spirituality/Religion (S/R)	73.2	72.9	73.8**	65.5 to 82.2**

Notes: * Capic et al. (2017); ** International Wellbeing Group (2013).

However, our statistics included those clients who regarded their clearing as unsuccessful, and we suggest this sub-group dragged the averages down. When only those clients who regarded their clearings as completely successful were assessed (for haunt and poltergeist data combined), the mean point score for SWB rose and now falls within its normative range (revised values are given under the column ‘Reduced Sample’). GLS also rose, still falling outside its normative range, but the difference was not found to be significant when tested against Capic et al.’s (2017) mean score (75.9), $t(14) = 0.05$, $p = .958$ (two-tailed). There were no significant differences between males and females on SWB, GLS, and S/R.

Subjective Wellbeing (SWB) correlated significantly with Global Life Satisfaction (GLS), $r(28) = .69$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed). This correlation is somewhat lower than the figure of .78 reported by Thomas (2005) for his correlation of SWB with the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985), but not significantly different, $z = .94$, $p = .174$ (one-tailed). SWB correlated significantly with Spirituality/Religion, $r(27) = .45$, $p = .014$ (two-tailed).

There were no outliers on SWB and S/R, but there were four outliers who scored very low on GLS. Surprisingly, these four (#25, #9, #52, & #66)

⁴ Norm ranges are based on ‘lower’ and ‘upper’ bounds, which are two standard deviations from mean values derived from combined data from a total of 32 surveys (#3 to #34; see Capic et al., 2017)

did not report all that many anomalies (17, 12, 40, and 29, respectively), with the exception of client #52, since the mean number of anomalies was 19 ($SD = 8$), as reported above (see the section *The anomalies*). Indeed, the count for client #52 is nearly three SD s above the mean, so that person might ordinarily be regarded as having an ‘unsatisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfied’ life. Yet this client had a score of 2 (the second highest possible score) on ‘How Successful’ when rating the clearing work, and a score of 2 (the highest possible score) on ‘Life now’, and stated “... not scared anymore. Feel like I have my house again” after originally claiming, for example, that she had experienced physical harm (“scratches” and bruises”) and heard “growling” noises prior to the clearing. She was also rated as a ‘low-transliminal’. It would be fair to say that this client rationalized her global life satisfaction primarily on the basis of other considerations besides those related to clearing.

Section 3: Success rates. In this section, we consider whether clearing is a worthwhile service needed by disturbed individuals. There are a number of ways of looking at the success rates of clearing, and these rates are given by clients, qualitatively in the form of written self-reports, and quantitatively in the form of measured scale responses on the PWI. The Survey also gave respondents the option to regard their incident as either a haunting, or a poltergeist disturbance, or both if it was not possible to discern one from the other. Incidents were classified as hauntings by 29 respondents (one client was noncommittal), with 25 also thinking they had encountered a poltergeist (i.e., four did not think a poltergeist was involved, but *did* consider that their residence was haunted).

Table 3 shows success rates for 25 clients who responded directly to both scales (haunt and poltergeist), which were of the Likert type, and reverse-scored (i.e., ratings were between 5 = *completely successful*, and 1 = *not at all successful*). Figures have been collapsed for ease of interpretation (counts of *not sure* were regarded as unsuccessful). It can be seen that 88% of clients generally regarded their residences as cleared *at least* partially. Not shown in Table 3 are figures for *completely successful* haunt clearings (19 out of 29; 66%), and *completely successful* poltergeist clearings (17 out of 25; 68%).

Success was indicated in two other ways: First, there was a free-response (self-report) question that directly asked clients ‘How successful’. Clients gave detailed responses, and written comments were converted to one of four values (0, 1, 2, or 3): 0 equated with opinions indicating no success; 1 equated with neutral responses (little achieved; mostly negative); 2 equated with partial success (mostly positive); and 3 equated with complete success (no complaints).

Table 3
Success Rates for Clearing of Hauntings and Poltergeists

Success Rate	Males	Females	Total
Completely or partially successful	5 (20%)	17 (68%)	22 (88%)
Not very successful or not at all successful	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)
Total	7 (28%)	18 (72%)	25 (100%)

Only two comments out of 29 were rated as 0 (7%); 7 were given neutral ratings of 1 (24%); 7 were rated as 2 (24%), and 13 were rated as 3 (45%). So, the typical rating was 3 (the highest rating). One client (a 67-year-old male) had sought help from a priest from the Roman Catholic church, so his rating was confounded (“I believe the place was cleared prior to Rob’ [sic] visit. I had a Catholic priest come in and bless the whole apartment and all strange activity ceased from that time.”).

Second, there was a free-response (self-report) measure referred to as ‘Life now’. Clients described how their lives (home life, general living), and/or those of their families, perceived their lives to be after the clearing. Written comments were easily converted to one of three values (0, 1, or 2), as we found clients gave only three types of responses: 0 was allocated to comments expressing complete dissatisfaction with the clearing, or complaints that it had not worked (e.g., “I’m still scared”; “The problem persists”); 1 was allocated to comments describing the clearing process as giving some relief at first, but there were still some problems (e.g., “Things are a little easier, but I still sense a presence”; “It did improve for a while but ‘it’ has returned”); 2 was allocated to comments describing the clearing as completely successful with absolutely no negativity reported (e.g., “I am more relaxed, feel more myself and more peaceful in myself”; “I feel more positive and I am looking forward to the future”; “There has been a massive improvement”; “We sleep better”; “No more damage”, etc.).

Only three comments out of 30 were rated as 0 (10%); 9 were rated as 1 (30%); and 17 were rated as 2 (60%). So, the typical rating was 2 (the highest rating). The count of ratings at 2 (60%) is on par with the earlier statistic for *completely successful* haunt clearings (66%), and *completely successful* poltergeist clearings (68%), given that some clients did not respond to those two items. There were no differences between males and females.

When we tested the ‘Life Now’ variable further, it was found to correlate with responses to ‘How Successful’. Table 4 shows the correlation was significant and medium in strength, indicating a tendency for life to be regarded as more improved the more clearing was regarded as successful. Two other correlations also indicated success: ‘Life Now’ correlated significant with ratings on haunt clearing, and ratings on poltergeist clearing, and the correlations were also moderately strong: there was a tendency for life to be regarded as more improved when haunt and poltergeist clearings were regarded as successful. Perhaps not surprisingly, ‘How Successful’ (a measure of success) correlated highly with success ratings on both haunt clearing *and* poltergeist clearing, and both types of clearing also highly correlated.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix (Spearman’s r_s): Four Success Measures

Scale	1.	2.	3.
1. Life Now	—		
2. How Successful	.53*		
3. Haunt Cleared	.61**	.80**	
4. Polt Cleared	.52***	.79**	.74**

* $p = .003$; ** $p < .001$; *** $p = .008$; All tests are two-tailed; row 2, $df = 28$; row 3, $df = 27$; row 4, $df = 23$.

Post Hoc Analyses

Although we expected ‘Life Now’ to correlate with Subjective Wellbeing (SWB), since they are both about quality of life, the correlation was not significant (see Table 5). This result is surprising as the two measures were administered and responses recorded at the same time (i.e., at the time the Surveys were completed). Nor did ‘Life Now’ correlate significantly with Global Life Satisfaction, or Spirituality/Religion. The other success measure, ‘How successful’ did not correlate significantly with any of the three PWB measures either.

The SWB measure is comprised of seven items, each of which corresponds to a quality-of-life domain. The correlations for these and the other measures are also given in Table 5. ‘How successful’ correlated significantly with ‘Personal Relationships’ ($p < .05$). However, if we control for multiple testing, the critical α divided by 20 (the number of tests) yields

a new critical $\alpha = .00025$, so that the r_s value is no longer significant. We must regard these two ‘success’ ratings (‘How successful’ and ‘Life now’) as either orthogonal to the various measures of personal wellbeing, or not sufficiently pertinent in the minds of clients to be factored into a general overview of wellbeing (see the DISCUSSION for further details).

Table 5
Correlation Matrix (Spearman’s r_s): Personal Wellbeing Scales

Scale	How Successful	Life Now
1. Global Life Satisfaction	.19	-.04
2. Subjective Wellbeing (SWB)	.13	-.13
2a. Standard of Living	.15	-.19
2b. Health	-.08	-.20
2c. Achieving in Life	.10	-.07
2d. Personal Relationships	.38*	.09
2e. How safe you feel	.31	.12
2f. Community-feeling	-.06	-.30
2g. Future security	.15	-.13
3. Spirituality/Religion	.16	.08

* $p = .041$; All tests are two-tailed; rows 1 to 2c, $df = 28$; rows 2d to 3, $df = 27$.

DISCUSSION

In this study we aimed to determine (i) what types of people request clearing services; (ii) current levels of wellbeing in a typical ‘clearing’ sample, and (iii) whether clearing has utility. It was expected that the current design would furnish the AIPR with independent feedback on the second author’s (R.T.’s) clearing work, and the probable benefits of clearing could then be conveyed to the wider community. To be specific about our aims, we expected that a number of important questions relating to haunting and poltergeists, and the clearing process itself, would be answered, such as: Have people’s lives improved? Have only certain types of people benefitted from clearing? Did some problems return? The answer was ‘Yes’ to all questions—life did improve for a majority of clients, and transliminality and subjective wellbeing scores were effectively on par with

corresponding norms, although the haunt/poltergeist problems did return for a minority. The kinds of problems that returned were generally the same as those reported in *The anomalies* section above (see RESULTS).

We found the typical client in the clearing study, was a 44-year-old female at the time the haunt/poltergeist episode occurred; she was living in a house at the time, with a significant other and one child, and those other occupants generally experienced the same anomalies (see above two sections, *The anomalies* and *The reports*). Having said that, a minority (10%) lived alone, and about one third of clients had lived in a haunted residence prior to living in the current residence where the episodes occurred. Her typical experiences were a sensed presence (in the house), a sense of being stared at, seeing apparitions and objects moving, hearing unexplained noises (e.g., doors banging, footsteps), and feelings of being touched (for details see the section, *The anomalies*).

Two measures were administered to clients: the Rasch-scaled Transliminality Scale (RTS; Lange et al., 2000), and the Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI; International Wellbeing Group, 2013). The mean RTS score for the sample was significantly lower than the Rasch mean. In addition to the above typological profile, the typical client in our sample was not likely to have the usual psychopathology or ‘dis-ease’ indicated for high transliminals (see Ventola et al., 2019). In fact, she is more likely to be a low transliminal, noted for being emotionally stable and less reactive to stress, prone to introversion and passivity; is cognitively organised, and not prone to dissociation or unusual experiences. Males and females were the same in that regard.

Transliminality did not correlate with any clearing success measure, but (after adjusting for multiple analysis) did correlate significantly with one frequency measure of anomalous activity we referred to as ‘sixth-sense’. Specifically, this variable included reports of feeling a sensed presence and a sense of being stared at or watched. This type of finding is in keeping with Houran et al. (2002a, 2002b) who reported significant correlations between transliminality and number of anomalous experiences, including poltergeist and haunt phenomena.

Personal wellbeing (i.e., quality of life) was measured in three ways on the Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)—Subjective wellbeing (SWB), Global Life Satisfaction (GLS), and Spirituality/Religion (S/R)—and we found scoring for our sample on all three measures were on par with Australian and Western norms. However, we have no way of knowing whether clients’ quality of life was below par prior to the haunting/poltergeist incidents, and we cannot claim that clearing was responsible for restoring the clients to a stable quality of life, if there was any kind of restoration *per se*. That is, other factors affecting any number of clients may have run concurrently with the clearing work, such as more

focussed support from family and/or friends, change of employment, taking up hobbies, and so on. Furthermore, ‘Life now’ and ‘How successful’ did not correlate significantly with any of the three SWB measures (nor component items), which suggests these ‘success’ ratings are independent of (orthogonal to) personal wellbeing (as a case in point, rating on the GLS measure for client #52 indicates this conclusion is justified)—alternatively, if successful clearing was a consideration in the ratings of wellbeing, it was not to a measurable degree. Nevertheless, we found all four ‘success’ measures correlated significantly and were medium-to-high in strength (see Table 4), suggesting our rating system accurately tapped clients’ responses, and the four measures may indeed have concurrent validity.

Findings indicate an 88% partial or complete success rate of clearing, although more conservative ratings for *complete success* range from 66% for haunt clearings to 68% for poltergeist clearings. Clients generally described their lives after the clearing in generally favourable terms, and notably referred to their lives as improved. The success rate of 60% reported by Gauld and Cornell (1979) is comparable to ours.

In closing, while the study was retrospective and pre-experimental (i.e., not a true experiment), and did not have pre-clearing and post-clearing measures (hence, no formal hypotheses); it was not limited in its findings. We were able to explore areas of interest more thoroughly and methodically than, say, by mere phone call or email inquiry. Of course, the option is there to develop specific and testable hypotheses. A subsequent study is advised that incorporates a repeated-measures design (involving measures before and after clearing). Specifically, ‘clearers’ (i.e., Robb Tilley, and/or his trained assistants) should administer the RTS and the PWI to clients before clearing work begins. A paranormal belief/experience measure, such as Thalbourne’s (2010a) Australian Sheep-Goat Scale, would also be appropriate. Clearers should then follow-up their clearing work by asking clients to complete the same measures at pre-defined intervals (e.g., 2 months, 6 months, and 12 months). Semi-structured interviewing of clearing experients may also be conducted. The interview material might then be subjected to “interpretative phenomenological analysis aimed at yielding comprehensive constituent themes that capture the essential aspects of the clearing experience” (A. J. Rock, personal communication, March 5, 2015).

Conclusion

We were interested in the *current* quality of life of people who have had their homes ‘cleared’ of hauntings and/or poltergeists. To type clients who make clearing requests, we administered Thalbourne’s (1996) Transliminality Scale to assess various sensitivities, and the Personal Wellbeing Index (International Wellbeing Group, 2013), to assess quality of

life. On average, clients were ‘low transliminals’, which tends to indicate emotional stability, passivity, and introversion, but not proneness to dissociation or unusual experiences. Clients’ scores on subjective wellbeing were on par with corresponding norms, but we cannot claim that subjective wellbeing was due to clearing. Findings indicate an 88% partial or complete success rate of clearing, although more conservative ratings for *complete success* range from 66% for haunt clearings to 68% for poltergeist clearings. Clients generally described their lives after the clearing in favourable terms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Results from this study were presented at the AIPR Mini-Conference 2019, and can be viewed at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q3mKMJ3oRps>
We thank the Cardigan Fund for financial support of this project. We also thank the late Dr. Laurence Cox (1945-2016) for his earlier contributions, particularly during the initial stages of survey distribution and collection. Dr. Cox was very enthusiastic about being involved in the project; indeed, his keen interest was instrumental in launching the project. For information about Dr. Cox, see the June 2016 issue of the *Australian Journal of Parapsychology* (pp. 102-104).

THE AUTHORS

Lance Storm earned a B.A. (Honours) in psychology (1998) and a Ph.D. in psychology and parapsychology (2002) at the University of Adelaide, South Australia, where he conducts research in psychology and parapsychology. He is Chief Editor of the *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*.

Robb Tilley has been an active member of the AIPR since 1982. Robb was Vice-President of the Australian Transpersonal Psychology Association for 16 years. He is Managing Editor of the *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*.

REFERENCES

- Alvarado, C. S. (1983). Psychological evaluations of poltergeist agents: A critique. In R. A. White & R. S. Broughton (Eds.). *Research in Parapsychology 1983* (pp. 117-118). Scarecrow Press.

- Auerbach, L. (2005). *A paranormal casebook: Ghost hunting in the new millennium*. Atriad Press.
- Braude, S. E. (2003). *Immortal remains: Evidence for life after death*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Capic, T., Hutchinson, D., Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M., Richardson, B., Hartley-Clark, L., Khor, S., Olsson, C., & Cummins, R. A. (2017). *Australian Unity Wellbeing Index*. Australian Centre on Quality of Life.
- Dixon, J. (2016). A case of ostensible poltergeist phenomena resulting in lingering haunt phenomena. *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 16, 7-39.
- Evans, H. (2001). The ghost experience in a wider context. In J. Houran & R. Lange (Eds.), *Hauntings and poltergeists: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 41-61). McFarland.
- Ferber, S. (2004). *Demonic possession and exorcism in early modern France*. Routledge.
- Francis, L. J., & Williams, E. (2009). Contacting the spirits of the dead: Paranormal belief and the teenage worldview. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 18, 20-35.
- Gauld, A. (1982). *Mediumship and survival: A century of investigations*. Heinemann.
- Gauld, A., & Cornell, A. D. (1979). *Poltergeists*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Houran, J. (2002). Analysis of haunt experiences at a historical Illinois landmark. *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 2, 97-124.
- Houran, J., Kumar, V. K., Thalbourne, M. A., & Lavertue, N. E. (2002a). Haunted by somatic tendencies: Spirit infestation as psychogenic illness. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 5, 119-133.
- Houran, J., Wiseman, R., & Thalbourne, M. A. (2002b). Perceptual-personality characteristics associated with naturalistic haunt experiences. *European Journal of Parapsychology*, 17, 17-44.
- International Wellbeing Group (2013). *Personal Wellbeing Index – Adult Manual (5th Edition)*. The Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University.
- Irwin, H. J., & Watt, C. (2007). *An introduction to parapsychology* (5th ed.). McFarland.
- Kramer, W. H., Bauer, E., & Hövelmann, G. H. (Eds.). (2012). *Perspectives of clinical parapsychology: An introductory reader*. Stichting Het Johan Borgman Fonds.
- Kumar, V. K., Pekala, R. J., & Gallagher, C. (1994). *The Anomalous Experiences Inventory*. Unpublished psychological test. West Chester University.
- Lange, R., Thalbourne, M.A., Houran, J., & Storm, L. (2000). The revised Transliminality Scale: Reliability and validity data from a Rasch top-

- down purification procedure. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 9, 591-617.
- Lau, A. L. D., & Cummins, R. A. (2005). Test-retest reliability of the Personal Wellbeing Index. Unpublished research report, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.
- Laythe, B., Houran, J., & Ventola, A. (2018). A split-sample psychometric study of 'haunters.' *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 81, 193-218.
- Moody, R. J. (1988). *The light beyond*. McMillan.
- Munro, P. (2015, February 5). Defeating the devil: Why exorcism in Australia is on the rise. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from <https://www.smh.com.au/lifestyle/defeating-the-devil-why-exorcism-in-australia-is-on-the-rise-20150121-12uuld.html>
- Ring, K. (1984). *Heading towards omega*. Quill.
- Rogo, D. S. (1986). *On the track of the poltergeist*. Prentice Hall.
- Roll, W. (1983). The psychopathological and psychophysiological theories of the RSPK agent. In R. A. White & R. S. Broughton (Eds.). *Research in Parapsychology 1983* (pp. 118-119). Scarecrow Press.
- Roll, W. (2006). A discussion of the evidence that personal consciousness persists after death with special reference to poltergeist phenomena. *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 6, 5-20.
- Stevenson, I. (1972). Are poltergeists living or are they dead? *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 66, 233-252.
- Thalbourne, M. A. (1996). An attempt to predict precognition scores using transliminality-relevant variables. *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 61, 129-140.
- Thalbourne, M.A. (2003). *A glossary of terms used in parapsychology*. Puente Publications.
- Thalbourne, M. A. (2010a). The Australian Sheep-Goat Scale: Development and empirical findings. *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 10, 5-39.
- Thalbourne, M. A. (2010b). Transliminality: A fundamental mechanism in psychology and parapsychology. *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 10, 70-81.
- Thalbourne, M. A., & Houran, J. (2000). Transliminality, the Mental Experience Inventory, and tolerance of ambiguity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 853-863.
- Thalbourne, M. A., & Houran, J. (2005). Patterns of self-reported happiness and substance use in the context of transliminality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 327-336.
- Thomas, J. (2005). Satyananda yogic lifestyle and subjective wellbeing. *YOGA: The Bihar School of Yoga*. Retrieved from <http://www.yogamag.net/archives/2008/bfeb08/life.shtml>

- Tilley, R. (2002). Poltergeist disturbances and hauntings brought to a lasting successful conclusion (some failures too). *Australian Journal of Parapsychology*, 2(2), 127-160.
- Tomyn, A. J., Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M., & Cummins, R. A. (2013). The Personal Wellbeing Index: Psychometric Equivalence for Adults and School Children. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3), 913-924. doi: 10.1007/s11205-011-9964-9.
- Ventola, A., Houran, J., Laythe, B., Storm, L., Parra, A., Dixon, J., & Kruth, J. G. (2019). A transliminal 'dis-ease' model of 'poltergeist agents.' *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 83, 144-171.
- Williams, B., & Ventola, A. (2011). Poltergeist phenomena: A primer on parapsychological research and perspectives. Public Parapsychology.org. Retrieved from <http://publicparapsychology.org/Public%20Parapsych/Poltergeist%20Phenomena%20Primer%20Final.pdf>
- Zahradnik, F., & von Lucadou, W. (2012). A counseling approach to extraordinary experiences. In W. Kramer, E. Bauer, & G. H. Hövelmann (Eds.), *Perspectives of clinical parapsychology: An introductory reader* (pp. 118-134). Stichting Het Johan Borgman Fonds.

*Lance Storm
School of Psychology
University of Adelaide
Adelaide SA 5005
AUSTRALIA*

Email: lance.storm@adelaide.edu.au

*Robb Tilley
c/o AIPR, Inc.
P O Box 295
Gladesville NSW 2111
AUSTRALIA*

APPENDIX A

Information Sheet



AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF PARAPSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH, INC.

Reg. No. YD7380-25 Associations Incorporation Act (NSW). Founded, 1977.

• Telephone: 9816 4279 or (0408) 648 849 • P.O. Box 295, Gladesville 2111 • www.aiprinc.org

Information Sheet—Haunt and Poltergeist Clearing in Australian Residences

My name is Dr Lance Storm, I am a university researcher with a PhD conducting research into psychically clearing unwanted haunting and poltergeisty. Our records show that you sought help with such problems from the Australian Institute of Parapsychological Research Inc (AIPR. Inc) and that Robb Tilley provided his services to you. We would like to find out how successful Mr. Tilley's services have been. Your help in this research project is very valuable. This is the first time that such research has been conducted anywhere in the world.

The details you provide will remain confidential and all research will be conducted in an ethical and legal way consistent with our duty of care obligation to you.

Please complete this questionnaire and return by email to lance.storm@adelaide.edu.au

For any questions concerning the ethical conduct of the research, please contact Dr. Paul Delfabbro, chair of the Human Research Ethics Subcommittee in the School of Psychology, 8313 4936 or paul.delfabbro@adelaide.edu.au.

Participant's Consent

1. I have read the above participant information and agree to take part in this research program.
2. I have had the project, so far as it affects me, fully explained to my satisfaction by the research worker. My consent is given freely.
3. I have been informed that, while information gained during the study may be published, I will not be identified and my personal results will not be divulged.
4. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time.

Participant Signature: Date:..... / / 20...

APPENDIX B

AIPR Survey—Haunt and Poltergeist Clearing in Australian Residences

ID Number Sex: M / F

Date of Birth: .../.../.....

Age:

Postcode:

Your dwelling (tick one):

- house
- flat/unit/apartment

Who you live with (tick one):

- I live alone
- I live with a significant other (e.g., spouse, de facto)
- I live with a significant other and a child/children
- I live with a nonsignificant other (e.g., flat-mate, house-mate, lodger)
- I live with a nonsignificant other and a child/children (mine or nonsignificant others)

Before the clearing by Robb Tilley what did you experience?

Please describe in your own words:

.....
.....
.....

Describe in your own words how successful the clearing was:

.....
.....
.....

Was Robb Tilley's psychic clearing of the hauntings ...

- completely successful
- partially successful
- not sure
- not very successful
- not at all successful

Was Robb Tilley's psychic clearing of the poltergeisty ...

- completely successful
- partially successful
- not sure
- not very successful
- not at all successful

How much time has passed since the clearing?

.....
.....
.....

How long did it take before there was no more paranormal activity in your home?

.....
.....
.....

How has your life improved following the clearing?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Before the clearing by Robb Tilley did you experienced any of the following?
Please tick appropriate boxes:

Seeing:

- saw mystical beings, such as angels or demons
- saw elves, fairies, and other types of little people
- seeing objects floating in the air
- apparitions (of deceased entities you do not know)
- apparitions (of deceased entities you know)
- apparitions (of living entities you know)
- apparitions (of living entities you do not know)
- objects moving/moved
- objects thrown
- opening and/or closing of doors
- opening and/or closing of drawers
- lights switched on and/or off by themselves
- electrical appliances switching on/off by themselves
- animals shy away from specific area(s)

Hearing:

- banging (doors, windows, etc)
- banging (unexplained, unlocated)
- knocking/tapping (doors, windows, etc)
- knocking/tapping (unexplained, unlocated)
- scratching sounds (walls, doors, windows, etc)
- scratching sounds (unexplained, unlocated)
- door-bell ringing (doors, etc)
- door-bell ringing (unexplained, unlocated)
- footsteps
- footsteps (unexplained, unlocated)
- music
- music (unexplained, unlocated)
- name calling, or hearing voices (please specify:
.....)

Smells:

- pleasant smell
- unpleasant smell: body odour
- unpleasant smell, tobacco
- unpleasant smell, dirty old man smell (uriniferous)
- other unpleasant smell (please specify:
.....)

Taste:

- experienced an unusual taste in my mouth

Touch:

- mysterious sense of cold spot
- mysterious sense of heat
- I was scratched, cut, bitten or otherwise physically injured
- unusual breeze or a rush of air and wind
- touching of the victim

Physical Movement:

- body movement (involuntary)
- body paralysis (involuntary)
- violent assault
- significant other(s) move out

Sixth Sense:

- experienced a sense of déjà vu
- I communicated with the dead
- experienced my physical body floating in the air

Sixth Sense (Cont'd):

- I felt possessed by an outside force
- felt unusual sensations in my body (dizziness, tingling, nausea)
- a sense of being stared at or being watched
- sensed presence
- emotional effects
- victim speaking in another voice (involuntary)
- psychic assault (details not specified by victim)
- victim reports being inhabited/possessed (involuntary)
- sexual assault of victim
- your mood thoughts or behaviour being influenced while in haunted house
- notice the difference when not in the haunted house
- is this the first time you have experienced being in a haunted house/place?
- do you normally have psychic experiences

If not specified above, describe in detail what was happening

.....
.....
.....

Significant Other(s)

- Did other people report any of the above: (e.g., Noises, Smells, Sightings, etc.):

.....
.....

Since the clearing, have you experienced any of the above (e.g., Noises, Smells, Sightings, etc.—see pages 12 to 14)

- Yes
- No

If Yes, please specify:

.....
.....

Other comments:

.....
.....
.....

Were you happy to pay a small fee to Robb Tilley for his services?

.....
.....

* * *

APPENDIX C

Transliminality Scale (Form B)

Your Date of Birth: ___/___/___

Your Age: _____

Your Sex: M F

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. | Horoscopes are right too often for it to be coincidence. | T | F |
| 2. | At times I perform certain little rituals to ward off negative influences. | T | F |
| 3. | I have experienced an altered state of consciousness in which I felt that I became cosmically enlightened. | T | F |
| 4. | At the present time, I am very good at make-believe and imagining. | T | F |
| 5. | I have felt that I had received special wisdom, to be communicated to the rest of humanity. | T | F |
| 6. | I have sometimes behaved in a much more impulsive or uninhibited way than is usual for me. | T | F |
| 7. | I am fascinated by new ideas, whether or not they have a practical value. | T | F |
| 8. | I have sometimes sensed an evil presence around me, although I could not see it. | T | F |
| 9. | My thoughts have sometimes come so quickly that I couldn't write them all down fast enough. | T | F |
| 10. | If I could not pretend or make-believe anymore, I wouldn't be me—I wouldn't be the same person. | T | F |
| 11. | Sometimes I experience things as if they were doubly real. | T | F |
| 12. | It is sometimes possible for me to be completely immersed in nature or in art and to feel as if my whole state of consciousness has somehow been temporarily altered. | T | F |
| 13. | Often I have a day when indoor lights seem so bright that they bother my eyes. | T | F |
| 14. | I am convinced that I have had at least one experience of telepathy between myself and another person. | T | F |
| 15. | I am convinced that I am psychic. | T | F |

APPENDIX C (CONT'D)

Transliminality Scale (*cont'd*)

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 16. | I have experienced an altered state of consciousness which I believe utterly transformed (in a positive way) the way I looked at myself. | T | F |
| 17. | I am convinced that I have had a premonition about the future that came true and which (I believe) was not just a coincidence. | T | F |
| 18. | I think I really know what some people mean when they talk about mystical experience. | T | F |
| 19. | I have gone through times when smells seemed stronger and more overwhelming than usual. | T | F |
| 20. | I can clearly feel again in my imagination such things as: the feeling of a gentle breeze, warm sand under my feet, the softness of fur, cool grass, the warmth of the sun and the smell of freshly cut grass. | T | F |
| 21. | A person should try to understand their dreams and be guided by or take warnings from them. | T | F |
| 22. | While listening to my favorite music, in addition to feeling calm, Relaxed, happy, etc., I often have a feeling of oneness with the music, or of being in another place or time, or vividly remembering the past. | T | F |
| 23. | At times I somehow feel the presence of someone who is not physically there. | T | F |
| 24. | I am convinced that it is possible to gain information about the thoughts, feelings or circumstances of another person, in a way that does not depend on rational prediction or normal sensory channels. | T | F |
| 25. | For several days at a time I have had such a heightened awareness of sights and sounds that I cannot shut them out. | T | F |
| 26. | I sometimes have a feeling of gaining or losing energy when certain people look at me or touch me. | T | F |
| 27. | Now that I am grown up, I still in some ways believe in such beings as elves, witches, leprechauns, fairies, etc. | T | F |
| 28. | Sometimes people think I'm a bit weird because my ideas are so novel. | T | F |
| 29. | When listening to organ music or other powerful music, I sometimes feel as if I am being lifted up into the air. | T | F |

APPENDIX D

Personal Wellbeing Index

The following questions ask how satisfied you feel, on a scale from zero to 10. Zero means you feel no satisfaction at all and 10 means you feel completely satisfied.

Part 1 [Optional Item]

1. "Thinking about your own life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?"

No satisfaction at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely Satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part 2

1. "How satisfied are you with your standard of living?"

No satisfaction at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely Satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. "How satisfied are you with your health?"

No satisfaction at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely Satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. "How satisfied are you with what you are achieving in life?"

No satisfaction at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely Satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX D (CONT'D)

Personal Wellbeing Index (cont'd)

4. "How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?"

No satisfaction at all											Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. "How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?"

No satisfaction at all											Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. "How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?"

No satisfaction at all											Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. "How satisfied are you with your future security?"

No satisfaction at all											Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[Optional item]

8. "How satisfied are you with your spirituality or religion?"

No satisfaction at all											Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you for your information. Please return forms to:
lance.storm@adelaide.edu.au